

Chapter 4: Pressures for Change

Major social change occurred in the American Sociological Society as well as American society during the turbulent decade of the 1930s.

To some extent the pressures producing change in our subsystem reflected the pressures pressing for change in the total society.

At both levels, there were economic and employment problems; public relations concerns, international entanglements, constitutional considerations, democratic pressures and organizational change.

And, at both levels, decisions were made to seek new means for getting the work done rather than to curtail expansion and services to members.

This article will cover the economic and employment problems confronted by the American Sociology Society in that period as well as its public relations concerns and international entanglement.

The next chapter will deal with organizational changes in the Society that stemmed from Constitutional revisions, the founding of the *American Sociological Review*, relationships with regional

sociological societies, the scope of the Society's research mission, and pressures for participation.

Economic

The Society began to experience small deficits as early as 1918. By 1925, the growing problem led the Finance Committee to state that it "is inclined to the belief that the activities of the Society cannot be adequately carried on with the present income of the society. It therefore respectfully recommends that the Secretary-Treasurer be authorized to send out an appeal to the members for next year, or that the Executive Committee give thought to the question of raising the dues."

In 1926, Maurice J. Karpf, Finance Committee Chair, reported that "the generous response on the part of the membership to the request for contributions last year is at least some index of the many friends which the Society has. Your Committee is confident that there are a number of members who will be willing to pay a larger annual fee in order to make it possible for the Society to function as it should." Total amount raised: \$726.50.

A new dues structure was established: \$5.00 members, \$10.00 subscribing member, \$25.00 contributing member, \$100.00 life member, and \$6.00 for joint membership.

The problem, however, worsened. By 1932, the debt stood at the all-time high of \$2,648.85. Contributing to the crisis were rising costs for publications, clerical assistance and postage plus a declining membership. In 1931, membership stood at 1567. It tumbled to 996 by 1937 before rebounding to 1034 in 1940.

In 1934, President F. Stuart Chapin instructed the Finance Committee to develop a plan to retire the debt. Up to this time, the University of Chicago Press carried the debt for the Society interest free. It now wanted five percent interest effective April 1935.

The Finance Committee was composed of Arthur J. Todd, Chair; E.W. Burgess, Earle Eubank, John L. Gillin, M.J. Karpf, E.D. Tetreau, and R. Clyde White.

In May 1935, the Committee developed a plan to sell members non-interest-bearing Certificates of Indebtedness in \$10.00 denominations. These Certificates were to be issued in order of purchase, with the agreement that they would be retired serially, at the rate of 20 per year, beginning with the 1936 fiscal year. Eventually, 135 Certificates were sold raising \$1,350.

In 1938, Dwight Sanderson, Finance Committee Chair, reported,

"We are glad to report that the financial condition of the Society is in excellent shape and that it has a good surplus over all its obligations." By that time, 65 Certificates had been redeemed.

Employment

In 1933, W.C. Reckless asked the Executive Committee to establish a committee "to study the opportunities for trained sociologists in non-teaching fields." The Committee on Opportunities for Trained Sociologists was formed in January 1934. It was composed of Wilson Gee, Charles C. Peters, Joseph Mayer, Maurice Parmelee, Ernest B. Harper, Clifford R. Shaw, M.C. Elmer, and Reckless as Chair.

During that same month an article appeared in the *American Journal of Sociology* by F. Stuart Chapin entitled, "The Present Status of the Profession," calling attention to the danger of overproduction of PhD's in sociology. Hiring by colleges had been curtailed by the Depression.

In 1935, the Committee reported that although there had been "a marked increase in the use of social scientists in public service" sociologists did not benefit from it as much as economists, political scientists, lawyers and social workers.

The Committee explained, "The main reason for this is that the administrators of practical affairs do not know what delivery a sociologist can make nearly so well as they know what can be ex-

pected of an economist, a commerce student, a political scientist, a lawyer or a social worker."

"By way of further explanation, it is undoubtedly true that sociology has maintained a greater degree of academic isolation than have its flanking disciplines, that sociology has been almost exclusively preoccupied with the training of teachers of the subject, and that until recent years it has shown a conspicuous lack of practical and applied research work—research that would be of immediate value to public administrators."

Even when sociologists are hired, the Committee reported, they are "called to minor positions" because "leaders in public affairs look upon sociology mainly as an academic discipline which does not possess men capable of coming to grips with concrete problems, and all this despite the *Recent Social Trends* study."

In 1936, the "Opportunities Committee" recommended the creation of "a permanent committee for the promotion of the professional interests of sociologists" because "heretofore, the American Sociological Society has functioned primarily as a learned society, providing an outlet for contact, meetings and papers and promoting fellowship and research. But it finds that the Society has not come to grips in any thorough way with the promotion of professional interests lying outside the fostering of an academic discipline."

The Committee urged the Soci-

ety to promote the professional interests of sociologists by pursuing "the most fruitful lines of endeavor" listed below:

1. To get sociological training and field experience recognizes as a qualification or substitute qualification for certain Federal and state civil service positions.

2. To study ways of gearing the graduate training program in sociology to meet the need for equipping students for technical positions in Federal bureaus and administrations and in state and local agencies.

3. To see to it that sociology gets a stake and protects its interests in the development of original and state planning commissions, in the reorganizations of state welfare set-ups, new Federal administrations, etc.

4. To establish a chairman of a sub-committee on publicity, whose job it will be to send releases to the press and periodicals, covering items on important contributions and developments within sociology and the Society.

5. To move wisely and expeditiously against the practice of hiring persons without any graduate training in sociology as teachers of sociology in American universities and colleges.

6. To take cautious steps toward opening up sociology in large university centers which persist in suppressing it.

The Committee concluded, "The Opportunities Committee in its three years of work has been impressed by the fact that

sociologists in America not only have been defenseless professionally but also have not been organized to participate very extensively in recent Federal and state developments."

"The record is clear, even in cursory inspection of Federal civil service specifications, as to which professional groups have been equipped to look after their own interests. If sociology as a profession is to have any status and growth, it appears to the Opportunities Committee that the parent Society needs to take steps to promote and protect the professional interests of sociologists in America."

Public Relations

Public relations concerns were first addressed by the Society with the formation of the Committee to Consider Means for Disseminating Important Sociological Research Findings in 1932. M.C. Elmer presented reports in 1933 and 1934 before the Committee was disbanded.

In summer 1938, however, President Frank H. Hankins appointed a Press Relations Committee for the purpose of "making available to the press information regarding the Society's thirty-third annual convention."

The Committee was composed of Alfred McClung Lee, Chair; Read Bain, Frank H. Hankins, Robert E. Park, Harold A. Phelps and Malcolm M. Willey.

In 1939, the Committee made some specific recommendations

regarding the press relations of the Society, and prefaced them with the following remarks:

"Social scientists, and especially sociologists, have been slow to emulate the physical scientists in this respect. The reasons for this—and weighty reasons they are—are readily discernible. After all, the subject matter and theories of social scientists are more controversial, less easily interpreted in a professionally desirable fashion, and more readily distorted by prejudice and emotion, than are the subject matters and theories of the physicists, chemists and biologists."

"On the other hand, for the theories of social scientists to gain wide acceptance, they must finally reach the columns of popular periodicals, the speeches of popular leaders, and the discussions of *Everyman*. Or, if you will, since we are so fortunate as to live in a democracy, and since many of us draw our salaries from governmental units, our facts and theories are subject to popular scrutiny *whether they are ready for such scrutiny or not*. In fact, to a large degree, the future of our science and of our profession depends upon the sort of personality-stereotype popularly held of the sociologist and the sort of institution-stereotype popularly held of sociology."

The Committee recommended the following:

1. A Press Relations Committee of technically-trained newspapermen-sociologists, i.e.,

of sociologists who have had newspaper and public relations experience, should become a continuing service agency of the American Sociological Society.

2. The work of such a Committee should be extended to include the interpretation of features of the year-long program of the Society other than the Annual Convention. We refer particularly to the *American Sociological Review*.

3. A more adequate appropriation.

In 1938, the Committee was allocated \$50.00. In 1939, it requested \$150.00.

International

The Society expanded its scope to the international level in 1918 when the Business Meeting authorized President Charles H. Cooley to send "a message of greetings" to Rene Worms, Secretary, International Institute of Sociology, as well as to sociological societies "in the nations recently our allies in arms, with a view to establishing a better understanding in our common labor."

In 1924, the Society took another step into the international arena by approving "honorary memberships for distinguished scholars." By 1940, those so honored included Rene Worms, L.T. Hobhouse, Leopold von Wiese, Ferdinand Tonnies, Marcel Mauss, Charles Bougle, Victor B. Branford, G.L. Duprat, Franz Oppenheimer, Maurice Halbwachs and Eduard Benes.

In 1935, the Society initiated a move that was to generate controversy through the remainder of the decade. It appointed a committee composed of Earle Eubank, Robert Park, and Pitirim Sorokin to study the question of affiliation with the International Federation of Sociological Societies and Institutes.

The Federation was organized in 1933 by Duprat as part of the International Institute of Sociology founded by Worms in 1893. In 1909, the Institute was incorporated under the government of France, from which it received a small subsidy. The Federation published the *Archives de Sociologie*. The Federation and the Institute were "the only authentic international sociological organizations in existence" at that time.

In 1936, the Committee recommended that the Society affiliate with the Federation provided that certain changes were made in its by-laws. In 1937, the Federation made the specified changes.

During a meeting of the Executive Committee later that year Burgess made a motion, seconded by H.P. Fairchild, to affiliate with the Federal Federation on the additional condition that steps be taken during the next International Sociological Congress to separate the Federation from the Institute.

L.L. Bernard offered a substitute motion, seconded by Dorothy Thomas, to delay the affiliation for one year to see if the separation actually took place. The substitute

motion was defeated and the original motion passed. Bernard also attempted to delay the action during the Business Meeting, but the action to affiliate was approved.

In 1938, Parmelee presented a resolution during the first Business Meeting requesting "that the Society rescinds every decision of the Executive Committee and of the Society concerning affiliation" with the Federation. He was concerned about the number of delegates the Society would receive in addition to the separation problem. The motion was tabled for further deliberation.

During the second Business Meeting, Eubank read a letter from Rene Maunier, Federation President, stating that the separation would take place. The motion

was then referred to the Executive Committee for a report at the next Business Meeting.

At the third Business Meeting, George Lundberg moved that all previous actions regarding the Federation be rescinded. A motion by E. Faris to postpone action on Lundberg's motion until the next annual meeting passed.

In 1939, Parmelee reintroduced his motion during the first Business Meeting. A substitute motion referred the issue to the Executive Committee for its report.

During the second Business Meeting, the motion by Parmelee was reintroduced. Lundberg moved that it be approved. A motion by Faris, however, delayed action on the motion indefinitely.

Chapter 5: Organizational Domain Disputed

An effort to establish the American Sociological Society as a scientific society was one of three major currents dominating organizational activities of the Society in the 1930s.

Besides this quest for scientific legitimacy, major attempts were made to commit the Society to greater involvement in applying sociological knowledge to New Deal programs, and develop the Society as a national organization aimed at promoting, safeguarding, and extending the common interests of sociologists throughout the country.

The multiple goals these currents proposed for the Society also implied different conceptions of the organizational structure of the Society. Consensus did not exist on either the goals or the organizational structures emerging from these efforts.

Throughout the 30s, these currents of change became embodied in a variety of groups and committees. And it was the interaction among these bodies that set the course of the Society in that decade and beyond by (1) emphasizing scientific sociology rather than applied sociology; (2) formalizing

relationships with regional and specialized scientific societies within sociology; (3) producing a new Constitution, and (4) establishing the *American Sociological Review* as the official journal of the Society.

Scientific Sociology

The major drive to establish the Society as a scientific society was made by a group of sociologists for whom Maurice Parmelee acted as spokesman. In a letter to the membership, Parmelee identified group members as "M.R. Davie, F.H. Hankins, R.M. MacIver, N.L. Sims, P.A. Sorokin, U.G. Weatherly, H.B. Woolston and other sociologists."

The group stated its position in a memorandum distributed to members during the 1931 Annual Meeting in the following manner:

"While the ultimate purpose of science is its utility for mankind, it is equally true that science can develop only in accordance with the facts of nature, whatever may be its practical application. Hence the scientist *qua* scientist should not be influenced by the practical significance of his work, whatever he may think, say and do in other

capacities. This is not so difficult for the physicist, the astronomer and the mathematician. But the social scientist is subjected not only to the inward urge to solve problems which interest him vitally, but also to external pressure from numerous persons who demand a speedy solution of problems of great human importance. It is not surprising that many sociologists succumb to this pressure, and that some of them consider hopeless the attempt to develop sociology like the physical and biological sciences.

"Article II of the Constitution of the American Sociological Society states that 'the objects of this society shall be the encouragement of sociological research and discussion, and the promotion of intercourse between persons engaged in the scientific study of society.' In spite of this statement, the programs and publications of the society are devoted in considerable part to practical rather than to scientific problems. Owing partly to pressure from outside, the Society is now divided into various sections, several of which are devoted almost exclusively to social problems (e.g., Social Work, Religion, Community, Family, etc.).

"The immediate result from this situation is that the public is given the impression that the Society is a religious, moral and social reform organization rather than a scientific society. A more serious result is that in the program of the principal organization of the sociologists themselves, sociology

as the science of society is almost smothered under the discussion of practical social problems. Thus the Society has become in large part a society of applied sociology.

"The undersigned members, animated by an ideal of scientific quality rather than of heterogeneous quantity, wish to prune the Society of its excrescences and to intensify its scientific activities. They believe that this means, in the first place, a membership of sociologists and of persons genuinely interested in the science. This may result in a reduction of the membership and revenues of the Society, but this is preferable to having many members whose interest is primarily or exclusively other than scientific. In the second place, it means limiting its programs and publications to the problems of our science without including numerous melioristic and propagandistic activities which however interesting and valuable as furnishing sociological data, do not in themselves constitute the science. In order to attain these ends, they submit for consideration the following proposals."

The proposals were presented during the first special business meeting in 1931 by Parmelee. A proposal requiring new voting members of the Society to be "professional sociologists, namely, persons engaged in sociological research, writing and teaching, and persons who have taken a higher university degree in

sociology" was referred to the Special Committee on the Scope of Research of the Society. The proposal allowed persons "interested in sociology" to become associate members.

Another proposal calling for the Society to conduct "a plebiscite for nominations for each of the elective offices" was referred to a committee composed of J.E. Cutler, George A. Lundberg and E.B. Reuter which recommended against the plebiscite in 1932.

A third proposal requiring the Society "to assume control of the official journal and its other publications" was assigned to a Committee to Consider the Publications of the Society composed of F.E. Lumley, Stuart A. Rice and Weatherly, Chair.

Two other proposals were accepted. One called for the creation of a Program Committee; the other based the sectional division of the Society "upon a classification of sociological problems in accordance with the annual program planned by the Program Committee."

Applied Sociology

The drive to commit the Society to greater involvement in applying sociological knowledge to New Deal programs was carried on by the Special Committee on the Scope of Research and its successor, the Research Planning Committee.

The Scope of Research Committee was created in 1930 when William F. Ogburn, who was shortly

to direct the Recent Social Trends study, presented the Executive Committee with an invitation from the Social Science Research Council to "undertake the preparation of a plan for the promotion of sociological research." The invitation had also been extended by SSRC to its other constituent societies.

The Executive Committee accepted the invitation and appointed Ernest W. Burgess, Neva R. Deardorff, M.C. Elmer, J.H. Kolb, Robert M. MacIver, Howard W. Odum, Arthur J. Todd, Malcolm M. Willey, and Rice, Chair, to the committee.

Over the next two years, the Committee conducted the most comprehensive examination of the Society to date. Its study went far beyond its "original assignment related to the Society's research activities...to include broad questions relating to the organization of the Society."

In 1932, the Research Committee submitted its final report which contained "recommendations compatible with the present retention in the Society of all of the viewpoints and interests now comprised" in the hope that its report "will aid in forestalling premature departures of subgroups from the parental roof."

The Committee called attention to the informal survey conducted by President L.L. Bernard which indicated that many members thought the Society should promote the following four purposes: (1) teaching, (2) training new sociologists, (3) attracting public

attention to questions of sociological interest, and (4) research. This ordering is "without suggestion of relative importance."

The Committee continued, "It may be that as sociology increasingly develops a substantial scientific status, the interests of members will become more centered upon research problems; but it is unwise to attempt an artificial and premature forcing of development in this direction."

Although the Committee did not hold "a critical attitude toward" the organizational concerns expressed by the Parmelee group, "it felt obliged to point out its bearing upon the problem of the Society's research function" which the Committee advised should concentrate on efforts "to improving, making available, and providing information concerning, basic research data."

The report continued, "The history of democratic government has long disclosed...the difficulty of reconciling diffuse control, checks, and balances with efficiency of functional operation. This dilemma now confronts the Society. If it desires to assume a wider and more active responsibility for the promotion of sociological research, it must make of itself an efficient instrument for that purpose...There must be greater centralization of responsibility, and greater continuity of authority, than are provided within the Society at present. The alternative is to leave to other bodies the activities which

the Society is unwilling to prepare itself to exercise. But this would involve a growth and eventual monopoly of control over research in our own field by these other, more efficient, agencies."

The Committee believed that the membership would chose a more efficient organization because "the structure of western society has become so complex that its ability to continue functioning without serious modification is today being questioned. Have we—students of society—anything to contribute to the clarification of the issues involved? If so, the next quarter-century may show tremendous development in sociological interest and study...The present stage of development and the future prospect, alike, offer us an opportunity and a challenge: Shall we organize in such a way as to supply some of the accumulating and crying demands of society for scientific sociological knowledge and for social leadership?"

The Committee offered thirteen recommendations in support of its program, including a new Constitution. Six recommendations were passed; the remaining seven which were central to the reorganization were handled in the following manner: The proposed Constitution was referred to another committee; another recommendation was substantially amended, and five recommendations were tabled.

The applied effort was maintained by the Research Planning

Committee which was mandated by the new Constitution adopted in 1933. The committee was composed of President E.W. Burgess, Secretary-Treasurer Herbert Blumer, both ex officio, plus W.I. Thomas, Ogburn and Rice.

In 1934, the Committee reported the "recognition of sociological research for the solution of practical problems is evident not only on the part of governmental agencies but also by our social institutions and welfare agencies."

The research program recommended by the Committee contained the following provisions:

(1) Closer integration of sociologists with the sociological work of government; (2) a more complete and discriminating canvass of research in progress; (3) research conferences; (4) emphasis on the region as a unit of research because of developments in social planning; (5) more publication outlets for dissertations and monographs; and (6) a clearing house of sociological research. To implement the program, the Committee recommended the hiring of a full-time secretary and locating the headquarters of the Society in Washington.

The report was accepted, but no funds were allocated by the Society. The Committee did not acquire outside support. It continued to exist, but had little influence on the Society.

Regional Societies

The third major current also began flowing in 1931 when John L. Gillin moved that a committee be created "to consider the matter of establishing branch units" of the Society. President Bogardus appointed a committee composed of Louis Wirth, Weatherly and Ogburn.

In 1932, the Committee found "several local and regional organizations of sociologists in this country" and recommended a Constitutional amendment to encourage the formation of others.

The amendment authorized the Secretary, with the approval of the Executive Committee, "to issue a charter to local or regional groups of ten or more persons at least one of whom shall be a member of the American Sociological Society." Annual dues were ten dollars. Each chapter received a copy of the Society's publications. They had no vote in the affairs of the Society and were subject to the general regulations of the Executive Committee.

This arrangement, however, did not last long. The regionals wanted representational rather than affiliated status and they did not want to pay the fee. In 1936, President H.P. Fairchild appointed "a special committee to study the question of affiliation and cooperation between regional sociological organizations and the national body."

The Committee on Regional Societies was composed of Jerome

Davis, President, Eastern Sociological Conference; Wilson Gee, President, Southern Sociological Society; W. E. Gettys, representing the Southwestern Social Science Association; C.N. Reynolds, President, Pacific Sociological Society; L.G. Brown, Chairman, Program Committee of the proposed Midwest Sociological Society; A.A. Johnston, President, Ohio Sociological Society; Forrest LaViolette, representing the Society for Social Research, and as members-at-large: Kimball Young, Howard B. Woolston, Donald Young, and E. T. Krueger, Chair.

Besides the organizations already mentioned, the Committee found the following organizations in existence: National societies: United Chapters of Alpha Kappa Delta, Sociological Research Association; State societies: Indiana Academy of Social Sciences, Iowa Association of Economists and Sociologists; and Local societies: Lester F. Ward Sociological Society, George Washington University; District of Columbia Chapter of the A.S.S.; Sociology Clubs at the universities of Cincinnati and Chicago; Toynbee Society, DePauw University; Johnson C. Smith Sociological Society; University of Utah Sociological Society, and 26 local chapters of AKD.

The Committee reported "a very real desire that our sociological organizations stand united and harmonious with each other and a deep conviction that the regional societies need a strong and vital

national organization to promote, safeguard, and extend the common interests of sociologists throughout the country."

The Committee also found "a strong emphasis in the regional societies upon maintenance of autonomy, with some fear that affiliation might affect local autonomy." Regionals also expressed concern about the easterly location of Annual Meetings and the lack of a service orientation on the part of the Society.

Generating greater cooperation between regionals and the national, however, was a major problem because of "the differences of opinion and motivations which underlie two approaches." The Committee said:

"Merely to raise the question, hence, precipitates a divergence of opinion between those persons who desire a more exclusive national organization and a closely knit interorganization of all societies, with a staggering of such societies from the top down, and those persons who desire a looser, freer national organization, with no gradations of membership, and a merely nominal relationship between the national society and subsidiary groups, as more likely to promote the welfare of sociologists."

The Regional Committee recommended the relationship be strengthened by (1) a representational rather than an affiliate relation; (2) elimination of dues; (3) representation on Executive Committee; and (4) promoting the

interests of regional societies in every possible way through the development of mutual and advisory relations.

The Committee further recommended that a regional society be recognized as eligible for representational status (1) when it represented three or more states (later amended to "parts of at least five states"); (2) when it has a membership of forty or more persons, at least fifteen of whom are members of the national society; and (3) when a majority of its officers and members of its governing board are members of the national society.

In 1939, the Committee on Organization, the successor to the regional committee, chaired by James H.S. Bossard, made the following recommendations concerning regional and specialized societies and the professional qualifications for individual members:

1. Creation of two classes of members: Fellows—persons engaged primarily in the advancement of sociology as a science, and Members—persons interested in the advancement of sociology through research, teaching or practical programs.

2. Affiliation with regional and specialized societies that maintained autonomy for all societies and only required affiliated organizations to coordinate their programs with the national society if they met at the same time and place.

3. Provided for representation elected by affiliated societies on the Executive Committee and creation of an Administrative Committee within the Executive Committee composed only of Fellows to act when the Executive Committee is not in session.

4. Approved the principle of election of officers of the Society by a vote taken by mail of all members of the Society rather than at the Annual Meeting.

In 1940, the membership provision was tabled, but the other three were approved. Another committee was appointed to revise the Constitution in accordance with the approved recommendations.

Constitution

The Constitution was a stable framework for the Society during its first 25 years. Except for changes in the dues structure, the only formal amendment came in 1914 to provide for the selection of a managing editor for publications of the Society.

In the 1930s, however, Constitutional revision was in the air. In 1931, there were the Parmelee proposals as well as the addition of one member to the Executive Committee "to be chosen annually by the Section on Rural Sociology."

In 1932, the Scope of Research Committee offered a new Constitution that (1) kept membership opened to interested persons; (2) recognized Sections; (3) created a

Board of Directors as the general governing body; (4) assigned the Executive Committee specific responsibilities for research and financial policy; (5) authorized the establishment of funds and endowments; (6) created the position of full-time Executive Secretary; and (7) raised the approval of amendments from a majority to a two-thirds vote.

In 1933, the Committee on the Revision of the Constitution composed of E.W. Burgess, L.L. Bernard, W.E. Gettys, M.C. Elmer, C.E. Lively, H.A. Miller, and Jerome David, Chair, produced the version that was adopted by the Society. It followed the model suggested by the Research Committee except for the following: (1) established divisions as well as sections; (2) deleted the Board of Directors; (3) retained the Executive Committee as the general governing body; (4) created a Research Planning Committee; (5) deleted the position of Executive Secretary; (6) required the appointment of a nomination committee that would solicit nominations from the membership; (7) returned to a majority vote for approving amendments, but required any amendment to be read at one business meeting before it could be passed at another; and (8) required the President and Secretary to meet with the chairmen of sections to consider plans for the next annual program.

Amendments kept coming: In 1935, to establish an editorial board for ASR; in 1936, to limit the

service of Past Presidents on the Executive Committee; in 1938, to allow an "independent society or association devoted to a special field of sociology" to become a Section. The last one was apparently not passed. It was submitted by C.E. Lively, Carl C. Taylor, J.H. Kolb, W.A. Anderson and Dwight Sanderson, members of the Rural Sociological Society.

American Sociological Review

The founding of the *American Sociological Review* in 1936 fulfilled an aspiration of the Society that went back, if not as far as the charter meeting, at least, as far as the appointment of the Committee on Advisability of Issuing a New Publication in 1919.

The publication question came up again in 1929 when a quarterly schedule was approved for the *Publication of the American Sociological Society*: (1) annual proceedings; (2) papers and abstracts of the Annual Meeting; (3) membership list; and (4) annual program.

When Parmelee raised the journal question in 1931, the Committee to Consider the Publications of the Society was created. Reporting for the Committee in 1932, Rice said, "...since the launching and support of such a journal does not at present time appear to be possible, it may justly be urged that the Society should at least have a more active and responsible share in the

management of the *American Journal of Sociology*."

Rice urged the Society to exercise its rights under the existing agreement to name five to seven advisory editors, one of which would serve as review editor. These editors were to constitute the majority of the board. Rice further urged the Society to appoint another committee to study problems associated with the establishment of a separate journal.

Sims moved that another committee be appointed to look into all the factors associated with the publication of a journal. The Committee to Consider a Plan for the Control of the Official Journal and the Other Publications of the Society was composed of Read Bain, Howard Becker, W.P. Meroney, Bernard, and Sims, as chair.

In 1933, Ellsworth Faris, Editor-in-Chief of *AJS*, suggested a new publication arrangement. Faris suggested that membership dues be used to "give members the option of a subscription to the *American Journal of Sociology*, *Sociology and Social Research* and *Social Forces* or any other recognized journal in the field of sociology and that in addition, the privilege of subscribing to other journals than the one selected under their dues, at such reduced rates as may be secured." The arrangement which was to begin January 1, 1935 was not employed. Notification was given that *AJS* would be discontinued as the official journal in December 1934.

In August 1934, the Committee reported that in view of the low bids received and the payments the Society was making for *AJS* "a bi-monthly journal equal to the *AJS* in every respect could be published by the Society and sold to its membership for the price now paid to the University of Chicago Press." The *Publications*, however, would have to be merged with the new journal. The contract for the *Publications* was cancelled effective January 1, 1936.

In 1935, the Committee presented its plan and recommended the establishment of a bi-monthly journal called "The American Sociological Review, with a subtitle, The Official Organ of the American Sociological Society."

In February 1936, the first issue of *ASR* appeared under the editorship of Frank H. Hankins.

Chapter 6: World War II and Aftermath

The impact of World War I on the Society was barely noticeable, but the same cannot be said of World War II. The Society was affected by the advent, conduct and aftermath of the Second World War.

Besides coping with the war, the Society took four major organizational steps in the forties, faced traditional issues, and began to take a stand on an emerging issue—racial discrimination.

The major organizational steps taken were incorporation under the laws of the District of Columbia, the establishment of an Executive Office with a part-time Executive Officer, adoption of a revised Constitution, and the establishment of qualifications for membership.

Two traditional issues assumed increased importance in the post-war years. Government relations became more salient when attempts to establish the National Science Foundation questioned the need for government support of the social sciences. Academic freedom became more prominent with the formation of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Other traditional concerns that reappeared in the forties were the annual meeting, employment, public relations, international relations, and social studies.

Although highly disruptive in its first half, the forties eventually became a decade of prosperity for the Society. Membership rose from 1034 in 1940 to 2673 in 1949 in response to aggressive membership committees. The financial picture also improved. One deficit did occur, but a reserve fund began accumulating.

World War II

The Society became involved in the advent of the war in 1939 with the appointment of a Subcommittee on the Participation of Sociologists in the National Emergency Program composed of J.K. Folsom, Chair; H.P. Fairchild, E.H. Sutherland, Maurice T. Price and Donald Young. President Roosevelt had declared the national emergency earlier that year.

The primary problem facing the Subcommittee was to determine the manner in which sociologists could contribute to the emergency program. In 1940, it recommended that the Civil Service Commission

be urged to create "a simpler channel for sociologists to enter the regular agencies of the Federal government", particularly in administrative positions, by establishing a general examination category entitled "sociologist" and that a standing committee be formed to work in liaison with the commission.

Folsom said, "The more persons there are with sociological training in administrative posts, the greater the chance of sociologists being called upon to give specialized services."

The commission responded that it would cooperate with a liaison committee, but it made no commitment to the general examination category.

Following Pearl Harbor, sociologists entered all branches of the armed forces and served in such war agencies as the Office of Strategic Services, the Selective Service System, the Office of War Information, the National War Labor Board, the War Department, and the Office of Price Administration. By 1944, teaching staffs had been reduced by 25 percent and the graduate student population declined by one third from the prewar peak.

Two Annual Meetings—1942 and 1944—were cancelled and a third—1945—was postponed because public transportation facilities, especially on weekends and during the Christmas holiday season, were largely restricted to military use. The Annual Meeting was then held between Christmas

and New Year's Day.

An attempt was made to hold the 1945 meeting in early 1946 in St. Louis. That effort was cancelled when the headquarters hotel refused to register blacks. The meeting was eventually held in March in Cleveland, making 1946 the only year in which two Annual Meetings were held. That same year the Society decided it would "not meet in hotels where racial discrimination was practiced."

By 1943, the Society had turned its attention to postwar planning. Secretary Conrad Taeuber, in his annual report, pinpointed the following areas of concern: (1) stimulation of research; (2) training of personnel, especially the resumption of training for persons whose graduate work or career start was interrupted by war service; (3) the adequacy of professional training programs in light of anticipated demands for training in sociology; (4) the place of sociology in the new college curricula; and (5) the opportunities for professionally trained sociologists in other than academic positions.

On a motion by Joseph Himes, the Society appointed a Committee on Training and Recruitment in 1943 composed of E.W. Burgess, Chair; L.S. Cottrell, Jr., Philip M. Hauser, Delbert C. Miller, Carl C. Taylor and Donald Young.

Reporting in 1944, the committee estimated that postwar staff increases would range from 45 to 70 percent and that the graduate student population increase would

range from a return to the prewar peak to 35 percent higher than that peak because of the G.I. Bill of Rights.

The committee recommended that graduate training in the postwar period include more quantitative methods and research experience plus preparation for the "emerging positions in industry, journalism and public administration as well as for teaching and research."

In 1945, President Kimball Young called attention to a set of problems that went beyond the professional "reconversion period" to "long-time trends, especially as to sources of support of research, the kinds of topics which we may investigate, and the omnipresent matter of practical applications of our findings."

He said, "In the years ahead public support for sociological research is very likely going to be much larger than private. Moreover, federal aid will probably outstrip that which the states, through their universities or otherwise, may be expected to provide. The implications of such a trend are pretty clear: In monetary subventions for research, as in other matters financial, he who pays the piper calls the tune."

Young felt the trend raised the following questions: "How much place will there be, under governmental auspices, for the more abstract, less immediately practical, and long-range research? And, how much will the requirements of the policy-makers and

appliers of research results influence not only the topics to be investigated but the interpretations of the findings?"

He concluded, "Just as many of us were not intellectually or emotionally prepared for the impact of the present war upon us, so we may not be adequately prepared for the crises of peacetime conditions."

Incorporation

The move to incorporate, which started in 1940, culminated on December 31, 1943. To incorporate the Society, it was necessary to dissolve another corporation, the American Sociological Congress, chartered in 1920 "to promote health, justice, patriotism and training for citizenship; to teach the sacredness of law both as to person and property; and to foster loyalty to home, church and government throughout the domain of the United States." One of the original incorporators, Colonel Wade H. Cooper, assisted in having ASC dissolved.

The following members who resided in the District served as incorporators for the Society: Raymond V. Bowers, Margaret Jarman Hagood, Frank Lorimer, Rev. Bernard C. Mulvaney, Carl C. Taylor and T.J. Woofter, Jr.

Executive Office

The establishment of an Executive Office headed by an Executive Officer had its roots in the work of the Special Committee on the Scope of Research and its succes-

sor, the Research Planning Committee, in the thirties.

The need for such action is evidenced in a recent letter from Ernest R. Mowrer, Secretary, 1947-48, that describes the office of the Society during his tenure:

"I established an office for the Society at Northwestern University in an old residence belonging to the university and housing the departments of sociology, economics and political science....My office was in a small sun parlor with an oriental rug on the floor! The name of the residence, given it by its former owner, was "The Lilacs". How often have I been thankful that the owner had preferred lilacs to pansies!....The working space of the sociology department was a dining room which I proceeded to divide into two sections through the use of screens, separating working space for the Society from that of the department....The records of the Society were not in the best of condition....With makeshift equipment of tables and desks, and the help of a part-time employee...we were off and operating." In 1949, the office moved to Washington when Irene Taeuber became Secretary temporarily, following Mowrer's resignation.

The Executive Office issue was revived in 1947 through a resolution submitted by the District of Columbia Chapter that called for a committee "to study needed modernization of the Society, particularly with reference to the establishment of a central full-time sec-

retariat."

In 1948, an ad hoc committee composed of Raymond Bowers, Chair; Conrad Taeuber and Peter Lejins reported that "the present administration arrangements for conducting the Society's business are inadequate to handle that business properly in the interests of the members. It believes further that more adequate management would not only yield increasing returns to the profession but is also in the national interest. The effective use of scientific knowledge and skills is as important to the nation as to the individual scientist and a national scientific society has by its existence assumed some responsibility for such effective use. Finally, the committee believes that the problem of a more adequate management is but one part of a much needed integration and reorganization in the interests of the sociological profession."

The committee felt this need could most fully be addressed by establishing a permanent national secretariat directed on a full-time basis by a sociologist and based in Washington because of its strategic location.

Consequently, the committee recommended the establishment of a Committee on Reorganization "to investigate and make recommendations concerning a paid secretariat for the Society; to negotiate with other sociological societies concerning the possibility of and bases for unification; to investigate and make recommen-

dations concerning other matters of organization deemed necessary to the more effective conduct of the Society's affairs."

On a motion by Louis Wirth the recommendation was approved and on a motion by Herbert Blumer the following were appointed to the committee: E. Franklin Frazier, Chair; Conrad Taeuber, Taylor, Bowers and Hagood.

In 1949, the committee reported the need for "greater continuity in planning and carrying out the work of the Society; greater recognition of the needs of specialized groups within the Society; and an executive staff with either a paid secretary or a paid secretariat."

In addition, the committee called for several amendments to the Constitution and By-Laws. The Constitutional amendments would establish the position of president-elect; reduce the term of past-presidents on the Executive Committee from five to three years; allow the Constitution to be amended by mail ballot; require 50-day notification of proposed amendments before any vote, and provide for the establishment of subject matter divisions in the Society that would be represented on the Executive Committee.

By-Law revisions included limiting student membership to five years; expanding the Program Committee to include three members elected by the Executive Committee, and elimination of the mandated requirement to conduct an annual census of research.

A \$10,000 grant from the Car-

negie Corporation to support reorganization activities was partially used in 1949 to establish the Executive Office and to appoint Matilda White Riley as Executive Officer on a part-time basis. The Executive Office was initially located at Columbia University for a few months before it became permanently located at New York University.

In addition, "a larger and more geographically representative" Reorganization Committee was appointed for 1950, composed of Gordon Blackwell, Maurice Davie, Harvey Locke, Harry Moore, Talcott Parsons, John Riley, Frederick Stephan, Dorothy Thomas, Donald Young, Bowers, Frazier, Hauser, Taeuber, Taylor, Wirth and Cottrell, Chair.

Constitution

The revised Constitution, effective January 1, 1942, was the product of reorganization efforts in the previous decade.

Among the new provisions in the Constitution were (1) representation on the Executive Committee for regional and affiliated societies; (2) the use of mail ballots in election of officers; (3) formation of administrative, program, public relations, and research planning committees; (4) addition of the improvement of instruction as an objective of the Society; and (5) the elimination of sections and divisions.

Sections, however, continued to exist under the Program Committee which each year submitted to the Administrative Committee a

list of sections that would be recognized in the program. A petition from a minimum of 25 members to the Secretary and approved by the Administrative Committee could add other sections to the program. The Program Committee appointed section chairs.

The Committee on the Revision of the Constitution and By-Laws was composed of Ray E. Barber, E.T. Kreuger, Dwight Sanderson and J.O. Hertzler, Chair.

Membership Qualifications

Qualifications for membership which were rejected in the thirties were accepted in 1946. The major categories established were Active, Associate and Student.

Qualifications for Active membership were (1) PhD degree in Sociology or (2) Master's Degree with two years of graduate study or professional experience in teaching, research or practice in sociology after receiving the degree or (3) have received the PhD or its equivalent in a closely related field and have had at least one year of professional experience in teaching, research, or practice properly classifiable as sociological or (4) be elected by the Executive Committee upon nomination by the Classification Committee because of contributions made to sociology.

Any person interested in the study, teaching or research in sociology could become an Associate. Graduate and undergraduate students sponsored by a

Society member could become Student members. Neither Associates nor Student members could vote or hold office.

The Classification Committee was composed of R.E.L. Faris, Chair; James H. Bossard and Leonard Broom. These new provisions were incorporated into the Constitution effective January 1, 1947.

National Science Foundation

Legislation to establish the National Science Foundation was introduced in Congress shortly after the war. The bills proposed various possibilities for the social sciences, ranging from a Division of Social Sciences to no specific provision for their support.

In 1946, President Taylor urged the Society to "make every contribution possible; in fact, influence in every way possible, the thinking concerning, the legislation providing for, and the setting-up of the program of the National Science Foundation." To insure some involvement, Taylor appointed a committee to look into the matter in 1945.

The inclusion of the social sciences in the new foundation, however, became a major point of controversy. Testifying before a Congressional committee, William F. Ogburn addressed the resistance to the social sciences by pointing out that every technological advance creates new social problems and, therefore, it did not seem sensible to pour resources

into the acceleration of technological change while ignoring any possible means of coping with the social problems such change produced or aggravated.

In an ASR article in 1946, Parsons, reporting for the committee appointed by Taylor, said the urgency of the social problems being generated by technological developments "means that someone is inevitably going to undertake action to solve them" and he was concerned about who that "someone" was going to be:

"As experts on technology many natural scientists will tend to consider it their responsibility to attempt to intervene in this field. The enormous popular prestige of the natural scientists will favor this tendency, since their pronouncements are widely considered as oracular.

"But insofar as social science has any validity at all, scientific competence in the field of social problems can only be the result of a professional level of training and experience in the specific subject matter. If, that is, we are to be moving more and more into a scientific age, and science is to help solve its social problems, it must be social science which does so."

Parsons viewed government as "an essential source for the kind of support needed for many new developments of social science" and urged that such support be sought even though there were "serious dangers in the involvement of the social science fields with government" that could "only be

minimized, not altogether eliminated."

That same year the Society passed a resolution calling for the full participation of the social sciences in a "National Science Foundation or other means for aiding scientific research and training through public funds." But, in 1950, when NSF was established, its organic act allowed it to support the social sciences, but such support was not made mandatory.

While the conflict over NSF was going on, another bill passed unnoticed through Congress that also had implications for the social sciences—the 1946 National Mental Health Act. As John Clausen pointed out in ASR in 1950, this act "constituted a declaration of intent to provide funds for a broad program of research, training and aid to states for the development of means of dealing with our mental health problems."

Besides support for research, the Society was also concerned about the adequacy and uniformity of the statistical records and data being generated by government agencies. A Committee on Social Statistics was appointed to look into the matter.

Academic Freedom

The academic freedom problem developed shortly after the war with the formation of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. In response to the activities of that committee, the Society passed in 1946 a resolution "reaffirming the indispensability

of unrestricted freedom to seek and present the facts and their interpretation in accordance with the best tradition of learning" and went "on record against any activities of Federal, State, and local agencies and committees impeding freedom of scientific inquiry and academic freedom."

Annual Meeting

The Annual Meeting was a topic of discussion and a subject of surveys throughout the decade. The issues were timing, location, cost, organization and participation.

Timing became an issue because the meetings were held during the Christmas holiday season. Although this time period received the highest "preference" score in one survey, the first September meeting was held in Denver in 1950.

The location issue involved several sub-issues: large cities vs. smaller cities/college towns; hotels vs. universities, and East/Midwest vs. West. One meeting tentatively scheduled for Cornell University had to be relocated because the university could not provide space on the designated dates. A poll of the membership indicated that the 1948 meeting, proposed for the Pacific Coast, would be attended primarily by members living on the West Coast. The meeting was held in Chicago.

The cost issue was related to the location issue. The belief was that meetings held in smaller cities/college towns, or on campuses and in different parts of the country would be less expensive.

The organizational issue concerned the proliferation of sessions, lack of general sessions, time for discussion from the floor, the number of papers per session, the length of papers, the number of discussants, and time for informal discussion.

The participation issue concerned the ratio of solicited vs. contributed papers. Up to this time, Annual Meetings were composed almost entirely of solicited papers. In 1947, the Executive Committee recommended to the 1948 Program Committee that the program be made up of contributed papers as far as possible.

Employment

Besides the concerns about employment expressed earlier, the Society took two concrete steps in this area in the forties. It provided the first placement service at the 1948 meeting. In 1949, it began publishing an employment bulletin.

Public Relations

The functioning of the Committee on Public Relations became an issue after it released a press digest of an address, "The Nature of the Challenge," delivered by Pitirim A. Sorokin during the 1940 meeting.

In his 1941 report, Alfred McClung Lee, chair, said he had received several comments about the propriety of such "destructive" publicity, but "judging from

editorials, Sorokin's Chicago speech was looked upon generally as a rare example of self-criticism by a leader of a dignified scientific society." The *Chicago Daily News* said, "No casualty list appeared in the news of the convention, so sociologists must be able to take it as well as dish it out."

Members of the Public Relations Committee supported Lee's decision to release the digest and rejected the suggestion that the committee be given the right of censorship. Some committee members, however, thought the incident raised the question of whether the Public Relations Committee should exist. The Society approved the functioning of the committee and it continued to exist.

International Relations

Relations with sociologists in European countries were interrupted by the war. The Society continued to operate at the international level by appointing, in 1941, a Committee on Sociology in Latin American Countries composed of T. Lynn Smith, Chair; Nathan L. Whetten; W. Rex Crawford; Clarence Senior; Donald Pierson; Frazier and Taylor. The scope of the committee was expanded to all other countries after the war.

In 1948, Wirth reported on plans being formulated by UNESCO for an international association of sociologists. Wirth was elected provisional president of the International Sociological Association

during its organizational meeting in 1949. The Society is a charter member.

The Society also established active liaison with the United States National Commission for UNESCO in 1946.

Social Studies

Interest in the teaching of sociology in secondary schools which initially was demonstrated in the formative years of the Society was revived in 1943 with the appointment of a Committee on Sociology in the Secondary Schools, composed of Lloyd A. Cook, Chair; Edmund deS. Brunner; M.C. Elmer; Wayland J. Hayes; C.R. Hoffer; Paul H. Landis; G.L. Marwell; Elio D. Monachesi; and Robert L. Sutherland.

The interest was maintained through the decade by this committee and its successors which redeveloped a relationship with the National Council for the Social Studies.