

**A HISTORY OF THE
AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION
1905-1980**

by
Lawrence J. Rhoades



**American Sociological Association
1722 N Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword.....	i
Separate and Independent.....	1
Building Social Science Institutions.....	6
Issues and Problems Emerge.....	11
Pressures for Change.....	18
Organizational Domain Disputed.....	24
World War II and Aftermath.....	33
Golden Era Dawns.....	42
Growth and Turmoil.....	52
Consolidation and Transition.....	62
Bibliography.....	73
Chronology of Events.....	74
Officers.....	79
Editors.....	82
Executive Office.....	83
Governing Bodies.....	84
Recipients of ASA Awards.....	85
Index of Subjects.....	87
Index of Names.....	88

Copyright © 1981
American Sociological Association

Anniversaries are a time for celebration and for reflection. On the approach of the 75th Anniversary of the founding of the American Sociological Association, a number of members suggested that it would be an appropriate time to do a history of the Association. Many of the "records" of the Association, however, existed only in the memories of many different members, only some of whom are alive today. Our limited resources precluded interviewing those who could have provided information and "context". Instead, we utilized those "official" records easily available.

The product, thus, does not detail a history of sociology in the U.S.; it deals with a history of an organization facing, over time, a series of problems. It is instructive to see the repetitiveness of concerns over the years; the problems seldom change but much of any organization's history is the reworking of solutions.

The repetitive issues are as follows: What is the scope of the Association? What are the qualifications for membership? How should the annual meetings be organized? How should our publications be organized? How do we finance our activities? How do we relate to regional associations? How should we relate to other social science associations? How should we relate to government? How should we relate to our colleagues around the world? Should we have a permanent Executive Office? What should such an office do? How do we encourage good research? How do we reward scholarship? How do we encourage good teaching? How do we strengthen academic freedom? How do we improve the application of sociological knowledge to the problems of society? How do we improve our image in the larger society? How do we identify and increase employment opportunities? In this sense, the history is a record of continual problem-solving related to a set of persistent issues.

The history was written by Lawrence J. Rhoades, Executive Associate, and initially published in a series of articles in the Association's newsletter, *FOOTNOTES*. Dr. Rhoades' experience in the Executive Office made him aware of the various source materials on which the history was based. His skill in organizing that material in a coherent and readable form illustrates once again the contributions he has made over a number of years in communicating information and ideas to members of the Association. He has provided a base on which others can build later. I am indebted to him for his excellent work, represented here.

Russell R. Dynes
Executive Officer
American Sociological Association
Washington, D.C.
June 1981

Chapter 1: Separate and Independent

At 3:30 p.m., Wednesday, December 27, 1905, some forty to fifty "specialists in sociology" from twenty-one educational institutions and a dozen organizations engaged in practical sociological work gathered in McCoy Hall at Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore.

They had responded to an initiative begun that summer by C.W.A. Veditz, George Washington University, to determine "the desirability and feasibility of forming some sort of an organization of sociologists."

Veditz began his exploration of that possibility by writing to "a number of the well-known sociologists of the United States" including Albion W. Small, University of Chicago; E.A. Ross, University of Nebraska; Lester F. Ward, Washington, D.C.; Simon N. Patten and Samuel M. Lindsay, University of Pennsylvania, and Thomas N. Carver, Harvard University.

Responses were favorable to the establishment of an organization, but divided on whether the organization should be "separate and independent" or part of an

existing organization such as the American Economics Association or the American Association for the Advancement of Science.

Initial Responses

Small wrote, "The formation of a sociological association has been suggested by a number of sociologically inclined people in this region, and I should certainly be glad to cooperate most heartily in any plan which may seem feasible. The main thing is getting together for free threshing out of ideas of common interest."

He continued, "Whether we should throw logic to the winds and organize a section of the Economic Association, simply for the practical reason that most of us are members of that body, and in general would prefer concentration of interests rather than division; or whether we should organize a parallel society like the Historical or the Political Science Association; or whether we should disregard the older societies altogether—these questions of detail about which I should be ready to acquiesce in the view of the majority."

Ross responded, "For three or four years I have thought the time was ripe for American sociologists to come together and thresh out their differences... I should thereafter heartily welcome the project for some sort of national association and believe that such an association could do a great deal to clarify our minds, acquaint us with one another's opinions, and exalt the dignity of sociology in the public eye.

"Sociology has grown up through one-idea thinkers, each of whom has worked his idea for all that it is worth clear across the field. Now, however, there is a get-together spirit abroad, and a continuance of the isolation of the past cannot but prove a damage to the development of our science."

At Small's suggestion, Veditz contacted the program committee of the Economic Association to see if time could be allotted for a conference of sociologists during the upcoming meeting. The request was granted.

Consequently, on December 2 a letter was sent to "about three hundred persons throughout the country supposed to be interested in sociology" inviting them to attend the conference.

In part the letter said, "Sociologists have been so largely accustomed to working along divergent lines, and so frequently hold radically different views, that there seems to be peculiar justification for some sort of an organization which shall bring together at regular intervals those in-

terested in the same group of problems, and permit of that interchange of ideas and comparisons of projects which in other fields of knowledge has so frequently contributed to the advancement of science."

The letter continued, "Several European nations already possess sociological associations for this purpose, although nowhere, perhaps, is there a greater, more widespread, or more truly scientific interest in the science of society than in the United States."

Those persons unable to attend the meeting were requested to "send an expression of opinion" on the following questions:

1. Is there need for an organization of sociologists?
2. Should it be formed now?
3. If needed and formed now, what should be its scope?
4. Ought it to be a separate, independent organization, or should it, at least for the present, form a part or division of some existing association?

Some sixty sociologists replied to the letter, which in addition to the sociologists already mentioned, bore the names of Franklin H. Giddings, Columbia University; William G. Sumner, Yale University; and Veditz.

The stage was then set for the first meeting in McCoy Hall at Johns Hopkins University.

First Meeting

William Davenport, Hamilton College, chaired the meeting. Veditz reported that written re-

plies to the letter of invitation unanimously favored the immediate creation of an organization while a considerable majority favored a separate and independent organization with a scope sufficiently wide to include among its members not only those interested in sociology from a purely theoretical and academic point of view, but also those who are engaged in practical sociological work.

Small wrote, "I should urge that the sociologists keep the machinery of their society as simple and inexpensive as possible, so that dues will not be a serious additional burden to anybody; and that we attempt to recognize in our fellowship and in our program all the different divisions of sociological interest. That is, the few general sociologists should not say to the social technologist of any type, 'We have no need of thee,' or vice versa."

A practical sociologist, Anna Garlin Spencer, New York School of Philanthropy, expressed "keen interest in any effort to consolidate and make more effective the labors of those who are trying to solve social problems and initiate social movements by the light of science. I am very desirous that there shall be a 'clearing-house' in the field of sociology, especially that which has focused into practical effort."

C.R. Henderson, University of Chicago, advised "that a very modest beginning be made"; Charles A. Ellwood, University of Missouri, favored "making mem-

bership in this association open to all who have any interest in sociological problems"; and Frank W. Blackmar, University of Kansas, supported "a separate and independent organization" because "to make it a part of one of the associations named would give it a subordinate position, and, what is worse, would seem to indicate that sociology is a branch of either history, political science, economics, or anthropology."

Upon completion of Veditz's report, conference participants spoke out on the questions raised. Giddings pointed out that no other country in the world exhibits as much interest in problems of sociology as does the United States; that many colleges and universities offer courses in sociology; that Professor Sumner, of Yale, was giving courses in sociology, using Herbert Spencer's *Sociology* as a textbook before many persons attending the meeting had entered college; that American sociology was receiving recognition abroad, and yet, no distinctively scientific national organization of sociologists existed in this country.

Clinton R. Woodruff, of Philadelphia, raised the question whether those interested in practical reform work would be allowed to become members. This question was not specifically answered. However, the ensuing discussion indicated that practical sociologists should be allowed to join the organization because "one of the best results of the new

organization would be achieved by bringing into close and regular contact the 'theoretical' and the 'practical' sociologists; each has much to learn from the other."

The question of whether the new organization should be separate and independent was addressed by Ward; Giddings; Carver; Veditz; Lindsay; David C. Wells, Dartmouth College; W.F. Willcox, Cornell University; David Kinley, University of Illinois; and Edward C. Hayes, Miami University.

The discussion concluded that if the organization was to join an existing organization there was no easy way to determine which organization it should join. In addition, if the organization became part of another organization, one could become a member only by joining the parent organization. Finally, such a move would imply that sociology is either subservient to or part of that field. The participants also believed that the parent organization would not provide sociologists with a sufficient portion of the annual meeting.

Carver thought the multiplication of organizations was undesirable. He also believed that there would be too few persons interested in sociology to warrant the creation of an independent society for some time. Willcox suggested that the new organization might unite with the American Social Science Association, an organization that had an honorable history, but was in a state of decline. Some hope was expressed

by others that a federation of societies engaged in the study of the social sciences would ultimately be formed.

A motion by Ward to immediately form a separate and independent organization was passed with only two dissenting votes. A motion by Woodruff authorized the appointment of a five-person Committee on Organization. Davenport appointed the following persons to that committee: Charles H. Cooley, University of Michigan; Veditz; Willcox; Wells; and Lindsay.

Second Meeting

At 3:30 p.m., Thursday, December 28, 1905, Veditz presented the conference with the Constitution drawn up by the Committee on Organization. The society was to be known as the American Sociological Society. Its purpose was "the encouragement of sociological research and discussion, and the promotion of intercourse between persons engaged in the scientific study of society."

Membership was open to any person upon payment of \$3 per year. Officers designated were President, two Vice Presidents, a Secretary, a Treasurer—the last two positions could be held by a single person—and an Executive Committee consisting of the officers ex officio, together with six elected members serving three-year terms. Officers were to be nominated by a committee appointed by the Executive Committee and elected by a majority vote

at the annual meeting. Resolutions were to be submitted to the Executive Committee for its approval before submission to the vote of the society. Amendments were to be proposed by the Executive Committee and adopted by a majority of the members present at any regular or special meeting of the society.

Each Article of the Constitution was put to a vote. Only two generated discussion. Carl Kelsey, University of Pennsylvania, wondered whether the "purpose" of the society could be interpreted to exclude those interested mainly in practical sociological work. Lucille Eaves of New York and Henry M. Leipziger, New York Bureau of Education, asked that it be made clear that practical sociologists could be included in the membership of the society. Giddings and Wells believed the original wording was ample enough to include everybody interested in "sociological discussion and research."

Discussion on the "resolution" article sought a specific provision that would prevent the society from passing "any resolution approving or disapproving specific sociological doctrines or specific schemes for social betterment." It was decided that the article was "sufficient to prevent the submission and consideration of undesirable motions." Each article and the Constitution as a whole was passed unanimously.

Davenport, then, appointed a Nominating Committee composed of Wells, Kelsey, and J. El-

bert Cutler of Wellesley. While the committee was considering a slate, a motion was made and carried to appoint a Committee on Membership as soon as possible "for the purpose of making known the existence and objects of the society and enrolling members."

In reply to the question whether the new organization would issue publications, the Committee on Organization decided to leave the creation of a Publication Committee to the Executive Committee because publications required funding which depended on membership.

The following slate of candidates produced by the Nominating Committee was approved unanimously by the conference: Ward, President; Sumner, First Vice President; Giddings, Second Vice President; Veditz, Secretary-Treasurer; and the following members of the Executive Committee—for three years: Ross and Willcox; for two years: Small and Lindsay; for one year: Wells and Davenport.

When the first Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Society was held December 27-29, 1906 in Providence, R.I., membership stood at 115. Fourteen of these charter members were eventually to serve as Presidents of the American Sociological Society.

Chapter 2: Building Social Science Institutions

In 1907, Albion Small predicted that "more will be said, and more definitely, and with more confident emphasis, from and about the sociological point of view" because a "corporate form" had been organized for sociology.

Small made his prediction in an editorial published in the first volume of *Papers and Proceedings of the Annual Meeting* and the first 25 years of the American Sociological Society validated his prophecy.

In those early years, the Society played a central role in promoting the development of the social sciences and to some extent the humanities in this country by pioneering or cooperating in the creation of what are now considered "institutions" in those communities.

These accomplishments of the Society were achieved in collaboration with other associations and societies, not only out of necessity, but also because the founding of the Society heralded "the faith that all the social sciences are unscientific in the degree in which they attempt to hold themselves separate from each

other, and to constitute closed systems of abstractions."

Small continued, "It (the Society) demands correlation of the social sciences, to the end that real knowledge of human life as it is may increase; that insight into the quality of life as it is capable of becoming may expand; and that effort to realize the possibilities of life may grow more concerted and more intelligent."

Perhaps the four most significant accomplishments were (1) the creation of the Social Science Research Council, (2) the establishment of the *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, (3) the development of the American Council of Learned Societies devoted to Humanistic Studies, and (4) the redefinition of the status of the social sciences in the curriculum of elementary and secondary schools.

Other accomplishments included (1) the founding of the journal, *Social Science Abstracts*; (2) the development of the *Dictionary of American Biography*; (3) the creation of a national social science fraternity—Alpha Pi Zeta; (4) the challenging of the classification of scientific positions in

economics, sociology, and statistics made by the Federal Personnel Classification Board, and (5) the sponsorship of the *American Yearbook*.

SSRC

The involvement of the Society in the creation of the Social Science Research Council began in 1922 when James P., Lichtenberger, current President, presented a proposal to organize a Social Science Council aimed at the problem of coordinating research activities that involved cooperation with other organizations. The move to create SSRC was initiated by the American Political Science Association's Committee on Research headed by Charles E. Merriam of the University of Chicago.

Small made a motion that "The Society approve the consideration of the establishment of a Social Science Council for the consideration of study and research in the various social sciences and the more effective and complete organization and development of social research, and authorize the President to appoint a committee to meet with representatives of the other social science associations." The committee was composed of F. Stuart Chapin and John L. Gillin.

A preliminary meeting was held February 24, 1923 in Chicago to consider the organization of the Council. A second meeting, May 17, 1923 in Chicago, attended by representatives from sociology, economics and political science

completed the formal organization of SSRC. The critical stimulus for creating the organization appears to have been a request from the National Research Council for social science representation in a study of human migration. It was the first time NRC had looked to the social sciences "for advice and suggestions."

It was through its participation in SSRC that the Society was able to achieve a goal it had been pursuing since 1920—an adequate abstracting service for the social sciences. The Committee on Social Abstracts, chaired by Chapin, had been prevented from achieving that goal by the financial condition of the Society.

SSRC was able to raise funds to establish the journal, *Social Science Abstracts*, and insure its continuance for 10 years. The journal was launched in 1928 with Chapin as editor.

In 1929, a grant from the Rockefeller Foundation enabled SSRC to assist President Hoover to form the President's Research Committee on Recent Social Trends which conducted the first national study in which sociologists and sociology played a major role. William F. Ogburn was Study Director; Howard Odum was Assistant Director.

Encyclopedia

A resolution sponsored by Howard B. Woolston and Alexander Goldenweiser initiated the effort to establish the *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences* during the 1923

meeting. The Executive Committee of the Society endorsed the publication of the *Encyclopedia* and appointed a committee to carry out the program on a motion by Charles A. Ellwood. The Committee was composed of Woolston, Goldenweiser, and Ogburn.

The committee enlisted the cooperation of six other social science associations, and in 1925 a joint committee was organized with an executive committee chaired by E.R.A. Seligman. In 1926, Seligman accepted the position of editor-in-chief and within 12 months he had elaborated the plan for the publication and obtained the necessary funds for its support.

At that point, ten organizations accepted sponsorship of the *Encyclopedia: American Sociological Society, American Anthropological Association, the American Association of Social Workers, the American Economic Association, the American Historical Association, the American Political Science Association, the American Psychological Association, the American Statistical Association, the Association of Law Schools, and the National Education Association.*

In 1928, Harry E. Barnes, Chair, Committee on the *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, reported, "It can be said without extravagance that this *Encyclopedia*, when it is complete after four or five years, will be far and away the most important work of its kind that has ever been prepared, and that it

will, I hope, redound to the credit of American scholarship." The first volume of the *Encyclopedia* was published in 1930.

ACLS

The Society became an early supporter of humanistic studies in this country by becoming one of the original members of the American Council of Learned Societies in 1919. ACLS was not incorporated until 1924.

Through its participation in ACLS, the Society played a part in the founding of the *Dictionary of American Biography* which was underwritten by Adolph S. Ochs, publisher of the *New York Times*, in 1924. ACLS began working on the idea of a dictionary in 1922. The first edition was published in 1928.

In those early years, grants from the Carnegie Corporation enabled ACLS to conduct a survey of learned societies and a survey of research in humanistic and social sciences. The latter study, published in 1928, was conducted by F.A. Ogg, a sociologist.

In addition, ACLS conducted a study of the linguistic and national stocks in the 1790 population of the United States, produced a directory of American societies, institutes and other organizations devoted to the humanistic and social sciences, financed a press bureau for the 1927 joint meeting of the associations in sociology, political science, history and economics, and began a fellowship program.

Social Studies

The participation of the Society in the movement to redefine the status of social science in the curriculum of elementary and secondary schools began indirectly in 1913 with the appointment of a Committee on Sociology in the Training of Teachers composed of John M. Gillette, Frederick B. Clow, and Reuben McKittrick.

Working with the National Education Association, the Committee was able to hold a session at that organization's meeting in 1914 which resulted in an NEA committee beginning an investigation into "the place of sociology in normal schools." During the 1918 meeting of the Society, Clow reported the investigation was then being carried on by the U.S. Bureau of Education.

In 1919, the Committee on Teaching of Sociology in Grade and High Schools of America urged sociologists and economists to lend their active, organized support to the movement and presented a recommended "program of social studies" that was based on reports and recommendations made by all the organizations participating in the movement. The program recommended greater attention to the economic and social aspects of human existence in all courses; a general social science at the 12th grade level that emphasized economics and sociology; and the inclusion of sociology courses in the training of teachers. The report was accepted and the formation of a Joint Committee with the American Economics As-

sociation was approved to pursue the matter.

At the 1920 meeting Ross L. Finney, Committee Chair, reported that the NEA Committee on Social Studies had passed a resolution recommending that a program of social studies, "approximately as set forth in our last year's report", be required of all schools.

Finney said, "This resolution is significant not only because of the radical innovation it recommends, but also because of the close affiliation between this committee of NEA and the Federal Bureau of Education, and also because this program represents, as stated last year, the consensus of opinion of all the committees at work on the problem, including that of the American Historical Association whose program the schools have been following for the last twenty-five years."

Besides Finney, the committee was composed of E.S. Bogardus, C.A. Ellwood, Cecil C. North, Dwight Sanderson, Walter R. Smith, and A.J. Todd.

In 1921, a Joint Commission on the Presentation of Social Studies in the Schools was formed by six associations. In 1922, the Society authorized the appointment of one of its members to the Board of Directors of the National Council of Teachers of Social Studies.

Alpha Pi Zeta

In 1923, the Society endorsed the formation of a national honorary social science fraternity upon a motion by H.B. Woolston and

F.H. Giddings. In 1926, Ellwood, reporting for L.L. Bernard, Chair of the Committee on a National Social Science Fraternity, stated that Alpha Pi Zeta "has now been organized and incorporated" under the laws of Illinois. Chapters had already been organized at five universities.

Civil Service

In 1924, the Committee on Personnel Classification in the Federal Government acting in concert with other associations presented "briefs regarding the proper classification of scientific positions in economics, sociology, and statistics to the President of the United States, the Civil Service Committees of the two House of Congress and to the Federal Personnel Classification Board."

This action was taken because "the budget for the fiscal year 1925 had revealed that the Personnel Classification Board had generally classified scientific government positions in the fields of economics, sociology, and statistics as being in the Clerical Administrative and Fiscal Service as defined in the Classification Act of 1923, and not in the Professional and Scientific Service as defined in that Act."

The Committee formally protested the action of the Personnel Board on the grounds "that it is contrary to the letter and the spirit of the Classification Act and that it is against the interests of the country which requires more complete and intelligent application of the social sciences."

The Committee believed the lower classification would adversely affect the application of the social sciences because it would not attract competent personnel to gather the data on which government decisions and the work of social scientists depends.

The Committee was composed of Carl Kelsey, Robert R. Kern and Mollie R. Carroll.

American Yearbook

In 1927, the Society joined with forty-nine other national learned societies as sponsors of *The American Yearbook* which recorded significant events in the sciences, social sciences, humanities, and public affairs. The Society's representative prepared the article on sociology. *The Yearbook* was published by the *New York Times*.

Chapter 3: Issues and Problems Emerge

When the American Sociological Society was created in 1905, one of its founders urged his colleagues to "keep the machinery of their society as simple and as inexpensive as possible."

Over the next 25 years the Society found it increasingly more difficult to follow that advice as it attempted to pursue "the encouragement of sociological research and discussion, and the promotion of intercourse between persons engaged in the scientific study of society."

The development of the discipline and the nurturance of the profession proved to be more complex than their conception.

Membership in the Society increased from 115 in 1905 to 1530 in 1930; the budget expanded from \$2,127 in 1912 to \$9,160 in 1930; the number of committees rose from three to ten; the scope of the Society enlarged from the national to the international level; and a deficit began accumulating even though membership dues increased from \$3 to \$5.

Issues appeared concerning the teaching of sociology, especially the introductory course; the promotion and standardization of

research; the application of sociological knowledge, and the protection of academic freedom and tenure.

Problems appeared concerning the governance structure; the fragmentation of the Society into sub-units called Sections; the format of the Annual Meeting; and the availability of publications.

Many of the problems and issues that surfaced in the first 25 years of the Society were to continue through the next 50.

Teaching

Teaching was the first issue addressed by the Society. The issue arose during the 1909 Annual Meeting because the program included the first session held on the teaching of sociology and featured a paper by James Q. Dealey, Brown University.

At the Business Meeting, Jerome Dowd, University of Oklahoma, made a motion, that carried, to "have a committee of ten appointed, including the President of the Sociological Society, to make a report to the next meeting of the Society, consisting of: first, a statement of the subject matter of first courses now given in the col-

leges of the country; and, second, a suggestion of the subject matter for a fundamental course to serve as a guide to sociological teachers and as a basis for advanced work."

Dowd said, "There are two reasons for this motion: first, in taking rank as a science and in attaining to that dignity and respect which the importance of the subject and the wide interest in it demand, it seems to me desirable that sociology should standardize its fundamental courses in the same way that the fundamental courses of other sciences are standardized. For illustration, when a student takes Chemistry 1, Physics 1, Biology 1, Economics 1, or Law 1, such course stands for a definite subject matter, and enables the student to find an easy adjustment in going from one institution to another, and it forms a solid basis for advanced work."

"Second, I believe that the concrete statement of the subject matter of a fundamental course would harmonize and crystallize our views as to the scope and field of sociology to an extent that no amount of theoretical discussion could possibly do."

The Committee of Ten was composed of Charles H. Cooley, University of Michigan; Charles A. Ellwood, University of Missouri; H.P. Fairchild, Yale University; Franklin H. Giddings, Columbia University; Edward C. Hayes, University of Illinois; Edward A. Ross, University of Wisconsin; Albion W. Small, University of Chicago; Ulysses G.

Weatherly, Indiana University; Dealey, and Dowd as Chair.

At the 1910 meeting, F. Stuart Chapin, Columbia University, reported the results of a survey of "some 400 colleges, universities, theological schools, and state normal schools." Of the 145 responding institutions, 128 indicated that sociology was being taught there.

Chapin concluded that "the majority of institutions place emphasis upon theoretical subject matter including the historical and psychological, as opposed to the practical subject matter. This same general conclusion represented the suggestions for a fundamental introductory course."

Historical subject matter included anthropology, ethnology, social institutions, and social evolution. Psychological subject matter included social psychology, association, and imitation. Practical subject matter included population problems of congestion and housing, social problems, poor relief and pauperism, charity, philanthropy, crime and criminology, and education.

At the 1911 meeting, the Committee of Ten reported its conclusions regarding the fundamental course: "We believe that a general agreement upon the subject matter of a fundamental course, and a comprehensive arrangement and unification of the material can be brought about most expeditiously and satisfactorily by a spontaneous assimilation of the best thought and experience, following

discussion and the leadership of competent teachers and institutions of rank.

"We find ourselves in substantial agreement upon the scope of a fundamental course, but we have individual preferences in the coordination and unification of the material. Any detailed outline proposed by the committee would not represent the practice and convictions of all the members, and such an outline, with the weight of our endorsement, would probably be less effective in promoting the object desired than a statement by the Committee limited to giving the practices and view of individual teachers." The remainder of the report contained course outlines used by each member of the Committee.

Research

The Society began its efforts in relation to research in 1912 with the appointment of the Committee on Investigation and Research. In 1913, the Committee recommended that a joint standing committee be formed with representatives from the American Statistical Society and the American Economics Association "to formulate general plans for such investigations, and to stand ready to advise with organizations or private individuals intending to make social investigations of any kind." The Committee felt such a program would require "a permanent office and a competent sec-

retary on salary to give continuity to the services."

No action on this recommendation was taken and the Committee became inactive because of the death of its chairman, C.R. Henderson, University of Chicago.

In 1917, Lucille Eaves, a member of the original committee, requested that the Committee be revived "for the purpose of securing the cooperation of its members in country-wide investigations" and "to correspond with college teachers and other members of the society interested in such research."

The Committee was reconstituted as the Committee on Standardization of Research with J.L. Gillin, University of Wisconsin, Chair. In 1920, the Committee made the following report:

"What we need is the organization of those interested in research in sociology to map the field, discuss methods, work out a plan of cooperation and secure money to promote research. Perhaps the last is the most important. Teachers are so swamped with teaching and administration that they have little time or energy to devote to promoting careful and intensive study of little known fields. Sociology must finally drive for the appointment of research professors.

"We must also interest rich men in providing money for the prosecution of research until we have shown niggardly boards and legislatures the importance of finding out the facts bearing upon ques-

tions of social theory and social policy. Great foundations like the Russell Sage should be interested in promoting studies of social processes, social organizations, and social ideals. The endowment of research must come if sociology is to be relieved of the charge that it is a pseudo-science. That is as true of applied as of theoretical sociology."

Lamenting the fact that "the philosophical method rather than the method of science has characterized the work of most sociologists", the Committee stated that "two things are necessary in the development of sociology. The one is a determination at all costs to apply the scientific method to social phenomena of all kinds. The other is to standardize research."

The Committee may have had doubts about the standardization of research for it later stated that "it is not so much standardization of research we need as research."

In 1924, the Committee on Social Research began publishing the results of surveys "to determine the nature and extent of research being done by the members of the Society." It was the only Society to do so.

Application

The application of sociological knowledge to the problems of society surfaced as an issue during the 1920 Business Meeting when Rev. S.Z. Batten, Philadelphia, presented the following resolution:

"In view of the fact that sociology is concerned with human well-being and the progress of society; and in view of the fact that there has accumulated a vast body of knowledge of social facts and progress: Resolved, that the ASS appoint a committee of five to consider ways whereby this body of knowledge may be thoroughly socialized and interpreted to the people in such a way as to lead to necessary changes in our educational system and to bring about conscious social action; this committee to report at the next annual meeting of the Society." The motion was referred to the Executive Committee for action. No record of the committee report is published in the *Proceedings*.

Academic Freedom

In 1913, a Joint Committee on Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure was formed by the Society, the American Political Science Association, and the American Economic Association "to examine and report on the present situation in American educational institutions as to liberty of thought, freedom of speech, and security of tenure for teachers."

Reporting in 1914, the Committee said it had "investigated several cases of alleged infringements of academic freedom. As a result it became apparent that the subject bristled with complexities of such a character that your committee feels itself in a position at present to make only a preliminary re-

port." No other reports were published.

Governance Structure

The governance structure of the Society began emerging as a problem in 1921 when the Executive Committee was requested by the Business Meeting "to prepare and report on a new plan for the election of officers of the Society."

In 1924, the Nominations Committee was informed that presidential nominations need not go to the first or second vice president; that the Committee should present, at least, two names for each office without stating a preference; and that the practice of renominating presidents for a second term should be dropped. The first five presidents served two terms.

In 1925, it was decided that Past Presidents could not serve on the Executive Committee for more than five years and that the Secretary-Treasurer should be elected by the Executive Committee rather than the Business Meeting.

Formation of Sections

The formation of Sections began in 1921 when Dwight Sanderson, Cornell University, Chair of the Rural Sociology Group, informed the Executive Committee that his group wanted to become a Section of the Society. The Secretary of the Social Research Group also requested Section status.

The Executive Committee decided to extend an invitation to the

rural sociologists "to become a Section in the Society, and its program, after consultation with the President, to be incorporated in the general program." The same invitation was issued to the Social Research Group. Both accepted.

In 1923, the Executive Committee empowered the President and the Secretary "to grant recognition to groups wanting to be Sections." The Committee also allocated three pages in the *Proceedings* for each of the Sections.

In 1924, the Business Meeting approved the creation of a Committee on Sections "to coordinate in the program both the general and special interests of members of the Society." The Committee became a Standing Committee in 1925.

The program for the 1930 Annual Meeting listed the following Sections: Rural Sociology, Social Statistics, Educational Sociology, Teaching of Sociology, Community, Sociology of Religion, Family, Sociology and Social Work, and Sociology and Psychiatry.

Annual Meeting

Until 1921, the Annual Meeting program was the "undivided responsibility" of the President. In that year, Hayes introduced "three marked departures" in the organization of the program:

1. The afternoon and evening sessions were divided into three sections. Previously, the meeting was arranged around a single topic.

2. A system of committees was placed in charge of the various subdivisions of the program. Committee members were "to act as scouts to discover the important work done anywhere in the country" in their division and to have that work reported at the Annual Meeting.

3. The morning sessions were devoted to a series of roundtables revolving around a discussion of the practical application of sociology.

Albion Small responded to changes made by Hayes in the following manner: "In a word, let us afford all the latitude required for groups of specialists within our field to cultivate their particular interests; but for the safe anchoring of each of the specialties let us at the same time magnify the importance of the plenary sessions, the committee of the whole, the congress of congresses in which we preserve the habit of surveying all the special problems of society in the perspective of the largest outlook which our combined vision commands."

A move toward integration and unification came in 1930 when program policy was changed to reduce the number of sessions and section meetings going on at one time. An attempt was also made to increase participation by limiting each individual to the presentation of one "major paper." And an emphasis was placed on the need to hold the Annual Meeting in conjunction with the meetings of other social science societies.

Publications

The publication problem was handled in the early years by adopting the *American Journal of Sociology* as the official journal of the Society and by the publication of the *Proceedings*.

In 1919, however, the Business Meeting instructed the President to appoint a committee of three "to consider the advisability of issuing the *American Journal of Sociology* monthly instead of bi-monthly or of establishing a new publication."

In 1920, the Committee on Advisability of Issuing a New Publication, chaired by Hayes, reported that the University of Chicago Press was losing \$1.72 per subscription from Society members. Hayes reported the Press had covered \$50,000 in deficits up to that time. The situation had become "intolerable."

Hayes said, "The same conditions (high cost of publications and deficit per subscriber) which have thus affected the publication of the *Journal* have also caused the publication of the *Annual Proceedings* to become an unprecedented drain on the treasury of the Society."

He continued, "In the opinion of the Committee, the American Sociological Society and all who are interested in the advancement of sociological science may fittingly express deep appreciation of the cooperation which has thus far received from the University of

Chicago in support of the *American Journal of Sociology*."

Plans for a new journal were dropped and the remittance to the University of Chicago Press was increased. New publications, however, began appearing because the Society arranged for the publication of Annual Meeting

papers in book form. By 1930, three publications appeared: *The City, Personality and the Social Group*, and *The Urban Community*.

Each of the books produced badly needed royalties for the accumulated deficit in 1930 stood at \$500.