

the discovery of truth by the separation of myths from facts. On the one hand, investigators gathered a pile of myths, and on the other hand, a pile of facts. Science was therefore predominantly "analytical."

But this development raised a new problem: How are the "facts" of history and of life to be controlled and interpreted after they have been discovered? A crowd of so-called "historical sciences" came into being as if by magic. There was the science of "politics," whose devotees undertook to tell how "states" developed; the science of "ethics," which dealt with the origin and meaning of "morality"; the science of "economics," whose province was the production and distribution of "wealth"; and these were but a few of the special sciences which dealt with the facts of history from one point of view or another. Each group of specialists tried to take away, or abstract, certain facts from the sum total of life, and then study these facts by themselves. The assumption controlling all specialism was that human experience can be intelligently studied and talked about as an "abstraction." This stage of thought is useful as contrasted with the mythological stage; but it brings evils of its own.

The inevitable scientific protest against the dangers of specialism took the form of "sociology." More and more the truth came into view that while analysis and abstraction have a useful function in thought, they represent the process of thinking only in part. Their points of view have to be combined in a single perspective in order to have practical value. All the special historical sciences are merely special ways of looking at the same familiar facts of human history. There is no such thing as a merely "economic" man, or a merely "political" man, or a merely "moral" man, or even a merely "religious" man, or a merely "legal" man. People may have all the characteristics denoted by these terms; but they are never one thing to the exclusion of the others. All social problems rest, therefore, upon the same, common basis, and are in a sense parts of one problem. Sociology undertakes to discover the connections that bind special problems together.



For a long time there was a misunderstanding between the sociologists and the various types of special scholars, and this was particularly marked in the case of economics. But the early feuds are now passing away. Although the American Sociological Society has been organized only five years, its initial session this year was merged with the initial session of the American Economic Association. President Giddings, of the former body, opened with an address on "The Quality of Civilization," followed by an address from President Farnum, of the Economic Association, upon "The Economic Utilization of History." Professor Farnum incidentally made the suggestion that economists should include in the field of their scientific investigations not only the classes who earn and produce wealth, but the classes which draw unearned incomes. This proposal was made without demagoguery, in a purely scientific spirit, and is one of the many signs of a change in the attitude of economists and other specialists toward the social problem. The papers and discussions at these

meetings indicated a broadening out of academic methods in order to provide a theory of the new civilization which is fast growing up around us. The different kinds of social and historical specialists are fast becoming imbued with the sociological spirit.

The addresses in connection with the Sociological Society will be published in the American Journal of Sociology during 1912. The president of the society for the coming year is Professor Albion W. Small, Head of the Department of Sociology in the University of Chicago.

LOUIS WALLIS.

---

## NEWS NARRATIVE

---

The figures in brackets at the ends of paragraphs refer to volumes and pages of *The Public* for earlier information on the same subject.

---

Week ending Tuesday, January 2, 1912.

---

### New York Banquet for International Peace.

A "peace banquet" at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York, at which Andrew Carnegie was honorary presiding officer, John Temple Graves, toastmaster, and President Taft the principal speaker, came off on the 30th. Theodore Roosevelt was invited to speak, but he refused to attend. The first announcement of his refusal became public on the 27th. He objected to an endorsement of the arbitration treaties now pending in the Senate, one with Great Britain and the other with France. Upon being apprised of this objection the managing committee authorized assurances that while the purpose of the banquet would be the promotion of "world peace in general, without reference to any treaty in particular," the specific purpose of the banquet was not to endorse the proposed British and French treaties. But Mr. Roosevelt would not withdraw his refusal to attend. The correspondence was made public on the 30th, when it appeared that Mr. Roosevelt had denounced the proposed treaties (without the amendments urged by Senators Lodge and Root) as opposed to the interests of peace and against national interest and honor. His letter was unreserved in denouncing the banquet, if it were to be in aid of these treaties, as a hypocritical affair. Among the banqueters were John Wanamaker, Congressman Bartholdt, Bishop Greer, Senator O'Gorman, Gen. Grant, Oscar S. Straus, Charles A. Towne, Congressman Sulzer and Seth Low. President Taft's speech was of course the event of the evening and he made an argument for the proposed treaties unamended. In better form than his speech and ex-President Roosevelt's letters, their respective views on the subject will be found, Mr. Roosevelt's in *The Outlook* for December 30, and Mr. Taft's in *The Century* for January. [See vol. xiv, page 827.]