abate its own violence. Both are blind to the faults of their own side. I never felt as much contempt for Haywood as I did for the Smelter Trust. [The final allusion is to the Capital and Labor war in Colorado, which culminated in the trial and acquittal of Haywood in Idaho after his kidnaping at Denver. See The Public, vol. x, pp. 962, 974.]

In addition to the criminal injustices of which both Capital and Labor are accused—indeed back of these and beneath them as the primary cause of their inciting causes—are institutional injustices, black in their elemental immorality and far-reaching in their influence. For these the "good" people rather than "wicked" capitalists or "wicked" Labor unionists are most to blame. It is an iniquity in which we are all involved. Even the Meyer Lissners cannot escape responsibility along with the destructive McNamaras, the asinine Kirbys and the bloody-minded Otises. No less than the crimes on both sides must these injustices be considered when the ramifications of the McNamara conspiracy are investigated.

Meanwhile, however, the Los Angeles bargain looms largest.

To uncover its significant secrets is vitally important in itself. For, if Mr. Connolly's inferences are right, the administrators of the law, which to be vital must be without preference, and of the order that must be just if it endure—aye, the very guardians of public opinion, those respectable leaders whose influence maintains law and order—all are under a cloud. If his inferences are right, violent lawlessness may in all reason seem to multitudes to be their only recourse.

To uncover the secrets of that Los Angeles bargain is vitally important also as a clew to the McNamara mystery in all its other aspects, from last back to first.

What were the terms of that bargain between Judge and District Attorney and leading citizens and chief counsel for the defense? What was its purpose? Why was it secret? What were the circumstances—all of them—and the influences that brought the bargain to a head?

To hide these secrets any longer, to hush up this bargain, is to discredit the good faith of every other move, and to cast doubt upon all more remote revelations.

Any law dealing with crime must be so humane and just in its provisions that public sentiment will support it, if you would increase the probability of arrest and conviction. If, in addition to its humanity and justice, it appeal to the interest of men, it will be still better.—"An Open Letter to Society by Convict 1776."

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE

THE SOCIAL SCIENCE CONVENTIONS.

Washington, D. C., Dec. 30.

The sixth annual meeting of the American Sociological Society was held at Washington on the 27th-30th of December. At the same time and place were held the annual meetings of the American Economic Association, the American Statistical Association, and the American Association for Labor Legislation. The American Association for the Advancement of Science, of which Section 1 concerns itself with Social and Economic Science, also met in Washington during the same week, together with the American Civic Alliance. The nation's capital has thus been invaded by a formidable army of social investigators. A large amount of interesting and significant material was considered which would require many volumes for adequate discussion.

The meetings as a whole were primarily academic and scientific, and not reformatory in the popular sense. Yet their annual proceedings have more and more of a popular interest. It is not so very long ago that "scientific" investigators either opposed "reformers," or declared that science had nothing to do with practical questions. The public-spirited citizen who had an interest in civic problems, was made to feel that the scientific atmosphere was foreign to him, and that the cultivators of academic disciplines were pursuing matters altogether too high and wonderful for the comprehension of ordinary human people. This condition of things was not due to anybody in particular. It was purely impersonal, and was part of the infirmity and immaturity of the intellect. The passing away of the older scientific attitude with reference to social questions is now in rapid progress; and the annual meetings of the various academic bodies mark the transition. The conventions just held have been especially noteworthy in this respect.

The seeds of the growth now coming to fruition were mostly sown in the nineteenth century. At the beginning of that period, public views upon all questions were held fast in what has been called the stage of "mythology." The meaning of this expression is made clear when we remember that at the opening of the nineteenth century, church and state were everywhere united in modern civilization, and that the Bible was commonly accepted as the supreme authority upon history. A rational view of human problems could not prevail so long as the mythological habit of thought ruled the minds of the people. The forces working toward the break-up of myth came to expression in the work of the German investigator, Niebuhr, who, about the middle of the nineteenth century, reconstructed early Roman history by the process of "higher criticism," eliminating the myth, and giving for the first time a rational account of the origins of a great empire. From this time, the critical method was extended to cover the whole field of history. The work of historical science in the early nineteenth century was therefore

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 demagogy, 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.]