

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_bib-sacra\\_01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php)

## ARTICLE V.

## WHAT IS SOCIOLOGY.

BY MR. Z. SWIFT HOLBROOK.

## I.

THE following letter, which explains itself, was sent to a large number of the leading thinkers in the United States. The replies which have been received speak for themselves:—

OBERLIN, OHIO, Jan. 15, 1895.

*Dear Sir:*—Owing to the wide diversity of opinions upon the propriety of using the word "Christian" as applied to "Sociology" in the phrase "Christian Sociology," we desire a concise statement of your views upon the question on the enclosed postal card with permission to publish the same in the BIBLIOTHECA SACRA.

Thanking you in advance, we are,

Respectfully yours,

THE EDITORS.

**Rev. Lyman Abbott, D.D.,** *Pastor of the Plymouth Church, Brooklyn, N. Y.*:—While the phrase Christian Sociology is not strictly accurate, it seems to me to be on the whole not inapt to define a school of thought, namely, that of those who hold that Jesus Christ taught not merely principles of individual character, but also those of social order, and that on his teachings a true and scientific order of society can be based.

**E. Benjamin Andrews, D. D., LL. D.,** *President of Brown University, Providence, R. I.*:—If we mean sociology objectively considered, as the science of society,

the adjective "Christian" is clearly not in place. The use of this adjective indicates that we mean social science according to Christian ideas or as urged by Christian writers, in distinction from the science of society as held by those who deny the possibility of improving the race. This last distinction is *very real*, vital even, and I see no better brief way to signalize it than to use the word "Christian Sociology," adding some title for the other sort of thinking (as "Devil's Sociology"), a good deal of which gets itself aired.

**James B. Angell, LL. D.,** *President of Michigan University,*

*Ann Arbor, Mich.*:—In a strictly scientific use of language I should question the use of the phrase "Christian Sociology." One may say it as one may say Christian Political Economy, Christian Politics, etc. But it is in that popular and general use of terms that it would seem to me to be allowable.

**W. J. Ashley, Professor in Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.**:—I have grave objections—scientific and literary—to the current use of "Sociology"; and still graver to the adjective "Christian" as applied to it. But these objections can scarcely be stated on a postal card.

**Rev. James Atkins, D. D., President of Asheville College, Asheville, N. C.**:—The word "Christian" as applied to Sociology is eminently proper. The sociological principles of Christianity are distinct, unique. No other adjective is so scientifically accurate and yet so broad in its place here. Dr. Gregory in naming his work on Ethics used it, and Dr. Albert Taylor Bledsoe, one of the greatest of American review editors, especially commended the author for his discernment and discretion in styling his work "Christian Ethics." The distinguishing adjective applied to the included sciences, cannot be rejected from the including science without confusion and error.

**Hon. Simeon E. Baldwin, LL. D., Judge of the Supreme Court of Errors of Connecticut, New Haven, Conn.**:—It is to be regretted

that we have no better term than Sociology, a word barbarously compounded out of two languages, to denote the science treating of human society: but it has acquired as definite a meaning as Geology has, and I see no propriety in assuming that it can be divided into a Christian branch and a non-Christian branch. Sociology can be treated from the standpoint of Christianity; but it cannot be identified with it or differentiated by it. Religion exists for man, not man for religion.

**Rev. W. G. Ballantine, D. D., LL. D., President of Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio**:—We say "Christian Ethics" and by analogy should say *Christian Sociology* in acknowledgment that the clearest light in each science comes from Christ.

If Christ came to regenerate society, and if he is the sole source of the vital forces that are regenerating it, and if he is to be eternally the Head of the human race, and if the evils of society arise mainly, not from ignorance nor from poverty, but from sin, and if Jesus alone can save his people from their sins,—then the principles of Christianity are the fundamentals of Sociology. This does not mean that sociology does not derive its *facts* from a wide range of inductive sciences.

**Rev. John Henry Barrows, D. D., Pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, Chicago, Ill.**:—I do not perceive any good reasons for criticizing the use of "Christian" as applied to "Sociology."

**Rev. S. C. Bartlett, D. D., LL. D.,** *Lecturer in Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.*:—Sociology, so-called, may be Christian, or it may not. A true Christian sociology lies imbedded in the "second great commandment," especially as expounded by our Saviour, and is involved in the whole spirit and maxims of Christ's religion, and true Christians have always been engaged in efforts, organized or unorganized, for the benefit of the oppressed and depressed. The benign influence of Christianity through every stratum of society has been in proportion to its power over its followers. Whether it is best for the church to endeavor to absorb all these efforts directly into its own hands as an "institutional church" or to continue its co-operation largely as a leavening force with other legitimate, established agencies and channels of influence, is another question.

**Ex-President John Bascom, D. D., LL. D.,** *Williamstown, Mass.*:—I do not like the phrase Christian Sociology. It implies that there is more than one kind of Sociology, and that one kind at least is not Christian. Christian principles correctly applied to society and a correct Sociology are identical.

**Edward W. Bemis, Ph. D.,** *Professor in Chicago University, Chicago, Ill.*:—I see no sufficient reason for prefixing the term Christian to Sociology any more than to Biology or Political Economy, though I believe the soundest Sociology is in harmony with Christ's life and teaching.

**Rev. W. F. Blackman, Ph. D.,** *Professor in Yale University, New Haven, Conn.*:—There can be no objection to the term "Christian Sociology" that does not apply equally to the terms "Christian Ethics" and "Christian Theology." I believe all three are legitimate. "The Sociology of Christ" is as correct a phrase as is "the Philosophy of Plato," or "the Politics of Aristotle," or "the Ethics of Kant," or "the Sociology of Comte." But I must add that much that passes for "Christian Sociology" appears to me to be a mischievous misinterpretation of a certain fraction of our Lord's teachings.

**Charles A. Blanchard, President of Wheaton College, Wheaton, Ill.**:—I suppose "Sociology" to be a designation of science, actual and embryonic. All science is of God in the sense that all truth is from Him; that all facts and relations are in His plan. Strictly speaking, I suppose that there is no more reason for saying "Christian Sociology" than "Christian Biology," yet because we find so many unchristian arrangements in society there may be an advantage in using the expression, illogical though it be, for a time.

**Rev. George Dana Boardman, D. D.,** *Professorial Lecturer in the University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.*:—I cannot understand why there should be any "diversity of opinion upon the propriety of the phrase 'Christian Sociology.'" While Sociology is largely a matter of observation, statistics, induction, etc., yet the altogether su-

preme factor is the voluntary element, and therefore the Ethical or Christian. Accordingly, a Sociology which leaves out this prime element of Christian motive is itself unscientific, for it omits the chief factor in the case.

**John E. Bradley, Ph. D., LL.D.,** *President of Illinois College, Jacksonville, Ill.*:—Sociology is a term employed to designate a very comprehensive field of study. I can see no impropriety in limiting the field of discussion to any branch of the general subject. "Christian Sociology" seems to me to embrace many very important topics.

**Rev. James Brand, D. D.,** *Pastor of the First Church, Oberlin, Ohio.*:—1. The evils from which society is suffering arise from selfishness and ignorance. The aim and end of Christianity is to eliminate both of these. Christ furnishes the only perfect ideal standard of social life. 2. Christ's conception of man gives the principle and motive, his sociology gives the method for improving society. 3. Sociology, apart from Christianity, is speculative rather than practical. At best it will remove ignorance without removing selfishness, therefore must fail. 4. Christ's two great commands embodying Theology and Sociology have practically the same end and aim, and cannot be separated without crippling both. 5. Any sociology, whether as a philosophy or a science, which rejects the Christian principle, ignores the moral nature of man and must be barren. 6. The use of the adjective "Christian" is

not tautological, for there are unchristian sociologies which are constantly drifting toward anti-Christian sociologies.

**Wm. M. Brooks, President of Tabor College, Tabor, Iowa.**:—Socialist as ordinarily used does not mean Christian, but there may be a community of interest without a community of property.

There is such a science as "Christian Sociology," meaning the science of society organized on a Christian basis, but no one has a right to teach the principles of so-called "socialists" and attach to them the name Christian. Society must be lifted individually, not in the mass.

**Rev. Charles O. Brown, D. D.,** *Pastor of the First Church, San Francisco, Cal.*:—We must use the word "Christian" as applied to "Sociology" if we are to discuss sociological questions on a Christian basis, to distinguish from much that goes under the name of "Sociology" that is manifestly not Christian. To me this appears every way as consistent as to speak of "Christian Ethics" to distinguish from systems of ethics that are not Christian, or "Christian doctrine" to distinguish from other than Christian doctrine.

**James H. Canfield, LL. D.,** *Chancellor of University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Neb., and President-elect of Ohio State University.*:—When I use the word "Christian" I mean that which possesses and is dominated by the spirit (teachings and life) of Christ.

Christian Sociology, therefore, would mean to me that branch of philosophy which treats of the phenomena of human society, with a clear recognition of the *fact* that the spirit of Christ is and must be the cardinal principle, the power preservative. I say "fact," because the conscious or unconscious acceptance of Christ's spirit is no longer a mere theory in human society. By all means *use* the expression.

**H. K. Carroll, LL. D.,** *New York Independent*.—I see no impropriety in defining as Christian Sociology that philosophy of explaining and conducting the business of Society which, while dealing with economic questions, shall be directly controlled by the broad principles of humanity which the *religion* of Christ inculcates.

**Franklin Carter, LL. D.,** *President of Williams College, Williamstown, Mass.*.—Christianity allows such variety of opinion on public questions that I can see no difficulty in admitting that one who favors the principle of association instead of competition as the basis of social activities may be a Christian. Is not such a one fairly described as a Christian Socialist?

**Robert C. Chapin, Professor in Beloit College, Beloit, Wis.**.—If Sociology is a descriptive science, the adjective "Christian" hardly seems to belong before it; if it is an art, the art of improving social conditions, it is fitting to call the application of Christian ethics to these relations "Christian Sociology." This latter task is so impor-

tant that I could wish for it a name more free from the ambiguity that now attaches to every use of the word Sociology.

**George C. Chase, President of Bates Collège, Lewiston, Me.**.—The words "Christian Sociology" seem to me warranted by usage and analogy. They are a natural implication of the truth that all social problems find their solution in the application of the enduring principles of Christianity. The current use of these words shows that Christian scholars have not forgotten that the founder of their religion loved to call himself the "Son of man."

**John B. Clark, Ph. D., Professor in Amherst College, Amherst, Mass.**.—In my judgment the term "Christian" may be properly used in connection with the practical art that corresponds to Sociology. I do not favor using it in connection with the title of the science as such.

**Rev. Joshua Coit, Boston, Mass.**.—Believing in "Christian Sociology," I approve of the phrase.

**J. R. Commons, Professor in Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind.**.—Sociology is the study of man in his Social relations. These relations depend upon his wants, his physical surroundings, his beliefs. Brahman Sociology is based on the belief that men are unequal—that the Sudra born from the feet of God shall forever be the slave of the Brahman who proceeds from the head of God. Christian Sociology is based on the be-

lief that men though unequal physically and mentally are equal in the sight of God—are all his children and brothers whom he equally loves. How social relations have developed from primitive inequality, that these relations are yet developing and may still further be promoted towards the Christian's ideal, is the field, the faith and the aim of Christian Sociology.

**Joseph Cook, LL. D., Boston, Mass.**:—*Christian Sociology* and *applied Christianity* are to me nearly synonymous phrases. I prefer the latter, but have no serious objection to the former. *Christian Socialism*, however, appears to me to be a highly objectionable phrase, there are so many mischievous kinds of socialism. I am a co-operationist, not a socialist.

**J. M. Coulter, LL. D., President of Lake Forest University, Lake Forest, Ill.**:—If Sociology is a study of society, I see no more reason why we should have "Christian sociology" than "Christian biology." It is surely a science without any reference to the kind of people who study it or proclaim it. In my judgment, therefore, I would regard the expression "Christian Sociology" as objectionable, just on the same grounds, as I would "Christian Astronomy."

**E. M. Cravath, D. D., President of Fisk University, Nashville, Tenn.**:—It strikes me that Sociology as a science cannot properly have the term Christian prefixed to it. I firmly believe that true Sociology will be found to include the Christian system of mo-

rality and the evangelical conceptions of God and His relations to men and society as revealed in Jesus, the Christ. This is because religion is a vital element in human society and must be taken account of, and the true religion must become a part of Sociology.

**Rev. Samuel W. Dike, LL. D., Secretary of National Divorce Reform League, Auburndale, Mass.**:

—Sociology must sooner or later be restricted to substantially the following definition: It is the *scientific* knowledge of the phenomena, forms and forces of associated human life or society, considered in their relation to society as a whole. This makes sociology a science, and not a social philosophy, or a practical art, or the equivalent of one or all the social sciences. It makes full provision for attention to all that Christianity has contributed in fact, form or power to society, *but as a part of the content of the material of the science.* It thus escapes the charge of being unscientific, that lies against "Christian Sociology," "Christian Geology" and like phrases, which mislead the people and really belittle our faith.

**Edward D. Eaton, D. D., LL. D., President of Beloit College, Beloit, Wis.**:—Why should we not say "Christian Sociology"? We speak of "Christian Ethics," because the facts and principles of Christianity furnish essential data, and clarify the conceptions and enlarge the scope of the science. For like reasons we may regard "Christian Sociology" as the broadest

and profoundest study of human relations.

**Rev. Brother Fabrician, President of St. John's College, Washington, D. C.**:—There is a philosophy—both Christian and Anti-Christian, the principles of each ramify all sub-divisions; and as sociology is logically a sub-division of philosophy, it must of necessity partake of the influences of either school; hence I regard "Christian" as applied to sociology as clearly proper.

**Rev. Arthur Fairbanks, Ph. D., Instructor in the Yale Divinity School, New Haven, Conn.**:—Outside of theological seminaries students of social phenomena are all but agreed that sociology is the proper name for the *science* of social phenomena. Believing that sociology should receive scientific form and scientific treatment, such as astronomy or psychology or economics have received, I feel that the word "Christian" in the phrase Christian Sociology is misleading and even absurd. A science is neither Christian nor un-Christian, even when it fulfils a true mission in helping the scientist to a larger Christian faith. Christian Sociology means *either* the science of Christian society,—in which case the name is incorrect and unwise,—*or* the ethics of Christian life in society, and in this case Christian *ethics* and not Christian Sociology is what is really meant.

**Charles G. Fairchild, President of Rollin College, Winter Park, Fla.**:—The teachings of Christ

from the beginning have influenced profoundly the thoughts and practices of men in sociological matters. That influence was never so potent as it is to-day. The term *Christian Sociology* seems to me eminently appropriate.

**Rev. Edm. B. Fairfield, D. D., LL. D., Grand Rapids, Mich.**:—It seems to me that it is a mere matter of definition. If "Sociology" is understood to mean "the philosophy of human society," then it would be entirely proper to use the prefix "Christian"; but if we accept the definition of "The Imperial Dictionary":—"The science which investigates the laws or forces which regulate human society in all its grades, existing and historical, savage and civilized"—then such a prefix seems out of place. And "The Standard Dictionary" defines thus: "The science that treats of the origin and history of human society and social phenomena, the progress of civilization, and the laws controlling human intercourse." To neither of these definitions can I prefix "Christian" with any satisfaction. As well say "Christian Astronomy."

**A. H. Fetterolf, Ph. D., LL. D., President of Girard College, Philadelphia, Pa.**:—*Sociology* as defined by Webster is "that branch of philosophy which treats of human society." We speak of Christian Philosophy, and I see no reason why we may not with equal propriety speak of Christian Sociology.

**D. W. Fisher, D. D., LL. D., President of Hanover College,**

*Hanover, Ind.*:—I do not like the term "Christian Sociology." Sociology is the *science*, and is no more Christian than Political Economy or History.

I see no objections, on the other hand, to "Christian Socialism" as describing a certain conception of the application of Christianity to the social organization.

**Rev. Rufus C. Flagg, D. D.,** *President of Ripon College, Ripon, Wis.*:—Your note of inquiry with regard to the propriety of speaking of "*Christian*" Sociology is received. I confess I do not like this manner of speaking. We surely cannot properly speak of Christian Political Economy, or Christian Psychology. The word does not seem to belong with any of the other sciences; then why with this? The implication it bears is that Sociology is not a science but an art, like the art of government, or the art of bestowing charity. If this be the nature of sociology we can prefix "Christian," not otherwise.

**Rev. F. H. Foster, D. D.,** *Professor in Pacific Theological Seminary, Oakland, Cal.*:—The use of the term "Christian Sociology" to indicate Sociology studied for Christian purposes and by Christian men seems to me natural and appropriate. Not every sociological problem is of immediate value to the Christian church.

**Rev. Wm. G. Frost, Ph. D.,** *President of Berea College, Berea, Ky.*:—The term "Christian Sociology" seems of doubtful propriety, and has no supporting analogy.

"Christian Philosophy" means a history of the philosophy held by Christian thinkers; "Christian Astronomy" would be an evident impropriety.

The temptation to use the term comes from two sources: the desire to present certain specific theories under a distinctive name, and the impulse to justify the introduction of this science in theological schools. Analogous to the latter are the now obsolete terms "sacred music" and "sacred rhetoric."

As a science Sociology stands on its own basis of observation and belongs in the college course. Special courses adapted to candidates for the ministry are to be justified like similar courses in rhetoric, but it is safer to find some other designation than the one proposed. A good description might be: "Sociology, and its relations to Christian work."

**Henry B. Gardner, Ph. D.,** *Associate Professor in Brown University, Providence, R. I.*:—If by sociology is understood one division of the science which deals with the life of men in organized societies "Christian Sociology" would mean the division of sociology which deals with peoples who accept Christianity, and I see no impropriety in using the term in that sense, though I should doubt the advantage of making such a division of the subject. If by "Christian Sociology" is meant a body of doctrine looking to the improvement of social conditions on the basis of Christian principles, it seems to me the phrase is undesirable because it involves an unscientific and confusing idea of sociology.

**Rev. Owen H. Gates, Ph. D.,** *Professor in Oberlin Theological Seminary, Oberlin, Ohio*.—So long as there is taught and studied in our schools a Sociology which ignores religion, and especially the Christian religion as a power in the determination of social institutions, refuses to see in Bible teachings the ideal of social as of individual life, and omits the teachings and spirit of Christ from the list of reforming influences, there will be ample justification of the term "Christian Sociology."

**Franklin H. Giddings, Professor** *in Columbia College, New York City*.—The term "Christian Sociology" confounds "Sociology" with "Social Ethics": a science of society as it is and has been with an effort to determine what social relations ought to be. Sociology is the natural history and natural philosophy of society; a descriptive, historical and explanatory account of natural communities, of animals and of men, savage, barbarian and civilized, as they have actually been, as they actually are. It affords data to Social Ethics. There can be a Christian Society. There can be a Christian Social Ethics, but a "Christian Sociology" is as absurd as a Christian Chemistry or a Christian Astronomy.

**Rev. Washington Gladden, D. D.,** *Pastor of First Church of Columbus, Ohio*.—If the use of "Christian" as applied to Sociology implies that there is more than one Sociology, or that Christian Sociology is not scientific, then I would not use it. My own belief is that

Sociology is Christian; that a complete induction—including the facts of historical Christianity—will establish the Christian law—"thou shall love thy neighbor as thyself"—as the fundamental law of society. But I want the induction made without prejudice for or against the Christian revelation; and therefore I would not insist, at the outset, upon calling sociology "Christian." The word expresses my faith, but I do not wish to impose it upon others.

**A. T. Hadley, Professor in Yale College, New Haven, Conn.**.—To those who use the name Sociology in the *descriptive* sense, as the science which describes the growth of social institutions, Christian Sociology naturally means that part of the science which describes the growth of institutions under the influence of Christianity.

To those who regard Sociology as a science in the higher sense, giving explanations rather than descriptions, the combination "Christian Sociology" seems an unfortunate one, which may readily lead to errors not unlike those of the alleged Galilean Astronomy, against which Galileo uttered his historic protest.

**Thomas C. Hall, D. D., Pastor of the Fourth Presbyterian Church, Chicago, Ill.**.—I can think of no sociology that ought not to be Christian, and although sociology is a science, because it is a science that relates to human conduct it is perfectly proper to characterize it as Christian, anti-Christian or material sociology. Ethics is also a

science, but there is a distinct science of Christian ethics. The main difficulty with our sociology heretofore has been the fact that it is essentially atheistic and anti-Christian, and that few Christians have any real faith in the social teachings of our Saviour. The denial of his real kingship is the heresy of to-day.

**P. A. Halpin, Professor in St. Francis Xavier's College, New York City:**—As Sociology means Social Science, Christian Sociology can mean nothing else but Social Science starting from Christian principles and building all its conclusions thereon. Consequently any sociology which would neglect the great principles for all sociology laid down by Christ, e. g. Matthew xxii. 21; Mark xii. 17; Luke xx. 25; Romans xiii. 7, or any tenet thereunto relating and taught by the Divine Christ is a misnomer, if not a caricature.

**Rev. George Harris, D. D., Professor in Andover Theological Seminary, Andover, Mass.:**—If the term Sociology is limited to the science of the actual structure and relations of society, it is not defined as Christian. If it is used in the wider sense of Social Ethics, the rights and duties of man, what ought to be, the ideal state—the term Christian may be employed. For, although the complete social morality can be of only one kind and that Christian, yet it is definite as Christian in contrast with other incomplete types which are advocated. The expression "Christian Sociology" is not tautological. Ex-

cept for convenience in use, however, some other term than sociology is preferable, as that is appropriated to scientific purposes. As theology has surrendered "Anthropology" to science, so ethics will surrender "Sociology."

**Albert Bushnell Hart, Professor in Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.:**—For the phrase "Christian Sociology" there is the same justification as for "Christian History" or "Christian Botany." Every question ought to be examined with that spirit of truth which is the essence of Christianity. I deprecate the use of the term because it seems to suggest that there can be a Sociology in which Christianity has no part.

**George D. Herron, Professor in Iowa College, Grinnell, Iowa:**—The recent dogma that there can be no Christian science of society any more than a Christian astronomy or a Christian biology is as unworthy of respect as intellectual honesty can make it; it is the scientific cant that covers a multitude of sins against social knowledge, and is as reprehensible as the old religious cant for which the scientific cant has such contempt. We all know that Christianity has been the chief factor in the constant development and change of modern civilization. Every honest mind knows that the social revolution now upon us is due to a widening and deepening faith in the applicability of the altruism of Jesus' teachings. The words of Christ are altogether the chief force and fact in society to-day. Christianity has not been

the chief force and fact in the development of the toad, the star, the plant, the rock. Though there be, as I always insist, but one universal life force and element, there has been no volition, no choice, no morality, in the development of the plant, the rock, the animal. It was not by faith in a certain person, or in certain principles, that the rock became the kind of a rock it is; that the sheep became what it is instead of becoming a horse; that the tree is not a plant instead of a tree. It is by the choice of men, or the apprehension of certain forces having their revelation in Jesus, that modern came forth from Roman civilization. Then it is simply untrue, it is supercilious and evasive, to say that we have as much reason for a Christian geology, or Christian botany, as for a Christian sociology. The teachings of Jesus are essentially a science of society, and I know of no other. And it is certainly unscientific, if we are to observe and indicate the actual and important processes and phenomena of society, to treat as incidental, or ignore, the chief factor of society, which Christianity has been, and is more fully coming to be.

Society is the creation of the forces which issue from the faiths of the people. The interpretation of these forces, with some judgment of their effect upon present economies and institutions, with some outline of the living structure the forces are building, is the first service not only of the Christian apostle, but of any true science of society. Without this knowledge of

the forces at work, and a vision of the social end for which they are working, the keenest analysis of social facts and conditions may but intensify the social pain, and the best constructive efforts work against the divine evolution.

**Alvah Hovey, D. D., LL. D.,**  
*President of Newton Theological Seminary, Newton Centre, Mass.:*

—It seems to me that the use of the word Christian with Sociology is unfavorable to clearness of thought. For Sociology is supposed to be the science of social phenomena. It is inductive more than deductive in its processes. It hopes to ascertain and explain all the facts, tendencies, and laws of social life, dealing first with what is, and then perhaps to some extent with what may be, or ought to be. But it is yet in its infancy. Its teachers do not yet agree in their definitions of its comprehensiveness or purpose. I do not therefore see why there should be a Christian Sociology any more than a Christian pathology.

**William I. Hull, Professor in Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pa.:**—The phrase "Christian Sociology" seems to me to be either a tautologous or a too restrictive one. Any system of Sociology which neglects Christianity as either a static or dynamic element in the life of society cannot properly be called the science of Sociology. On the other hand, to limit Sociology by the term Christian would be to exclude from that science individual and social traits which it is Christianity's chief mission to combat or transform.

**Wm. DeW. Hyde, D. D.,** *President of Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Me.*—There is no more inherent objection to the term "Christian Sociology" than there is to the term "Christian Ethics." Inasmuch as the general science of sociology is still in its infancy there is of course great danger that an attempt to treat a special phase of it will prove premature.

**Rev. George H. Ide, D. D.,** *Pastor of Grand Avenue Church, Milwaukee, Wis.*—Using the word Sociology in its strict meaning, there is no more propriety in speaking of "Christian Sociology" than of Christian Geology or Chemistry. Sociology is the science that investigates the laws regulating human society. There is no special reason for calling the investigation of a phenomenon *Christian*. Still as Christianity is interwoven with all this phenomenon, and perhaps is the cause of much of it, and should control it, it does not seem far out of the way to speak of "Christian Sociology."

**J. W. Jenks, Professor in Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.**—I believe Sociology to be a science dealing with definite facts and principles. I fear that the use of the expression, "Christian Sociology," may mislead many people regarding the nature of the science, and will thus do harm, while I see no good that can come from its use.

The expression "Christian Biology" would, in my judgment, be as fit for current use as is "Christian Sociology."

**Rev. Herrick Johnson, D. D.,** *McCormick Theological Seminary, Chicago, Ill.*—The word "Christian" is made to cover almost as great a multitude of "ologies" as the multitude of sins covered by "Charity." When "Sociology" gets its inspiration and glory and fundamental law from *Calvary* it is "Christian." Otherwise, not.

**Rev. James Gibson Johnson, D. D.,** *Pastor of New England Church, Chicago, Ill.*—I believe that there is such a thing, possibly not yet satisfactorily formulated, as a science of society. It consists of the laws of social life and progress. That science is Sociology. I also believe that the Christian theory of life and progress is the true one; that as Mr. Kidd shows, it is the only one. The true science of society is Christian. It may be tautology to speak of Christian Sociology, but I see no other objection.

**W. P. Johnston, D. D.,** *President of Geneva College, Beaver Falls, Pa.*—If Sociology has to do with man's social nature and deals with all social forces and evils, then it ought to be a Christian Sociology and ought to be named that. If the law of Christ is to be studied and applied anywhere under heaven, surely it must be in this domain.

**David S. Jordan, LL.D.,** *President of Leland Stanford Junior University, Palo Alto, Cal.*—Sociology as I understand it is the science which treats of the social relations of men. I know of no

other sense in which it can be properly used. I believe that the teachings of Christ contain very much that is most true and valuable in regard to Sociology. Independent of any theological question every one must admit that Christ's words as recorded show a wonderful insight into the laws of human nature. I do not think, however, that the term "Christian Sociology" has any ground of justification. The word "Christian" prefixed to the name of any science is a species of venerable quackery. Sociology is a science because its facts and inferences are true, not because they are the teaching of any authority.

**M. Kellogg, LL. D.,** *President of University of California, Berkeley, Cal.* :—Sociology treats of the phenomena of human society. Its facts are drawn from the development of our civilization, which is largely a Christian civilization. It implies duties as well as facts, and duties are Christian.

Sociology is a hybrid word; but it can not be displaced, and the adjective "Christian" is its best modifier.

**David Kinley, Professor in the University of Illinois, Champaign, Ill.** :—I regard Christian Sociology as that body of doctrine whose application to social forces will, it is thought, strengthen those of them which are in harmony with Christian principles, and so tend to evolve a social condition in conformity with the Christian ideal.

**J. H. Kirkland, Chancellor of Vanderbilt University, Nashville,**

*Tenn.* :—I do not regard the term "Christian Sociology" as scientific, but still it indicates a certain phase of the subject and has therefore, in my opinion, a right to exist.

**George Trumbull Ladd, D. D.,** *Professor in Yale College, New Haven, Conn.* :—I am opposed to using the word "Christian" in such connections as the phrase "Christian Sociology." By "Sociology" we understand the science, or would-be science, of the phenomena of human social life. That this life ought to be Christian—that is, pervaded with the principles of Christianity—there is no doubt. This is, however, a discussion of an ethico theological character. It can only result in a series of homilies which may be profitable for instruction in righteousness, or otherwise. It certainly is not science; nor is it sociology, which deals with the facts and laws of actual social development.

**Henry M. McCracken, Chancellor of University of New York City** :—A question similar to the one you ask has arisen in reference to the advisability of retaining the word Christian in the title of the American Institute of Christian Philosophy founded by the late Dr. Charles F. Deems, of which I am now President. Either phrase Christian Philosophy or Christian Sociology implies that there are certain postulates in philosophy and science which are settled for adherents of the Christian faith, albeit they may be rejected by others. It seems entirely appropriate for either a quarterly magazine or an Institute to

limit its own field of inquiry by saying *we have settled some propositions*. Large room for discussion is left beyond this limitation.

**W. F. McDowell, Chancellor of University of Denver, Denver, Colo.**—The use of the word Christian as applied to Sociology seems to me exactly as appropriate as when applied to theology. We went all over that ground when organizing the American Institute.

**Rev. Alexander McKenzie, D. D., Pastor of First Church, Cambridge, Mass.**—In the interest of clear thought there should be some limitation to the use of the word Christian which has a definite meaning. It should not be used where e. g. Mohammedan or American would be as appropriate. If the Sociology has a distinct connection with Christ and his teachings the term Christian is properly applied to it. Accuracy is required.

**Peter McVicar, D. D., President of Washburn College, Topeka, Kan.**—Christian Sociology is the science of applying the teachings of the Christian religion to social conditions and problems. The term "Christian" denotes, that the principles applied in the solution of all social problems, in the family, church, municipality, state and nation, shall conform to the teachings of Christ.

**Rev. George F. Magoun, D. D., Ex-President of Iowa College, Grinnell, Iowa.**—As a convenient, conventional, and popular designation I do not see much objection to the phrase "Christian Sociology." If either term of it was

a scientific name the comparison with Methodist Mathematics, Baptist Botany, or Presbyterian Physiology would have some point. But nobody claims that the Christian Religion is a science, and no discriminating person will assert that Sociology, as such, is *yet*. Some of us can remember when what is now Scientific Physics bore the loose and vague name of "Natural Philosophy,"—and "Sociology" is still even more loose and vague. If it ever becomes really a title for distinctive and rigidly co-ordinated facts, with definite and unquestionable laws running through them, it will be more clearly seen than now, even, that "Christian Sociology" is an inexact synthetic phrase,—Christianity not being drawn analytically from social facts, or social science,—or what is chiefly called "social science," from the facts of Christianity.

Meantime the conventional association of the two terms may stand—usefully—for the study of society in a Christian spirit, under Christian guidance, and for the maintenance of Christian ends. This allows the understanding that there is a sort of natural philosophy of society that has nothing to do with what is characteristically Christian, and in co-ordinating and systematizing social facts has no place for the agency of the Christian religion in producing any of them. This is "of course hostile to the spirit of Christian Sociology,"—as Dr. Stuckenbergh said fifteen years ago,—along with many other true things. When Comte devised the name "to designate Social Phys-

ics," it was that sort of natural philosophy of society which he plainly meant. Dr. Stuckenberg refers to "recent works on Sociology [which] as a rule, do not claim to be Christian or even theistic. Their relation to Christian Sociology is, of course, very remote,"—naming Spencer particularly. I do not see that the proportion of such works to the whole is to-day any less, and this gives importance largely to the teachings of Dr. Stuckenberg, Professor Holbrook, and others. There is amazing laxity, however, and consequent confusion along the dividing lines, in other cases, and many things said and printed are just a bizarre, absurd, or fanatical mixture of rationalism and socialism. They come from lack of education, incapacity for logic, and hostility to ancient Bible truths, on which all real Christian Sociology must be founded.

**T. P. Marsh, D. D., LL. D.,**  
*President of Mt. Union College, Alliance, Ohio.*—My sympathy favors "Christian Sociology." My judgment does not. The word Christian may be misleading to those who are indifferent to or prejudiced against Christian thought. Sociology as a permanent and reliable science must be based upon truth and right. So far as it is so based, it becomes invincible and of necessity acceptable to all thought without awakening suspicion or questioning or antagonism. However, truth and right, and Christian are coincident. Sociology will never reach its true basis or right development unless it is along the lines of Christian teaching. Moral Phi-

losophy is as acceptable a term to Christian thought as Christian Ethics.

**Rev. C. M. Mead, D. D., Ph. D.,**  
*Professor in Hartford Theological Seminary, Hartford, Conn.*:—Although no one definition of "Sociology" has received universal approval, I suppose that it may be, in a general way, defined as the science of correct social living. If this is so, then inasmuch as Christianity professes to determine what the right kind of life is, it is obvious that a *correct* sociology *must*, in the Christian mind, be a *Christian* sociology. The science of social life being a form of general ethics, the propriety of the term "Christian Sociology" can be no more disputed than that of "Christian Ethics."

**A. R. Merriam, Professor in Hartford Theological Seminary, Hartford, Conn.**:—The reasons which seem to me strongest against the use of the expression "Christian Sociology" are: 1. That in speaking of what aspires to be a science, there should be no more room for the prefix than in speaking of any other science, like *Sociology* e. g. 2. That the term unnecessarily and timorously indicates a disharmony between Christianity and the fullest scientific research. 3. That the prefix still further confuses the many meanings which Sociology is burdened to carry.

On the other hand, it should be said:—1. That Sociology is by no means as yet a science in the strict sense of the word: and cannot be, on account of human nature, placed

in the same category with the natural sciences. 2. There is special need of emphasizing certain great ethical laws of Christ which are often ignored in current scientific discussion, and certain facts of human will which affect social obligations. 3. The difficulty of finding another term which sufficiently recognizes these facts and principles in a scientific study of social problems.

There is not, however, in my opinion, the same necessity for differentiating Sociology from a scientific extreme that there was some years ago; and there is now the danger of identifying the term Christian Sociology with another extreme school of religious thought.

**Bishop S. M. Merrill, D. D., LL.D., Chicago, Ill.**:—The word Christian is probably of pagan origin, derived from what was supposed by its authors to be the name of a person, but was in fact an official title. By appropriation or adoption, it became a descriptive epithet properly applied to the disciples of Christ, and to whatever of doctrine or spirit is a part of the system of religion produced by the Gospel. From being an epithet of reproach, as in its origin, it has become an honorable title, and should not be degraded in its use by application to anything merely ethical, theoretical, or secular.

**Rev. Richard Montague, D. D., Newton Centre, Mass.**:—"Christian Socialism" is to me an objectionable phrase. "Socialism" is a definite economic theory, a plan of industry, a scheme of production,

an offered substitute for the present economic system. It is a question of economics, of science, of expediency. Christianity has nothing to say about "Socialism" as such. Not a word in the New Testament refers to it. The system has moral aspects, and so spiritual bearings, and upon these Christianity may fitly speak. But to use the phrase "Christian Socialism" is to raise a fog where we need clear skies.

**Henry Morton, Ph. D., President of Stevens Institute of Technology, Hoboken, N. J.**:—I consider the use of the phrase "Christian Sociology," when appropriately applied, as entirely proper and correctly suggestive of the essential connection between Christianity and social development.

**Bishop John P. Newman, D. D., LL. D., Omaha, Neb.**:—Christianity sanctifies and glorifies humanity—personal, domestic, social, national, racial. The term "Christian" is expressive of the truest and the best in anthropology, and appropriately characterizes true Sociology; but it is a prostituted term when applied to social phenomena segregated from the authority and beneficence of the Christian Religion.

**Cyrus Northrop, President of University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.**:—The expression "Christian Sociology" is sometimes convenient, doubtless, for advertising the particular views of a writer or speaker who treats of Sociology, but otherwise it has no more propriety than Christian Po-

litical Economy, or Free Trade Political Science, or Protective Political Science, or Free Silver Finance. Sociology is Sociology. Into it, Christian principles enter as they do into any other science affecting human action.

**S. A. Ort, D. D.,** *President of Wittenberg College, Springfield, Ohio.*—Sociology is the science of social facts. Christian Sociology is the science of the facts of Christian Society. Special sense. In higher Christian education, social facts are viewed and their right relations determined in the light of the principles of Christianity. In this sense any science may be Christian. It is the true sense of higher Christian education. Hence the word Christian should qualify Sociology no more than Zoölogy.

**Dr. Simon N. Patten, Professor in University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.**—I do not like the term "Christian Sociology." It implies that Sociology proper is not Christian but agnostic, atheistic, or something else as bad. I heartily sympathize with the movement to interest Christian workers in Sociology, but it would be a mistake to inculcate the idea that they as Christians are not interested in the general problems affecting human welfare, but only in those problems affecting religious progress.

**Francis G. Peabody, D. D., LL. D.,** *Professor in Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.*—I think the title Christian Sociology ill-judged. It is like the phrase "Christian science." Sociology is

a science, and a science is the same in its principles whether studied by Christians or Unbelievers. Christianity is a spirit of life and the same spirit, whether applied to Sociology or any other pursuit.

**J. A. Peters, D. D.,** *President of Heidelberg College, Tiffin, Ohio.*—In my judgment "Sociology" and "Christian Sociology" are not synonymous terms. Hence I deem the retention of the attribute "Christian," in the treatment of the subject, as appropriate for definiteness and differentiation. *Christian Sociology* is a branch of theology: as the title indicates, it proposes to give a scientific exposition of the origin and laws, purpose and influence of society under the moulding power of the presence of the Christ in human history.

**Rev. Arthur Piper, S. T. D.,** *Warden of Racine College, Racine, Wis.*—It is hard to conceive of any *true* Sociology that is not Christian.

**Eliphalet Nott Potter, S. T. D., LL. D.,** *President of Hobart College, Geneva, N. Y.*—The term "Christian Sociology" is admissible as indicating the relation of Christianity to Society. Doctors of Divinity differ as to dogma, but agree that Christ said, "I will draw all men unto me;" and taught human brotherhood (his followers once having all things in common) that thus Christianity is essentially Social. Like Christianity, Sociology has had to struggle for recognition. As Sociology is not an exact science, so the Christian, or let us say Christendom, is not exactly Christ-

like. But to convert the soul, and to permeate society with the Christianity of Christ, is to make it Christ-like. In this view I am of the Council of the Church Social Union, and of the officers of the Christian Social Union. To make life Christian on this planet being the mission here of Christ and His followers; the sooner Christianity and Sociology are married in thought and act beyond the possibility of divorce, the more certainly can we name the result of their happy union "Christian Sociology."

**D. B. Purinton, LL. D.,** *President of Denison University, Granville, Ohio.*—I see no more impropriety in the term "Christian Sociology" than in such terms as "Christian Ethics," "Christian Theism," "Christian Civilization," "Christian Education," etc. In each case, I take it, the adjective indicates, not an inherent quality of the Science named, but rather a school of philosophy inculcating the science. It is sociology, ethics, etc., according to the Christian view, and as modified by Christian principles and practices. In this sense, I deem the combination perfectly legitimate and intelligible.

**B. P. Raymond, D. D., LL. D.,** *President of Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.*—I think there is reason for the use of the word Christian as applied to Sociology, on precisely the same ground as for the use of *Christian Ethics*. Philosophical ethics starts from the rational consciousness; Christian ethics presupposes a religious process, and starts from the Christian con-

sciousness. The same distinction obtains in Sociology. In general, sociology starts from the social consciousness, or from the consciousness of the individual as related to his fellows. Its study could be prosecuted from the Brahministic, or Buddhistic point of view, or in a purely empirical way, without any religious postulates. Christian Socialism has a point of view quite unique, in the Christian consciousness, and the use of the term seems to me to be justified.

**P. B. Reynolds, D. D.,** *President of West Virginia University, Morgantown, W. Va.*—If "Christian Sociology" means, as I think it does, the principles of society furnished by, and recognized by, the Christian religion, the term is used with entire propriety.

**Rev. William Salter, D. D.,** *Burlington, Iowa.*—If by "Christian Sociology" is meant what our fathers called "the mutual edification of one another in the fellowship of the Lord Jesus," and the principles and rules appertaining thereto, after the spirit of Bishop Butler's sermon on "The Social Nature of Man," I approve the use of the word "Christian" as applied to "Sociology"; but if the term "Christian Sociology" is used to cover what is commonly understood by socialism as a revolutionary system, after the ideas of the French and "the Commune," sacrificing the individual man and absorbing or doing away with personal rights and duties, and handing over mankind to the whims of "society" and the rule of the mob, I

deem it a misnomer and another instance of "the imposture of words."

**T. J. Sanders, Ph. D.,** *President of Otterbein University, Westerville, Ohio*.—Having in mind the laws regulating human society as Christian, I think the term "Christian Sociology" is correct.

Of course "Sociology," the broader term, will always include specific phases of it.

**Charles A. Schaeffer, Ph. D., LL. D.,** *President of Iowa State University, Iowa City, Iowa*.—In reply to your inquiry, I have never heard any objection to the term "Christian community" or "a Christian people," and therefore cannot see why the phrase "Christian Sociology" should provoke any criticism.

**J. G. Schurman, LL. D.,** *President of Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.*.—The single word "Sociology" has as yet no accepted meaning. Why adopt the phrase "Christian Sociology" until scholars have come to some agreement on the subject of a social science, or the social sciences?

**Sylvester F. Scovel, President of the University of Wooster, Wooster, Ohio**.—It seems to me that we not only may, but must, use the phrase "Christian Sociology" just as we say Christian life or Christian Church. Sociology without Christ is one thing, and a bad thing; with Christ it is another, and a good thing. The term Christian in the phrase tells a long story in a very brief way. It cuts away the whole system it repre-

sents, from a biological or a materialistic or a pessimistic origin or tendency.

**L. Clark Seelye, D. D.,** *President of Smith College, Northampton, Mass.*.—If sociology be a science, then it seems to me the term "Christian" can strictly be applied to it with no more propriety than to other sciences; at the same time I believe Christ's life reveals the only life out of which a perfect society can be formed.

**John S. Sewall, D. D.,** *Professor in Bangor Theological Seminary, Bangor, Me.*.—Thinking of sociology as a science, there would be no more propriety in speaking of a Christian sociology than of a pagan, a Mohammedan, a Buddhist sociology. But in studying the forces that are at work in social evolution, and forecasting the results that are manifestly coming, the term is a convenient one, easily intelligible to the student, and not likely to be misinterpreted. In that way I have no hesitation in using it.

**J. B. Shearer, D. D., LL. D.,** *President of Davidson College, Davidson, N. C.*.—Sociology is a Biblical Science. Its foundation facts and principles are Divinely attested. Just and fair inference from these facts and principles are not excluded from the science. Mere human postulates have no more place in sociology than in theology. Christ added nothing either of facts or principles to previous utterances in the Scriptures. He only re-expounded and vindicated the "Old" against the heresies of his day. I

therefore prefer the name "Sociology." "Christian Sociology" is misleading.

**William F. Slocum, Jr., LL.D.,** *President of Colorado College, Colorado Springs, Col.*:—I see no objection in using the term *Christian Sociology*. The social aspect of the Christian movement is an important one, and Sociology may be considered from an almost exclusively Christian stand-point.

**Albion W. Small,** *Professor in the University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.*:—I object to the phrase "Christian Sociology" because it seems to me either pleonastic or fraudulently pretentious. In the latter case it is offensive both to taste and morals in the airs which men give themselves under its shelter. I object to its use to conceal ignorance of social facts and of the processes by which ignorance must be informed. I object to it as a device for dignifying incompetence and laziness. I object to the humbuggery of reading irresponsible opinions into the New Testament, and then reading them out again in the name of Christ. New Testament Theology is not changed in its content by labeling it "Christian Sociology." It is the self-same truth, which does not include the desideratum of Sociology any more than it contains a treatise on mathematics. Sociology is not a substitute for Christian truth, but it is a body of inquiries about subjects which the New Testament does not expound any more than it elaborates Physics or Chemistry or the theory of medicine. A man who has no

special knowledge of society no more deserves to rank as a prophet for calling himself a "Christian Sociologist" than any other species of ignoramus would be entitled to a teacher's certificate by distinguishing himself as a "Christian Ignoramus." I heartily agree with the men who believe that no Sociology can be permanent that is not radically Christian, and I appreciate their motive in coining and uttering the phrase to convey that truth. I believe, however, that its service in impressing the conclusions of Christian scholarship is more than offset by the popular influence which it lends to unscholarly Christians.

**Dr. J. H. Smart,** *President of Purdue University, La Fayette, Ind.*:—That depends upon definition. From one view point sociology may be either heathen or Christian; with another definition sociology must necessarily be Christian. If we wish to distinguish the Christian view of sociology from the heathen view of sociology, I think we may properly use the term "Christian Sociology." I have as yet been unable to see any serious mischief in the use of the term "Christian Sociology."

**Goldwin Smith,** *Emeritus Professor in Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.*:—In answer to the question you submit to me, I would say that strict science of any kind must be independent of religious belief, and can therefore hardly be called "Christian." But I suppose the phrase would pass muster as denoting the science of society studied from a Christian point of view.

**Rev. Henry T. Spangler, D. D.,** *President of Ursinus College, Col-legeville, Pa.*:—In reply to your inquiry of 15th inst. I would say: Make "Sociology" "Christian" in name and in fact. Speak of it as "Christian" and make it "Chris-tian" in reality. For the principles which underlie the development of history are those revealed by Christ. The social life of man is best understood when studied in the light of these principles. Christianity is the only panacea for social, as well as all other, ills.

**Rev. John L. Steffan, Ph. D., D. D.,** *President of St. Mary's Col-lege, St. Mary's, Ky.*:—Since Chris-tian principles can be applied to all questions of Sociology and the Christian view of them is the only correct one, we see no objection to the application and meaning of the phrase "Christian Sociology."

**Theo. Sterling M., D., LL. D.,** *President of Kenyon College, Gam-bier, Ohio*:—*Sociology* is based on facts derived from History and ex-perience, interpreted by our knowl-edge of human nature. *Christian Sociology* is sociology modified by the principles of conduct given in the teachings of Christ. It seems to me that both terms should be used, each in its proper place.

**Rev. Henry A. Stimson, D. D.,** *Pastor of Broadway Tabernacle, New York City*:—Sociology must embrace Christian facts and there-fore is so far Christian of necessity. The same is true of metaphysics and psychology. If any of these sciences should ignore Christian or any other group of facts it would

in time be corrected not in the name of Christianity, but of the science itself. If Sociology is, or is to be, a science, the single name is enough. "Christian Sociology" suggests sentimentalism and spe-cial pleading.

**Rev. Josiah Strong, S. T. D.,** *General Secretary of Evangelical Alliance, New York City*:—It is said that as Sociology is a science there is no more propriety in saying *Christian* sociology than there would be in saying Christian chem-istry or Christian mathematics. But neither between particles of mat-ter nor between numbers are there moral relations. Such relations be-tween men constitute a basis for a Christian science of society; and it is as fit to say Christian Sociology as to say Christian ethics, which expression has gained general cur-rency. Christian sociology might be called the science of society as it ought to be and is to be. The science of society as it is can be only partially Christian because society is only partially Christian as yet.

**Dr. M. W. Stryker, President of Hamilton College, Clinton, N. Y.**:—By Christian Sociology I under-stand the study of Social law as contained in, or implied or war-ranted by, the law which we are under to Christ. Its ideal is a so-ciety built upon the fullest applica-tion of the teaching of Christ. Its realization would be the answer to the petition, "Thy will be done on earth," etc. I like the term and pray for the thing which is its theme. The only other Sociology is (in some degree) Demonology.

**Rev. J. H. W. Stuckenberg, D. D.,** *formerly Pastor of the American Church, Berlin, Germany.*—In 1880 my book on "Christian Sociology" appeared, and thus the use of that term was introduced. At first it aroused suspicion because it seemed to savor of scepticism, Sociology having till then been used for works which either ignored or rejected the claims of Christianity. I used it because I found while lecturing to theological students that the New Testament contains such principles of Christian society as need but be properly developed in order to form a complete system of that society. I quote from my book, but substitute system for science as being less liable to misunderstanding: "Christian Sociology is the system of Christian Society, or the system of that society which is controlled by Christian principles. Its aim is to describe this society; to explain its origin, nature, laws, relations and purposes." We might say that Christian Sociology aims to give the philosophy of Christian Society. This use is legitimate and it designates a most important and well-defined sphere of human thought.

In Christian Sociology use can be made of history, of philosophy, of science, and of all departments of learning in order to interpret Christian society, just as in dogmatics all thought is made contributory to the explanation and defence of the Christian system. If a scientific or philosophical sociology is ever developed, Christian Sociology can use it freely. Such a system of Christian Society is no unwarranted

assumption; it really exists and ought to be recognized.

Whatever opposition the term "Christian Sociology" may meet with, it is evidently here to remain.

**Charles W. Super, LL. D.,** *President of Ohio University, Athens, Ohio.*—By Christian Socialism I understand the use of the facts and principles of sociology to prove that the fundamental doctrines of Christianity, if put in practice in the body politic, would conduce to the highest good of the greatest number; and I understand its champions to maintain that these doctrines should be embodied in legislation to promote the prosperity of all citizens in the widest sense, somewhat as the champions of Protection would have their tenets enforced to promote the material well-being of the State.

**Rev. Albert Temple Swing,** *Professor in Oberlin Theological Seminary, Oberlin, Ohio.*—When anarchistic socialism has succeeded in stirring up class hatred as never before in this country, there is need of something more than mere technical sociology as a remedy. The one hundred and twenty-five thousand Christian ministers, who come regularly into personal contact with more than twenty-five million persons, need in addition to all practical social facts, also correct principles of Moral Philosophy, and Christian Ethics, in order to meet properly the problems before them. If this is not entitled to the name "Christian Sociology" then retain the "Christian" and drop the "Sociology."

**Charles E. Taylor, D. D.,** *President of Wake Forest College, Wake Forest, N. C.*:—I believe that the expression "Christian Sociology" is entirely defensible both on grounds of inherent fitness and of analogy.

**J. M. Taylor, D. D., LL. D.,** *President of Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.*:—I know of no valid reason for objecting to the word Christian in connection with Sociology. It conveys the idea of a Sociology permeated by Christian theories, and as Sociology may be viewed from a non-Christian standpoint, the adjective is justified. So we speak also of a Christian Pantheism—a Pantheism modified by the peculiar conceptions of Christianity.

**Rev. Henry M. Tenney, D. D.,** *Pastor of the Second Church, Oberlin, Ohio*:—Sociology as a mere scientific study is one thing. Sociology as a school of positive thought is another thing. To a mere historic and scientific study of the origin and development of social conditions there is no fitness in applying the adjective Christian.

If Sociology stands for a school of positive thought, and is an attempt at the exposition of the philosophy of society, the propriety of the use of the adjective Christian will be determined manifestly by the philosophy which is held and taught. If we hold to the materialistic philosophy, and regard social conditions as the result of the evolution of blind matter or force, denying human freedom and responsibility, and claiming that

"ethics is the science of psychological mechanics," the use of the term Christian Sociology is a manifest misnomer.

On the contrary if we hold to the Christian philosophy of a personal God revealed in Christ, and revealing through his life and teachings the divine ideals and principles of society to responsible men, the Sociology in which we believe and which we wish to promote can be nothing else than Christian, and it should be so named. Holding to the Christian philosophy, I believe in and wish to stand for a Christian Sociology, and for nothing else.

**Rev. Reuen Thomas, D. D.,** *Pastor of Harvard Church, Brookline, Mass.*:—I see no particular objection to the use of the phrase "Christian Sociology" if it is simply intended thereby to indicate that society can be organized on Christian principles and that this fact should be put as scientifically as possible before the mind. If, however, it is assumed that mere organization of unchristianized men into a certain kind of externally righteous condition, so as to prevent some men becoming inordinately rich and others pitifully poor is all that is necessary to make society what it should be, then I should be disposed to "forbid the banns" and keep these words apart.

**Rev. R. E. Thompson, D. D.,** *Philadelphia, Pa.*:—I confess I always have been prejudiced against the qualifying term "Christian" when prefixed to "Sociology," and

yet cannot justify the prejudice to myself. We do not want a Christian Chemistry or a Christian Geology. Why then a Christian Sociology?

Yet sociology deals with the three natural forms of society, family, state, and church; and as we speak rightly of Christian households, Christian nations, and the Christian church, must not the sociology which recognizes this quality in them be a Christian sociology? Especially is this true of sociology in dealing with the church, the institute of humanity. The idea of a universal brotherhood, transcending natural and local bounds, is not confined to Christianity. The old empires and Islam tried to realize the idea in the sphere of political life. Since Christianity alone works toward its independent realization of it, it must be a Christian Sociology which deals with the Christian Church.

**Rev. Charles F. Thwing, D.D., LL. D.,** *President of Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio:*—In my humble opinion the answer is determined by the simple definition we give sociology. When Sociology is defined simply as a science, I think that the epithet Christian would be a no more proper epithet to be applied to Sociology than to be applied to Mathematics. If, however, Sociology is used to express a general movement, the epithet Christian might properly be applied to it.

**Bishop John H. Vincent, D. D., LL. D.,** *Topeka, Kan.:*—May it not be well to distinguish carefully

VOL. LII. NO. 207. 7

between Sociology as a science and the Christian *use* of Sociology.

As a science it attempts to formulate scientific laws of social development, structure and activity. Having studied these with scientific care, should not Christians make a Christian use of the science? How would it do therefore to speak of "The Christian Application of Sociology." I do not, however, forget that Sociology deals scientifically with the subject-matter of Christian revelation concerning character and conduct.

**Henry Randall Waite, Ph. D.,** *President of American Institute of Civics, New York City:*—If it be thought wise to encourage the idea that Sociology, as it is, ignores or insufficiently recognizes that in it which is "Christian," it may be desirable to formulate its facts under this title.

But is there in truth, reason or need for this assumption where the mass of citizens are agreed as to the justice and propriety of regarding their country as a Christian land?

Certainly to the extent that this agreement represents truth, Christian ideas may be regarded as imbedded in society, and therefore in Sociology; thus warranting the postulate that Sociology, from the point of view of the average American citizen, is theoretically Christian from base to cap-stone.

Shall we, then, assume that the fort is not ours and that we must organize for its capture, or that it is ours and that we must not permit its capture by others?

The American Institute of Civics,

as whose representative I am asked to present these thoughts, assumes that we are citizens of a Christian Commonwealth; that those who represent the essential ideas of Christianity, using the word in its largest sense, are now in possession of the fort; and that there is no ammunition in the arsenal of Sociology (or Applied Sociology as represented in Civics) which requires the stamp of "Christian" to identify it as ours. It is ALL ours and ours already. Instead of presenting any statement calculated to encourage the belief that conditions in this country warrant a distinctive school in Sociology defined as "Christian," I am inclined to believe that we should avoid even the appearance of a surrender of the properly tenable position that where we have a people professedly Christian, we already have, in theory, a Christian Sociology; and if the facts do not properly correspond with the theory, we should endeavor to make them do so, not by giving Sociology a new definition or qualification, but by simply making it in reality what putatively it is already.

**F. A. Walker, Ph. D., LL. D.,**  
*President of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Boston, Mass.:*  
—If *Sociology* is a name given to a science, then the expression "Christian Sociology" is as improper as would be the title "Christian Geology" or "Christian Thermodynamics."

**Professor Lester F. Ward,**  
*Washington, D. C.:*—I am in the habit of considering Sociol-

ogy to be a science, not a religion, cult, or programme of action, and therefore "Christian Sociology" sounds to me about as would Christian Mathematics, Mohammedan Biology, or Buddistic Chemistry. If it is no better than Christian Astronomy, Geology, and Geography used to be in the days when such things were recognized, it is a rather poor article.

**Rev. B. B. Warfield, D. D., LL. D.,**  
*Professor in the Theological Seminary at Princeton, N. J.:*—If "Sociology" be taken as meaning "that branch of philosophy which treats of human society," as Webster defines it after Herbert Spencer, then the prefixing of the word "Christian," it would seem, can properly mean only one of two things. It either ought to designate that branch of the science of society which treats of organizations purely Christian; in which case it is another way of speaking of organized Christianity, or of the Church and its modes of organized life. Or else it ought to designate Science of Society which rests on a revealed as distinguished from a purely natural basis: in which case it is a term analogous to such titles as "Christian Ethics," "Christian Cosmogony" and the like. It is to be feared, however, that, as currently used, it is often little better than the salt which Socialism is seeking to put on the tails of the birds it would fain catch.

**Ethelbert D. Warfield, LL. D.,**  
*President of Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.:*—If we are to retain

the older view that Sociology is the philosophy of the development of human society, I can see no propriety in the use of the term "Christian Sociology." If, however, we are to fall in with the tendency to regard Sociology as the science of the mutual rights and duties of men in society, I think we may have a distinct field for Christian Sociology. In this case we have a parallel in Natural Ethics and Christian Ethics. As every department of human knowledge has a philosophical, a scientific, and a practical aspect, the real difficulty is to secure a recognition of the method employed in any given discussion.

**William F. Warren, S. T. D., LL. D.,** *President of Boston University, Boston, Mass.*—The term "Christian Sociology" seems to me as appropriate, and as little in need of defence, as "Christian Ethics," or "Christian Anthropology," or even "Christian Theology." I should not like to live in any society in which the propriety of any one of the three was generally questioned.

**W. E. Waters, Ph. D.,** *President of Wells College, Aurora, N. Y.*—Sociology is the science of social life in all of its departments. It has to do with the religious life of society as well as with its industrial, or political, or domestic life. The phrase "Christian Sociology," the study of society from the standpoint of Christianity, is therefore, it seems to me, thoroughly correct.

**James Riley Weaver,** *Professor in De Pauw University, Green-*

*castle, Ind.*—The scope of sociology being so much broader than that of *socialism*, the expression "Christian Sociology" would seem to be useful as showing that special phase of the general subject, while the definite contents of socialism as now advocated by its leading apostles is so specific and distinct from, if not antagonistic to, the Christian Church, that *Christian Socialism* is confusion of terms, misleading if not contradictory. On the other hand "*Christian Sociology*," it would appear, implies no such antagonism but that social reform must largely depend on the christianization of society, through the individual heart, for success.

**Rev. Joshua W. Wellman, D. D.,** *Malden, Mass.*—This question cannot be definitely answered until sociology has been clearly defined. It is said to be "the science of human society." But science is not necessarily Christian, we do not speak of Christian geology, or of Christian physiology. Why should we speak of Christian sociology if it be merely a science? It has been said that "sociology is more of a philosophy than a science." But the philosophies of human society are numerous. There is a philosophy of human society back of French socialism. So of anarchism, shakerism, monasticism. The Andover House (so called) in Boston is founded upon a philosophy of human society. If that philosophy is hostile to evangelical faith and all evangelistic effort—we do not say it is now—but if it is, if it avowedly excludes all Christian evangelism, it cannot with truth be

called Christian. So if the philosophy which is back of sociology excludes the gospel of Christ, or even ignores it, deeming itself all-sufficient for the reformation and salvation of men, how can it be called Christian? But if sociology is an honest investigation and a truthful setting forth of the pattern of holy society shown in the Christian scriptures, and of the divinely appointed means by which that holy society can be established on earth, it may properly be called Christian. Yet how would such a sociology differ from Christian theology? There is a great rage of late, on the part of certain minds, to call old things by new names, and then to imagine that because the name is new the thing is new.

**Rev. B. L. Whitman, D. D.,**  
*President of Colby University,*  
*Waterville, Me.:*—To me Christian Sociology is the attempt to reconstruct society along the lines of the spirit and teaching of Christ. Of course the first step is study of present social conditions. I see no objection to the use of "Christian" as indicating the end proposed by workers who seek the christianizing of society.

**Rev. J. L. Withrow, D. D., Pas-**  
*tor of Third Presbyterian Church,*  
*Chicago, Ill.:*—It seems to me that "christian" has been joined with "Sociology" as "theistic" was with "Evolution"; to give it the best standing and introduction to good company.

*Theistic* Evolution is only the old doctrine of *Second Causes*; and Christian Sociology is only the

Good Samaritan principle at work as it has been for nearly two thousand years.

**Hon. Carroll D. Wright, United States Commissioner of Labor,**  
*Washington, D. C.:*—We speak of the Christian religion because it is a religion founded by Christ, and, therefore, thoroughly, emphatically, and positively Christian. A man might deny Christ and yet adopt all the particular precepts of his religion. He would not, as I understand it, be a Christian, although he might be a religious, a moral, a philosophical man, and one deeply imbued with the importance of everything that Christ taught; but if he does not accept Christ in the full sense as of Divine Sonship, he is not, as I understand it, a Christian. I do not see, therefore, how the term "Christian" can be applied to any science of sociology, admitting for the moment that there is such a science; it can have no relation whatever to what is distinctively understood as "Christian." If, on the other hand, the word "Christian" is applied to all religion which follows in any way the precepts taught by Christ, sociology must certainly come under the general designation, because any science of sociology must seek the amelioration of the human race, and along (as I contend) ethical as well as economic lines. Sociology generally embraces everything that relates to society, to the interests of man, to man in his relations to other men and to all men. Such a science or such a doctrine or such a department of human knowledge has always existed, but has not

been developed until within recent years. If the science itself does not recognize Christ as its founder, and Christ as the Son of God for the founder, is it not a misnomer to call it "Christian Sociology"? Believing, as I do, in the broad application of the Christian religion to all things,—that economics can not succeed fully without the most earnest application or influence of moral forces and that Christ taught in the best way possible the application of such forces,—I should not object, without stopping to discuss the question of Divine Sonship, to the term "Christian sociology." But I think much harm would be done if those who advocate the use of the term "Christian sociology" attempted to convey thereby the idea that sociology, as such, was founded by Christ himself, and that it is for that reason called "Christian." You very clearly say that you do not mean simply a Christian view of Society; but your great query is,

Are the forces in our civilization such as to characterize them as Christian, and does a philosophy or a plan or a science of such society warrant the use of the word "Christian"? In this sense, and with this sense clearly understood, I most thoroughly believe that the forces in our Western civilization are such (and are growing more in this direction) as to characterize them as "Christian"; so on this broad basis, the term "Christian sociology," if it can be so used as to convey this meaning, may be appropriate.

**E. V. Zollars, LL.D.,** *President of Hiram College, Hiram, Ohio:*

—I see no objection to the use of the word "Christian" as applied to "Sociology." It may not be the best term to use as a designation of the science in its broadest sense, but as limiting the application of the term to a particular field it seems to me to be entirely appropriate and adequate.

## II.

In the symposium which precedes, sociology is defined from so many different points of view, and there is such a diversity of opinions expressed, that one may be pardoned for concluding that sociology stands for no well-defined science; that clouds and darkness are round about it, even if righteousness and judgment are the habitation of its throne. This is emphasized the more clearly from the fact that the symposium represents the ablest thinkers in America. Sociology is viewed as science, philosophy, and art; as descriptive, statical, or dynamic; upon its subjective or objective sides. The varying opinions as to the propriety of using the word Chris-

tian in connection with it may largely be accounted for under this generalization. The task of reconciling such a variety of opinions would appear, at first sight, to be hopeless.

Sociology is to-day divided into two clearly defined schools,—the speculative and the practical. Speculative sociology is reaching out in the direction of an exact science, and for that reason would claim the right to the name scientific. And yet it is largely empiricism. It illustrates aptly Emerson's saying, that empirical science is apt to cloud the sight, and, by the very knowledge of functions and processes, to bereave the student of the manly contemplation of the whole.<sup>1</sup> It is largely a speculative philosophy and is worthy of being called an exact science only so far as it has borrowed its terminology and its analogies from biology and the sub-sciences. This, of itself, is a confession of weakness and an admission that it cannot walk alone. It observes animal and vegetable organisms, assumes society to be an organism, mistakes analogies for identities, borrows its terminology instead of creating one of its own, and then proceeds to discover the value of  $x$  deductively. The result is that society is proved to be an organism and one whose phenomena can be observed, discriminated, and so classified that safe generalizations can be deduced. Hence the Spencerian law of evolution applies, and social evolution becomes the admitted fact.

And sociology becomes the study of one thing,—the universe, or of two things—matter and mind. It is modest: it aims at the unification of all knowledge; and the first textbook for students' use is a mixture of physiology, pathology, psychology, biology, and anthropology. It tells of advertising, book agents, banks, botany, chemistry, friendship, geology, gambling; but the great forces that move men, like the desire to acquire, love of home, offspring, reputation, and the religious motive, are quite forgotten in the mad haste to appear and become scientific. Monopolies and trusts (having

<sup>1</sup> Essay on Nature, p. 80.

their origin in a perverted sense of the desire to acquire, in other words, in greed), the despotism of fashion, and, in fact, most of the spiritual forces that mould and move society, are quite overlooked.

Practical sociology frankly confesses itself to be more of a philosophy than a science. It is even willing to be ranked as an art,—the general art of social control, as Professor Bernard Moses defines it. It makes use of the scientific conclusions of the social sciences, but its end is practical, and it does not attain to the unattainable. It does not admit such a mass and medley of knowledge into the equation that the solution becomes impossible, so that the multitudinous facts overpower the mind, ending in a hopeless jumble. Professor Powers well says<sup>1</sup> that the facts of sociology are commonplace, but its conclusions should not be. It causes society to pass before it, and photographs the view. This is called Descriptive Sociology. It presents an ideal social condition which is a picture of society as it ought to be. This is called Statical Sociology. It then inventories the forces which would make society what it ought to be, and this is Dynamic Sociology. Descriptive sociology reveals, therefore, the doctrine of sin. The voluntary element in the unit of society, the individual, has resulted practically in so universal a tendency to do evil that society's ills can be accounted for on no other ground. Statical sociology borrows from Christianity its ideal unit,—the perfect man. From Plato down, ideal units have been admitted to be all that the world needs to insure an ideal social condition. Its social ideal is the coming kingdom. Dynamic sociology reveals the greatest reforming force in the world to be some Power operating with the truth through human agents, the units of society, to regenerate, transform, and purify society. This is a scientific and philosophical no less than a historical truth, and no enumeration of the forces that are transforming society can be complete without the

<sup>1</sup> Annals of the American Academy, March, 1895.

frank and full acknowledgment of the reality of this Power to move and regenerate men by acting through these agencies.

There is no such thing as an exact science of human society viewed as an organism. The phenomena of society are largely the unseen forces of the spiritual or the soul world; and of the mind no less than of the material world. Or, as the sociologists would say, they are the psychical no less than the psycho-physical phenomena; the subjective realities no less than objective phenomena.

But we cannot observe all the forces that move men, we cannot discriminate between them accurately, we cannot classify them, hence we cannot generalize with precision.

The first great force that observation teaches us moves many men is one which we hear the sound thereof but cannot tell whence it cometh or whither it goeth. So is every one that is born of the Spirit. We can assume the value of  $x$  and use it for a working hypothesis, but that is not inductive. The presence of the free will of man in the midst of objective realities, or the physical universe, makes prediction impossible. It is an old saying, that even divine foreknowledge cannot predict what a petit jury will decide. The presence of conscience, or the want of it, or of any of the perverted traits of human nature in place of the noble traits,—such as superstition in place of religion, or credulity in the place of faith, or greed in the place of the desire to acquire, or wilfulness in the place of will, renders prediction impossible as to man's action in view of given objective conditions. Christ may have meat to eat that we know not of. And entire communities will often follow a lead in uncertain directions, as in the case of witchcraft or of a tulip or real-estate craze. Great waves of influence and power which we can with difficulty account for seem at times to overcome entire communities, and lead them they know not whither. These are invariably ultra-rational and oftentimes contra-rational.

The motives cannot be always determined. Hence after viewing the efforts of men to make an exact science out of sociology we are led to exclaim, "Art thou a master in Israel and knowest not these things?"

In one of her charming letters, George Eliot says:—

"You will see by the *Fortnightly*, which you have not read, that Mr. Herbert Spencer is very anxious to vindicate himself from neglect of the logical necessity that the abstraction, 'Society,' is dependent on the modified action of the units; indeed he is very sensitive on the point of being supposed to teach an enervating fatalism. Consider what the human mind *en masse* would have been if there had been no such combination of elements in it as has produced poets. All the philosophers and savants would not have sufficed to supply that deficiency. And how can the life of nations be understood without the inward light of poetry, that is, of emotion, blending with thought."

Plato said poetry comes nearer to vital truth than history. George Eliot says further, and she speaks as the intimate friend of Mr. Herbert Spencer:—

"But the consideration of molecular physics is not the direct ground of human love and moral action any more than it is the direct means of composing a noble picture or of enjoying great music. . . . That every study has its bearing on every other is true; but pain and relief, love and sorrow, have their peculiar history, which make an experience and knowledge over and above the swing of atoms."

Dr. W. F. Poole said that fiction was nearer to truth than history.

The efforts that have been put forth to make of sociology an exact science excite our admiration for their erudition, for their persistence, and their optimistic spirit; but they call forth equally our pity for their futility, and awaken our sense of the ludicrous at the practical results. The data required to make of sociology an exact science would simply be infinite, and we are not surprised to read that Mr. G. H. Lewes, the first husband of George Eliot, wrote in his journal as follows:—

"Jan 28, 1859. Walked along the Thames towards Kew to meet Herbert Spencer, who was to spend the day with us, and we chatted with him on matters personal and philosophical. . . . His intense *theorizing*

tendency was contagious, and it was only the stimulus of a *theory* which could then have induced me to work."<sup>1</sup>

If by scientific sociology one supposes that a complete system of exact scientific knowledge has been attained or is attainable, the words are a misnomer. Viewed in that light, there is no such thing as scientific sociology. The mind of man cannot circumscribe the subject. It can think at it, and about it, but not around it. Knowledge that is obtained by some general observations of the working of society as a unit, and then some striking and apt analogies between it and other organisms, such as vegetable or animal organisms, does not prove that society is an organism. Such a process of reasoning is simply to plead guilty to ignorance of one of the first laws of logic,—the undistributed middle. Man is an organism, society presents analogies similar to man, therefore society is an organism. To define the workings of society in terms of science does not necessarily give scientific sociology. Society grows like a plant, unfolds like a flower, viewed in some aspects is analogous to man. It has a head, heart, hands, a nervous system, arteries, veins; it is subject to ills, sickness, disease, death. We diagnose society's ills. We speak of the birth of nations, of their infancy, of their decline, old age, and death. But these are similes. But similes and analogies are not exact, and must not be pressed, as Herbert Spencer admits, until they go on all fours. For society has not hair or skin or a liver; it has not teeth or finger nails.

August Comte is called the Father of Sociology, because he first used the word and made some valuable suggestions as to how it should be studied. But he did not systematize it, or come to any conclusions beyond some analogies and similes. He pointed the way, like a signboard, and many have followed his directions; but not one who has done so, including Herbert Spencer himself, has ever reached the

<sup>1</sup> Life of George Eliot, p. 15.

journey's end. Comte himself did not do it for two reasons. He was a bald materialist and could cognize no phenomena of the spiritual world. He thought of sociology as social physics. The second reason why he accomplished nothing was that he died. Students in sociology have the habit of dying, the same as other mortals, and this has a tendency to cut short their investigations into the infinite data of human society.

In his "Data of Ethics," Herbert Spencer says, in the preface, that his reason for hastening on to write the "Data" and leaving certain intermediate work untouched, was the constant premonition, occasioned by certain bodily infirmities, that his work might be cut short and thus the world be deprived of his conclusions,—the most valuable part of it. His life was spared, and he turned back after writing the "Data of Ethics" to do the intermediate part, but he has not yet completed it. And not one other of the sociologists agrees with him in his conclusions. Professor Simon N. Patten says of the very attempt to view society as an organism:—

"It is a common sociological concept to think of a society as an organism. This concept is, however, defective. The members of a society act together not because they are parts of an organism having an independent *vital force*, but because they project and visualize the same subjective environment."<sup>1</sup>

Small and Vincent say of Spencer's sociology, that it ends precisely where sociology proper should begin. In other words, he talked up to his subject and then stopped. Like a man who started so far back to run before jumping the gate he had no strength left to get over it. Where is the strictly scientific sociologist who has yet come up to the gate and opened it so that we may go in and see the garden with its flowers and fruits? Small and Vincent's text-book is called an introduction to the study of society. Aside from some striking similes and deep analogies, and an attempt to

<sup>1</sup> Annals of the American Academy.

clothe the commonest concepts in scientific terms, it has introduced us to some postal routes, some ordinary information about a rural community that any farmer's boy knows, some phases of a village that any grocer's clerk is familiar with. Such a book necessarily misses the deeper truth and comes to no practical conclusions. It is a hand pointing the way again. It talks about the psycho-physical communicating apparatus, about the pathology of social organs, the phenomena of social psychology and of social consciousness. We have social anatomy, physiology and pathology. And the conclusion which follows some ponderous propositions is that the telephone girl may be both a "communicating cell" and an "end organ." We are then warned that ordinary minds must not meddle with such deep themes. It is the exclusive province of scholarship to arrive at such weighty conclusions.

Our thought is not that sociology is to do more than end where social reform begins. Its province is not to Christianize society by preaching the gospel or present a plan of salvation, or to cure intemperance; but it does furnish the data for every social reform, and Christian Sociology does give the objective reasons for every Christian effort, and its investigations have this end in view. Professor Giddings says that Spencerian sociology, in general, whether formulated by Mr. Spencer or by other writers under the influence of his thought, is essentially a physical philosophy of society, notwithstanding its liberal use of biological and psychological data. In the words of Professor Giddings,—

"These theorems [of Mr. Spencer in his "First Principles"], taken together, are an interpretation of social changes in terms of those laws of the persistence of force, the direction and rhythm of motion, the integration of matter and the differentiation of form, that, together, make up Mr. Spencer's well-known formula of universal evolution."<sup>1</sup>

Small and Vincent view sociology as a science, a philosophy, and an art. On page 25 it is a science. "Sociology is a

<sup>1</sup> Theory of Sociology, p. 9.

science less than fifty years old." On page 32 it is a philosophy. "The philosophy of human welfare." On page 77 it is an art. "It was born of the modern ardor to improve society." Professor Giddings asks:—

"Is it not as nearly certain as anything can be that sociology must abandon the biological terminology?"<sup>1</sup> adding, "It is the superficial aspects of social organization that are described, not the deeper relations and hidden forces."<sup>2</sup>

Professor H. H. Powers, speaking of Small and Vincent's book, says:—

"The sentences are involved and cumbersome, and there is a suggestion that the author places too great confidence in the scientific value of mere terminology."<sup>3</sup>

"The result of this headlong haste to be first is never a science—only a book. There must certainly be a science of sociology, but it will not come in a day, and its advent will be hastened more by the moderation and self-restraint than by the impetuosity of its devotees." "Superficial and misleading methods."<sup>4</sup>

In like manner Professor Bernard Moses gives it as his opinion that,—

"Although it may be true that sociology deals with society generally, yet its purpose does not appear to be scientific but practical."<sup>5</sup>

Writing at greater length, Kidd says:—

"One of the monumental works of our time is the 'Synthetic Philosophy' of Mr. Herbert Spencer begun early in the second half of the century, and not yet completed. It is a stupendous attempt not only at the unification of knowledge, but at the explanation in terms of evolutionary science of the development which human society is undergoing, and towards the elucidation of which development it is rightly recognized that all the work of science in lower fields should be preliminary. Yet so little practical light has the author apparently succeeded in throwing on the nature of the social problems of our time, that his investigations and conclusions are, according as they are dealt with by one side or the other, held to lead up to the opinions of the two diametrically opposite camps of individualists and collectivists into which society is slowly becoming organized."<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Yale Review, Nov. 1894, p. 327.    <sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 328.

<sup>3</sup> Annals of the American Academy, March, 1895, p. 121.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 123, 122.

<sup>5</sup> Journal of Political Economy, December, 1894, p. 38.

<sup>6</sup> Social Evolution, p. 2.

With this agrees the Professor of Political Economy in the University of Montpellier, France, Charles Gide, who affirms that,—

“All workers at sociology, whether they be of the school of Comte or of the school of Herbert Spencer, apply their main efforts to the formation of a huge synthesis of all the social sciences; but the field is so vast that it is easy to miss the right road.”<sup>1</sup>

In 1818 Fourier wrote: “To-day, Good Friday, I have found the secret of universal association.” But Gide says: “Association is not one of those phenomena that require discovery.” The bees, the ants, the beavers, no less than worlds in the solar system, follow such a law which seems to be a universal and general law.<sup>2</sup> Emerson says that manners is the secret of association; another says sympathy, and the play of self-interest seems to many to govern it.

Upon this point Richard T. Ely speaks as follows:—

“Sociology as a whole is so vast a subject that comparatively little progress, it must be confessed, has been made in its prosecution. . . .”

“Herbert Spencer is the best known English sociologist, and in his various works, *Study of Sociology*, *Social Statics*, *Principles of Biology*, he has covered a wide field, but for the most part superficially. . . .”

“. . . in reading the works of sociologists, while making full and frank acknowledgment of their erudition, patient research, and ability, it must be confessed that the impression left by all is that of work unfinished, of work, in fact, scarcely more than begun. . . . They are men who are feeling their way, and who, like other explorers, often stumble and fall. Suggestion and impulse describe the debt we owe to sociologists.”<sup>3</sup>

As late as March, 1892, Mr. Leslie Stephen said that—

“There is no science of sociology properly scientific—merely a heap of vague empirical observations, too flimsy to be useful in strict logical inference.”<sup>4</sup>

Mr. Kidd says:—

“So far, the larger part of the most useful work of the century in the department of sociology appears to have been merely destructive.”

“. . . There is at the present time no science of human society. Many of the spokesmen of science who concern themselves with social problems continue to speak and act as if they conceived that their duty

<sup>1</sup> Political Economy, p. 4.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 145.

<sup>3</sup> Political Economy, pp. 16, 17.

<sup>4</sup> Quoted by Kidd, p. 5.

to society was to take away its religious beliefs. But it is not that they have any faith of their own to offer instead; they apparently have themselves no grasp of the problem with which the world is struggling as best it can. Science has obviously herself no clear perception of the nature of the social evolution we are undergoing. She has made no serious attempt to explain the phenomenon of our Western civilisation. We are without any real knowledge of the laws of its life and development or of the principles which underlie the process of social evolution which is proceeding around us."<sup>1</sup>

The foremost names in so-called scientific sociology are Comte, Spencer, Schäßle, and Ward, but not one of them has a single practical suggestion to offer upon the social evolution that is going on about us. As a protest against all attempts to define society in terms of biology and of science, Kidd's "Social Evolution" has emphasized the service of the religious motive, the function of idealism and of supernatural sanction in social progress.

Hence our proposition, that the science of human society, as an organism, so far from being exact, is merely an ideal, a theory, and is nearer the domain of speculative philosophy, unless we use the word scientific in a loose sense to express a method rather than a definite body of knowledge. It is not practical nor attainable because the data are infinite, and the mind is too limited to know such infinite data with sufficient exactness. Professor Giddings says:—

"No science is at this moment in greater need of theoretical organization than sociology. [On page 13 he says sociology is not a science.] A rapidly growing body of coördinated knowledge is called by this name. An increasing number of earnest thinkers in England, Germany, France, Belgium, Italy and the United States are known as sociologists. Several universities in Europe and America have introduced courses in sociology. Yet there is no definite agreement among scientific men as to what the word shall be understood to mean.

"In some of the university courses it stands for a philosophy of society. In others it denominates a study of the institutions of tribal communities. In yet others it is applied to highly special studies of pauperism, crime and philanthropy. In the literature of sociology, also, an equally varied usage may be found. Special investigators employ the word in senses that are unrecognized by the systematic writers."<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Social Evolution, p. 5.

<sup>2</sup> Theory of Sociology, p. 7.

And yet Small and Vincent say that sociology is fifty years old. For all these reasons we have said that sociology is more of a philosophy than a science. It is a philosophy of society defined in terms of science or in a scientific mood.

Social organisms are not hatched out by machinery like chickens. They lie outside of the sphere of observable and positive knowledge. Has scientific sociology, falsely so-called, then, any patent on this department of thought so that it has acquired the right to the exclusive exercise of investigation and can warn Christian thinkers off as trespassers, as Professor Small has essayed to do? We answer, It has no such exclusive monopoly. It never had it, in the first place, and, if it had, fifty years is long enough for the patent to have expired; and especially because science has accomplished nothing practical. It has put out some ponderous volumes full of scholastic pedantry and metaphysical jugglery and intellectual gymnastics, but it has not found a remedy for a single social malady. It has so far been a blind leader of the blind.

At the opening of the University of Brussels, the rector, M. Van der Rest, took for his subject "La Sociologie," and refused to institute a special chair for it, saying it was—

"a badly determined science, that presents no well-defined line of demarcation from the moral and political sciences and that touches the most varied questions, all of which nevertheless are comprised within the limits of the studies of existing chairs."

Many leaders of sociological thought deny that the use of the word Christian as applied to sociology means anything. The Hartford School of Sociology connected with the Seminary has recently dropped the use of the word. Professor Small maintains that we cannot be Christian sociologists until we have become sociologists, thus using the word Christian subjectively, which very few have any thought of doing. These warnings to Christian teachers and preachers not to confound sociology with social reforms, or with applied Chris-

tianity, or with the Christianization of society; and, much more, not to confuse sociology with Utopian dreams, and define it in terms of the emotions instead of the intellect; and to be very careful about confounding piety and pity with scientific knowledge are forcibly stated by such writers as Professor Small, Professor Giddings, and Dr. Dike. Notwithstanding, we are told that sociology has no other task and no other evidence than the task and the evidence which the facts of associated life contain, and that the problems of society are not in some social *terra incognita* constructed by the kaleidoscope of abstract reasoning and visible only in imagination; that the terms of social problems are the most commonplace facts of social experiences: yet we are told that there is a fashionable social sciolism which assumes ability to perform large social generalization without precise knowledge of any contained particular. We are told by Small and Vincent that Christian purpose and aspiration cannot furnish technical skill or information; that piety without knowledge of facts would work disaster in politics and economics just as in navigation or in pharmacy. Professor Small covers the ground more plainly when he says that many people are dabbling with sociology who lack both the talent and the training requisite for the investigation of social principles.

When theoretical sociologists claim that the study of sociology is less than fifty years old, we answer, that Amos, Joel, Hosea, and Isaiah were sociologists. Amos lived about 750 B. C. Two and a half centuries before Plato, therefore, he preached justice and righteousness and a sound ethics,—treating the nation as an organic unity in all of God's dealing with it. He agrees with President Fairchild as to the true source of right conduct. His mission was not to individuals, but to the nation. "Seek Jehovah; seek good, that ye may live." Hosea also treats the nation as an organism. He sees with true sociological instinct that Jehovah has a controversy with the nation. Loving kindness and not sac-

rifice is what he desires; a knowledge of God more than burnt offerings.

And Isaiah is full of sociology. His book is a warning not to grind the face of the poor. He warns against injustice to the poor, against acquiring vast estates by dispossessing small holders; against splendid palaces with their sumptuous banquets and riotous revels; against extravagant wardrobes, costly jewels; against materialism in all its forms. He deals with society as an organic unity. This antedates August Comte and Herbert Spencer by about twenty-five hundred years. And Micah and Habakkuk lay down principles of life and death for a nation; likewise Jeremiah and Zechariah. Professor Edward L. Curtis, of Yale College, has well remarked, that the Old Testament mainly reveals God's dealing with nations, while the New Testament dwells especially upon his relations to the individual.

The study of society as a unit or an organism is, therefore, not new. It is older than Plato's Republic or Cicero's Commonwealth. It antedates Moses and Confucius, for aught we know. That human beings are moved by common impulses, actuated by similar motives, and in their associated capacity present phenomena analogous and similar to other organisms, is no new discovery. The twelfth chapter of Romans and the twelfth chapter of First Corinthians are in evidence. But the remarkable advances made in the sciences; the increase of striking analogies found, especially in the study of biology; *and more particularly the practical need of solving some burning social questions which are vital issues in our national life*,—these have all combined to bring sociology to the front as seemingly a new philosophy or a new science. Kidd says that the triumphs of society over nature are the prominent facts of the present century. "The influence of machinery, steam transportation, and electrical communication upon social structures and activities has been so great that the contrast between the old and the new is al-

most startling. But the task is not complete. Exploring expeditions, surveying parties, physical and chemical laboratories, agricultural experiment stations, and countless individuals in virtual co-operation with each other and with those whose work they inherit, are constantly engaged in the great task of finding out more of nature's secrets and putting them at the service of society."<sup>1</sup>

Professor Bascom says:—

"Sociology is a discussion of the conditions and laws of combination and growth in society."

"Indirectly sociology involves every force that touches human life, and so may be said to spread out into all knowledge. It ought, however, directly to include only those departments of action whose immediate and primary office it is to organize society. . . . We confine, then, our attention to those agencies which are directly formative forces in society, and by which society is understood.

"There are, in social phenomena, five modes of action sufficiently distinct and organic to be termed departments of sociology. They are customs, laws, economics, religion and ethics."

"Customs may be divided into social, religious and civil customs. Social customs may be divided into those which pertain to the family, to classes and to general intercourse. Religious customs are rites and observances. Civil customs appertain to economic action, to methods in civil procedure and to law."<sup>2</sup>

If sociology is to be traced to August Comte because he first used the word, and in 1830 said that positive philosophy could be completed by bringing social phenomena within its comprehension and consolidating the whole into one body of homogeneous doctrine, then sociology is less than fifty years of age. But may not Comte's service in this sphere be likened to Bacon's in philosophy in this particular, that, as Lord Macaulay says, Bacon discovered nothing, he only a stated a principle that was as old as man and revealed its bearings and importance. Comte said it is time to complete the vast intellectual operations begun by Bacon, Descartes, and Galileo by constructing the system of *general* ideas, which must henceforth prevail among the human race.

<sup>1</sup> Social Evolution, p. 266.    <sup>2</sup> Sociology, pp. 2, 6, 7.

And the end was surely Baconian, for this is the way, Comte said, to put an end to the revolutionary crisis which is tormenting the civilized nations of the world. Comte was not the first to imagine that what man needed was simply a way and the truth, but not the life. If in all ages men had acted as he imagined they would,—follow the truth when they see it, Plato's Republic might have been a reality long since, instead of a dream. It is a very common mistake that is made in every age by some of the best thinkers, that man's intellect instead of his will needs converting. Paul knew better. "For we know that the law is spiritual: but I am carnal, sold under sin," etc. (Rom. vii. 14-25).

While universities in Europe and in America have introduced courses in sociology, there is no agreement yet as to what the word shall be understood to mean. Professor Giddings says:—

"Sociology is an attempt to account for the origin, growth, structure, and activities of human society by the operation of physical, vital and psychical causes, working together in a process of evolution."

Hence he finds in Spencer, Darwin, and Hæckel suggestions of an evolutionist account of social relations. He says a sociologist must be historian, economist, statistician, biologist, psychologist.

Small and Vincent claim that sociology in its historical and analytical department, or descriptive sociology, is the organization of all the positive knowledge of man and of society furnished by the sciences and sub-sciences now designated and included under the titles Biology, Anthropology, Psychology, Ethnology, Demography, History, Political and Economic Science, and Ethics. Descriptive Sociology attempts to combine the testimony of these special sciences into a revelation of the accidental and the permanent factors in social combinations, and thus of the forces to be taken into calculation in all doctrines or policies of social progress. Nearly fifty years ago Herbert Spencer enumerated the re-

quirements of descriptive sociology, which he called the Natural History of Society, to be knowledge of government, political and ecclesiastical; customs, usages, industrial systems, superstitions, myths, labor guilds, organizations, the agencies for distribution, communication, circulating medium; all the arts, the intellectual condition, the sciences, architecture, sculpture, painting, music, poetry and literature, æsthetic culture, the daily lives of the people, their food, homes and amusements, and finally the morals, theoretical and practical, laws, habits, proverbs, etc. These must all be grouped and arranged and comprehended in their *ensemble* and contemplated as mutually dependent parts of a great whole. The task of the sociologist, if all this were necessary, is therefore not light. We are not surprised, therefore, that no man has yet arisen who can be called the leader in sociological thought. Giddings says, that Aristotle in the *Politics*, that Montesquieu and the physiocrats gave objective explanation of society in terms of race, soil, climate, heredity, and historical conditions. They were followed by Hobbes, Locke, Hume, Bentham, Berkeley, Kant, and Hegel with subjective interpretations in terms of human nature, utility, ethical inspirations and ideals. And Professor Giddings reasons that a definite, coherent, theoretical sociology must unite the subjective and objective explanations.

Accordingly, the sociologist has three main quests. "First, he must try to discover the conditions that determine mere aggregation and concourse. Secondly, he must try to discover the law that governs social choices, the law, that is, of the subjective process. Thirdly, he must try to discover also the law that governs the natural selection and survival of choices, the law, that is, of the objective process." Hence Professor Giddings concludes that sociology of itself is not a science. So says Professor Bascom. Is there any science of the infinite, or is it at the best a speculative philosophy? Sociology viewed in some aspects reminds one, therefore, of

the museum where, Washington Irving says, was combined in the highest degree those things of rarity and uselessness. Every special philosopher claims to be a sociologist, and defines sociology in terms of those forces which are the object of his own investigations. Political economy enlarged is sociology; so is the study of crime, of pauperism, intemperance. Ethnology becomes sociology.

But a living science is like the poet, *nascitur, non fit*. Its origin is practical,—its end is to add somewhat to the sum of human happiness. True science, like true philosophy, as Bacon showed, must be enlisted in the service of mankind. It must justify its existence by its very usefulness.

Now, is sociology to become a living thing, justified in its existence by its usefulness and by positive service to mankind, adding to the welfare of human happiness, and an earnest seeker for truth, not as an end, but as a means to a higher end,—the betterment of mankind? If society is an organism, then Christian Sociology is scientific in this, that it recognizes the necessity of perfecting the individual units, namely the individuals that make up the organic whole. This was what Plato said was all that society needed,—justice in the individual. As Paul said: "That we may grow up into him in all things which is the head, even Christ: from whom the whole body fitly joined together, and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body, unto the edifying of itself in love." (Eph. iv. 15, 16.) That Christianity does perfect the individual can be proved both inductively and deductively. It puts character in the will, it moves upon that stronghold through both the emotions and the intellect. And Christian Sociology clearly defines the relations of these units in the organism, for there is no proper conception of altruism in science. The altruism of science is natural, and not spiritual. The tiger has it, the

wild geese, the Newfoundland dog, the bees. But that is not the love commended because it is born of God. Theoretical sociology is like the warehouse where are a lot of machines. Its duty is to take them all and make one machine of them. But practical sociology melts up the iron before making one machine of all. Sociology must cognize all forces at work in society. Practical sociology puts its depth of thought in the concept, and not in the words that image the concept. It is free from that curse of the dialecticians,—scholastic pedantry, the menace to-day to American scholarship. It assumes that simplicity is the soul of culture. Clearness of thought is a first requisite; as Lincoln's speech at Gettysburg lives when Everett's is forgotten.

Sociology is not to be an Edward Casaubon, spending a life on some impracticable investigations which are like Jay Gould's road that begins nowhere and ends nowhere. Christian Sociology is modest. It asks questions of other departments of thought, like ethics, philosophy, exegetical theology, psychology. It builds upon the conclusions of other departments of Christian thought. It asks of moral philosophy, What is the *summum bonum*? It does not assume to know all things, and when all knowledge has brought its conclusions, it asks of all, *Cui bono*? Its end is practical,—to add to the sum of human happiness. Christian Sociology recognizes *sin* in the world and looks for it in the home of the rich and in the hovel of the poor,—among capitalists no less than in labor organizations. Any view of the world that fails to discover sin is superficial. Sin is a matter of proportions and of relations, and not necessarily of definite acts. Christian Sociology, therefore, takes cognizance of all of the forces that play any part in shaping society. It views the material, mental, moral, and spiritual phenomena only in their social aspects. It is scientific in method, philosophic in spirit, and zealous for wise conclusions, because it is a condition, and not a theory, that confronts us; and because

Christian Sociology aims primarily at the betterment of mankind and to add to the sum of human happiness. It brings its fruit to market, and not the machinery by the help of which the fruit was raised. The world wants results more than it wants learned disquisitions on methods; it wants sense rather than sound; wisdom of thought rather than words.

Christian Sociology learns its lessons of evolution from biology; its laws of the mind from psychology. It derives its definition of duty from ethics, and its religious teachings from biblical and exegetical theology, but is not concerned with purely speculative questions. It enters into no discussion with ethics as to the *summum bonum*; it will not even dispute that society is evolved, provided such a theory does not logically end in fatalism. Hence Christian Sociology is descriptive, it is statical, it is dynamic. It is inductive, scientific, philosophical. It is simple, practical. Its end is not to prove a theory, but to ameliorate the condition of mankind, and in this it is like the Divine Master, who went about doing good, for only thus can it justify its right to the respect of the thinking world and to be supported by the endowments of Christian philanthropy.