

CARTON 127

WRITINGS

"THE RACE RELATIONS THEORY OF ROBERT E. PARK:
A CRITICAL SOCIAL-BIOGRAPHICAL REVIEW"
SPECIAL AREA QUALIFYING EXAMINATION, UCSF
SOCIOLOGY PROGRAM

1979

2017/193

SPECIAL AREA QUALIFYING EXAMINATION

THE RACE RELATIONS THEORY OF ROBERT E. PARK:
A CRITICAL SOCIAL-BIOGRAPHICAL REVIEW

By Robert L. Allen

Examination Committee:

Robert Staples, Ph.D., Chair
Leonard Schatzman, Ph.D.
Anselm Strauss, Ph.D.

Sociology Program
University of California,
San Francisco
April, 1979

THE RACE RELATIONS THEORY OF ROBERT E. PARK:

A CRITICAL SOCIAL-BIOGRAPHICAL REVIEW

by Robert L. Allen

To understand the development of the race relations theory of Robert Park it would be useful to first survey the social and intellectual context in which his thinking was formed.

THE PROGRESSIVE ERA

Park came to intellectual maturity during the Progressive Era, a period of great social ferment (Allen, 1974: 81-119; 263-272). In the latter part of the 19th Century the United States underwent a period of rapid economic development; the country changed from being a rural-agricultural to an urban-industrial society. Huge new industries arose, including railroads, iron and steel manufacturing, giant utility companies and others. With these came forms of economic concentration and monopoly such as the nation had never seen before. Gigantic family and corporate fortunes were built; the names Mellon, Morgan, Rockefeller, and Vanderbilt became household words. Smaller businesses were elbowed aside by the large corporations and banks which increasingly dominated the economy.

The class and racial structure of the country also changed. Large numbers of European immigrants poured into the U.S. to take advantage of low-paying, unskilled factory jobs. Black workers, who had previously formed the backbone of the southern agricultural system were beginning to be forced off the land by monopolization, terrorism and mechanization. Increasingly black labor was reduced to a subproletariat, a kind of labor reserve that could be recruited into the worst jobs of the new industrial

system. Moreover, employers often engendered conflicts between different ethnic and racial groups in order to keep wages down and undermine labor union organizing efforts. Black workers frequently found themselves forced to play the role of pawns in the clash between white labor and white capital. Labor strife and racial violence were frighteningly common occurrences.

Members of the old middle class -- independent professionals and small businessmen -- were alarmed by the growing economic concentration and the corruption and violence it seemed to spawn. They saw the doors of opportunity closing for themselves as monopolization spread through the economy. It was this class that provided the social base of the Progressive movement. The response of the middle class involved two divergent and even contradictory social tendencies. On the one hand there was a pronounced sentimental yearning for a return to a romanticized past of frontier individualism and primitive competitive capitalism where, with hard work and a bit of luck, an entrepreneur could still hope to make his fortune. On the other hand was a tendency which called for reforming and rationalizing the economic system by regulating competition and controlling the giant corporations through legislation. Most of the reforms of the Progressive Era were aimed not so much at destroying monopoly industrial capitalism but at making it more "reasonable" and efficient through government intervention and regulation (Weinstein, 1968).

Similarly, the racial attitudes of the Progressives were expressed in two tendencies: the virulent white supremacist attitudes of many political figures, and the accommodationist paternalism of the urban reformers (Hofstadter, 1945: 146f; Frederickson, 1971; Gossett, 1965: 144-175, 253-286). Social Darwinism, as a racial ideology, embodied both of these tendencies: in the struggle for survival it was asserted that the white race had been "selected" by natural forces to dominate other races; but this carried with it a moral responsibility to "uplift" the allegedly inferior colored races.

Booker T. Washington became the darling of the Progressives because his program of industrial education and forswearance of political agitation converged with the Progressives' interest in incorporating black labor into the industrial order but without challenging white domination. Social harmony, not radical change, was a chief concern of the Progressive era, and Washington's program promised the creation of a docile black labor force that would quietly accept its assigned place at the bottom of the new economic order -- and wait patiently to be gradually "uplifted" by philanthropists, reformers and well-meaning industrialists.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

The founding of the University of Chicago in 1892 was squarely within the conservative reform impulse of the Progressive Era. Supported by the philanthropy of John D. Rockefeller and guided by the reform spirit of its first president, William Rainey Harper, the University sought to join the academic life to community service. Harper's wish was to prove that the University could "do a great service to mankind" (Matthews, 1977:88). A Baptist minister, Harper thought that scholarship could be combined with serving the social needs of the community.

The city of Chicago was an ideal place for this social experiment that was called the University of Chicago. Less than 60 years before, Chicago was a small settlement located on a swampy site beside Lake Michigan. The rapid development of the West and Midwest after the Civil War made Chicago a strategic site for the burgeoning meat-packing and steel industries, and a transportation hub. The swift growth of industry and commerce in turn attracted thousands of European immigrants to toil in the stockyards and mills. Chicago soon exhibited the symptoms of rapid industrial and population growth: labor unrest, ethnic group conflict, a growing disparity between the wealthy and the mass of the population, the emergence of slums

as the well-to-do abandoned the central city and moved to the periphery, the growth of organized crime and political corruption.

The new University plunged into the life of the city. In 1894 President Harper established a settlement house near the stockyards. He also instituted the four-quarter academic year and an extension system which made the University more accessible to the citizens of Chicago. Harper's commitment to the social gospel of community service led him to establish strong departments in divinity and the new fields of social science. Indeed, the first true department of sociology was established at Chicago with the founding of the University.

That a sociology department was established with the founding of the University was indeed fortunate, for it gave the new department a prestige and freedom from tradition and vested interest which were to delay the development of the field in many eastern universities (Faris, 1967:12,25).

Harper recruited another Baptist minister, Albion Small, to head the new Department of Sociology. Small shared the conservative reform impulse of Harper. Trained in theology, history and political economy, Small was dissatisfied with the fragmentation of the traditional social science disciplines and their inability to come to grips with the phenomenon of modern urban America. In THE ORIGINS OF SOCIOLOGY Small noted that there was a general unrest among many social scientists who had come to believe that "all the traditional ways of interpreting human experience were futile... Sociology was not primarily a promulgation of doctrines about society. It was an assertion that better ways must be invented than all the rationalizers about society had practiced in their attempts to understand the fortunes of men in the past, and to point out wise courses for the future" (Small, 1924:335). Small saw American sociology as a social movement whose objective was

to formulate a new discipline providing accurate, rational understanding of human behavior and illuminating the possibilities for constructive social action. For Small, "sociology in its largest scope and on its methodological side is merely a moral philosophy conscious of its task" (Matthews, 1977:93). He agreed with W.I. Thomas that sociology aimed to substitute action based on knowledge for action based on feeling (Ibid, 95), a view that Park would later share.

In 1890 Small and about 20 others who were attending a meeting of the American Economic Association held an informal gathering to discuss the new discipline of sociology. These men shared Small's dissatisfaction. They "were moved by a common unrest about the unconvincing character of everything that had been done up to that time in the way of interpreting human life. These men felt that social science in its current forms was all shallow, and unsatisfying and misleading. They wanted to do something about it" (Small, 1924:342). For his part, Small started a new course in Sociology at Colby University. Later at Chicago he was to found the AMERICAN JOURNAL OF SOCIOLOGY and be co-founder of the American Sociological Society.

Small and his colleagues in the new department were all influenced by the reform impulse of Protestant^t social gossellers, although Small and Thomas distrusted the emotionalism of the reformers. Small and Charles Henderson were both ministers; George Vincent and W.I. Thomas had theological influences in their backgrounds. These men shared, along with some other early American sociologists, an interest in the meliorative possibilities of sociology and a desire to establish sociology on a scientific basis. They opposed the determinism and fatalism of Herbert Spencer and the Social Darwinists (Matthews, 1977: 91-93). They believed that it was possible to gain a general scientific understanding about the nature of society, and that this understanding could be applied to the alleviation of social problems.

But social theory could not be constructed nor could social problems be alleviated without knowledge of the facts -- research. From the beginning the Chicago school stressed research in the field, rather than in the library, as the most reliable path to sociological knowledge. Chicago itself was the great laboratory, and students were dispatched to inquire into many facets of the social life and institutions of the city -- a practice that was to become a Chicago school tradition under the influence of Robert Park.

One of the most interesting of the Chicago school founders was W.I. Thomas. Thomas was one of the first students in the department, taking his degree in 1896. It was Thomas who formulated the key concepts of "social disorganization" and "definition of the situation" which were to become so important in later Chicago school writings. Thomas also introduced the method of using personal documents in sociological research (Janowitz, 1966). (Parenthetically, it was Thomas who also developed the system of note-taking on colored slips of paper which was to be employed by generations of Chicago students.)

Thomas was one of the first American sociologists to combine theory with field research. He also formulated a "crisis" theory of social change which foreshadowed the later work by Park (Matthews, 1977:97-98). Thomas is probably most well known for his monumental work, *THE POLISH PEASANT IN EUROPE AND AMERICA* (written with Florian Znaniecki).

Thomas helped to shift sociology away from biological interpretations of human behavior; but on the matter of race prejudice he put forward a largely biological analysis:

Psychologically speaking, race-prejudice and caste-feeling are at bottom the same thing, both being phases of the instinct of hate.... Of the relation of black to white in this country it is perhaps true that the antipathy of the southerner for the Negro is rather caste-feeling than race-prejudice, while the feeling of the northerner is race-prejudice proper. In the North, where there has been no

contact with the Negro and no activity connections, there is no caste-feeling, but there exists a skin prejudice -- a horror of the external aspect of the Negro -- and many northerners report that they have a feeling against eating from a dish handled by a Negro. The association of master and slave in the South was, however, close, even if not intimate, and much of the feeling of physical repulsion for a black skin disappeared. (Thomas, 1904: 609-610)

A similar amalgam of "instinct" theory and "caste" theory will appear later in the work of Robert Park, who was affected by Thomas' views.

PARK'S INTELLECTUAL FORMATION

Robert Ezra Park was born on February 14, 1864. When he was still quite young his parents moved to Red Wing, Minnesota, where his father established a business that over the years was to become ever more successful. In some ways Park's early life paralleled the experiences of the second generation immigrant youth -- the marginal men -- he was later to study. He rebelled against the commercial quest for money and ~~security~~^{security} which his father represented, but neither was he happy with the nostalgia for New England (the symbolic "old country") which seemed to pre-occupy his mother. Torn between the "new" and "old" Americas, Park attached himself to youthful neighborhood gangs and became something of an outsider (Matthews, 1977:2-3). This detachment was his first step, albeit unintended, toward the awakening of sociological insight.

At 19 years of age Park enrolled as a student at the University of Michigan. Here he studied with John Dewey, who introduced him to the notion of communication as being a key to the process of social cohesion and social change. Dewey's democratic vision profoundly influenced the young Park. Park began to see the possibility of rational change through a process of accommodation and adjustment facilitated by the media of communication (Ibid, 5, 19). Ironically, Dewey also introduced Park to the organicism and Social Darwinism of Herbert Spencer. Spencerian

thought fed into another side of Park's emerging character: his fatalism and, curiously, his elitism, his admiration for the superior individual, "the big and original men " who through their thought and work are able to alter the course of history (Ibid).

It was also through Dewey that Park met the newspaperman Franklin Ford. Ford, like many newspapermen of the Progressive Era, was acutely conscious of the rapid pace of change in America and the role of newspapers in making the public conscious of change. In an autobiographical fragment Park wrote later that Ford "came to believe, and I did too, that with more accurate and adequate reporting of current events the historical process would be appreciably stepped up, and progress would go forward steadily, without the interruption and disorder of depression and violence, and at a rapid pace" (Park, 1950: v-vi). Park, Dewey and Ford conceived of publishing a journal to be called THOUGHT NEWS which would interpret current news events from the standpoint of philosophy. Although the project never really got off the ground, the collaboration with Ford contributed to Park's belief that knowledge (E.g., a deep understanding of the significance of current news) could itself contribute to rational change by altering the consciousness of individual actors. Indeed, here is one source of Park's later contention that social reformers are doomed to failure because they begin with emotion rather than knowledge.

Park soon grew weary of the academic world and, like Faust whom he admired, he turned to the "world of men." Between 1887 and 1898 Park worked as a reporter for newspapers in Minnesota, Detroit, Denver, New York and Chicago. He became intimately acquainted with the painful problems engendered by the transition from a rural-agricultural to an urban-industrial society. He witnessed and described the squalid conditions, corruption and crime afflicting urban immigrants (Coser, 1977:367; Matthews,

8-11). Park was concerned with ameliorating the appalling conditions he encountered but his idealistic reforming urge was tempered by the realism (and sometimes cynicism) that was fostered by his experiences as a big city reporter. He came to believe that "a reporter who had the facts was^a/more effective reformer than an editorial writer who merely thundered from his pulpit, no matter how eloquently" (Park, 1950:viii).

But the effective career of a reporter was short and after 12 years Park realized that he must either change occupations or settle for a declining career in newspaper work (Coser, 1977:377). His journalistic experiences had deepened his interest in the problems of the city and mass communication. With financial help from his businessman father Park decided to return to academia to study philosophy and psychology; he enrolled as a graduate student at Harvard.

At Harvard Park studied with William James, whose essay, "A Certain Blindness in Human Beings," made a great impression on him. This essay, in stressing the importance of the subjective perceptions of actors in social situations, served to counterbalance Park's early tendency to regard the stance of the outside observer (e.g., the reporter) as the sole position from which to gain insight into social reality. "The 'blindness' of which James spoke," Park wrote, "is the blindness each of us is likely to have for the meaning of other people's lives. At any rate what sociologists most need to know is what goes on behind the faces of men, what it is that makes life for each of us either dull or thrilling.... But the thing that gives zest to life or makes life dull is, however, as James says, 'a personal secret' which has, in every single case, to be discovered. Otherwise we do not know the world in which we actually live." (Park, 1950:vi-vii)

After taking classes at Harvard for a year Park decided to go to Europe to further his studies. At Berlin he attended the lectures of Georg Simmel, which constituted his only formal instruction in sociology.

From Simmel Park derived the notion of society as a system of interactions and processes. Simmel also stimulated Park's ideas about social conflict, ecology, the marginal man, and social distance (Coser, 1977: 374; Matthews, 1977:34-35,41).

Through the writings of the Russian social scientist Bogdan Kistiakowski Park learned of the work of Wilhelm Windelband, whom he went to study with at Heidelberg. Windelband argued against the positivistic effort to make history a natural science. But the main effect of Windelband on Park was to inspire the latter's idea of "natural history," a history that seeks to identify "natural" stages and cycles in the evolution of social institutions (Coser, 1977:375).

In Europe Park seems to have developed a romantic infatuation with the alleged virtues of the Teutonic race. He wrote a magazine article which spoke approvingly of the "ancient conviction inherent in the Teutonic race, the conviction that the man or nation that is not willing to fight for its own does not deserve to live" (Matthews, 1977: 34). Park shared the Social Darwinist perspective of many Progressives who viewed war as a social good in that it stiffened the national spirit and counteracted social decay. Note, too, the reference to "inherent" racial qualities, a biological perspective from which Park was never entirely free.

The other side of this romanticism was a fascination with European peasants, whom he regarded as an embodiment of the simple, unassuming "natural man" (Ibid, 35). Park was later to transfer this romanticized perspective to southern blacks,

Returning to the United States after four years, Park completed his Ph.D. dissertation, MASSE UND PUBLIKUM, which incorporated many of the ideas he had encountered in Europe. The dissertation reflected Park's struggle to grasp the transition between the "old" and "new" worlds. Park suggested that modern society offered two alternatives to traditional

society: the irrational crowd, swayed by emotions of the moment; and the enlightened public, capable of rational discussion and action. Park's sociological faith was that through understanding both alternatives it was possible to promote the rational choice.

With the completion of his degree Park was again at a turning point in his career. He was restless in the academic world and soon decided to return to the "world of men." In the style of Progressive muckrakers, Park for a short time worked as a propagandist for the Congo Reform Association, a group of religious reformers that sought to expose the horrors perpetrated by King Leopold in the Congo. Park sympathized with the reformers but he soon came to feel that their zeal was misplaced and even opportunistic (Matthews, 1977:58-59). No amount of religious instruction, he believed, would undo the fact and consequences of European penetration of Africa. The solution, he felt, was to help the African natives accommodate themselves to the new capitalist order through, for example, vocational education. In typically Progressive fashion, Park saw the spread of white civilization as being "destructive and wasteful," but also necessary to world "progress." (Park, 1950:vii; Matthews, 61). The real task for reformers, he thought, was not to berate this "natural" process or try to reverse it, but instead to help the natives (and immigrants and blacks and lower classes, he later concluded) incorporate themselves into the new order.

In Booker T. Washington Park found a living embodiment of the accommodationist praxis and perspective he was developing. Park met Washington in 1905 and for the next seven years he worked at Tuskegee as Washington's personal assistant and publicist. Under Washington's guidance Park roamed the South collecting data on race relations and the conditions of black people. Park was enormously impressed by

Washington and clearly regarded him as one of the "big and original men" who give shape to history. Park wrote: "I think I probably learned more about human nature and society, in the South under Booker Washington, than I had learned elsewhere in all my previous studies" (Park, 1950:vii).

In the turn-of-the-century South Park saw an evolutionary process of conflict and accommodation which he generalized as a universal phenomenon:

I was not, as I found later, interested in the Negro problem as that problem is ordinarily conceived. I was interested in the Negro in the South and in the curious and intricate system which had grown up to define his relations with white folk. I was interested, most of all, in studying the details of the process by which the Negro was making and had made his slow but steady advance. I became convinced, finally, that I was observing the historical process by which civilization, not merely here but elsewhere, has evolved, drawing into the circle of its influence an ever widening circle of races and peoples. (Ibid)

The Tuskegee years reinforced several interrelated themes in Park's thought which underlay his formal theories of race relations: rationalism, romanticism, and gradualism. All of these, in turn, were very much part of the social and intellectual climate of the Progressive Era.

RATIONALISM -- For Park the prerequisite for social progress -- for social actors, reformers and sociologists -- was rational knowledge of existing social reality. Such knowledge provided the conceptual and practical tools necessary for an effective adjustment to the modern "civilized" world. The program of vocational and industrial training at Tuskegee epitomized this view of the social role of knowledge for actors. The Tuskegee program was premised on the subordination of black people within American society: that was the given social reality. The purpose of the program, then, was to teach self-discipline, self-restraint, and those basic interactional and practical skills necessary for black workers who are expected to fit into assigned slots at the bottom of the industrial economic order. In this manner the students at Tuskegee were being cooly,

rationality remade -- in self-conception and skills -- to accommodate the self-interested needs of the larger white society. The "primitiveness" of the rural black youth was to be replaced by the rationality, competence and restraint of the Tuskegee product.

Park was excited by this program of rational educational accommodation. The Tuskegee program was designed to present black youths with a definite view of social reality and to raise them above the irrational "animal existence...., and existence controlled by impulse merely, rather than ideas and ideal." Park continued: "Dr. Washington believed that...the most fundamental way to solve a race problem is to encourage individuals to solve their own problems...getting a job, learning a trade or profession was not a way of making a living but a way of making a life" (Matthews, 70).

ROMANTICISM -- The other side of Park's rationalism was his bourgeois romantic infatuation with the peasantry, particularly black peasants in the South. Park was acutely sensitive to the many perils involved in the transition from rural to urban lifestyles. He had seen these problems in his newspaper work and his experiences in Europe. Park was fascinated by city life but he also experienced a certain moral revulsion at the hardship and social disorganization occasioned by the move to the city by rural folk. Park agreed with Washington that the virtuous, upstanding black peasant was in grave danger of being corrupted by city life (Ibid, 72-73). For Park, as for many white Progressives, the "primitive" peasant was the symbol of moral purity and true freedom. For the Progressive movement this romanticism was an aspect of the reactionary protest against the encroachment of urban monopoly capitalism. Intellectually, Park understood the necessity for the transition to an urban industrial society and, like other Progressives, he wished to make this process as rational and painless as possible; but emotionally he seemed still tied to a vision

of an idealized past, which was symbolized for him by the black peasantry. It was almost as though Park were still torn between the urban commercial impulse of his father and the rural nostalgia of his mother.

GRADUALISM -- In practice the conflict between rationalism and romanticism was resolved by a gradualist-evolutionary perspective of social change, in which change was seen as evolving through several necessary stages. The years at Tuskegee threw Park onto a collision course with black radicals such as W.E.B. Du Bois and William Monroe Trotter. The radicals were strongly critical of Washington's program and called instead for political agitation for full equality now. Park vigorously defended his employer and his gradualist views. Park shared Washington's faith in gradual uplift through education, and he was affronted by what he considered to be arrogance on the part of the radicals. But where Washington's gradualism was partly a pragmatic tactic developed in response to the harsh realities confronting blacks in the South, Park, consciously seeking a theoretical model, elaborated this tactic into a sociological principle, a theory of an accommodationist race relations cycle. Unfortunately, this gave a certain conservative and even fatalistic bent to Park's theory, a fatalism which was subsequently incorporated into much of American sociology of race relations (Matthews, 81).

THE SOCIOLOGICAL TRADITION IN THE U.S.

A concern with race relations is deeply rooted in American sociology. The two earliest sociological works written in this country -- Henry Hughes' TREATISE ON SOCIOLOGY, THEORETICAL AND PRACTICAL, and George Fitzhugh's SOCIOLOGY FOR THE SOUTH: OR THE FAILURE OF FREE SOCIETY -- were extended defenses of the institution of slavery (Frazier, 1947), and the subordination of black people generally.

E.B. Reuter has suggested that the sociological approach to the study of race has developed through three distinct stages in the United States (Reuter, 1945). The first stage was characterized by an emphasis on biological determinism. Sociologists in this period attempted to explain general social phenomena in biological terms. It was assumed that biological differences between the races accounted for cultural differences; therefore, the task of social scientists was to classify and measure the physical and mental differences between various human groups as a prerequisite for explaining differences in status and behavior.

The second period saw a shift toward a cultural frame of reference. As the futility of trying to explain cultural differences in strictly biological terms became more apparent, social scientists began studying the development of language, customs, beliefs and institutions, and how these varied between different groups. Characteristic of this period was the Social Darwinist perspective of William Graham Sumner. For Sumner competition between human groups led to cultural differentiation and the evolution of a superior capitalist civilization (Hofstadter, 1945: 37f; Sumner, 1963). From his theory Sumner drew the conservative conclusion that the process of cultural evolution should not be tampered with by "social doctors" (reformers) because, in his famous dictum, "stateways cannot change folkways."

The third period in the study of race was marked by an emphasis on relationships between the races rather than focusing on the biological or cultural characteristics of particular races. In this period attention is directed to the social processes involved in contact and interaction between ethnic groups.

The race relations theory developed by Robert Park belongs to this third period. However, there are occasional elements of the earlier perspectives which surface from time to time in Park's writings. For example, Park was opposed to theories of biological determinism of social behavior, as were all members of the Chicago school. He insisted that "cultural changes are not consolidated and transmitted biologically, or at least to only a very slight extent" (Park, 1928, 1950:347). Still, Park, like W.I. Thomas, could speak of racial "instincts" and "temperaments" as biological bases of racial behavior. This kind of biopsychological reductionism is reflected in the following passage:

This (racial) temperament, as I conceive it, consists in a few elementary but distinctive characteristics. These characteristics manifest themselves in agential, sunny, and social disposition, in an interest and attachment to external, physical things rather than to subjective states and objects of introspection; in a disposition for expression rather than enterprise and action.... The Negro is, by natural disposition, neither an intellectual nor an idealist, like the Jew; nor a brooding introspective, like the East African; nor a pioneer and frontiersman, like the Anglo-Saxon. He is primarily an artist, loving life for its own sake. His metier is expression rather than action. He is, so to speak, the lady of the races. (Park, 1918, 1950:280)

Here Park has selected certain racial stereotypes and treated them as biological facts and determinants of psychological and social behavior. Yet Park certainly knew that not all blacks (or Jews or East Africans or Anglo*saxons) conformed to these stereotypes -- there were important regional and class differences in behavior. Moreover, given his usual emphasis on historical perspectives it is strange that Park did not inquire into how the development of specific socio-cultural systems may have shaped certain

personality types and personality stereotypes. Park does analyze the historical development of aspects of black religion and music, but he treats personality and temperament as an expression of a mystical "racial wish" rather than as a complex, creative and social response to group cultural heritage and present social environment. Such reductionist statements are frequent in Park's early writings but seem to appear less often in later works. This reductionism may have been due in part to the early influence of W.I. Thomas on Park's thinking.

Park was not explicitly a Social Darwinist but he also appears to have been strongly influenced by the views of William Graham Sumner. Park frequently cites Sumner on the war-like nature of primitive societies, the nature of culture, the struggle for existence, in-group versus out-group, mores and folkways. Indeed, in Park's collected writings on race, RACE AND CULTURE, there are more citations to Sumner's work than to the writings of any other social scientist.

Interestingly, Park does not seem to have shared Sumner's view of the social evolution of culture. Park does have an evolutionary perspective, but what Park regards as evolving are the relations between ethnic groups rather than the cultures of ethnic groups. Park's famous race relations cycle theory presents an evolutionary model of racial interaction, a process which he believes has repeated itself throughout human history.

RACE RELATIONS CYCLE

For Park race relations include "all the relations that ordinarily exist between members of different ethnic and genetic groups which are capable of provoking race conflict and race consciousness or of determining the relative status of the racial groups of which a community is composed" He continues that race relations comprise "all those situations in which some relatively stable equilibrium between competing races has been achieved

and in which the resulting social order has become fixed in custom and tradition" (Park, 1939, 1950:82).

Robert Park's unique contribution to the theory of race relations was to develop a concept of the natural history of race contacts and interaction. Drawing broadly and comparatively on the processual sociology of Simmel, his experiences in the South, and his journalistic encounters with the European immigrants, Park developed a theory of a race relations cycle.

It is obvious that race relations and all that they imply are generally, and on the whole, the products of migration and conquest. This was true of the ancient world and it is equally true of the modern. The interracial adjustments that follow such migration and conquest are more complex than is ordinarily understood. They involve racial competition, conflict, accommodation, and eventually assimilation, but all of these diverse processes are to be regarded as merely the efforts of a new social and cultural organism to achieve a new biotic and social equilibrium. (Park, *ibid*, 104).

The four processes mentioned here became in fact the basis of Park's general sociology. Park defined competition as "interaction without social contact" (Park and Burgess, ^{1921,} 1969: 506). Competition stems from the struggle for survival; it involves both the "struggle of the individual to find a place in the local economy" and the "struggle of a racial unit to discover a niche" in the social order (Park, 1939, 1950:106).

But competition is not conscious. "Competition takes the form of conflict or rivalry only when it becomes conscious, when competitors identify one another as rivals or as enemies" (Park & Burgess, *ibid*). When consciousness of competition develops it is accompanied by (racial) labelling of competitors and the arousal of hostile sentiments. "Conflict is always conscious, indeed, it evokes the deepest emotions and the strongest passions and enlists the greatest concentration of attention and effort. Both competition and conflict are forms of struggle. Competition, however, is continuous and impersonal, conflict is intermittent and personal" (Park & Burgess, *ibid*, 574). Competition is "a struggle for position

in an economic order," whereas conflict establishes "the status of the individual, or group of individuals, in the social order" (Ibid).

Accommodation does not end antagonism between groups, but it represents an adjustment of relative status and power of the groups aimed at reducing conflict.

In accommodation the antagonism of the hostile elements is, for the time being, regulated, and conflict disappears as overt action, although it remains latent as a potential force. With a change in the situation, the adjustment that had hitherto successfully held in control the antagonistic forces fails. There is confusion and unrest which may issue in open conflict. Conflict, whether a war or a strike or a mere exchange of polite innuendoes, invariably issues in a new accommodation or social order, which in general involves a changed status in the relations among the participants (Ibid, 665).

Where accommodation is a temporary adjustment, assimilation involves a deeper, more permanent change.

Assimilation is a process of interpenetration and fusion in which persons and groups acquire the memories, sentiments, and attitudes of other persons or groups, and, by sharing their experiences and history, are incorporated with them in a common cultural life. In so far as assimilation denotes the sharing of tradition, this intimate participation in common experiences, assimilation is central in the historical and cultural processes (Ibid, 735-6).

As suggested earlier, Park regarded these four processes as universal and inevitable in race relations. Park thought that the outcome of these processes was that human "diversities will be based in the future less on inheritance and race and rather more on culture and occupation. That means that race conflicts in the modern world, which is already or presently will be a single great society, will be more and more in the future confused with, and eventually superceded by, the conflicts of classes" (Park, 1939, 1950: 116).

There is a certain determinism and fatalism in Park's theory which is problematic. In the first place, since each stage is regarded as necessary and inevitable, the theory can be used to imply that the racial groups involved must accept whatever conflicts and accommodations arise

as "progressive and irreversible" steps along the path to eventual assimilation (Park, 1926, 1950:150). Thus, the theory, as Staples notes, can be employed to defend the racial status quo and a gradualist approach to change (Staples, 1976:7).

In the second place, as Barth and Noel point out, this "is clearly a unilinear evolutionary model as it implies that there is a probability of 1.00 that each stage of the cycle will lead to and culminate in the next with assimilation-amalgamation ultimately assured" (Barth & Noel, 1975:17). But cross-cultural data (and indeed U.S. history itself) reveal that other outcomes are possible, including ethnic stratification, exclusion, symbiosis, and pluralism (Ibid, 18). Brewton Berry has lodged a similar criticism of Park's theory.

Dr. Park's theory is open to doubt, for assimilation and amalgamation may not be inevitable, and certainly there are instances of racial contacts where conflict and competition have been conspicuously lacking. Some scholars, therefore, question the existence of any universal pattern, and incline rather to the belief that so numerous and so various are the components that enter into race relations that each situation is unique, and the making of generalizations is a hazardous procedure (Berry, 1965:135).

Park himself was not unaware of problems with his theory. He realized that after 300 years in America black people were not being assimilated. However, he attributed the cause of this to blacks' "divergent physical traits," the "racial uniform" of skin color (Park, 1913, 1950:208; 1928, 1950:353). This is another retreat into biological determinism. Park continued that unlike European immigrants who can shed their cultural "uniforms" and assimilate into the cosmopolitan mass of the urban populations, blacks (and Oriental's in his view) are "condemned to remain among us (whites) an abstraction, a symbol." He suggested that what in fact was developing in the U.S. South was a form of "bi-racial organization."

Originally race relations in the South could be rather accurately represented by a horizontal line, with all the white folk above and all the Negro folk below. But at present (1928) these relations

are assuming new forms, and in consequence changing in character and meaning. With the development of industrial and professional classes within the Negro race, the distinction between the races tends to assume the form of a vertical line. On one side of this line the Negro is represented in most of the occupational and professional classes; on the other side of the line the white man is similarly represented.... The result is to develop in every occupational class professional and industrial bi-racial organizations. Bi-racial organizations preserve race distinctions, but change their content (Park, 1928a, 1950:243).

What Park is describing here in rather sanitized and idealized terms is the Jim Crow "separate-but-equal" system, a system whose purpose was to actively prevent assimilation. Park did not pursue the implications of his description, but it may be argued that assimilation has not occurred not simply due to biological or cultural "racial uniforms" but because of a social organization (apartheid) which was fully functioning until quite recently and whose purpose was to maintain racial social distance and circumvent assimilation.

Other key concepts in Park's race relations theory are social distance, race prejudice and marginality. Social distance refers to feeling "a sense of distance toward individuals with whom we come into contact." Moreover, it refers to "a state of mind in which we become, often suddenly and unexpectedly, conscious of the distances that separate, or seem to separate us, from classes and races whom we do not fully understand" (Park, 1924, 1950:257). Social distance refers to the notion that subordinate individuals and races have a "proper distance" and a "proper place" which are maintained by social rituals and social etiquette. Indeed, etiquette becomes a means of social control in race relations (Park, 1937, 1950:182).

"Race prejudice," Park asserts, "is like class and caste prejudice -- merely one variety of a species. So far as it can be described in these terms, race prejudice may be regarded as a phenomenon of status." He adds

further that race prejudice is the "resistance of the social order to change" (Park, 1928a, 1950:231-33). In his view race prejudice is a kind of spontaneous expression of conservatism. But here Park runs into trouble, for he never questions the spontaneous nature of race prejudice. On the contrary, he emphasizes its spontaneity and thereby makes race prejudice a feature of human nature rather than a product of social organization or social process. Once again Park falls into a kind of bio-psychological reductionism:

What we ordinarily call prejudice seems to be more or less instinctive and spontaneous disposition to maintain social distances (Park, 1924, 1950:259).

Elsewhere Park writes of a "spontaneous response" to what is "strange and unfamiliar" which develops from our "sense of insecurity" (Park, 1928a, 1950:238). In these remarks Park has abandoned a sociological perspective or even a social psychological perspective. We are left instead with a deterministic perspective that does not examine why and how certain forms of prejudice develop, but instead asserts that prejudice is an ahistorical fact of human nature. I believe this again reflects the influence of Sumner (and possibly Thomas) whom Park uses as the starting point for his analysis of prejudice.

Marginality is a result of cultural and racial conflict, and in turn the marginal individual can influence the course of social developments.

The marginal man is a personality type that arises at a time and a place where, out of the conflict of races and cultures, new societies, new peoples and cultures are coming into existence. The fate which condemns him to live, at the same time, in two worlds is the same which compels him to assume, in relation to the worlds in which he lives, the role of a cosmopolitan and a stranger. Inevitably he becomes relatively to his cultural milieu, the individual with the wider horizon, the keener intelligence, the more detached and rational viewpoint (Park, 1937a, 1950:375-6).

Park asserts that in the black community it is the mixed bloods, the marginal individuals, who are often the political leaders and cultural

innovators (Park, 1931, 1959:381). He is careful to point out that this cannot be accounted for by any alleged biological superiority due to infusions of white blood, but his emphasis on the mixed blood as the typical marginal person acts to obscure other forms of cultural marginality which may be more important and of which the mixed blood may only be a subtype. In particular, since a large proportion of the black American population is racially mixed it seems rather pointless to single this out as an important criterion of marginality. More relevant criteria would appear to be: circumstances of early socialization, social privileges, access to higher education, social interaction with whites, etc. Moreover, Park's treatment leans toward psychological reductionism in his emphasis on the personality of the marginal individual rather than marginality as a social process. Does the marginal individual indeed have a "keener intelligence" and a more "rational" mind, or is it more useful from a sociological perspective to ask whether marginality as a social process tends to direct human intelligence toward certain problems and concerns and not toward others?

There are other problems in Park's conception of the role of the marginal individual in social change. For Park, competition and conflict between groups was the motive force of social change. But once change is set in motion what factors shape its direction and outcome? Strauss and Fisher have argued that Park shared with W.I. Thomas a general perspective on social change (Strauss & Fisher, n.d.) In this perspective the collision of groups shakes some individuals loose from the constraints of custom and opens the way for new responses to the situation. These individuals -- the marginal man, the creative person -- become the emancipated thinkers and leaders of social movements, and it is they who give direction to social change and shape its outcome by building new social institutions (Strauss and Fisher, 7). Thus, the self-conscious, emancipated individual

becomes both the sign of change and the agent through which new responses are organized. These individuals come to form an enlightened, educated elite capable of consciously guiding the process of change (Strauss and Fisher:26).

The difficulty with this theory is that it assumes a certain relationship between the individual and the collectivity which may not stand up to scrutiny. It also, as Strauss and Fisher point out (24), can be reduced to equating progress with outcomes for individuals. Thus, Park's belief that education would help foster new occupational groupings which would gradually replace racial groupings is an incremental perspective which equates social progress/change with educational and occupational mobility of individuals. But individual advancement does not necessarily imply social change; indeed, upgrading of certain individuals may be a society's method of preventing more general change.

What is the relationship between the emancipated individual and the collectivity? Park clearly regarded such individuals as Booker T. Washington and W.E.B. Du Bois as examples of the marginal man rising to the task of leadership. Implicit here is an assumption that marginality leads to greater awareness of the need for social change and a concomitant commitment to struggle for the needed change. But, as is apparent in the works of certain later Chicago sociologists, marginality may also lead to alienation and "deviancy" -- that is, to a search for individual freedom rather than collective struggle and change. Franklin Frazier's "black bourgeoisie" (1962) chose the illusion of individual freedom over the commitment to social struggle. The "deviants" studied by Howard Becker (1963) and Erving Goffman (1961) were marginal individuals who sought protected niches of individual freedom within the confines of an oppressive social order. One is also reminded of the split in the social movements of the

Sixties between "political" and "cultural" activists -- the former committed to collective struggle, the latter to individual "head changing." In short it seems untenable to assume that marginality generally fosters social awareness; it may just as likely promote individual escapism. Moreover, even where marginality leads to social awareness it is unsafe to assume that the leadership of the emancipated individuals will be accepted by the masses. History reveals all too many instances of charismatic but irrational individuals assuming the leadership of great nations.

Despite his general democratic impulse, Park appears to have adopted an elitist "great man" theory of social change. It is the educators, sociologists, philanthropists, and enlightened marginal men generally who will guide change and promote a rational process of change. This elitism is very much within the tradition of Progressive Era social thought. Many Progressives believed that it was the enlightened intellectuals who must control and direct the frightening forces resulting from industrialization and urbanization.

But for sociological theory Park's elitism is problematic, for it amounts to a form of reductionism. Change is initiated by a social process, the clash of social groups, but once change is set in motion Park alters the focus of his analysis from social process to individual consciousness. I think it was Park's rationalism that led to this reductionism. From a very early age Park was seeking a way of coping with the irrational forces which he saw at work in social life. For him, knowledge, communication and discussion were prerequisites for rational action. But the locus of knowledge, communication and discussion is the individual. Crowds may mill and riot, but it is only individuals who think and communicate. Crowds may initiate action but it is only enlightened individuals who can rationally guide social change. Thus

Park adhered to the ^Progressives' faith (perhaps itself irrational?) in the role of enlightened individuals in conquering the irrational impulses unleashed by blind group conflict.

SUCCESSORS

The prestige of the Chicago school and Robert Park attracted many students to the University of Chicago. Park trained some of the nation's most outstanding race relations scholars, including Charles S. Johnson, Edward B. Reuter, Louis Wirth, John Dollard, Frederick Detweiler, Herbert Blumer, Everett Hughes, and E. Franklin Frazier.

Everett Hughes once described E. Franklin Frazier as Park's most complete student. In 1931 Frazier completed a dissertation on The Negro Family in Chicago. The study was later expanded and in 1939 it was published as THE NEGRO FAMILY IN THE UNITED STATES. Frazier's study was squarely within the Chicago style, taking a natural history approach and making use of the ecological and personal documents methodologies. Frazier attempted to show that social disorganization, rather than biological differences, accounted for the "deviations" of black family life from the normative pattern of white American families. In a later theoretical essay Frazier called attention to what he regarded as the "important role of the family in acculturation and assimilation (which) is due to the nature of contacts within the family as compared with other types of human association.... It is almost exclusively through the intimate contacts of family living that the sentiments and ideals characteristic of a society are transmitted and become a part of the personalities of the members of society (Frazier, 1953).

Frazier's emphasis on assimilation (and social disorganization as inhibiting assimilation) has prompted some criticism of him by later black sociologists (Staples, 1976:59-60,127). Frazier seems to have uncritically accepted white middle-class values and practices as norms

against which the values and practices of black Americans must be measured. Interestingly enough, late in his career Frazier wrote a lengthy polemic against Negro intellectuals, accusing them of having an "obsession" with assimilation. He wrote of the black intellectual's "failure to dig down into the experiences of the Negro and bring about a transformation of that experience so that the Negro could have a new self-image or new conception of himself. It was the responsibility of the Negro intellectual to provide a positive identification through history, literature, art, music and the drama" (Frazier, 1962a). But Frazier was no cultural nationalist: black culture was simply to be another "contribution" to a general American cultural heritage.

Like Park, Frazier went on to undertake a broad and comparative study of race relations in other parts of the world, including Africa, the Caribbean, and South America (Frazier, 1957). Frazier generally employed the processual theory of Park, but he was also deeply interested in the role of key institutions, such as the family and the church, and also the role of social stratification.

Another line of succession was the symbolic-interactionist school represented by such scholars Tamotsu Shibutani and Herbert Blumer. Taking W.I. Thomas' concept of the "definition of the situation" as its starting point, this social-psychological school has stressed the importance of shared meanings and definitions in situations of racial interaction. As Shibutani and Kwan put it: "What is of decisive importance is that human beings interact not so much in terms of what they actually are but in terms of the conceptions that they form of themselves and of one another (Shibutani and Kwan, 1965:38). Accordingly, it is the self-conception and self-definition of ethnic groups which lie at the heart of race relations; issues of economic exploitation and political power are of only secondary concern.

Although not primarily a race relations theorist, Herbert Blumer in 1955 wrote an important essay which sought to rescue theories of race prejudice from the psychological reductionism then being popularized by such authors as Gordon Allport. Blumer stressed the need to view race prejudice in terms of group status and social definitions rather than as a matter only of individual sentiments.

My thesis is that race prejudice exists basically in a sense of group position rather than in a set of feelings which members of one racial group have toward members of another racial group. This different way of viewing race prejudice shifts study and analysis from a preoccupation with feelings as lodged in individuals to a concern with the relationship of racial groups. It also shifts scholarly treatment away from individual lines of experience and focuses interest on the collective process by which a racial group comes to define and redefine another racial group. (Blumer, 1955)

Blumer avoided reductionist appeals to innate "fears" or "instincts" -- to which Park had fallen prey -- and instead concentrated on the collective processes by which racial groups develop a sense of group position as the explanatory key. He wrote: "The sense of group position is the very heart of the relation of the dominant to the subordinate group. It supplies the dominant group with its framework of perception, its standard of judgment, its patterns of sensitivity, and its emotional proclivities."

Symbolic interactionist theory has been criticized by some writers for not incorporating a concept of power. However, Blumer's discussion of the sense of group position as the key to explaining race prejudice suggests that the ability of one group to impose a social definition on other groups is an expression -- an perhaps a useful interactionist definition -- of power. But, to my knowledge, no interactionists have pursued this line of thought.

Elsewhere Blumer discusses the role of industrialization in race relations. He contends that industrialization, contrary to popular wisdom, is not necessarily inimical to a system of racial oppression.

On the contrary, he asserts, "available evidence everywhere sustains the thesis that when introduced into a racially ordered society, industrialization conforms to the alignment and code of the racial order. Where the racial order is clear-cut and firm, the industrial apparatus will develop a corresponding racial scheme" (Blumer, 1965:245). Blumer suggests that racial changes in the industrial order are provoked by pressures in the outside society, rather than vice versa.

Another Park student, Everett Hughes, has written several essays on race and ethnic relations -- particularly French-English relations in Canada and to a lesser degree, black-white relations in the U.S. South. What is most interesting in Hughes' writings has been his effort to call attention to the presuppositions of sociologists themselves in studying race relations and the impact these have on the sociological work performed. For example, he notes the common tendency of sociologists to study minority groups rather than majority groups, with the presupposition that the former somehow pose a "problem" (Hughes, 1971:155-6). He points out that it takes at least two groups to create a race relations problem, and that the locus of the problem is not infrequently the extreme behavior of the dominant group (Ibid, 163f). There is a conservative bias in sociological work, Hughes suggest, in that sociologists prefer to study the middle range of human behavior and avoid the difficult extremes. The sociological imagination is thereby imprisoned and blinded. Hughes blames this sociological myopia on the drive toward professionalization and its tendency to restrict the creative imagination.

ALTERNATIVE SCHOOLS AND CRITICS

W.E.B. DU BOIS -- Du Bois, a contemporary of Park, offered an alternative approach to race relations study and the role of sociology. Du Bois would have agreed with Park that knowledge was the key to action, but where Park sought to formulate a universalistic "natural history" of race relations, Du Bois instead sought detailed empirical knowledge about a particular group of human beings in a definite historical context as a prerequisite to social reform action in that situation. Moreover, Du Bois soon came to see the social scientist as engaged, even a social activist. "Not simply knowledge," he wrote, "not simply direct repression of evil, will reform the world. In long, indirect pressure and action of various and intricate sorts, the actions of men which are not due to lack of knowledge nor to evil intent, must be changed by influencing folkways, habits, customs, and subconscious deeds" (Du Bois, 1978: 19). Du Bois would have taken sharp exception to the determinism of Sumner, and the Freudians.

Staples points out that Du Bois helped lay the foundation for a black sociological perspective.

Over 75 years ago he (Du Bois) noted that the past studies of Afro-Americans had been characterized by a lack of detail, failure to be systematic, and a tendency to be uncritical. Hence, he advocated basic research on Blacks that would separate opinion from fact. The task of sociology, he said, was to put science into sociology through the study of the condition and problems of Blacks. Moreover, he opposed the idea of a value-free sociology as it is generally defined. Instead, the sociologist should be oriented toward a humanistic perspective of his society. What he wanted was a shift from the negative values held by social scientists, which tended to support the oppression of Blacks, to more positive values that allowed Blacks to maintain their cultural patterns unrestricted by the laws and social customs of the White majority (Staples, 1976: 3-4).

Du Bois did not formulate a general theory of race relations. Rather his importance as a sociologists is found in his careful studies of black social conditions and his elaboration of the historical mechanisms of racial

oppression in the United States (See Du Bois, 1964). He also called attention to the importance of viewing race relations from the standpoint of the victims of racial oppression. In these ways Du Bois helped point the way toward the later exploitation theory of race relations developed by Oliver Cox.

OLIVER C. COX — Oliver Cox was born in Trinidad but migrated to the United States while still a teenager. He studied economics and sociology at the University of Chicago, earning a Ph.D. degree in 1938. Subsequently, he taught at several institutions, including Tuskegee. Ironically, it was during his tenure at Tuskegee that Cox wrote his most well-known book, *CASTE, CLASS AND RACE* (1948). This book is in part a rebuttal to the race relations theory formulated by Park.

Cox objects to Park's theory on several grounds. In the first place Cox contends that race is a social concept disguised as a biological concept. Races are socially defined in the process of interaction; hence, racial antagonism is not "natural" or biological but must be socially constructed (Cox, 1948:319, 465). Cox examines ancient societies and notes various forms of cultural and political conflict, but he does not find evidence of race conflict; race antagonism is a phenomenon of modern times (Ibid, 322-25). Similarly, race prejudice is a modern invention. Moreover, race prejudice, for Cox, is definitely not the same as caste prejudice. "Caste prejudice is an aspect of culture prejudice," he asserts, whereas race prejudice is "the socio-attitudinal matrix supporting a calculated and determined effort of a white ruling class to keep some people or peoples of color and their resources exploitable" (Ibid, 350, 475).

Cox goes to great lengths to demonstrate that the concepts of caste, class and race are quite distinct in their origins and social manifestations.

He criticizes the "caste school" of race relations for taking certain superficial similarities between race relations and caste relations and using these as the basis for a theory.

The method of selecting and identifying isolatedly certain aspects of intercaste relationship, such as endogamy, non-commensality, or other marks of social distinction with their apparent counterparts in race relations, may at first seem convincing. In almost every case, however, the comparison is not between caste and race but merely a recognition of apparently common characteristics of all situations of superior-inferior or superordinate-subordinate relationships (Ibid, 497).

Cox takes specific exception to the notion of a universal race relations cycle (Cox, 1976: 36f). Instead he counterposes the idea of racial dominance and race prejudice ^{as} unique products of European capitalism and nationalism.

Our hypothesis is that racial exploitation and race prejudice developed among Europeans with the rise of capitalism and nationalism, and that because of the world-wide ramifications of capitalism, all racial antagonisms can be traced to the policies and attitudes of the leading capitalist people, the white people of Europe and North America (Cox, 1948:322).

Cox is careful to point out that "there is no assertion....that race prejudice is a biological heritage of the white race" (Ibid, 346); rather it is the spread of the capitalist system and its exploitation of the land and labor of peoples of color which accounts for the rise of race prejudice. "Racial exploitation is merely one aspect of the problem of the proletarianization of labor, regardless of the color of the laborer," he maintains (Ibid, 333). Cox saw the elimination of racial exploitation as requiring a world-wide class struggle:

The problem of racial exploitation, then, will most probably be settled as part of the world proletarian struggle for democracy; every advance of the masses will be an actual or potential advance for the colored peoples. Whether the open threat of violence by the exploiting class will be shortly joined will depend upon the unpredictable play and balance of force in a world-wide struggle for power (Ibid, 583).

Like Du Bois, Cox saw the problem of the "color line" as central

to the future course of world history. (Interestingly, as will be remarked below, Park also saw this problem, but from a different angle of vision, the perspective of white America.)

The strength of Cox's theory lies in his insistence that race relations cannot be understood apart from analysis of the specific social and political context in which they arise. Thus, he attributes modern race relations to the rise of capitalist exploitation. Unfortunately, Cox nowhere clarifies his central concept of exploitation. Indeed, he often seems to use the term in a moral-condemnatory sense rather than as an analytic tool. Cox apparently borrowed the technical concept of exploitation from Marx where it refers to the extraction of surplus value from labor; but Cox's use of the term is much broader and less clear.

Furthermore, if racial exploitation and prejudice are largely the outcome of concerted action on the part of the capitalist class alone, then one would expect to find that racial prejudice would be relatively easy to combat among white workers. But this has not proved to be true. In focusing narrowly on capitalist manipulation, Cox's theory fails to sufficiently analyze the social-psychological and material benefits which white workers derive from the continuance of racial oppression of non-whites.

Finally, in treating racism as a unique invention of modern European capitalism Cox largely limits the focus of his discussion to race relations between whites and non-whites. Pierre L. van den Berghe takes exception to this position, arguing instead that racism "has been independently discovered and rediscovered by various peoples at various times in history." But he goes on to state that "the Western strain of the virus (racism) has eclipsed all others in importance" (van den Berghe, 1978:12-13). Van den Berghe agrees with Cox in assigning pre-eminence to the role of capitalist exploitation in the evolution of racial oppression, but

he also attributes importance to Darwinian ideas and the prevalence of democratic ideologies which, ironically, made it necessary to deny the humanity of oppressed groups in order to justify denying them basic rights (ibid, 16-17).

GUNNAR MYRDAL — One of the most massive studies of U.S. race relations ever published is AN AMERICAN DILEMMA, compiled by the Swedish sociologist Gunnar Myrdal and his associates. Funded by the Carnegie Corporation, the book is chiefly a compilation of existing knowledge; no new field work was undertaken.

The importance of this study lies not in any new theoretical constructs which it advances — for it advances none -- but rather in the perspective employed in presenting the material. For Myrdal, American race relations were embedded in a moral dilemma -- the contradiction between the American Creed and American practice. According to Myrdal, the American Creed embodies the

ideals of the essential dignity of the individual human being, of the fundamental equality of all men, and of certain inalienable rights to freedom, justice, and a fair opportunity....

From the point of view of the American Creed the status accorded the Negro in America represents nothing more and nothing less than a century-long lag in public morals. In principle the Negro problem was settled long ago; in practice the solution is not effectuated. The Negro in America has not yet been given the elemental civil and political rights of formal democracy, including a fair opportunity to earn his living. And this anachronism constitutes the contemporary "problem" both to Negroes and to whites (Myrdal, 1944: I, 4-5, 24).

Myrdal's perspective reflects the new defensive liberalism which was one ideological response to the rise of fascism, on the one hand, and the emergence of anti-colonial struggles in various parts of the colored world (Allen, 1974: 272f). A new liberal racial ideology was critical to America's national solidarity during World War II, and to her claims to international political leadership. Interestingly, no one was more aware of this ideo-

logical necessity than Robert Park. Park, too, realized that the problem of the "color line" was key to the future of world history. In a perceptive and revealing essay written shortly before his death Park noted that World War II "has given the (white) American public a new orientation and a new issue."

We have hitherto maintained toward the peoples of India, China Japan, and Africa a curious attitude of complacency verging on contempt. Toward peoples of a different color we have usually acted as a benevolent "master-race", possessing all the wisdom and therefore entitled to impose our political and religious institutions and social practices upon both lands and peoples.

But now that we find ourselves fighting on the same battlefields for the same cause, all this seems to be an anachronism....

Under these circumstances many people in the United States have become suddenly conscious of the limited and parochial view which our previous isolation has fostered and are now apparently in a way to revise their opinions of alien peoples and to improve, at least, our international and interracial manners....

What the war has done thus far has been to make race relations an international rather than a local and national problem.... Furthermore, in the prosecution of the war and in the organization of the peace, racial diversities of the American population will be either a national handicap or a national asset, depending upon our ability to make our racial policies and our racial ideology conform to our national interests (Park, 1943, 1950: 312, 315).

Overhauling and revamping its racial ideology due to a changing international power structure was the real dilemma facing America. Park was no doubt sincere in the concerns he expressed, but I suspect that the general intellectual acceptance of his race relations cycle theory, with its implication of gradual assimilation, was due not only to the vigor of the Chicago school but also to the situational context: Park's theory provided intellectual legitimation and content for a new "liberal" racial ideology at a time when old-style racism was objectively in retreat. Since World War II we have seen the emergence of cultural chauvinism as the new racial ideology (Allen, *ibid*). Colored peoples are no longer categorized as inferior, merely "culturally deprived." This ideology holds out the promise of assimilation to those non-whites who accept the social and cultural values of Western (capitalist) white culture. It is thus an

important weapon in the U.S. struggle against anti-colonial and socialist revolutionary movements — both at home and abroad. Neither Park nor Myrdal saw themselves as ideological architects of U.S. neo-colonialism, but the popularization of their works raises interesting sociology of knowledge questions about the relationship between scholarly work and social-ideological needs and consequences. Unfortunately, these questions are much beyond the scope of the present paper.

RECENT CONTRIBUTIONS

Although this paper has focussed on the work of Robert Park and his students and contemporaries, the theoretical contributions of several more recent writers will be mentioned by way of conclusion.

ROBERT STAPLES — Along with Robert Blauner (1972) and William Tabb (1970), Staples has been one of the chief architects of the colonial model of race relations. "The colonial model," he writes, "views the black community as an underdeveloped, exploited colony controlled by individuals outside the community."

An important feature of this model when applied to the United States is its technique of combining racial and class oppression into one theoretical framework. It also illustrates the institutionalized patterns of racist oppression. Instead of focussing on individual attitudes of racial prejudice, it treats racism as a political and economic process that maintains domination of Whites over Blacks by systematic subjugation.... It illustrates that Black deprivation is not a result of the Black individual's limitation or the White person's lack of tolerance. The Black condition can be more realistically viewed as a pattern of systematic subjugation maintained by those people who stand to profit the most from it (Staples, 1976: 13).

ROBERT ALLEN — In 1974 Allen suggested a model of race relations in the United States which emphasized the interrelationship between prevailing racial ideologies and socio-economic institutional arrangements (Allen,

1974: Ch. 8). Drawing upon the work of Cox, the theory stresses the role played by the demand for black labor in the functioning of the American economy. It identifies three stages of racial ideology in the U.S.: (1) biological racism (black people as "subhuman") associated with the slave-plantation economy; (2) Social Darwinist racism (black people as "inferior" human beings) associated with the emergence of industrial monopoly capitalism; and (3) cultural chauvinist racism (black people as "culturally deprived") associated with domestic and international challenges to the hegemony of capitalism and white western culture, especially since World War II.

WILLIAM J. WILSON -- Most recent of all is the theory advanced by Wilson (1978). Wilson, who is a professor of sociology at the University of Chicago, also identifies three stages in the development of race relations in the U.S. His first two are quite similar to the first two stages suggested by Allen, but where Allen sees racism continuing in the modern era in the form of cultural chauvinism, Wilson concludes that economic class subordination has become more important than racial oppression in determining black life chances. Moreover, occupational and class differentiation within the black community has fragmented black solidarity, he contends, and affected the direction taken by the black struggle for freedom and equality.

All of these recent theories are concerned with the interrelationship between race and class. Where they differ is in the relative weight assigned to race and class factors in black oppression. Ironically, 40 years ago Robert Park posed this problem when he predicted that "race conflicts in the modern world...will be more and more in the future confused with, and eventually superceded by, conflicts of classes."

Park put his finger on a problem with deep implications for both sociology and social action, and the accuracy of his prediction has become the subject of a growing theoretical and policy debate.

In this paper I have reviewed the role of family background, general social setting, training, experiential and intellectual influences on the development of Park's race relations cycle theory. I have also discussed certain presuppositions and themes in his thought, and the substance of the theory itself. Finally, I have reviewed some of the alternative and critical views put forward by certain of Park's contemporaries and later writers. It is clear that Park has had a major impact on sociological analysis of race relations in the United States. No doubt his views will continue to be a subject of critical discussion and debate by sociologists.

REFERENCES

- Allen, Robert L.
1974 RELUCTANT REFORMERS: RACISM AND SOCIAL REFORM MOVEMENTS IN THE UNITED STATES. Washington, DC: Howard University Press.
- Barth, Ernest A.T. & Donald L. Noel
1975 "Conceptual Frameworks for the Analysis of Race Relations: An Evaluation," in Norman Yetman & C. Hoy Steele (eds), MAJORITY AND MINORITY. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, Inc.
- Becker, Howard
1963 OUTSIDERS: STUDIES IN THE SOCIOLOGY OF DEVIANCE. New York: The Free Press.
- Berry, Brewton
1965 RACE AND ETHNIC RELATIONS (3rd edition). Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, Co.
- Blauner, Robert
1972 RACIAL OPPRESSION IN AMERICA. New York: Harper & Row.
- Blumer, Herbert
1955 "Race Prejudice as a Sense of Group Position," in THE PACIFIC SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW, Vol I, No 1 (Spring, 1958), reprinted in Jitsuiichi Masuoka & Preston Valien (eds.), RACE RELATIONS: PROBLEMS AND THEORY. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1961.
- 1965 "Industrialization and Race Relations," in Guy Hunter (ed.), INDUSTRIALISATION AND RACE RELATIONS. London: Oxford University Press.
- Coser, Lewis A.
1977 MASTERS OF SOCIOLOGICAL THOUGHT: IDEAS IN HISTORICAL AND SOCIAL CONTEXT (2nd edition). New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich.
- Cox, Oliver
1948 CASTE, CLASS, AND RACE. New York: Doubleday.
- 1976 RACE RELATIONS: ELEMENTS AND SOCIAL DYNAMICS. Detroit: Wayne State University Press.
- Du Bois, W.E.B.
1964 BLACK RECONSTRUCTION IN AMERICA, 1860-1880. New York: Meridian Books.
- 1978 W.E.B. DU BOIS ON SOCIOLOGY AND THE BLACK COMMUNITY, edited by Dan S. Green and Edwin D. Driver. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Faris, Robert E.L.
1967 CHICAGO SOCIOLOGY, 1920-1932. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Co.
- Frazier, E. Franklin
1932 THE NEGRO FAMILY IN CHICAGO. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Frazier, E. Franklin (cont.)

- 1939 THE NEGRO FAMILY IN THE UNITED STATES. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- 1947 "Sociological Theory and Race Relations," AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW, 12, No. 3 (June).
- 1953 "Theoretical Structure of Sociology and Sociological Research," reprinted in E. FRANKLIN FRAZIER ON RACE RELATIONS, edited by G. Franklin Edwards. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968.
- 1957 RACE AND CULTURE CONTACTS IN THE MODERN WORLD. New York: Knopf.
- 1957a THE NEGRO IN THE UNITED STATES (rev. Ed.). New York: Macmillan.
- 1962 BLACK BOURGEOISIE. New York: Collier Books.
- 1962a "The Failure of the Negro Intellectual" NEGRO DIGEST (February, 1962), reprinted in E.F. FRAZIER ON RACE RELATIONS (op. cit.)

Frederickson, George M.

- 1971 THE BLACK IMAGE IN THE WHITE MIND: THE DEBATE ON AFRO-AMERICAN CHARACTER AND DESTINY, 1817-1914. New York: Harper & Row.

Goffman, Erving

- 1961 ASYLUMS: ESSAYS ON THE SOCIAL SITUATION OF MENTAL PATIENTS AND OTHER INMATES. New York: Anchor Books.

Gossett, Thomas F.

- 1965 RACE: THE HISTORY OF AN IDEA IN AMERICA. New York: Schocken.

Hofstadter, Richard

- 1945 SOCIAL DARWINISM IN AMERICAN THOUGHT, 1860-1915. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Hughes, Everett C.

- 1971 THE SOCIOLOGICAL EYE: SELECTED PAPERS ON INSTITUTIONS AND RACE. Chicago: Aldine.

Janowitz, Morris

- 1966 W.I. THOMAS ON SOCIAL ORGANIZATION AND SOCIAL PERSONALITY. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

Madge, John

- 1962 THE ORIGINS OF SCIENTIFIC SOCIOLOGY. New York: The Free Press.

Matthews, Fred H.

- 1977 QUEST FOR AN AMERICAN SOCIOLOGY: ROBERT E. PARK AND THE CHICAGO SCHOOL. Montreal: McGill-Queens University Press.

Myrdal, Gunnar

- 1944 AN AMERICAN DILEMMA. (2 vols.) New York: Harper.

Park, Robert E.

- 1913 "Racial Assimilation in Secondary Groups," reprinted in RACE AND CULTURE: ESSAYS IN THE SOCIOLOGY OF CONTEMPORARY MAN. New York: 1950. (Hereafter cited as R&C, 1950.)
- 1918 "Education in its Relation to the Conflict and the Fusion of Cultures," reprinted in R&C, 1950.

Park, Robert E. (cont.)

- 1921 INTRODUCTION TO THE SCIENCE OF SOCIOLOGY (3rd. edition). (Written with Ernest W. Burgess.) Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969.
- 1924 "The Concept of Social Distance", reprinted in R&C, 1950.
- 1926 "Our Racial Frontier on the Pacific," reprinted in R&C, 1950.
- 1928 "Human Migration and the Marginal Man," reprinted in R&C, 1950.
- 1928a "The Bases of Race Prejudice," reprinted in R&C, 1950.
- 1931 "Mentality of Racial Hybrids," reprinted in R&C, 1950.
- 1937 "The Etiquette of Race Relations in the South," reprinted in R&C, 1950.
- 1937a "Cultural Conflict and the Marginal Man," reprinted in R&C, 1950.
- 1939 "The Nature of Race Relations," reprinted in R&C, 1950.
- 1943 "Racial Ideologies," reprinted in R&C, 1950.
- 1950 RACE AND CULTURE: ESSAYS ON THE SOCIOLOGY OF CONTEMPORARY MAN. New York: The Free Press.

Reuter, E.B.

- 1945 "Racial Theory," AMERICAN JOURNAL OF SOCIOLOGY, Vol. 50, No 6 (May).

Rose, Peter I.

- 1968 THE SUBJECT IS RACE. New York: Oxford University Press.

Shibutani, Tamotsu and Kian M. Kwan

- 1965 ETHNIC STRATIFICATION: A COMPARATIVE APPROACH. New York: Macmillan.

Small, Albion W.

- 1924 ORIGINS OF SOCIOLOGY. New York: Russell & Russell.

Staples, Robert

- 1976 INTRODUCTION TO BLACK SOCIOLOGY. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Strauss, Anselm and Bernice Fisher

- n.d. "Dilemmas of Social Change: Chicago Sociology"

Sumner, William Graham

- 1963 SOCIAL DARWINISM: SELECTED ESSAYS OF WILLIAM GRAHAM SUMNER. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Tabb, William

- 1970 THE POLITICAL ECONOMY OF THE GHETTO. New York: Norton.

Thomas, W.I.

- 1904 "The Psychology of Race Prejudice," AMERICAN JOURNAL OF SOCIOLOGY, 9 (March).

- 1966 W.I. THOMAS ON SOCIAL ORGANIZATION AND SOCIAL PERSONALITY, edited by Janowitz, op. cit.

Van den Berghe, Pierre
1978 RACE AND RACISM: A COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVE (2nd. ed.). New York:
John Wiley & Sons.

Weinstein, James
1968 THE CORPORATE IDEAL IN THE LIBERAL STATE: 1900-1918. Boston:
Beacon Press.

Wilson, William J.
1978 THE DECLINING SIGNIFICANCE OF RACE: BLACKS AND CHANGING AMERICAN
INSTITUTIONS. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Zanden, James vander
1963 AMERICAN MINORITY RELATIONS: THE SOCIOLOGY OF RACE AND ETHNIC
GROUPS. New York: The Ronald Press Co.

Intro - (

I

To understand the development of the race relations theory of Robert Park it would first be useful to survey the social context in which his thinking was formed.

Park came to intellectual maturity during the ^(Oaken) Progressive Era, a period of great social ferment. ¹⁹⁷⁴ In the latter part of the 19th century the United States underwent a period of rapid economic development; the country changed from being a rural-agricultural to an urban-industrial society. Huge new industries arose, including railroads, iron and steel manufacturing, giant utility companies and others. With these came forms of economic concentration and monopoly such as the country had never seen before. Gigantic family fortunes were ~~formed~~ built; the names Mellon, Morgan, Rockefeller, Vanderbilt became household words. Smaller businesses were elbowed aside by the large corporations and banks which increasingly dominated the economy.

The class and racial structure of the country ~~was~~ also changed. Large numbers of European immigrants poured into the U.S. to take advantage of low-paying, unskilled factory jobs. Black workers, who had previously ^{were being forced off the land} formed the backbone of the southern agricultural system, ^{by} ~~the~~ monopolization and terrorism. Increasingly, black labor was reduced to a subproletariat, a kind of labor reserve that could be recruited into the worst jobs of the new industrial system. Moreover, employers often engendered conflicts between different ethnic and racial groups in order to undermine labor organizing efforts. Black workers frequently found themselves reduced to pawns in the clash between white labor and white capital. Labor strife and racial violence were ~~common~~ frighteningly common occurrences.

Members of the old middle class -- independent professionals and small businessmen -- were alarmed ~~by these developments~~ by the growing economic concentration and the corruption and violence it seemed to spawn. They saw the doors of opportunity closing for them as monopolization increased. It was in this class that the Progressive movement had its roots. The response

of the middle class involved two divergent and even contradictory tendencies. On the one hand there was a pronounced sentimental yearning for a return to the romantic past of frontier individualism and competitive capitalism where, with hard work and a bit of luck, an individual could still hope to make his fortune. On the other hand was a tendency which called for reforming and rationalizing the economic system by regulating competition and imposing uniform standards. Most of the reforms of the Progressive Era were aimed not so much at destroying monopoly industrial capital but at making it more "reasonable" and efficient through government intervention and regulation. (Hofstadter, James Weinstein, fn 12)

Similarly the racial attitudes of the Progressives were reflected in two tendencies: the virulent white supremacist attitudes of ~~many~~ ^{some} political leaders as Theodore Roosevelt, and the accommodationist paternalism of many urban reformers. (Hofstadter, S.D. 146f; Frederickson; Gossett, fn 13)

Social Darwinism, as a racial ideology, embodied both of these tendencies: in the struggle for survival the white race had been "selected" by natural forces to dominate other races; but this carried with it a responsibility to "uplift" the allegedly inferior colored races.

Booker T. Washington became the darling of the Progressives because his program of industrial education and forswearing of political agitation converged with the Progressives' interest in incorporating black labor into the industrial order but without challenging white domination.

Social harmony, not radical change, was a chief concern of the Progressive Era, and Washington's program promised the creation of a docile ^{black} labor force that would quietly accept its assigned place at the bottom of the new economic order.

and then gradually be uplifted by philanthropic, reformers, and well-meaning individuals

Social and Intellectual Context

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

The founding of the Univ of Chicago in 1892 was squarely within the conservative reform impulse of the progressive era. ~~Based~~ Supported by the ~~Philanthropy~~ of John D. Rockefeller and guided by ^{the} reform spirit of its first president, William Rainey Harper, the Univ. of Chicago sought to join the academic life to community service. Harper's wish was to prove that the university could "do a great service to mankind" (Matthews, 88) A baptist minister, Harper thought that scholarship could be combined with serving the needs of the community.

The city of Chicago was an ideal place for this social experiment that was called the Univ. of Chicago. Less than 60 years earlier Chicago was a small settlement located on a swampy site beside Lake Michigan. The rapid development of the West and Midwest after the Civil War made Chicago a strategic site for the burgeoning meat-packing ^{and industries} steel and transportation ^{hub.} ~~industries.~~ The swift growth of industry and commerce in turn attracted thousands of European immigrants to toil in the stockyards and mills. Chicago soon exhibited ~~all~~ the symptoms of rapid industrial and population unrest, ethnic group growth: Labor ~~and ethnic group~~ conflict, a growing disparity between the wealthy and the ^{mass} ~~bulk~~ of the population, the emergence of slums as the well-to-do abandoned the central city and moved to the periphery, the growth of organized crime and ^{p.d. local} corruption.

The new university plunged into the life of the city. In 1894 President Harper established a settlement house near the stockyards. He also ~~instituted~~ ^{instituted} the four-quarter ~~academic~~ academic year and an extension system which made more accessible to the citizens of Chicago. Harper's the university ~~attractive to students who were also working~~ ^{Commitment to the social gospel of} interest in community service led him to establish strong departments in divinity and the new fields of social science. Indeed, the first ~~first~~ true department of sociology was established at Chicago with the founding of the University.

That a sociology department was established with the founding of the University was indeed fortunate, for it gave the new department a prestige and freedom from tradition and vested interest which were to delay the development of the field in many Eastern universities (Faris, 12, 25)

Harper recruited another Baptist minister, Albion Small, to head the new sociology department. Small shared the conservative reform impulse of Harper. Trained in theology, ~~and~~ history and political economy, Small was dissatisfied with the fragmentation of the traditional social science disciplines and their inability to come to grips with the phenomenon of modern urban America. ~~Small seemed to be experiencing that "psychic crisis" (Hofstadter) which troubled many members of the old, independent middle class and professional class as they witnessed the disquieting industrialization and urbanization of America.~~ In the ORIGINS OF SOCIOLOGY Small noted that there was general unrest among many social scientists who had come to believe that "all the traditional ways of interpreting human experience were futile." ~~Thereupon sociology became an assertion of intention to invent new and better ways to take the place of the old ones....~~ Sociology was not primarily a promulgation of doctrines about society. It was an assertion that better ways must be invented than all the rationalizers about society had practiced in their attempts to understand the fortunes of men in the past, and to point out wise courses for the future." (Small, 335) Thus ~~xxxxxx~~ American sociology was seen by Small as a social movement whose objective was ~~xxxx~~ accurate, rational understanding of human behavior and the possibilities for constructive social action. For Small "sociology in its largest scope and on its methodological side is merely a moral philosophy conscious of its task." (Matthews, 93) He agreed with W.I. Thomas that sociology aimed to substitute action based on knowledge for action based on feeling (Matthews, 95)

In 1890 Small and about 20 others who were attending a meeting of

the American Economic Association held an informal gathering to discuss shared Small's dissatisfaction, the new discipline of sociology. These men ~~were expected to~~ They "were moved by a common unrest about the unconvincing character of everything that had been done up to that time in the way of interpreting human life. These men felt that social science in its current forms was all shallow, and ~~was~~ unsatisfying and misleading. They wanted to do something about it." (Small, 342-345). For his part Small started a new course in Sociology at Colby ~~College~~ University. ~~in 1892~~. Later at Chicago he was to found the American Journal of Sociology and be a co-founder of the American Sociological Society.

Small and his colleagues in the new department were all influenced by the reform impulse of Protestant social gospellers, although Small and Thomas distrusted the emotionalism of the reformers. Small and Charles Henderson were both ministers; George Vincent and W.I. Thomas had theological influences in their backgrounds. These men shared, along with some other early American sociologists, an interest in the meliorative possibilities of sociology and a desire to establish sociology on a ~~new~~ scientific basis. They opposed the determinism and fatalism of Herbert Spencer and the Social Darwinists. (Matthews, 91-93). They believed that it was possible to gain a general scientific understanding about the nature of society, and this understanding could be applied to the alleviation of specific social problems.

But social theory could not be constructed nor could social problems be alleviated with ^{only} knowledge of the facts -- research. From the beginning the Chicago school stressed research in the field, rather than in the library, as the most reliable path to sociological knowledge. Chicago itself was the great laboratory, and students were dispatched to inquire into many facets of the social life and institutions of the city.-- a practice that was to become a Chicago School tradition under the influence of Robert Park.

One of the most interesting of the Chicago school founders was W.I. Thomas. Thomas was one of the first students of the departmne, taking his degree in 1896. It was Thomas who formulated the key concepts of "social disorganization" and "definition of the situation" which were to become so important in later Chicago school writings. ^{Paranthetically,} it was Thomas who also developed the system of note-taking on colored slips of paper which was later ^{emloyed} picked up by generations of Chicago students (Janowitz, W.I. Thomas book, xxn) Thomas also introduced the method of using personal documents in sociological research.

Thomas was one of the first American sociologists to combine theory with field research (~~Matthews, 97~~). He also formulated a "crisis" theory of social change which foreshadowed the later work by Park (Matthews, 97-98) Thomas is probably most well known for his monumental work, THE POLISH PEASANT (witten with Florian Znamecki)(sp?)

Thomas helped to shift sociology away from biological interpretation^s of human behavior; but on the matter of race prejudice he put forward a laregly biological conception:

Psychologically speaking, race-prejudice and caste-feeling are at bottom the same thing, both being phases of the instinct of hate.... Of the relation of black ~~to~~white in this country it is perhaps true that the antipathy of the southerner for the Negro is rather caste-feeling than race-prejudice, while the feeling of the northerner is race-prejudice proper. In the North, where there has been no contact with the Negro and no activity connections, there is no caste-feeling, but there exists a skin prejudice -- a horror of the external aspect of the Negro -- and many northerners report that they have a feeling against eating ~~xxdick~~ from a dish handled by a Negro. The association of master and slave in the South was, however, close, even if not intimate, and much of the feeling of physical repulsion for a blackskin disappeared. W.I. Thomas "The Psychology of Race Prejudice," AJS, 9 (March, 1904, 609-610.

A similar amalgam of "instinct" theory and "caste" theory will appear later in the work of Robert Park, who was stronly influenced by Thomas.

II

Robert Ezra Park was born of Feb. 14, 1864. When he was still quite young his parents moved to Red Wing, Minnesota, where his father established a business that over the years was to become ever more successful. In ^{some} ~~many~~ ways Park's early life paralleled the experiences of the second generation immigrant youth -- the marginal men-- he was later to study. He rebelled against the commercial quest for money and security which his father represented, but neither was he happy with the nostalgia for New England (the symbolic "old country") which seemed to engage his mother. Torn between the "New" and "old" Americas, Park attached himself to youthful neighborhood gangs and became something of an outsider (Matthews, 2-3). This detachment was his first step, albeit unintended, toward the awakening of sociological insight.

At 19 Park enrolled as a student at the University of Michigan. Here he studied with John Dewey who introduced him to the notion of communication as being a key to the process of social cohesion and social change. Dewey's democratic vision profoundly influenced ~~Park's~~ the young Park. Park began to see a possibility of rational change through a process of accommodation and adjustment (Matthews, 5, 19), and fostered by the media of communication. Ironically, Dewey also introduced Park to the organicism and Social Darwinism of Herbert Spencer. Spencerian thought fed into another side of Park's emerging character: his fatalism and, curiously, his elitism, his admiration for the superior individual, "the big and original men" who through their thought and work are able to alter the course of history (Matthews, 19)

It was also through Dewey that Park met the newspaperman Franklin Ford. Ford, like many newspapermen of the Progressive era, was acutely ^{rapid} conscious of the pace of change in America and the role of newspapers in making the public conscious of change. In an autobiographical fragment Park wrote later that Ford "came to believe, and I did too, that with more accurate and adequate reporting of current events the historical

process would be appreciably stepped up, and progress would go forward steadily, without the interruption and disorder of depression or violence, and at a rapid pace." (Park, ~~v-vi~~ v-vi) Park, Dewey and Ford conceived of publishing a journal to be called THOUGHT NEWS which would interpret current news events from the standpoint of philosophy. Although the project never really got off the ground, the collaboration with Ford contributed to Park's belief that knowledge (e.g., a deep understanding of the significance of current news) could itself contribute to rational change by altering the consciousness of individual actors (readers). Indeed, here is one source of Park's later contention that social reformers are doomed to failure because they begin with emotion rather than knowledge.

Park soon grew weary of the academic world and, like Faust whom he admired, he turned to the "world of men." Between 1887 and 1898 Park worked as a reporter for newspapers in Minnesota, Detroit, Denver, New York and Chicago. He became intimately acquainted with the painful problems engendered by the transition from a rural-agricultural to an urban-industrial society. He ~~described~~ witnessed and described the squalid corruption and crime conditions/afflicting urban immigrants (Coser, 367; Matthews, 8-11)

Park was concerned with ameliorating the appalling conditions he encountered but ~~his~~ his idealistic reforming impulse was tempered by the realism (and sometimes cynicism) that was fostered by his experiences as a big city reporter. He came to believe that "a reporter who had the facts was a more effective reformer than an editorial writer who merely thundered from his pulpit, no matter how eloquently" (Park, viii).

But the effective career of a reporter was short and after 12 years Park realized that he must either change occupations or settle for a declining career in newspaper work (Coser, 377). His journalistic experiences had deepened his interest in the problems of the city and mass communication. With financial help from his businessman father Park decided to return

to academia to study philosophy and psychology; he enrolled^d as a Graduate student at ^Harvard.

At Harvard Park studied with William James, whose essay, "A ^Certain Blindness in Human ^Beings," made a great impact on him. This essay, in stressing the importance of the subjective perceptions of actors in social situations, served to counterbalance Park's tendency to regard the ^{stance of the} outside observer (e.g., the reporter) as the sole position from which to gain insight into social reality (Matthews, 32-33). "The 'blindness' of which James spoke," Park wrote, "is the blindness each of us is likely to have for the meaning of other people's lives. At any rate what sociologists most need to know is what goes on behind the faces of men, what it is that makes life for each of us either dull or thrilling....~~the~~ But the thing that gives zest to life or makes life dull is, however, as James says, 'a personal secret' which has, in every single case, to be discovered. Otherwise we do not know the world in which we actually live." (Park, vi-vii).

After taking classes at ^Harvard for a year Park decided to go to Europe to further his studies. At ^Berlin he ^{attended} ~~listened to~~ the lectures of ^Georg Simmel, which constituted his only formal instruction in Sociology. From Simmel Park derived the notion of society as a system of interactions and processes. Simmel also stimulated Park's ideas about social conflict, ^{207694,} the marginal man, and social distance (Coser, 374; Matthews, ⁴¹ 34-35).

Through the writings of the Russian social scientist Bogdan Kistiakowski Park learned of the work of Wilhelm Windelband, whom he went to study with at ^Heidelberg. Windelband argued against the positivistic effort to make history a natural science. But the main effect of Windelband on Park was to inspire the latter's idea of "natural history," a history that seeks and cycles to identify "natural" stages in the evolution of social institutions (^{Coser, 375} ~~Matthews~~).

In Europe Park seems to have developed a romantic infatuation with the alleged virtues of the Teutonic race. He wrote a magazine article which spoke approvingly of the "ancient conviction inherent in the Teutonic race, the conviction that the man or nation that is not willing to fight for its ~~own~~ own does not deserve to live" (Matthews, 34) Park shared the ^{Social Darwinist} perspective who many Progressive who viewed war as a social good in that it stiffened the national spirit and counteracted social decay. ¶

The other side of this romanticism was an ~~exactly~~ infatuation with European peasants, whom he regarded as an embodiment of the simple, unassuming natural man (Matthews, 35). Park was later to transfer this perspective to Southern ~~Negroes~~ Blacks.

Returning to the United States after four years Park completed his Ph.D. dissertation, Masse und Publikum, which incorporated many of the ideas he had encountered in Europe. The dissertation reflected Park's struggle to grasp the transition between the "old" and "new" worlds. ~~With the completion of his degree Park was again at a turning point. Park suggested that modern society offered two alternative to traditional. He was restless in the academic world.~~ society: the irrational crowd, swayed by emotions of the moment; and the enlightened public, capable of rational discussion and action. Park's sociological faith was that through understanding both alternatives it was possible to promote the rational choice.

With the completion of his degree Park was again at a turning point in his career. He was restless in the academic world and soon decided to return to the "world of men." In the style of Progressive muckrakers, Park for a short time worked as a propagandist for the Congo Reform ^{religious reform} Association, a group that sought to expose the horrors perpetrated by King Leopold in the Congo. Park sympathized with the reformers but he soon came to feel that their zeal was misplaced and even opportunistic (Matthews, 58-59)

No amount of religious instruction, he believed, would undo the fact and consequences of European penetration of Africa. The solution, he felt, was to help the African natives accommodate themselves to the new capitalist order through vocational ~~training~~ education (Matthews, 61). In typically Progressive fashion, Park saw the spread of white "civilization" as being "destructive and wasteful" ~~for~~ but also necessary to world "progress." (Park, vii; Matthews, 61). The real task for reformers, he thought, was not to berate this "unnatural" process or try to reverse it, but instead to help the natives (and immigrants and lower classes) incorporate themselves into the new order.

In Booker T. Washington Park found a living embodiment of the accommodationist perspective. Park met Washington in 1905 and for the next seven years he worked at Tuskegee as Washington's personal assistant and publicist. Under Washington's guidance Park roamed the South collecting data on the conditions of Black people. Park was enormously impressed by Washington and clearly regarded him as one of ~~these~~ those "big and original men" who give shape to history. Park wrote: "I think I probably learned more about human nature and society, in the South under Booker Washington, than I had learned elsewhere in all my previous studies" (Park, vii).

turn-of-the-century ~~an evolutionary~~
In the South Park saw ~~a~~ process of conflict and accommodation which he generalized as a universal phenomenon:

I was not, as I found later, interested in the Negro problem as that problem is ordinarily conceived. I was interested in the Negro in the South and in the curious and intricate system which had grown up to define his relations with white folk. I was interested, most of all, in studying the details of the process by which the Negro was making and has made his slow but steady advance. I became convinced, finally, that I was observing the historical process by which civilization, not merely here but elsewhere, has evolved, drawing into the circle of its influence an ever widening circle of races and peoples (Park, vii-viii)

The Tuskegee years reinforced several ^{Assumed} ~~presuppositions~~ ^{Themes} in Park's thought which underlay his formal theories of race relations: rationalism, ^{gradualism} ~~evolutionism~~, and romanticism. All of these, in turn, were very much part of the social and intellectual climate of the Progressive era.

RATIONALISM -- For Park the ^{progressive} ~~key~~ to social progress -- for social actors, reformers and sociologists -- was rational knowledge of ^{existing} social reality. Such knowledge provided the conceptual and practical tools necessary for an effective adjustment to the modern ^{civilized} world. The program of vocational and industrial training at Tuskegee epitomized this view of the ^{social} role of knowledge. The Tuskegee program was premised on the subordination of Black people within American civilization: that was the given ^{social} reality. The purpose of the program, then, was to teach self-discipline, self-restraint, and those basic skills necessary for black workers who are expected to remain at the bottom of the economic ladder. In this manner the students at Tuskegee would coolly, rationally remake themselves to fit in with the self-interested needs of the larger white society. The "primitiveness" of the rural Blacks would be replaced by the rationality and restraint of the Tuskegee product.

Park was excited by this program of rational educational accommodation. The Tuskegee program was designed to present Black youths with a definite ~~"Dr. Washington" doctrine, "believed that the most fundamental way to~~ view of social reality and to raise them above the irrational "animal existence... an existence controlled by impulse merely, rather than ideas and ideal." Park continued: "Dr. Washington believed that...the most fundamental way to solve a race problem is to encourage individuals to solve their own problems...getting a job, learning a trade or profession was not a way of making a living but a way of making a life." (Matthews, 70)

ROMANTICISM -- The other side of Park's rationalism was his ^{bourgeois} romantic infatuation with the peasantry, particularly Black peasants in the South. Park was acutely sensitive to the many perils involved in the transition

from rural to urban lifestyles. He had seen these problems in his newspaper work and in his experiences in Europe. Park was fascinated by city life but he also experienced a certain moral revulsion at the hardship and social disorganization occasioned by the move to the city by rural folk. Park ~~felt~~ ^{agreed with}

Washington

that the virtuous, upstanding Black peasant was ~~represented~~ in grave danger of being corrupted by city life. (Matthews, 72-73) For Park, as for many white Progressive, the primitive peasant was the symbol of moral purity and true freedom (Matthews, 64-73) For the Progressive movement this reomanticism represented a reactionary protest against the encroachment of urban monopoly capitalism. Intellectually, Park understood the necessity for the transition to an urban industrial society and, like other Progressives, he wished to make this process as rational and painless as possible; but emotionally he was still tied to a vision of an idealized past, which was symbolized for him by the Black peasantry. ⁱⁿ ~~Put psychologically terms~~ ^{almost}, it was as if Park were still torn between ^{urban} commercial impulse ^{represented by} of his father and the ^{rural} nostalgia ^{represented by} of his mother.

^{Gradualism} the conflict between ^{resolved} EVOLUTIONISM -- in practice, rationalism and romanticism was ~~accommodated~~ ^{gradualist-evolutionary} by an evolutionary perspective of social change. The years at Tuskegee threw Park into a collision course with Black radicals such as W.E.B. Du Bois and William Monroe Trotter. The radicals were strongly critical of Washington's program and called instead for political agitation for full equality. Park vigorously defended his employer and his gradualist-evolutionary views. Park shared Washington's faith in gradual uplift through education, and he was affronted by what he considered to be the arrogance of the radicals (Matthews, 77-82) Of course, Washington's gradualism was partly a tactic developed in response to the harsh realities confronting Blacks in the South. But Park, ^{suspecting a therapeutic model} ~~struggling with his own "psychic crisis,"~~ elaborated this tactic into a sociological principle, a theory of an accommodationist race relations cycle. Unfortunately, this gave a certain fatalistic bent

PARK background - 8

to Park's theory, a fatalism which was subsequently incorporated into
much of American sociology (Matthews, 81)

of nk

develop but instead asserts that prejudice is ~~a~~ fact of human nature. This again reflects the influence of Sumner whom Park uses as the starting point for his analysis of prejudice.

and racial
Marginality is a result of cultural conflict, and in turn the marginal individual can influence the course of ^{social} ~~cultural~~ development.

The marginal man is a personality type that arises at a time and a place where, out of the conflict of races and cultures, new societies, new peoples and cultures are coming into existence. The fate which condemns him to live, at the same time, in two worlds is the same which compels him to assume, in relation to the worlds in which he lives, the role of a cosmopolitan and a stranger. Inevitably he becomes relatively to his cultural milieu, the individual with the wider horizon, the keener intelligence, the more detached and rational viewpoint. (R&C, 375-6)

Park asserts that in the black community it is the ~~not~~ mixed bloods, the marginal individuals, who are often the political leaders and cultural innovators. (R&C, 381) He is careful to point out that this ~~is not due to~~ cannot be accounted for by any alleged ~~any~~ biological superiority due to infusions of white blood, but his emphasis on the mixed blood as the typical marginal person serves to obscure other forms of cultural marginality which may be more important. In particular, since a large proportion of the black American population is racially mixed it seems rather pointless to single this out as an important criterion of marginality. More relevant criteria would appear to be: circumstances of higher early socialization, social privileges, access to education, social interaction with whites, etc. Moreover, Park's treatment leans toward ^{psychological} reductionism in his emphasis on the ^{personality} ~~role~~ of the marginal individual rather than marginality as a social process. Can we in ~~fact~~ ^{fact} say that the marginal individual has a "keener intelligence" and a more "rational" mind, or is it that marginality as a social process directs human intelligence toward certain questions and problems and not others?

THE SOCIOLOGICAL TRADITION IN THE U.S.

A concern with race relations is deeply rooted in American sociology.

The two earliest sociological works written in this country -- Henry Hughes' Treatise on Sociology, Theoretical and Practical, and George Fitzhugh's Sociology for the South: or the Failure of Free Society --

were extended defenses of the institution of slavery (Frazier, 30) Not surprisingly, ~~the~~ biological inferiority of black people were ~~explicit~~ explicit themes in these works.

E.B. Reuter has suggested that the sociological approach to the study of race has gone through three stages in the United States. The first period

was characterized by an emphasis on biological ^{determinism} ~~problems~~. Sociologists in this period attempted to explain ^{general} ~~biological~~ social phenomena in biological terms.

^{a/s} It was assumed that biological differences between the races determined cultural differences; therefore, the task of social scientists was to classify and measure the physical and mental differences between various human groups. The second period saw a shift toward a cultural frame of

reference. As the futility of trying to explain cultural differences in biological terms became more apparent, social scientists began ~~looking~~ ^{studying} at the development of language, customs, beliefs and institutions, and

how these varied between different groups. Characteristic of this period was the Social Darwinist perspective of William Graham Sumner. For Sumner competition between human groups led to ^{cultural differentiation and} the evolution of a superior ^{Capitalist} ~~white~~ civilization (Sumner, ^{Holstadter, 37f} social darwinism book) From his theory he drew

the conservative conclusion that the process of cultural evolution should not be tampered with by "social doctors" (reformers) because, in his famous dictum, "stateways cannot change folkways." The third period

in the study of race was marked by an emphasis on relationships between the races rather than focussing on the biological or cultural characteristics of particular races. In this period attention is directed to the social processes involved in contact and interaction between ethnic groups.

The race relations theory ~~and~~ developed by Robert Park belongs to this third period. Interestingly, however, there are occasional elements of the early perspectives which pop up from time to time in Park's writings. Park was opposed to theories of biological determinism of social behavior. He insisted that "cultural changes are not consolidated and transmitted biologically, or at least to only a very slight extent, if at all. Acquired characteristics are not biologically inherited." (R&C, 347) Still, Park ^{W.I. Murray} could speak of racial "Instincts" and "temperaments" as biological bases of racial behavior. This kind of bio-psychological reductionism is reflected in the following passage:

This (racial) temperamant, as I conceive it, consists in a few elementary but distinctive characteristics, determined by physical organization and transmitted biologically. These characteristics manifest themselves in a genial, sunny, and social disposition, in an interest and attachment to external, physical things rather than to subjective states and objects of introspection; in a disposition for expression rather than enterprise and action.... The Negro is, by natural disposition, neither an intellectual nor an idealist, like the Jew; nor a brooding introspective, like the East African; nor a pioneer and frontiersman, like the Anglo-Saxon. He is primarily an artist, loving life for its own sake. His metier is expression rather than action. He is, so to speak, the lady among the races. (R&C, 280)

Here Park has collected a hodge-podge of racial stereotypes and treated them as biological facts and determinants of psychological and social behavior. Such statements are frequent in Park's early writings ^{6A} and seem to appear less often in later works.

Park was not explicitly a Social Darwinist but he ^{also} appears to have been strongly influenced by the ^{view} thinking of William Graham Sumner. Park frequently cites Sumner on the war-like nature of primitive societies, the nature of culture, the struggle for existence, in-group versus out-group, mores and folkways, and so on. Indeed, in Park's collected writings on race, Race and Culture, there are more references to Sumner's work than to the writings of any other social scientist. ~~and~~

Interestingly Park does not seem to have shared Sumner's view of the social evolution of culture. Park has an evolutionary perspective,

but what Park's sees as evolving are the realtions between ethnic groups rather than the cultures of ethnic groups. Park's famous race relations cycle ^{theory} presents an evolutionary model of racial interaction, a process which he believes has repeated itself throughtout human history.

RACE RELATIONS CYCLE

Insert 3A

Robert Park's unique contribution to the theory of race relations was to develop a concept of the natural history of race contacts and interaction. ^(locally + comparatively) processual Drawing on the ~~work of~~ sociology of Georg Simmel, his experiences in the South and his study of European immigrants, Park developed a theory of a race relations cycle.

It is obvious that race relations and all that they imply are generally, and on the whole, the products of migration and conquest. This was true of the ancient world and it is equally true of the modern. The interracial adjustments that follow such migration and conquest are more complex than is ordinarily understood. They involve racial competition, conflict, accomodation, and eventually adsimilation, but all of these diverse processes are to be regarded as merely the efforts of a new social and cultural organism to achieve a new biotic and social equilibrium. (R&C, 104)

(Note the biological references here)

The four procesesses mentioned here became in fact the basis of Park's general sociology. Park defined competition as "interaction without social contact." (Park and Burgess, 506) Competition stems from the struggle for survival; it involves both the "struggle of the individual to find a place in the local economy" and the "struggle of a racial unit to discover a niche" in the social order (Park, 106)

But competition is not conscious. "Competition takes the form of conflict or rivalry only when it becomes conscious, when competitors identify one another as rivals or as enemies" (P&B, 506) When consciousness of competition develops it is accompanied by (racial) labelling of competitors and the arousal of hostile sentiments. "Conflict is always conscious, indeed, it evokes the deepest emotions and strongest passions and enlists

For Park race relations include "all the relations that ordinarily exist between members of different ethnic and genetic groups which are capable of provoking race conflict and race consciousness or of determining the relative status of the racial groups of which a community is composed." He continues that race relations comprise "all those situations in which some relatively stable equilibrium between competing races has been achieved and in which the resulting social order has become fixed in custom and tradition" (R&C, 82)

correlate
Park does not attempt to ~~relate~~ ^{and correlate} his concept of race relations to different types of social systems, and variations in the types of competition and conflict these systems may produce. In seeking a universalistic conception he glosses over ~~many~~ the role of specific socio-historical forces in producing racial antagonism. Moreover, Park in several passages lapses into biological reductionism in his treatment of racial antagonism. ^{and} He speaks of the "essentially fundamental" or "instinctive" antipathy between different racial groups. (Park & Burgess, 636-7)

the greatest concentration of attention and effort. Both competition and conflict are forms of struggle. Competition, however, is continuous and impersonal, conflict is intermittent and personal" (P&B, 574) Competition is "a struggle for position in an economic order," whereas conflict establishes "the status of the individual, or a group of individuals, in the social order" (Ibid)

Accommodation does not end antagonism between groups, but it represents an adjustment of relative status and power ~~and status~~ of the groups aimed at reducing conflict. "In an accommodation the antagonism of the hostile elements is, for the time being, regulated, and conflict disappears as overt action, although it remains latent as a potential force. With a change in the situation, the adjustment that had hitherto successfully held in control the antagonistic forces fails. There is confusion and unrest which may issue in open conflict. Conflict, whether a war or a strike or a mere exchange of polite innuendoes, invariably issues in a new accommodation or social order, which in general involves a changed status in the relations among the participants. (P&B, 665)

Where accommodation is a temporary adjustment, assimilation involves a deeper, more permanent change.

Assimilation is a process of interpenetration and fusion in which persons and groups acquire the memories, sentiments, and attitudes of other persons or groups, and, by sharing their experiences and history, are incorporated with them in a common cultural life. In so far as assimilation denotes this sharing of tradition, this intimate participation in common experiences, assimilation is central in the historical and cultural processes. (P&B, 735-6)

As suggested earlier, Park regarded these four processes as universal and inevitable in race relations. Park thought that the outcome of these processes ~~was~~ was that human "diversities will be based in the future less on inheritance and race and rather more on culture and occupation. That means that race conflicts in the modern world, which is already or presently will be a single great society, will be more and more in the future confused with, and eventually superseded by, the conflicts of classes." (R&C, 116)

(over)

supported
Park ~~introduced~~ his developing theory with comparative data from throughout the world, including, Hawaii, Brazil, China, India and South Africa. approach
Indeed, a broad, comparative ~~approach~~ became a characteristic of his style of theoretical work in race relations.
~~approach~~ race relations theory.

determinism + fatalism

There is a certain ~~fatalism~~ in Park's theory which is problematic. In the first place, since each stage is regarded as necessary and inevitable, the theory can be used to imply that the racial groups involved must accept whatever conflicts and accommodations arise as "progressive and irreversible" steps along the path to eventual assimilation (R&C, 150), as Staples notes, Thus, the theory can be employed to defend the racial status quo and a gradualist approach to change. (Staples, 7)

~~Second~~ In the second place, as Barth and Noel point out, this "is clearly a unilinear evolutionary model as it implies that there is a probability of 1.00 that each stage of the cycle will lead to and culminate in the next with assimilation-amalgamation ultimately assured." (Steele & Hoy, Majority & minority, 17) *Assimilation is assumed to be desirable and inevitable.* But cross-cultural data (and an ~~objective~~ inspection of U.S. history) reveal that other outcomes are possible, including ethnic stratification, exclusion, symbiosis, and pluralism. (Ibid, 18) *(over)*

Park himself was not unaware *problem in his theory* of the ~~second~~ problem. He realized that after 300 years in America black people were not being assimilated. He attributed the cause of this to ~~the~~ *their* "divergent physical traits," the "racial ~~uniform~~ *~ and the inherent white biology.*" of skin color (R&C, 208, 353) Thus, unlike European immigrants, *in contrast* who can shed their cultural "uniforms" and assimilate into the cosmopolitan mass of the urban populations, blacks (and Orientals in Park's view) are "condemned to remain among us an abstraction, a symbol!" He suggested that what in fact was developing in the U.S. *South* was a form of "bi-racial organization."

Originally race relations in the South could be rather accurately represented by a horizontal line, with all the white folk above, and all the Negro folk below. But at present (1928) these relations are assuming new forms, and in consequence changing in character and meaning. With the development of industrial and professional classes within the Negro race, the distinction between the races tends to assume the form of a vertical line. On one side of this line the Negro is represented in most of the occupational and professional classes; on the other side of the line the white man is similarly represented.... The result is to develop in every occupational class professional and industrial bi-racial organizations. Bi-racial organizations preserve race distinction, but change their content. (R&C, 243)

What Park is describing here is a manifestation of the *Jim Crow* "separate but ~~equal~~" doctrine, a policy whose purpose was to prevent assimilation.

Brewton Berry has lodged a similar criticism of Park's theory.

Dr. Park's theory is open to doubt, for assimilation and amalgamation may not be inevitable, and certainly there are instances of racial contacts where conflict and competition have been conspicuously lacking. Some scholars, therefore, question the existence of any universal pattern, and incline rather to the belief that so numerous and so various are the components that enter into race relations that each situation is unique, and the making of generalizations is a hazardous procedure.

Brewton Berry, *Race and Ethnic Relations*, 3rd ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1965 p.135.

Park ^{did} ~~does~~ not pursue the implications of his ^{description} ~~analysis~~, but ^{it may be suggested} ~~the suggestion~~ is that ~~black~~ assimilation has not occurred not simply due to "racial uniforms" but because of a ^{social} ~~social~~ organization whose purpose is to ~~circumvent~~ ^{maintain} racial social distance ^{and circumvent assimilation.}

Other key concepts in Park's race relations theory are racial prejudice, social distance, and marginality. Social distance refers to feeling "a sense of distance toward individuals with whom we come into contact." Moreover, it refers to "a state of mind in which we become, often suddenly and unexpectedly, conscious of the distances that separate, or seem to separate us, from classes and races whom we do not fully understand." (R&C, 257) Social distance refers to the notion that subordinate individuals and races have a "proper distance" and a "proper place" which are maintained by social rituals and ~~reflected in~~ social etiquette. Indeed, etiquette becomes a means of social control in race relations (R&C, 182)

^{He adds here that race prejudice is the} ~~Racial prejudice, Park asserts, is a "phenomenon of status," it is the~~ "resistance of the social order to change." (R&C, 237-33) In ^{this} ~~view~~ race prejudice is a kind of spontaneous expression of conservatism. Here Park runs into trouble, for he never questions the spontaneous nature of race prejudice. On the contrary he emphasizes its spontaneity and therefore racial makes prejudice a feature of human nature rather than an aspect of social organization or social process. Once again Park falls into a kind of bio-psychological reductionism:

What we ordinarily call prejudice seems then to be more or less instinctive and spontaneous disposition to maintain social distances. (R&C, 259)

Elsewhere Park writes of a "spontaneous response" to what is "strange and unfamiliar" which develops from our "sense of insecurity." (R&C, 238) In these remarks Park has abandoned a sociological perspective or even a social psychological perspective. We are instead left with a deterministic perspective which does not examine why and how certain forms of prejudice

"Race prejudice," Park asserts, is like class and caste prejudice -- merely one variety of a species. So far as it can be described in these terms, race prejudice may be regarded as a phenomenon of status." (P&C, 231-2)

There are other problems with Park's conception of the role of the marginal man in social change.

I have already mentioned certain tendencies -- rationalism, romanticism, gradualism -- in Park's thinking with regard to race. These tendencies, combined with certain ~~continued~~ particularly rationalism and gradualism, ~~continued characteristics~~ ~~themselves~~ other presuppositions in his thought and manifested themselves as a set of tensions in his theory of social change in race relations.

For Park, competition and conflict between groups was the motive force of social change. But once change is set in motion ~~Park seems ambivalent~~ ~~about~~ what factors shape its direction and outcome? Strauss and Fisher have argued that Park shared with W.I. Thomas a general perspective on social change (cite S&F). In this perspective the collision of groups shakes some individuals loose from the constraints of custom and opens the way for new responses to the situation. These individuals -- the marginal man, the creative person -- become the emancipated thinkers and leaders of social movements, and it is they who give direction to social change and shape its outcome by building new social institutions (S&F, 7). Thus, the self-conscious, emancipated individual becomes both the sign of change and the agent through which new responses are organized. These individuals come to form an enlightened, educated elite capable of consciously guiding the process of change (S&F, 26).

The difficulty with this theory is that it assumes a certain relationship between the individual and the collectivity which may not stand up to scrutiny. It also, as Strauss and Fisher point out (24), ~~tend to equate~~ *can be reduced to equating* progress with outcomes for individuals. Thus, Park's belief that education would help foster new occupational groupings which would gradually replace racial groupings is an incremental perspective which equates social progress with educational and occupational mobility of individuals.

What is the relationship between the emancipated individual and the collectivity? Park clearly regarded such individuals as BTW and W.E. B. Du Bois as examples of the marginal man rising to the task of leadership

of the collectivity. Implicit here is an assumption that marginality leads to greater awareness of the need for social change and a concomitant commitment ~~of~~ to struggle for the needed change. But, as is apparent in the work of later Chicago sociologists, marginality may also lead to alienation and "deviancy" -- that is, to a search for individual freedom rather than collective ~~change~~ struggle and change. Franklin Frazier's black bourgeoisie chose the illusion of individual freedom over the commitment to social struggle. The "deviants" studied by Howard Becker and Irving Goffman were marginal individuals who sought ~~and~~ a protected niche of individual freedom within the confines of an oppressive social order. One is also reminded of the split in the social movements of the Sixties between "political" and "cultural" activists -- the former committed to collective struggle, the latter to individual head changing. In ~~sum~~ short, it seems untenable to assume that marginality generally fosters social awareness; it may just as likely promote individual escapism.

every one may, with ready to critical response

M. Park's position is not to assume that the individual is the only source of change. He is saying that individuals will lead society, that they lead change, that they lead society.

Despite his general democratic impulse, Park appears here to have adopted an elitist "great man" theory of social change. It is the educators, sociologists, philanthropists, and enlightened marginal men who will guide change and promote a rational process of change. This elitism is very much within the tradition of Progressive era social thought. Many Progressives believed that it was the enlightened intellectuals who must control and direct the frightening changes resulting from industrialization and urbanization.

But for sociological theory Park's elitism is problematic, for it amounts to a form of reductionism. Change is initiated by a social process, change is the clash of social groups, but once set in motion Park's alters the focus of his analysis from social process to individual consciousness. and the role of emancipated individuals. I think it was Park's commitment to rationalism that led to this reductionism. From a very early age Park was seeking

a way of coping with the irrational forces which he saw at work in social life. For him, knowledge, communication and discussion were prerequisites for rational action. But ^{the locus of} knowledge, communication and discussion is the individual. Crowds may mill and riot, but it is only individuals who think and communicate. Crowds may initiate action but it is only enlightened individuals who can rationally guide social change.

~~Despite the fact that~~
 Although he sometimes seemed to slip into reductionism, Park never abandoned his basic perspective of group conflict as the source of social change. He had great faith in increased communication and discussion ^{vehicles} as ~~vehicles~~ of rational change, but he also knew that ~~that~~ there was a tenacious, irrational element in ideologies which changed only through group conflict. ^{Near the end of his life he} Thus, when he was once asked about his view on race riots, he replied:

"I am not quite clear in my mind that I am opposed to race riots. The thing that I am opposed to is that the Negro should always lose. If they had a fair chance of winning once in a while I don't know but what I would be in favor of them.... I am sure that one way to expedite change in racial ideology, which is after all back of all public opinion, may not be expedited by these conflicts. (Matthews, 189)

Progressive
~~reductionist~~
 Thus Park adhered to the ^{enlightened} ~~progressive~~ individuals
 faith in ^{group conflict} ~~the~~ role of ^{irrational} ~~group~~ conflict
 in conquering the ^{unleashed} ~~group~~ conflict
 of the

IV

The prestige of the Chicago school and Robert Park attracted many students to the University of Chicago. Park trained some of the nation's most outstanding race relations scholars, including Charles S. Johnson, ^{Iturbide blum, Everett Hughes} Edward B. Reuter, Louis Wirth, John Dollard, Frederick Detweiler and E. Franklin Frazier.

Everett C. Hughes ^{once} ~~has observed~~ described E. Franklin Frazier as Park's most complete student. In 1931 Frazier completed a dissertation on The Negro Family in Chicago. (The study was later expanded and in 1939 it was published as The Negro Family in the United States.) Frazier's ^{study} ~~Chicago~~ study was ~~well~~ within the Chicago style, taking a natural history approach and making use of the ecological and personal documents methodologies. Frazier attempted to show that social disorganization, rather than biological differences, accounted for ^{the} ~~for~~ "deviations" of black family life from the normative pattern of white American families. In a later theoretical essay Frazier called attention to what he regarded as the "important role of the family in acculturation and assimilation (which) is due to the nature of contacts within the family as compared with other types of human association.... It is almost exclusively through the ~~family~~ intimate contacts of family living that the sentiments and ideals characteristic of a society are transmitted and become ~~part~~ a part of the personalities of the members of society." (Frazier, Race relations bk, 19)

Frazier's emphasis on assimilation (and social disorganization as inhibiting assimilation) has prompted some criticism of him by later black sociologists. (Staples, 59-60, 127) Frazier seems to have accepted white middle-class values and practices as norms against which the values and practices of black America must be measured. Interestingly enough, late in his career Frazier wrote a lengthy polemic against Negro intellectuals, accusing them of having an "obsession" with assimilation. He wrote of

the black intellectual's "failure to dig down into the experience of the Negro and bring about a transvaluation of that experience so that the Negro could have a new self-image or new conception of himself. It was the responsibility of the Negro intellectual to provide a positive identification through history, literature, art, music and the drama." (Frazier, ^{Race relations,} ~~278~~ 278) But Frazier was no nationalist; black culture was simply to be another "contribution" to a general American heritage.

Like Park, Frazier went on to undertake a broad and comparative study of race relations in other parts of the world, including Africa, the Caribbean (cite Race Contacts in Modern World) and South America. Frazier generally employed the processual theory of Park, but he was also deeply interested in the role of key institutions, such as the family and the church, and also the role of social stratification.

Another line of succession was the symbolic-interactionist school represented by such scholars as Herbert Blumer and Tomatsu Shibutani. Taking W.I. Thomas' concept of the "definition of the situation" as its starting point, this socialpsychological school stressed the importance of shared symbols and definitions in situations of racial interaction. As Shibutani and Kwan put it: "What is of decisive importance is that human beings interact not so much in terms of what they actually are but in terms of the conceptions that they form of themselves and of one another." (S&K, 38) Accordingly it is the self-conception and self-definition of ethnic groups which lie at the heart of race relations. Like Park, Shibutani and Kwan take a processual and broadly comparative approach in their well-known book, ETHNIC STRATIFICATION.

Although not ^{primarily} really a race relations theorist, Blumer in 1955 wrote an important essay which sought to rescue theories of race prejudice from the psychological reductionism then being popularized by such authors as Gordon Allport. Blumer stressed the need to view race prejudice in terms of group status and social definitions rather than as a matter only of

individual sentiments.

My thesis is that race prejudice exists basically in a sense of group position rather than in a set of feelings which members of one racial group have toward members of another racial group. This different way of viewing race prejudice shifts study and analysis from a preoccupation with feelings as lodged in individuals to a concern with the relationship of racial groups. It also shifts scholarly treatment away from individual lines of experience and focuses interest on the collective process by which a racial group comes to define and redefine another racial group. (Masuoka, 217) *and 'in the end'*

Blumer avoids reductionist appeals to innate "fears", as a source of race prejudice and instead concentrates on the collective process by which racial groups develop a sense of group position as the explanatory key. "The sense of group position is the very heart of the relation of the dominant to the subordinate group. It supplies the dominant group with its framework of perception, its standard of judgment, its patterns of sensitivity, and its emotional proclivities." (Ibid, 220-21)

Symbolic interactionist theory has been criticized by some writers for not incorporating a concept of power. However, Blumer's discussion of the sense of group position as a key to explaining race prejudice suggests that the ability of one group to impose a social definition on other groups is an expression -- and perhaps a useful interactionist definition -- of power. But, to my knowledge, no interactionists have pursued this line of thought.

Blumer elsewhere discusses the role of industrialization in race relations. He contends that industrialization, contrary to popular *wisdom* belief, is not necessarily inimical to a system of racial oppression. *everywhere* On the contrary, he asserts, "available evidence" sustains the thesis that when introduced into a racially ordered society, industrialization conforms to the alignment and code of the racial order. Where the racial order is clear-cut and firm, the industrial apparatus will develop a corresponding racial scheme. "(herbert Blumer, "Industrialization and Race Relations," in Industrialisation and Race Relations, ed. by Guy Hunter London: Oxford Univ Press, 1965, 245.

Blumer suggests that racial changes in the industrial order are provoked by pressures in the outside society.

Another ^{Park student} Chicago school theorist, Everett Hughes, has written several essays ~~on~~ race and ethnic relations -- particularly French-English relations in Canada and ^{to a lesser degree} black-white relations in the American South. What is most interesting in Hughes' writings has been his effort to call attention to presuppositions ~~and~~ of sociologists themselves in studying race relations and the impact these have on the sociological work performed. For example, he notes the common tendency of sociologists to study minority groups rather than majority groups, with the presupposition that the ~~latter~~ former somehow poses a "problem." (Hughes, 155-6) He points out that it takes at least two groups to create race relations or a race problem, and that the ~~problem~~ locus of the problem is not infrequently the extreme behavior of the dominant group. (163f) There is a conservative bias in sociological work, Hughes implies, in that sociologists prefer to study the ~~latter~~ middle range of human behavior and avoid the difficult extremes. The sociological imagination is thereby imprisoned and blinded. Commenting on the unexpectedness of the black struggle of the 1950s and early 1960s Hughes wrote: "Perhaps we (sociologists) failed to foresee present racial movements because our whole inward frame is adapted to study of the middle range of behavior, with occasional conducted tours towards, but not dangerously near, the extremes." (494) Hughes blames this sociological myopia on the drive toward professionalization and its tendency to restrict the creative imagination.

V

W.E.B. DU BOIS -- Du Bois, a contemporary of Robert Park, offered an ~~next~~ ^{alternative approach to the role of} would have alternative ~~conception of the role of~~ sociology. Du Bois agreed with Park

that knowledge was the key to action, but where Park sought to formulate a universal natural history of race relations Du Bois instead sought detailed empirical knowledge about a ^{particular} ~~specific~~ group of human beings in a definite historical context as a prerequisite to social reform action.

Increasingly Du Bois came to see the social scientist as also a social activist. "Not simply knowledge," he wrote, "not simply direct repression of evil, will reform the world. In long, indirect pressure and action of various ~~kind~~ and intricate sorts, the actions of men which are not due to lack of knowledge nor to evil intent, must be changed by influencing folkways, habits, customs, and subconscious deeds." (quoted in Du Bois antho, 19) Staples points out that Du Bois helped lay the foundations for ~~what~~ ~~in contrast to the active reformer and value-free perspective of Park~~ a black sociological perspective.

~~Du Bois presented~~

Over 75 years ago he (Du Bois) noted that the past studies of Afro-Americans had been characterized by a lack of detail, failure to be systematic, and a tendency to be uncritical. Hence, he advocated basic research on Blacks that would separate opinion from fact. The task of sociology, he said, was to put science into sociology through the study of the condition and problems of Blacks. Moreover, he opposed the idea of a value-free sociology as it is generally defined. Instead, the sociologist should be oriented toward a humanistic perspective of his society. What he wanted was a shift from the negative values held by social scientists, which tended to support the oppression of Blacks, to more positive values that allowed Blacks to maintain their cultural patterns unrestricted by the laws and social customs of the White majority" (Staples, 3-4)

Du Bois did not formulate a general theory of race relations. his careful studies of black social conditions and Rather his importance lay in ~~the fact~~ his elaboration of the historical mechanisms of racial oppression in the U.S. (see Black Reconstruction).

He also called attention to the importance of ^{viewing} ~~seeing~~ race relations from the ^{standpoint} ~~point of view~~ of the victims of racial oppression. In these ways Du Bois helped pave the way for the later exploitation theory of race relations developed by Oliver Cox.

Du Bois would have taken shape except for Sumner & the Frenchmen

Oliver C. Cox was born in Trinidad but migrated to the U.S. while still a teenager. He studied economics and sociology at the University of Chicago, earning a Ph.D. degree in 1938. Subsequently, he taught at several institutions, including Tuskegee. ^{Ironically} It was during his tenure at ^{not well-known} Tuskegee that Cox wrote his famous book, Cast, Class and Race. This book is in part a rebuttal to the race relations theory formulated by Park.

Cox objects to Park's theory on several grounds. In the first place Cox contends that race is a social concept disguised as a biological concept. Races are socially defined in the process of interaction; hence, racial antagonism is not natural or biological but must be socially ^{constructed} ~~created~~ (Cox, 319, 465) Cox examines ancient societies and notes various forms of cultural and political conflict, but he does not find evidence of race conflict; race antagonism is a phenomenon of modern times (322-25). Similarly race prejudice is a modern invention. Moreover, race prejudice, for Cox, is definitely not the same as ~~class and~~ caste prejudice. "Caste prejudice is an aspect of culture prejudice," he asserts, whereas race prejudice is "the socio-~~attitudinal~~ attitudinal matrix supporting a calculated and determined effort of a white ruling class to keep some people or peoples of color and their resources exploitable." (Cox, 350, 475) Cox goes to great length to demonstrate that the concepts of caste, class and race are quite distinct in their origins and social consequences. He criticizes the "caste school" of race relations for taking certain ^{superficial} similarities between race relations and caste relations and using ~~these~~ as the basis for a theory.

The method of selecting and identifying isolatedly certain aspects of intercaste relationships, such as endogamy, non-commensality, or other marks of social distinction with their apparent counterparts in race relations, may at first seem convincing. In almost every case, however, the comparison is not between caste and race but

merely a recognition of apparently common characteristics of all situations of superior-inferior or superordination-subordination relationships. (Cox 497)

Cox takes specific exception to the notion of a universal race relations cycle (Cox, RR book, 36f). Instead he counterposes the idea of ~~the~~ racial dominance and race prejudice as a unique product of European capitalism, + *nationalism*

Our hypothesis is that racial exploitation and race prejudice developed among Europeans with the rise of capitalism and nationalism, and that because of the world-wide ramifications of capitalism, all racial antagonisms can be traced to the policies and attitudes of the leading capitalist people, the white people of Europe and North America. (322)

Cox is careful to point out that "there is no assumption...that race prejudice is a biological heritage of the white race" (346); rather it is the spread of the capitalist system and its exploitation of the land and labor of peoples of color which accounts for the rise of race prejudice, "Racial exploitation is merely one aspect of the problem of the proletarianization of labor, regardless of the color of the laborer," he maintains. (333)

Insert 3B

The strength of Cox's theory lies in his insistence that race relations cannot be understood apart from analysis of the specific social and political context in which they arise. Thus, he ~~xx~~ attributes modern race relations to the rise of capitalist exploitation. Unfortunately, Cox nowhere ~~xx~~ clarifies his central concept of exploitation. Indeed, he often seems to use the concept in a moral-condemnatory sense rather than as a analytic tool. Cox apparently borrowed the concept ^{of exploitation} from Marx where it ~~xx~~ refers to the extraction of surplus value from labor, but Cox's use of the term is much broader and ~~there~~ less clear. Furthermore, if racial exploitation is simply an outcome of ~~the~~ capitalist exploitation of labor then we would expect to observe a general prejudice against laborers of all colors. ~~not~~ finding such a general prejudice, we are forced to conclude that factors other than economic exploitation alone must enter in the formation

Insert 3C

is not in evidence, then

*white
with
ethnic?*

(over)

and elaboration of systems of racial antagonism and race prejudice.

Cox himself suggests some such factors, including the role of organized religion and the specific nature of the southern plantation system.

Finally, in treating racism as a unique invention of modern European capitalism ^{Cox largely} limits the focus of his discussion to race relations between white and non-whites. Pierre L. van den Berghe takes exception to this position, arguing instead that racism "has been independently discovered and rediscovered by various peoples at various times in history." But van den Berghe goes on to state that "the Western strain of the virus (of racism) has eclipsed all others in importance." (12-13, van den Berghe book)

Van den Berghe agrees with Cox in assigning great importance to the role of capitalist exploitation in the evolution of racial oppression, but he also attributes importance to Darwinian ideas and the prevalence of democratic ideologies which, ironically, made it necessary to deny the humanity of oppressed groups (ibid, 16-17)

INSERT 3B

Cox saw the ^{elimination} ~~ending~~ of racial exploitation ^{as the world} ~~in terms~~ of a world-wide class struggle:

The problem of racial exploitation, then, will most probably be settled as part of the world proletarian struggle for democracy; every advance of the masses will be an actual or potential advance for the colored people. Whether the open threat of violence by the exploiting class will be shortly joined will depend upon the unpredictable play and balance of force in a world-wide struggle for power. (Cox, 583)

Like Du Bois, Cox saw the problem of the "Color Line" as central to present world history. (Pank also saw this, but from a different angle of view.) See below

INSERT 3C

Furthermore, if racial exploitation and prejudice is ^{largely} the outcome of concerted action on the part of the capitalist class, then one would expect to find that racial prejudice would be relatively easy to combat among white workers. But this has not proved to be the case. In focusing on capitalist manipulation Cox's theory fails to sufficiently analyze the ~~psy~~ social-psychological and material interests which white workers may have in the continuance of racial exploitation.

GUNNAR MYRDAL -- One of the most massive studies of U.S. race relations ever published is An American Dilemma, compiled by the Swedish Sociologist Dr. Gunnar Myrdal and his associates. ~~Has~~ Funded by the Carnegie Corporation the book was chiefly a compilation of existing knowledge ~~in~~; no new field studies were undertaken.

The importance of this book lies not in any new theoretical constructs which it advanced -- for it advanced none -- but rather in the perspective employed in presenting the material. For Myrdal, American race relations were embedded in a moral dilemma -- the contradiction between the American Creed and American practice. According to Myrdal, the American Creed embodies the

ideals of the essential dignity of the individual human being, of the fundamental equality of all men, and of certain inalienable rights to freedom, justice, and a fair opportunity....

From the point of view of the American Creed the status accorded the Negro in America represents nothing more and nothing less than a century-long lag in public morals. In principle the Negro problem was settled long ago; in practice the solution is not effectuated. The Negro in America has not yet been given the elemental civil and political rights of formal democracy, including a fair opportunity to earn his living, ~~upon which a general~~ And this anachronism constitutes the contemporary "problem" both to Negroes and to whites.

Gunnar Myrdal, An American Dilemma (New York: Harper, 1944), I, 4-5, 24

Myrdal's perspective reflects the new defensive liberalism which was one response to the rise of fascism in Germany and the emergence of anti-colonial struggles in various parts of the world. ^(A/low, 1974: 272f) A new liberal racial ideology was critical to America's national solidarity during WWII and to her claims to international political leadership. Interestingly, no one was more aware of this ideological necessity than Robert Park. In a perceptive essay written shortly before his death Park noted that WWII ^(white) "had given the American public a new orientation and a new issue."

We have hitherto maintained toward the peoples of India, China, Japan, and Africa a curious attitude of complacency verging on contempt. Toward peoples of a different color we have usually

acted as a benevolent "master-race", possessing all the wisdom and therefore entitled to impose our political and religious institutions and social practices upon both lands and peoples.

↪ But now ^{that} we find ourselves fighting on the same battlefields for the same cause, all this seems to be an anachronism....

↪ Under these circumstances many people in the United States have become suddenly conscious of the limited and parochial view which our previous isolation has fostered and are now apparently in a way to revise their opinions of alien peoples and to improve, at least, our international and interracial manners....

↪ What the war has done thus far has been to make race relations an international rather than a local and national problem....

Furthermore, in the prosecution of the war and in the organization of the peace, racial diversities of the American population will be either a national handicap or a national ~~disaster~~ asset, depending upon our ability to make our racial policies and our racial ideology conform to our national interests. (R&C, 312, 315)

Although this paper has focussed on the work of Robert Park and his students and contemporaries, the ^{theoretical} contributions of several more recent ^{writers} ~~theorists~~ will be mentioned by way of conclusion. (1, 20)
~~& William Tabb (cite)~~
ROBERT STAPLES -- Along with Robert Blauner (cite), Staples has been one of the chief architects of the colonial model of race relations. "The colonial model," he states, "views the black community as an underdeveloped, exploited colony controlled by individuals outside the community."

An important feature of this model when applied to the United states is its technique of combining racial and class oppression into one theoretical framework. "It also illustrates the institutionalized patterns of racist oppression. Instead of focussing on individual attitudes of racial prejudice, it treats racism as a political and economic process that maintains domination of Whites over Blacks by systematic subjugation.... It illustrates that Black deprivation is not a result of the Black individual's limitation or the White person's lack of tolerance. The Black condition can be more realistically viewed as a pattern of systematic subjugation maintained by those people who stand to profit the most from it." (Staples, 13)

Robert B

Robert ALLEN — In 1974 Allen ^{suggested} ~~point forward~~ a theory of race relations in the United States which focussed on the interrelationship between prevailing racial ideologies and ^{social-economic in the US} ~~the structure of social and economic~~ ^{arrangements} (cite RR book). The theory stresses the role played by the demand for black labor in the functioning of the American economy. It identifies three stages of racial ideology: (1) ~~the~~ biological racism (black peoples as 'subhuman') associated with the slave-plantation economy; (2) ~~the~~ Social Darwinist racism (black people as an ^{human} inferior race) associated with the emergence of industrial monopoly capitalism; and (3) ~~the~~ cultural chauvinist racism (black people as 'culturally backward') associated with ~~the~~ domestic and international challenges to the hegemony of capitalism, especially since WWII.

Drawing upon the work of Cox,

WILLIAM J. WILSON -- Most recent of all is the theory advanced by Wilson (cite) who is a professor of sociology at the Univ. of Chicago Wilson/also identifies three stages in the development of race relations in the U.S. His first two are quite similar to the first two stages suggested by Allen -- but where Allen sees racism continuing in the modern era in the form of cultural chauvinism Wilson concludes that ~~the~~ economic class subordination has ~~been~~ become more important than racial oppression in determining black life chances. Moreover, occupational and class differentiation within the black community has fragmented black solidarity and affected the direction taken by the black struggle for freedom and equality.

All of these recent theories are concerned with the interrelationship between race and class. Where they differ is in the relative weight assigned to race and class factors in black oppression. Ironically, 40 years ago Robert Park posed this problem when he predicted that "race conflicts in the modern world... will be more and more in the future confused with, and eventually superseded by, the conflicts of classes."

~~Park's concepts may no longer be popular in sociological theories of~~
~~race relations, but the accuracy of the above prediction is the subject~~
~~of a growing theoretical debate.~~
 Park put his finger on the theory & this substantive &

on a question with deep implications for both sociology & social action;

PARK, Early influences (from Mathews, 1977) ch 1

DEWEY vs Herbert Spencer, 5, 8, 10, 19
Dewey + Franklin Ford, 20

FAUST, 7, 8

Newspaper^{work} introduces him to problems of City, 10

Organicism (from Spencer via Dewey), 8, 10, 21, 23

Reporting as contributing to change, 11, ^{Change then} understanding 20, 22

Reform impulse, 14 (search for a cause) 15, 19

Anarcho-Individualism, 15

Intolerance of reformers, 16-17, 28

Ethical concept of "the people", 17 (bourgeois romanticism)

Anti-elitism, 17-18

Fatalism, 18

Social Darwinism, 19-20, 26-27

Social significance of news (exchange), 20

Thought News project, 22, 27, 28

Franklin Ford, 22, 29

Organicism and division of labor as key ^{presuppositions} principles in
Park's research views, 23, 24

Contradictions of Industrial-technical progress,
Impact on Park, 24

Naturalism, Sources of (Hegel, Darwin, Spencer), 26

Summary, 28

PARK (Intellectual Training) (Matthews, ch 2)

William James, 32 (subjectivist influence, participation)

Admiration for Teutonic race, 34

<u>Georg Simmel, 34, 41f</u> ecological perspective, 41, 46 forms of interaction , 43-4 interactionist perspective, 45 natural history, 45	Origins of sociology, 36f (+ conservatism)
<u>Comte, 38</u> subjectivism, 48	fatalism, 48
Herbert Spencer, 39 (and organicism), 41	Park's study of peasant, 35

Crowd & Public (Ph.D. Thesis) 51-2
+ social change, 55-6

Park Congo Reform + Tuskegee (Matthews, ch 3)

^{Congo Reform}
Contempt for reformers, 58-9
race relations, interest 60-1 (comparative)
interest in industrial ed. 61

BTW + Tuskegee (note BTW's influence on Park's ^{preconceptions})
assimilation thru vocational ed, 62
Ghost writer for BTW, 63-4, 66

'Emergent theory perspective, 68

Evolution
in race relations

Tuskegee program as evolutionary solution to
race problem, 70, 77, 78, 81

Negroes as peasants, 72-6 'romanticism' primitivism, 75

Black Nationalism, 78-79

Ethnic pluralism, 79

Federalism, 81

Park + Chicago School (Matthews Ch 4)

Class Park's inheritance, 86

Tools for comparative perspective, 87

First paper on racial assimilation, 85

Univ
of Chicago

Chicago sociology dept history, 87f (philosophy of university)

Baptist influence, 89

Origins of sociology as a discipline, 90

Religious factor 90 92

Albion Small, 91, 93

Reform assumption 91

Social Darwinism under attack, 91

Meliorism of sociology, 93, 96, 111

Albion Small's influence 91, 93, 94, 96

Social process, 96

W. I. Thomas, 97, 101

Attitude + defn of situation, 101

Ernest Burgess, 105

Park's interest in personal experience 107-8

Rockwellers
1105 Chicago
87

(over)

¹¹ "Disinterestedness" in our collections
Survey of West Coast, 113-4
Parks' "Conservation", 117
Parks' writing/work style, 118

Park - Urbanism (Matthews, Ch 5)

Anti-urban

Environmentalism, 123, 142 Middle west romanticism on
basis of social psychology
ecology, 128, 135, 138

Anti-bioscience
142

Park's "The City" article, 129

Theory: Park's conception of. 130

Review of Intro to ~~society~~ Science of Sociology, 130

Evolutionism, 131

Stoicism, 132

Dualism, 132

Marginalism, 134

Processualism, 134

Natural history, 135

Collective behavior, 136

Social control

Competition, 138, 140

Social Darwinism, 139, 144

Community, 140

Moral order, 145

(o ver)

preexisting
concepts

Social role of news, 146

Theory of human personality, 148, 49, 50 (role
theory)

Concept of status, 151

Deviance & disorganization, 155-6

Park - Racial Theories (Mathews, Ch 6)

Opposition to biotology, 157

Shift in social science assumptions, 159

Assimilation, 160, 166

Race Relations Cycle, 160-1, 2 (Interaction Cycle)

* Change thru understanding 163, 169, 187, 192

* ^{Contribution} How can change in ^{individual} ^{consciousness} change social structures or processes? esp. given Park's emphasis on environment & culture (e.g. external)

Conflict blamed on the minority, 165 (Not true of blacks)

* Park does not discuss different economic/social functions imposed on Asian & black groups, 170, 173 Assumes competition is generalized

to be put as anything

Race Riots, 189
(from Slaves
winning)

Marginal man, 121

Park's biologism vs

171-2

racial temperament
critics of Park's
race relation theory, 184-5

Prejudice, 173

Frazier & Johnson, 176

Chicago Union League, 177

Park House

} Reform as
adjustment

Fisk University

Park's concept of Science, 179-80
& Sociology

Critique of ecology, 181

Park's model of society, 182-3

Racial-national solidarity 165, 188 (The role of the oppressed
in breaking through
barriers)

Mark - Auto biographical note (ⁱⁿ Race + Culture)

Progressivist Social Darwinism, VII

BTW

Blacks as making "slow but steady advance.", VIII

Park - The Nature of Race Relations (in Race + Culture)

idealist defⁿ of race relations, 81
as competition, 82

Note: Competition is an ideologically loaded term.
It connotes competition of equal, unlike conquest
or domination or exploitation, 82, 104 (thesis)
106, 114

Social Darwinism, 85, 104

Assumption of warlike character of primitive people, 87, 88, 91

Role of cities + market ^(trade) place, 86, 88, 90, 91, 93, 95, 97
in Natural history of race relations _{progressive} 108

European expansion, 103-4, 108-9, 112

marginal man, 111

Assimilation, concept of, 116

Pork - The Pases of Race Prejudice (IN race & culture)

Sumner quoted on war and strangers, 231

Race Prejudice as resistance to status change, 232-3, 236
[Why ~~is~~ resistance? As individuals, 259]

Note: This thesis makes prejudice an automatic response to upward mobility of blacks, rather than seeing the prejudice is stirred up, inflamed by white rulers (of history of KKK) pos not treat prejudice as social phenomenon (psych, ved, etc, not even biological?)

Opposition to biological determinism, 237, 240
(but slips in a biological argument for fear of the unknown)

Contradiction: is race prejudice based on status change or fear of strangers? 232
(black people not strangers) 238, 240

Biracial ~~ass~~ society, 243 (eliminates mixed for assimilation)

Pork — The Concept of Social Distance (in Race + Culture)

Orientalists blamed for failure to
assimilate, 258-9

Prejudice as partly, instructive, 259
as conservative, 260

Park - Race Ideologies (Race & Culture)

Social Dominism, 304

Collective thinking, & public opinion, 306

Integrative function of ideology, 307

Factors in changing race relations, 308, 311

U.S. racial ideology, 309-10

Race relations as problematic for national solidarity, 312, 314

International aspect, 313, 314-5

Park — Education & Culture (Race & Culture)

Ecological processual cycle - 261, 2, 263

Education as social ^{cultural} renewal, 262 (Dewey) 316
319

Anti-biologism, 264

Racial temperament, 264 & biology, 280

feminine racial qualities asserted, 280
(mysticism!)

Concludes that education can't change
temperament, 281

Leaves biological question open 281

Thesis, 281-2, 3 (problem of Americanization
thru education)

cultural continuity break & marginality 318

cultural lag, 320

International perspective, 328

Posk - Problem of cultural differences (Kant & culture)

* (Social order) ↓

Deming - culture & communication, 3-4

* Society exists through communication, 4

Struggle for existence of cultural traits, 8

Sumner's "strain toward consistency," 8

Progress western civilization, 9

* Sacred & Secular, 12-13
(immobility) (mobility)

Park - Migration & Marginal Man (Race & Culture)

Civilization based on contact, communication 346
opposition to biological determinism, 347

Emancipation of the individual, 350

Social change and emancipated ind, 351

Secularization, 351

Cities 353

* Biological opposition to assimilation assumed, 353
(Critique this, of assimilation, into black & white
miscegenationists)

(See also "Racial Assimilation in Secondary Groups")
assimilation to interbreeding

Jewish intellectual as marginal man 354-5

Pork - Cultural Conflict + Marginal man (^{Race +}
culture)

Summer i, in-group, out-group, 372

Marketplace + break-down of traditional attitudes, 373

Duality of marginal man 373, 74, 75-6
+ detachment

Park - Mentality of Racial Hybrids (Race + Culture)

Mulattoes as non-assimilated, 380
as racial leaders, 381

Cultural duality + mentality, 382

Intelligence tests question, 383

* Hint of biological determinism re accomplishments
of mulattoes, 384-6 + temperament, 387
Intelligence & social situation, 387 388-7
corrected 388-9, 390

Park — Etiquette & New Relations (Race & Culture)

(?) Reductionism — Etiquette (conscious, individual
perhaps not behavior) as essence of caste
184-5 (also 182-3)

Should be other way around: Caste system,
create/maintains etiquette, not other way
around

Natural history of "race problem" 185-6

Park - Racial Assimilation in Secondary Groups (Race & Culture)

Two views of assimilation, 204

Individuation & group break-up, 205

Skin color as barrier to assimilation, 206, 208

Social solidarity (order) based on sentiment & habit, 207

Blacks compared to Russian peasants, 211

Increasing black solidarity in response to segregation, 214-5

Understates economic factors in race conflict, 216

"Nation within a nation" (Kew) 218-9

Bi-racial society as outcome, 220

Cox's Theory of ^{Explosive} race relations
(note, is limited situations of racial
dominance involving Euros & non-Euros
of 349

Basic hypothesis 322, 345-6, 348-9
lack of racism in ancient times 327-5

Caste prejudice & race prejudice 350

Defn of race prejudice, 349, 475

Critique of para 463 - 466, 474

Critique of caste theory 492 f

strength of Cox: his insistence that
race relations cannot be understood
apart from analysis of the political-
economic context in which they arise. 464

instead of expression, justification
for

(over)

Criticism of Park's
"human nature" theory
of racism (conflict)

status insecurity, ^{on race instinct, p. 178}
¹⁷² ^{cult. difference}

Caste theory (Cox, p. 492)
(See Cox) Cox, p. 464, 65
466

Role of Park: from
"Negro problem" to "problem
of race prejudice" (Cox, p. 463)

of Gussell book
Cox's defn of prejudice, 475

Park's confusion of race, caste,
class 171, 73, 76

flabby metaphor ^{which equates race,}
class, caste abstractly

Compare Park & Cox
conceptually:

Race

Race Relations { note Park's historical
approach view brought
into cycle criticism
also

Race Prejudice { Park: race prejudice
as caste prejudice

Move on to Sumner (cf William
Wilson book) Cox, RR. 14, 23-24

W.I. Thomas Theories

Everett Hughes

Myrdal?

Critique Cox for not specifying
his concept of exploitation
(of Marx)
defn

Note: Park
did not relate
his race
relations theory
to the development
of political-
economy of
society
social structure
of Kuse book

2658 Bridgeway • Sausalito, California 94965 • (415) 332-3134



**BLACK
WORLD
FOUNDATION**

ROBERT L. JOHNSON

Vice President
For Program Development

successors and ^{over} →
 17-18 Alternative Schools

→ ~~Charles Johnson (main)~~ ^{at} →
 Shubert - Rimer - S.I. sched. - min. ^{See maj - min.}
 mark, 21. →

Franklin Frazier

see G. Franklin Edwards intro
 Frazier as Park's "most complete student"

Critics

~~Alternative Schools~~ ^{as} ^{social scientist} ^{Committee} ^{activity}
 W.E.B. DuBois ^{at A.V.}

~~Consensus School~~

Conflict School

(a) Oliver Cox

→ ^{over} →
 - Myrdal
 moral dilemma
 School
 Majavla 20-21
 William Wilson

(3) Colonial Analog, style, 13
 Carmichael, Planni, style, Allen
~~from - African model (2)~~

Addition: "Once, near end of his life,
Whom asked abt race views "

Sought to rescue theories of race
prejudice from psychological reductionism by

Blumer. ^{Straghtaway need to view race}
~~Called attention to the way~~
prejudice in terms of ^{group} status and social
~~to refocus attention~~ ^{only as}
~~deals~~ rather than individual sentiment,

Quote Masvone book, p. 217

S-I view does not interfere with
notion of power, although Blumer's
discussion of the ~~state~~ ^{status} of group position
as a key to ~~understand~~ explaining race
prejudice ~~implicitly raises the question~~
~~of how group positions~~ suggests that
the ability of one group to impose a
social order on others is an expression -
and perhaps useful interactionist definition
of power. Masvone, 223f

Early

D. B. is agreed with race. Race
knowledge was the key to action. But
when Park Realized abt a universal
Natural history of race relations, D. sought
detailed explicit knowledge about a specific
group of human beings as prerequisite to
social reform. When Park sought to postulate
general principle D. was interested in
study of concrete cases of ~~expressed~~ ^{prejudice}
Dubois, 14 changed position, 19, 31, 39

~~Another~~ ^{Keep} pattern / person
in park (Human nature)

5. Reductionism (psychological,
biological) VS Emergence
(^{Human action} sociological)

E.g. causes of race prejudice
racial temperament
Childhood, competition, "war-like" character
Nature of human nature, of institutions

Note how reductionism leads
to determinism (conservatism)
reductionism \rightarrow determinism \rightarrow constraint
emergence \rightarrow ^{social} self-determination \rightarrow freedom
Human nature VS human action

2 lives in park: (1) Create knowledge/
awareness in key individuals and
things will change (evolve)
(2) Move masses to action/
struggle / conflict and things
will change.

(I suspect park was moved by new of showing
will / ideas - Dewey, Ford, Russell, G.W. - then
provided his model of change)

Think Sociologically! 2/1/79

Dimensions of analysis
+ tensions
illustration 12 Park { select examples
from text
immigrant shift

Social change:

1. Knowledge vs action problem
(~~How~~ How change occurs) Education vs rights

2. ~~Elitist~~ Social change: Elitist
Individualism vs mass
democratic struggle (inds. +
grps) mutators (biological, artistic, deterministic)
philanthropists, educators, social workers

Who moves
change?

3. Social change: Evolutionism vs
Conflict (Why change occurs)

4. Social change: The Social/
Intellectual context — Park
as conservative (nostalgic, etc)
progressive ~~the~~

Successors

Franklin Furness — conservative
Charles Johnson
Olivier Cox — progressive

(Olivier)

III Park's ~~General Sociology~~ Race Relations Theory

1. The Sociological tradition

Ruse
Frazier article
Race Relations book

2. What was Park fighting?

(a) Biological Determinism
Matthews, 142, 157

Race & Culture book 87, 88, 91, 237
238, 240, 347, 353, 387-9

(b) Social Darwinism

R+C book: vii, 85, 104, 304
Matthews 19, 20, 26, 27, 139, 144

3. The Natural History of Race Relations

overview
of ~~Cause~~
article

Contact

Competition

Accommodation

Assimilation

biological opposition to assimilation, R+C 206, 208, 353

~~Race~~ ~~Matthews~~ ~~Risks vs reform~~
~~Matthews~~ Matthews 177, 189

comparative approach
R+C: "Nature of Race
Relations"
See note

Matthews
160-166

~~238, 240~~

& Social Distances: R+C 259
racial etiquette

- 4 Racial Prejudice Matthews, 173
R+C: "Basis of Race Prejudice" see with
Racial temperament
Matthews, 171-2

~~5 Social~~

~~6 Marginal man~~
~~R+C book~~

5. Social Distances & Racial Etiquette
R+C book
Coser

6. Marginal man
R+C book

7. Developments since Park
Elaborations:

Rose

Critics: Cox

of Hawthorne Book Race + Ethnic Relations

Peter van der Bogaart Race + Ethnic Relations 25-34

1

Outline

I Social + Intellectual context

A. Character of the Progressive era

- RR book 85-86, 92-93, 97-99, 110, 285
Social Darwinism, RR 282-3

Strawson - Fisher paper (5 - social harmony interest 1 page)

B. University of Chicago

1 - Its founding & character (^{Reform-}~~Foris~~ Religious influence)
Foris, 2 of
Matthews 87-89

2 - Sociology dept dissatisfaction, reform impulse
Albion Small (quote him 335, 342, 347-8)
Meliorism, Matthews, 93, 96, 111
Social Darwinism (determinism) under attack
[Matthews, 91
Religious factor, 90-92
Reform impulse, 91

Coser, 379

II Park's Intellectual Formation

A. 1. Son of the mid. middle class
Coser 366

2 Dewey & democratic impulse
Matthews, 5, 8, 14, 19 anti-elitism 17-18
Futolish 18

3 Franklin Ford and the news as understanding
leading to change
Matthews, 20, 22, 11, 27, 28, 30

4. Newspaper Experience
Lincoln Steffens, (Forer, 72)
Coser, 367, 377
Matthews, 10-11

5. Harvard - William James
(subjectivism, participation)
Matthews, 32

6. Georg Simmel
Matthews, 34, 41f
Coser, 374

64 Kistritzoff

(over)

Congo
7. Reform 58-61 (Matthews)

8. BTW
62-81 (Matthews)

9. others

B- Who/What is Park fighting

1. ~~the~~ biological determinism,
Matthews, 142, 157

Note, biological arguments in Raw & Culture
87, 88, 91, 231, 237, 240, 238, ~~2~~
347, 353, 387-9

2. Social Darwinism
R+C ^{VII}, 304, 85, 104

C - Presuppositions in Park
(See Cond)

C- Presuppositions in PWH

1 ~~Organicism~~ (Matthews, 23, 24
8, 10, 21, 41)

(Gradualism)
2. Knowledge & change 11, 29, 22, 27, 28, 34
163, 167, 187, 192

3 Reform, 14, 15, 19 (also Strauss & Fisher)

Intolerance 16-17, 28

4 Evolutionism, ^{reverses} 70, 77, 78, 81, 131

5 Nationalism (Strauss & Fisher, 12, 15,
17, 29, 33)

6 Dualism

Race & culture, 373, 74, 75-6, 382

Matthews, 132, 134

6. ^{long years} Romanticism ^{new} lower
classes

"Uplifting Race"

Matthews, 71

Outline for Park paper 2/2/29

1. Social ^{+ Intellectual} context: Character of the progressive era
2. Univ of Chicago
 - a) Its founding and character
 - b) Dept of Sociology
3. Park's Intellectual background:
 - ~~personal biography~~ antecedents + autogenous traits
 - personal biography (if social context) ^{News/press network}
 - Intellectual influences
 - philosophical premises + presuppositions
4. Park's Sociological concepts/schemes
Theories - background on his sociology
5. ~~that~~ Park's ^{known} ~~background~~ ^{relationships} ~~of~~ ^{from} ~~social~~ ^{sociological} ~~background~~ ^{background} ~~reduction~~ ^{revelation}
6. Tensions in his thought (see other note card)
7. Conclusion: Critique

Questions for Park paper

1. ~~How~~ What is basic
motive force of ^{general} social
change? Sources of
social order

2. Who changes (which
groups?)

3. Interrelationship between
changes in ind. consciousness
↔ change in ind. action

↔ change in social processes
(Compare with today's
sociological perspectives)

4. Epistemology
5. world-view

Discuss Park's
race relations

Theory →
The formation
of progressive
ideology

Who is Park fighting?
this?

prejudices

Park

Inside - outside problem

Ind. consciousness ↔
social psychology

social forms
structures
(e.g. ecology)

Reductionism

emergence

MARXIST SOCIOLOGY. Tom Bottomore NY: Holmes & Meier Publishers, 1975

B. contends that Marxism has failed to develop as a systematic sociology and particularly there has been a lack of empirical research in the Marxist tradition.

Sociology 212-B
Sociological Theory
Winter 1979
Dr. Glenn Goodwin

Written Assignment

Write a short paper (6-8 typewritten pages) on how the biography of one of the theorists we have discussed fed into or helped structure an idea (or set of ideas, concepts, theoretical perspectives, etc.) that they developed. The paper should be typed, double-space, and should follow all the rules of good scholarship (well researched, documented, appropriate format, etc.). The paper is due on or before Friday, March 9, our last class meeting. While not required, it might be helpful to you if you submit to me a written proposal outlining what you wish to do. I would read it, give you feedback on it and generally try to direct you to sources.

Could park be
described →
a social organicist
(e.g. influenced by
~~Animal~~ / plant ecology)
rather than biological
organicist ?

to direct you to sources.

when to do. I would read it, give you feedback on it and generally try

and to you if you submit to me a written proposal outlining what you

March 9, our last class meeting. While not redrafted, it might be help-

appropriate format, etc.). The paper is due on or before Friday.

follow all the rules of good scholarship (well researched, documented,

they developed. The paper should be typed, double-spaced, and should

idea (or set of ideas, concepts, theoretical perspectives, etc.) that

one of the theorists we have discussed fed into or helped structure an

Write a short paper (6-8 typewritten pages) on how the photography of

Written Assignment

Dr. Glenn Goodwin

Winter 1976

Sociological Theory

Sociology 215-8

Chicago Sch — general topics

1. Social and intellectual climate at its founding

2 Founders — biographical sketches.

Note: Small, Vincent, Henderson were all influenced by theology (Faris, 1967, 10)
Reform impulse (2628, 30,

Not only was Department new but Univ. of Chicago was also new; this minimized interdepartmental opposition (Faris, 1967, 12)(25

Data handling methodology — Thomas used small slips of paper; technique was taught by Ellsworth Faris to his students (Faris, 1967, 19)

Early history of Univ. of Chicago (Faris, 1967 23f)

Charles S. Johnson, E. Franklin Frazier, John Dollard trained at Chicago
in 1920s (~~Faris~~ Faris, 32

Dissertation 1931
Early interest in the city, 51-2 immigrants, 56-7
+ assimilation
Ecological Theory opposed to biological theories of slums, 62

Robert Allen

January 8, 1979

PROPOSAL FOR A SPECIAL QUALIFYING EXAMINATION IN RACE RELATIONS THEORY

I propose to write a paper that would review the contributions of the Chicago School to race relations theory in the U.S. The paper would focus primarily on the work of Robert E. Park, but it would also include discussions of the race relations writings of W.I. Thomas, Everett Hughes, Herbert Blumer, Edward Reuter, E. Franklin Frazier and Oliver Cox. I would also discuss some of the critics of the Chicago School, and alternative schools of thought. My chief interest is in familiarizing myself with the seminal writings of the Chicago theorists.

The paper would be organized around the following topics:

1. Origins: antecedents and antagonists
2. Professional/personal biographies
3. Philosophical premises and presuppositions
4. Nature of data and methods of analysis
5. Conceptual schemes, themes, theories
6. Critics and alternative schools of thought

*Strauss:
Park a
social Darwinist
without evolution
(even)*

*7. relation between general approach to sociology
& approach to race relations.*

*Myrdal
Rose*

*Shibutani
Kilian*

*Human action,
collective behavior
influence*

*Fred Matthews
Louis Wirth*

PROPOSAL FOR
SPECAIL
QUALIFYING EXAMINATION IN RACE RELATIONS THEORY

I propose to write a paper that would review the contributions of the Chicago School to race relations theory in the U.S. The paper would focus primarily on the work of Robert E. Park, but it would also include race relations discussions of the writings of W. I. Thomas, Everett Hughes, Herbert Blumer, ^{Edward Reuter} E. Franklin Frazier and Oliver Cox. I would also discuss some of the critics of the Chicago School, and alternative schools of thought.

My chief interest is in familiarizing myself with the seminal writings of the Chicago theorists. The paper ^{would} ~~might~~ be organized ^{around} ~~into~~ the following

Topics
sections:

1. Origins: antecedents and antagonists
2. Nature and ~~Sources~~ of data and
3. ~~Techniques~~ Methods of Analysis
4. Concepts, themes, theories
5. Critics and alternative schools of thought.

personal
professional biography
philosophical premises
& presuppositions
(what is problematic?)
conceptual schemes
& their sources

Natural history approach

Central substitution context

Strauss
Monday
5 pm

G. Franklin Edwards
Lewis Killian

a paper on the sociological study of race relations in
the U.S.: A review of the Chicago School

~~A review of the study of race relations in U.S.~~
~~Chicago School~~

Origins: antecedents + antagonists

~~sources of data~~

Nature

Techniques of investigation

Techniques + methodologies in handling data

Methods of Analysis

Themes

Concepts and Theories

Critics

Authors to survey

W. I. Thomas ✓

Abner Small

Robert Park ✓

Elsworth Faris

Blumer
Herbert

Everett Hughes ✓

Ernest Burgess

E. Franklin Frazier ✓

William Wilson

Oliver Cox ✓

Du Bois

Edward Reuter ✓

Clorena

Glueck
(whole on
Chinese
find his
books)

Charles Johnson ✓
Lewis William
Hylan Lewis

✓ G. Franklin Edwards

Students {
Bertrand Doyle
Detweiler

Committee

A. Strauss

E. Schatzman

R. Styles

List of
theses

Robert Faris
James Carey

wrote books on
Chicago School