ANTIEVOLUTION AND THE TRANSFORMATION OF AMERICAN SOCIAL SCIENCE

Michael Lienesch
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

ABSTRACT

For more than half a century, scholarly studies of the antievolution movement have been concerned almost exclusively with its influence on the teaching of the natural sciences, especially biology. Yet from its inception in the 1920s, antievolution agitation has been aimed not only at the natural sciences but also, and almost as often, at the social sciences. Moreover, although antievolution campaigns had only limited impact on the natural sciences in the United States, it can be shown that they played a significant part in the development of the early twentieth century social sciences. This paper tells this previously untold story. Using public writings and private papers of antievolution activists, academic social scientists, and university officials from the 1920s, it examines how antievolutionism contributed to the creation of a set of characteristics—secular, scientific, and professional—that came to define the emerging social sciences. In concluding, the paper describes how antievolutionists have carried out campaigns aimed at the social sciences since that time, and it suggests that their efforts continue to influence the disciplinary identity of social scientists even today.

Prepared for delivery at the 2010 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, September 2-5, 2010.

ANTIEVOLUTION AND THE TRANSFORMATION OF AMERICAN SOCIAL SCIENCE

For more than half a century, a steadily growing body of studies has described the development of the antievolution movement, analyzing its presence in American politics from the time of the 1925 Scopes "monkey" trial to today. The studies have come from diverse disciplines and treated the topic in a wide variety of ways, but they have been similar in framing the story as a conflict between religion and science, with science being limited almost always to the natural sciences, especially biology. With few exceptions, what they have missed is that at the time of the trial, antievolution agitation was aimed not only at the natural sciences but also, and almost as often, at the social sciences. Throughout the 1920s, antievolution activists targeted the teaching of evolution not only in courses in biology but also in anthropology, geography, history, sociology, and psychology. Teachers who were fired or forced to resign for discussing evolution included biologists and botanists, but also sociologists, psychologists, and professors of education. Biology textbooks were censored, removed, and rewritten, but so were many of the leading social science texts. Indeed, for many antievolutionists, the Darwinism they knew best and feared most was not abstract biological theory but applied social thought, not scientific evolution but social scientific applications of it. As one Minnesota minister explained, "I have generally understood that it is not the scientists who cause the anxiety on the part of most of us who believe in revelation, but it is the wrongful application of the theory of evolution in psychology, history and sociology."[1]

Antievolutionism is also almost entirely absent from the histories of the social sciences. In a score of important studies, scholars led by Mary Furner, Thomas Haskell, Dorothy Ross, and others have described the development of the modern social sciences over the half century or so from roughly 1880 to 1930. Their studies show how intellectual and institutional identities changed dramatically at this time, as social scientists turned from older conceptions of scholarship that were heavily influenced by nineteenth century religious reform to newer notions based on more secular, scientific, and professional views of vocation.[2] The story the scholars tell is rich in detail, describing how a host of factors—the changing character of America's colleges and universities, the development of distinctive academic disciplines with their own identities and professional institutions, the growing role of private foundations and state agencies in supporting social

research—came together to bring about the transformation of the social sciences.[3] Yet their studies fall short on several counts. Some of best, among them those by Furner, Haskell, and David Hollinger, tell only the beginning of the story, ending at or even before the onset of World War I. Others, including fine works by Robert Bannister and Peter Novick, focus on single disciplines. At least a few of the studies, as Christian Smith has argued, describe the transformation of the social sciences in triumphalist terms, celebrating it as the inevitable outcome of the process of modernization.[4] Furthermore, almost all attribute the changing character of the social sciences to conflicts that took place among social scientists themselves, in particular the protracted academic and intellectual struggles that set older religious reformers at odds against younger and more secular scientists.[5] In telling the story in these terms, the scholars overlook the fact that many of the changes in the social sciences, particularly in the highly partisan atmosphere of the 1920s, came about in response to political pressures brought to bear from outside the academic world. Put simply, with few exceptions, they fail to even mention that the transformation of the social sciences was in part the product of the political debates of the day.

This study tells this previously untold story. Using public writings and private papers of antievolution activists, academic social scientists, and university officials, it examines how antievolutionists of the 1920s targeted social scientists for their advocacy of evolution, how these academics responded to the campaigns that were waged against them, and how in responding they contributed to changing the character of their emerging disciplines. In charting these changes, the study concentrates on three important themes, each of which has been the topic of sustained study by scholars of American higher education: 1) secularization, or the transformation of academic authority from religious to non-religious sources; 2) scientization (to borrow the term of Jürgen Habermas), meaning the application of assumptions and methods from the natural sciences to other areas of knowledge; and 3) professionalization, specifically the development of disciplinary identities and institutions.[6] In each of these areas, it examines how antievolutionism contributed, albeit often in ironic and unintended ways, to the creation of more secular, scientific, and professional versions of social science. In concluding, it describes how antievolutionists have

carried out campaigns aimed at the social sciences since that time, and it suggests that their efforts continue to influence the disciplinary identity of social scientists today.

ANTIEVOLUTION AND THE SOCIAL SCIENCES

For the antievolution movement, the social sciences were a convenient target. Among the early fundamentalists who made up the core of movement, few had any serious understanding of evolutionary science. Indeed, to the extent that evolution had any meaning at all to them, it was as a concept associated not with Darwinism but with Social Darwinism, the social theory that William Jennings Bryan pointed to in a series of important speeches in the early 1920s as the root of contemporary evils ranging from atheism and immorality to war.[7] Inspired by Bryan, antievolution activists turned their attention to the social sciences, where they found in fact little Social Darwinism, a theory that had been discredited in academic circles for decades, but much in the way of evolutionary thinking. With its roots in the social gospel, American social science was at heart religious and reformist, and for most social scientists, evolution was moralistic as well as teleological, with history being seen as a process of providential progress that moved inexorably toward more perfect forms of what was called "Christian civilization." At the same time, many of their colleagues saw evolution in less religious and more rationalistic terms, as a process in which humans acted to transcend their animal ancestry by creating ever higher stages of rational social order.[8] Almost all agreed, however, on the basic principle of evolutionary progress, so much so that by the 1920s social evolutionism had become a unifying theme across the social sciences, with courses and textbooks commonly beginning with descriptions of primitive society and continuing onward to document the march of human progress, ending with calls to solve contemporary social problems.[9] Indeed, social evolution was present in the biological sciences as well, particularly where biology combined with sociology and political science in such hybrid fields as "social biology" and "civic biology."[10] Furthermore, with strong ties to Progressivism and with a sprinkling of socialists among their most visible practitioners, the social sciences had a decidedly liberal political profile.[11] Added to this was that they were also, as a rule, more accessible to broader audiences than the natural sciences, with many high school and college textbooks in history and sociology selling in the hundreds of

thousands of copies over the course of the decade.[12] For all of these reasons, antievolutionists were understandably suspicious of the social sciences. Besides, in the final analysis, antievolutionists were less concerned with the effect of evolution on animals or plants than on human society. As Bryan himself would explain, "The only part of evolution in which any considerable interest is felt is evolution applied to man."[13]

The antievolution campaign began with the church colleges. For years fundamentalists had been claiming that their denominational schools had become hotbeds of modernism, where professors of religion subjected students to contemporary methods of biblical criticism and modern notions of Christian social reform. But in 1920, amid Bryan's warnings about the dangers of evolution, they began to turn their attention to teachers of more secular subjects, particularly those in the social sciences. Taking the lead was Fort Worth evangelist J. Frank Norris, who denounced the prominent Baylor University sociologist G. S. Dow for describing human society in his Introduction to the Principles of Sociology, a popular text in college classrooms, as beginning not with Adam, "the first man that God created," but with "primitive man."[14] In a series of splashy reports in his nationally circulated newspaper The Searchlight, Norris rallied supporters with a shrill campaign of criticism that within weeks had forced Dow, consistently declaring his religious orthodoxy and denying any belief in evolution, to resign his Baylor position.[15] Dow was only the beginning, as by 1921 church convocations across the country had begun appointing committees to investigate evolutionary teaching in their denominational schools, calling for the removal of "anything that squints at the Darwinian theory of evolution."[16] For his part, Norris kept up the attacks and extended them in spectacular ways, notably by staging a mock trial at the 1923 annual convention of the World's Christian Fundamentalist Association in Forth Worth, where students from five Texas colleges trooped to the stage carrying their classroom notebooks to give evidence that the teaching of evolution was "almost universal" in their schools.[17] Although teachers of many kinds came in for Norris's continuing criticism, much of his focus remained on the social scientists. Thus over next two years he would make a practice of bringing stacks of textbooks into the pulpit of his First Baptist Church ("$24.50 worth of them," he informed his congregation on one occasion), where he would read passages, not only from Dow's Introduction but also from Emory S. Bogardus's History of Social Thought, Robert E. Park and Ernest W. Burgess's Introduction to the Science

of Sociology, and even J. K. Hart's Democracy in Education, which he condemned for listing Jesus as a philosophical thinker alongside Jean-Jacques Rousseau, who, he explained, "according to the American Encyclopedia was the father of five illegitimate children."[18] Indeed, for Norris the definitive evidence against evolution was to be found in social science textbooks, in "the written and undisputed documents that I have read to you," he would tell his appreciative congregation, "and many others I could read to you, and will read as time goes on. The fight is to a finish."[19]

Antievolution activists turned next to the state universities. Bryan took the lead in a series of speeches beginning at the University of Michigan, where he set out a list of specifics that would grow over the next two years, describing case after case in which evolutionist professors had destroyed the faith of unsuspecting students. While a few of the professors were identified as biologists, most seemed to come from a broad cross-section of academic disciplines, a point confirmed by T. T. Martin, the Mississippi evangelist and leader of the Anti-Evolution League of America, who described reports he had received from students that evolution was in almost every classroom, with students getting "the same teaching in sociology, in history, in psychology and in biology."[20] Over the next several years the campaign would continue, centering on state universities in the South and Midwest, with much of the attention still solidly on the social sciences. At the University of Tennessee, controversy exploded when nervous administrators ordered Jesse W. Sprowls, a professor of secondary education, to stop teaching James Harvey Robinson's popular history of Western thought Mind in the Making because it was said to contain "radical doctrines…particularly his views of evolution."[21] In Wisconsin, where Bryan engaged in a celebrated confrontation with University President Edward A. Birge, resolutions against the teaching of evolution were passed by church groups including the state conference of Catholic women's organizations, who singled out for censure not only the UW zoologist Michael Guyer but also the sociologist E. A. Ross and the philosopher Max Otto.[22] The University of North Carolina became the site of a prolonged struggle following publication of articles critical of orthodox religion and sympathetic to social evolution in Howard W. Odum's Journal of Social Forces, provoking broadside pamphlets, newspaper editorials, open letters to the governor, and petitions from church associations, civic groups, and chapters of the Ku Klux Klan.[23] And at the University of Minnesota, where the fundamentalist

leader William Bell Riley took charge of the campaign, antievolutionists once again targeted the social sciences, giving special attention to the sociology department, where they denounced Luther L. Bernard for making comments deriding Christianity in his classroom, demanded the removal of Maurice Parmelee's Criminology and F. Stuart Chapin's Introduction to the Study of Social Evolution from course syllabuses and reading lists, and warned that if members of the department continued to have their way, "we will have our political trials and troubles, the like of which Russia herself has not yet seen."[24] Similar controversies could be found in colleges and state universities across the country.[25] As Riley put it in a 1926 speech, "every Fundamentalist Christian of the world is fighting a battle with the college next door to him."[26]

By mid-decade, the antievolution movement had begun to open out, broadening its base and taking on a wider range of issues. In the wake of the Scopes trial and in response to Bryan's unexpected death, activists regrouped, creating new grassroots organizations, forging alliances with other conservative causes, and turning antievolutionism into a weapon against any and all kinds of social and political reform. With these changes, social scientists seemed to become even more suspect than before. In North Carolina, for example, agitation spread from the University at Chapel Hill to both North Carolina State College and Duke University, where faculty in the social sciences and humanities came under fire for their views on evolution, religious reform, and the "race question."[27] In Florida, activists in the Florida Purity League called for the removal of textbooks used in courses at Florida State College for Women, declaring that more than a score of books—among them Allport's Social Psychology, Freud's General Introduction to Psychoanalysis, Kroeber's Anthropology, and Wells's Outline of History, along with works by Bertrand Russell, Sherwood Anderson, D. H. Lawrence, and George Bernard Shaw—were advocating not only evolution but also "ideas altogether foreign to Southern tradition and chivalry."[28] At the University of Missouri, the sociologist and social psychologist Charles A. Ellwood, whose strong support for evolution led him to be known locally as the "monkey man," came under fire for a series of stands, including his outspoken condemnation of a 1923 lynching that took place on the university campus.[29] Ellwood and other colleagues would continue to be hotly criticized for several years for their progressive views, before popular protest culminated in the removal of sociologist Max Meyer for being associated with a class questionnaire that included attitudes on gender

relations.[30] (The 1929 "sex survey" incident led Ellwood and several other faculty to leave the university, and the American Association of University Professors to issue its first censure for the violation of academic freedom.)[31] Meanwhile in colleges and high schools across the country, social science textbooks that included anything broadly conceived as evolutionary were being singled out for removal. Ellwood himself complained to correspondents that his books had been barred from classrooms in Kansas, Missouri, Oklahoma, Texas, and Louisiana, both for their advocacy of evolution and for their support of social reform.[32] From Florida to Hawaii, local campaigns worked to censor textbooks in economics, history, and civics, with writers like Charles Beard, Carl Becker, Harold Rugg, and George Counts coming under pressure from religious and patriotic groups to remove left-leaning passages from their works.[33] In Kansas, Gerald B. Winrod's Defenders of the Christian Faith focused on textbooks used in state high schools, condemning more than a score of sources in history, psychology, and education for their "putrid immorality."[34] More teachers were dismissed for their views, including one Kansas instructor who was said to have led his citizenship course in what was described as "classroom discussions and pedagogical advocacy of evolution and free love."[35] Over the course of the decade, as debates over evolution took place more frequently in the natural sciences, they were still often overshadowed by those in the social sciences. The University of Minnesota geologist Frederick W. Sardeson described the situation in a 1927 article in Science, where he observed that the antievolution controversy had "gone beyond the field of natural sciences, dogmatically into theology and politics on both sides." Indeed, wrote Sardeson, amid all the social and political controversy, the science professor had become "only an innocent bystander."[36]

SECULARIZATION

The secularization of the social sciences was both a cause and an effect of the debates over evolution. In the half century or so prior to 1930, the United States experienced a prolonged period of secularization, in which mainstream Protestant domination of public life gave way to institutions that were increasingly independent of church control. The process was hotly contested, especially in American colleges and universities, where secularizers challenged the authority of religious models of scholarship in a long series of

struggles that Christian Smith has called the "secular revolution."[37] As Smith and others have argued, the social sciences were the site of many of the fiercest fights, in which a rising cohort of secular scholars launched relentless attacks on the social gospel scholarship practiced by most of their senior colleagues and many of their own contemporaries.[38] Over the course of several decades, as their studies have shown, the secularizers would triumph, relegating religion to second class status in the social sciences, where journal articles on religious topics declined steadily toward what would be by the 1930s all-time lows.[39] Yet in telling the story in these terms, as a struggle between academic factions and generations, these scholars have overlooked an even more apparent reason for the secularization of the social sciences. For in the 1920s, amid antievolutionists attacks, and with fundamentalist preachers calling for censorship of anything that sounded remotely critical of conventional Christian dogma, religion had become a topic that was simply too hot for most social scientists to handle.[40]

In the social sciences, the treatment of religious topics was especially sensitive. Although there were clear differences among competing camps, with Christian scholars continuing to be often at odds with more secular ones, most mainstream social scientists agreed on having little use for outdated forms of religious orthodoxy, including the version of it associated with the new fundamentalist movement. Yet even as they challenged conservative religion, they were themselves being challenged by religious conservatives. Thus when L. L. Bernard, an outspoken secularist, proceeded to make his views known to students at the University of Minnesota, the letters began to roll in. "I took work of him in his extension class a year ago this past winter and was completely disgusted with his constant attacks and ridiculing of conservative Christian doctrine," reported a former student in a letter to the president of the university. "He would go out of his way to make these attacks and spend from a quarter to a third of the hour in dilating upon his position, mostly in ridicule of conservative ideas held by orthodox Christians."[41] Similarly, when Howard Odum's Journal of Social Forces printed articles by Minnesota's Bernard and Smith College's Harry Elmer Barnes, another even more fiercely outspoken secularizer, in which Bernard described the idea of God as the product of the "folk imagination" and Barnes referred to the Bible as an "alleged sacred book," all hell broke loose in North Carolina. What followed was an avalanche of condemnation in which one local minister leveled no

fewer than thirty-one specific charges of heresy against the journal, religious editors across the country jumped on the bandwagon with criticism, and even moderate religious voices began calling for an academic cleansing that would "bring all atheists into the open."[42] Christian scholars came in for criticism as well, as seen in the case of Charles Ellwood, the distinguished sociologist and Presbyterian elder who in addition to being attacked for the religious liberalism of his scholarship was forced out of his own church by fundamentalist members. "They do not seem to value very much my long years of service to the Christian cause," he lamented in a letter to a friend. "The bone of contention is of course my scientific attitude and the doctrine of evolution."[43] Meanwhile, Bryan was addressing audiences across America on the dangers of secularism in American universities, armed with a survey by the Bryn Mawr psychologist James H. Leuba which showed that more than half of faculty members at nine leading colleges believed in neither God nor immortality, and that there was almost the same percentage of unbelievers among historians, psychologists, and sociologists as among natural scientists.[44] Surveying the situation from his relatively protected position at the University of Chicago, political scientist Charles E. Merriam expressed dismay. "Perhaps I am unduly alarmed," he wrote to his brother John in 1925, "but I can see very unpleasant possibilities growing out of the present situation. Seems to me that unless a highly organized and highly intelligent move is made, Mr. Bryan is likely to sweep the boards."[45] Added the Columbia University sociologist Franklin Giddings, commenting on the proliferation of antievolution activism across the country, "there is a jolly good fight ahead."[46]

At first, social scientists were slow to respond to the criticism. Predisposed to think of themselves as reformers rather than radicals, and inclined to view popular politicians like Bryan (let alone rabble rousing preachers like Norris or Riley) with some measure of scorn, they tended to dismiss the protests. But as letters and petitions began to arrive on the desk of their college presidents, they were forced to take notice. For their part, university officials acted more quickly, with many of them attempting to put out the fires by assuring antievolutionist critics that all was well on their watch. Among the earliest to act was University of Kentucky President Frank McVey, who made it clear in a public appeal to the citizens of Kentucky not only that no "atheism, agnosticism, and Darwinism (in the sense that a man is descended from baboons and gorillas)" was taught at the university, but also that no faculty member "attempts, directly or indirectly, to

modify, alter, or shape the religious beliefs of students."[47] Dean F. J. Kelly took a similar tack at the University of Minnesota, where he wrote personal letters to those who protested against the use of controversial textbooks, assuring them that the authors were "splendid gentlemen of the highest moral character."[48] Responding to the controversies at Florida Women's College, University of Florida President Albert A. Murphree declared that there was not a single member of his faculty who would permit the use of any book "that would undermine the moral life of a young man or shake his faith in the bible."[49] Even while defending their faculties, however, university officials were scrambling to learn exactly what was going on in their classrooms. Thus at the same moment that University of Minnesota President L. D. Coffman was sending an open letter to the state's newspapers saying there would be no investigation of textbooks at the university, he was initiating one of his own, beginning with the department of sociology.[50] Asked to respond to the demands of antievolution activists for the removal of evolutionary textbooks, department head F. Stuart Chapin (himself the author of one of them) reported back in detail, insisting that the books had been misquoted, taken out of context, or simply not assigned. Chapin went on to make it clear that no attempt was made in any class to change the religious beliefs of students, and that at the beginning of every introductory course "students are informed that they will be given the facts of Sociology and other sciences, as far as know (sic) and are advised to go to their pastors if they have difficulties of any religious character which seem to need reconciliation."[51] Some faculty members took it upon themselves to personally respond to the antievolutionists. In a few cases, they fought back, like Minnesota's David Swenson, a professor of philosophy who confronted William Bell Riley in a series of newspaper articles and a stage debate.[52] More often, they defended their religious credentials. Responding to criticism of his sociology text by an Oklahoma clergyman, Ellwood assured school officials in that state that his book was used in church colleges across the country, and that "I have been a ruling elder in the First Presbyterian Church of Columbia, Missouri, for twenty years and in all that time no one has ever questioned my Christianity."[53] (Forced out of the church, he would subsequently turn to other arguments, including that "it has been my privilege in my twenty-five years of teaching at the University of Missouri to send out over 100 students into the ministry, the foreign mission field and Christian work."[54]) In North Carolina, Odum made similar claims, citing his credentials as a

Christian and a Southerner, while attempting to mollify his detractors by offering to meet together, inviting them to spend weekends at his home, and in the case of one critic even soliciting an article for the journal.[55] But for Odum, as for most of the social scientists who tried it, such outreach seems to have made little headway, leading his colleague Harry Barnes to advise him that for the time being the best strategy was probably to "lay low."[56]

Realizing the seriousness of the situation, the social scientists began to take more decisive steps. Having failed to impress their critics with their own personal religious credentials, they began to reassess their professional treatment of religion. Thus while a few determined secularizers charged ahead with skeptical and sometimes scathing treatments of religious topics, many others began to tread carefully, whenever possible avoiding the subject altogether. Here anxious administrators could be found encouraging them, with college presidents like Harcourt Morgan at the University of Tennessee and James Day of Syracuse University making it clear to their faculties that they were to (in Morgan's term) "soft pedal" evolution, teaching it in a non-confrontational way, while being (as Day was reported to have demanded) "as pious as you can."[57] Publishers began to put pressure on their textbook writers, as when George W. Benton, editor-in-chief of the American Book Company, wrote to Ellwood concerning the removal of explicit comparisons between biblical and Darwinian theories of the origin of the family in his Sociology and Modern Social Problems. "I cannot help feeling that the fanaticism which breaks out everywhere is destined to wear itself out," Benton explained,

> but it will last as long as the present generation of preachers, especially in the Presbyterian Church, has the upper hand. In the meantime I see no reason why publishers and authors should willfully and unnecessarily flaunt the red rag which helps them to maintain the excitement. We cannot falsify our books but we can soft pedal unnecessary things and this is what we are trying to do.[58]

A few authors apparently began to take steps to censor themselves, as when the University of Southern California sociologist Emory Bogardus, whose 1922 Introduction to Sociology was one of the texts that J. Frank Norris had singled out to read before his congregation, made sure that the 1928 revised edition of the book included a statement on the compatibility of Christianity and evolution. ("No religiously-minded person needs to be disturbed by 'evolution,'" Bogardus assured his readers. "It does not eliminate God as a

cause; it may be viewed as explaining how God ordinarily works."[59]) Similarly, academic editors like Odum, having heard the message first hand, took steps to avoid further controversy. Within weeks of the first shots fired at the Journal of Social Forces, Odum was writing his book review editors Harry Barnes and Frank Hankins, another outspoken social evolutionist and critic of established religion, advising them to be careful with sensitive topics and chiding them for being "regular artists at seeing how much trouble you can get us into."[60] While publically defending his editors, he privately began to revise their reviews, carefully eliminating anything that could elicit controversy, while also passing on complaints and schooling them on the need to "be careful."[61] At the same time, he was taking steps to avoid future problems, not only moving to replace Barnes and Hankins with his own editorial staff, but also restricting the publication of articles on religion by removing the entire section of the journal that featured articles on "The Church." The changes marked a sharp shift in the philosophy of the publication, which from its start in 1922 had included a strongly religious statement of purpose, a commitment "to work constructively and sympathetically with the churches for the extension and enactment of Christian principles of living."[62] By the end of 1925, following the controversies of that year, it had become clear that such a commitment only invited trouble. As Odum would put it to Barnes in eventually asking him to avoid reviewing any religious books, "my digestion is suffering from varied attacks on all sides."[63]

It was ironic that in demanding an end to Darwinism, antievolutionism would contribute to the increasingly secular character of the social sciences. After all, the aim of antievolution activists had been to restore religion to its rightful place in American education. Yet in the social sciences, where evolution was often tied to notions of Christian reform and moral uplift, removing evolution often meant removing religion altogether. In his 1924 presidential address to the American Sociological Society, Charles Ellwood described the situation. Titling his address "Intolerance," and pointing specifically to what he called "the revival of religious bigotry," he proceeded to document the dangers posed to American society by "the Fundamentalist and kindred movements." The centerpiece of his talk was a study carried out by one of his graduate students, an investigation of the teaching of the social sciences in sixty-two denominational colleges in the southern states. As summarized by Ellwood, the study found "little freedom" in the teaching of these subjects, "when

they were tolerated at all." Even more troubling to Ellwood were the problems reported by his student in gathering information on the subject, since faculty members were "loath to talk about conditions in their institutions, and especially about the ban of the church on the teaching of evolution." As one reticent professor had put it, "we are not fools." Commenting on the findings, and citing evidence published by the American Association of University Professors, Ellwood went on to suggest that such cases were by no means limited to denominational colleges, nor to the South, since "there are hundreds of such in the colleges of this country," and they are "all too frequent in some of our largest and leading universities." The problem was a matter of concern to all sociologists, he told the meeting, contributing directly to "the slow development of the social sciences in our institutions of learning."[64] Ellwood's words would be prophetic, for while he himself would continue to contribute to the sociology of religion, albeit more circumspectly, most American sociologists of the 1920s had begun to turn toward more secular topics, so much so that by 1929 the Miami University sociologist Read Bain could report "an almost non-existent, or negative interest of sociologists in religion."[65] After all, to write about religion was to court controversy. Indeed, the very study that Ellwood cited would become itself a case in point, because even a full eight years later, speaking to the historian Howard K. Beale, he would confide that the graduate student who had written the dissertation had not dared publish his results, "as it would have ruined him in the community in which he lived."[66]

SCIENTIZATION

The evolution debates of the 1920s were instrumental in changing the ways social scientists thought about science. Ever since Darwin, social theorists had been applying concepts from the physical and biological sciences to explain changes taking place in human society, constructing not only some of the most elaborate versions of evolutionary theory but also some of the most popular ones. By the 1920s, however, a growing group of academic reformers had begun to challenge these evolutionary explanations, advocating in their place a positivist social theory that came without moral or teleological preconceptions, and that stressed incremental investigation, objective observation, and a commitment to "value free" scholarship in matters of ethics and public policy.[67] Dorothy Ross, Robert Bannister, and Hamilton Craven have described the almost

obsessive determination of these reformers to bring this "scientism," loosely based on the natural sciences and approaches associated with social engineering, into the mainstream of the social sciences. Yet in charting the conflicts that ensued between advocates of evolutionary and objectivist science, Ross and the others have told only part of the story. For by concentrating on the academic battles that took place between evolutionists and objectivists, they have overlooked the larger political struggle that was taking place at the time. What the historians of social science have failed to mention is that one of the reasons social scientists were debating evolution in the first place was that they were being attacked as evolutionists. Moreover, what they seem to have missed is that in such a situation, science became for some a matter of self-protection.

For antievolutionists, social science was easy picking. Although a few attempted to make sense of biological evolution, most were befuddled by concepts like natural selection or speciation. By contrast, social evolution, with its fossil skulls and museum models of primitive people, seemed simple to understand and even simpler to parody. Introductory textbooks in the social sciences did not help matters by describing human society as originating with primitive creatures who were, in G. S. Dow's clumsy terms, "halfway between the anthropoid ape and modern man."[68] Critics of evolution could not have asked for better proof that that evolution somehow linked humans to monkeys. In the hands of J. Frank Norris, the social science textbooks he carried to his pulpit served primarily to provide material for a continuing round of wisecracks. "The professor's ancestors might have been an ass or an ape," he told his congregation, referring to Emory Bogardus, "but I don't think he is talking to me. (Laughter.)" On occasion, his one-liners would actually contain some semblance of an argument, as when he used Bogardus's History of Social Thought to draw attention to the absence of precise dating in evolutionary theory. "He says man might have been here 200,000 years ago; might have been 500,000—a small matter of 300,000 years doesn't bother the average evolutionist. (Laughter.)"[69] But eventually Norris would get around to more serious stuff, invariably proceeding to make the point that evolution consisted of theory rather than fact. "Evolution of any sort proceeds upon the theory of continuity," he told his congregation while reading passages from Park and Burgess, "and contradicts the facts of creation as given to us in Genesis."[70] William Bell Riley took the argument from there, making the case that evolutionary science was not scientific all. Embracing Baconian

notions of science as a process of collecting and categorizing facts, Riley argued that evolutionary theory could not be considered good science since it consisted of hypothesis testing, drawing inferences from probabilities. By extension, he went on, if evolutionary science was bad science, then evolutionary social science was not science at all, but rather "science falsely so-called." Thus Riley's problem with Chapin's Social Evolution was not only that it was religiously suspect, but also that it was scientifically unsound. "A more unscientific production than Chapin's 'Social Evolution,'" he wrote in 1924, "never found place in print."[71]

Taken aback, social evolutionists found themselves on the defensive. Admittedly, evolution was a theory that had been criticized before in the social sciences, notably by the anthropologist Franz Boas, who had for some time been making the case that societal relations were less a matter of biology than culture.[72] But while they knew how to argue with their academic critics, social scientists seemed completely unprepared to take on the media savvy preachers. Thus they proceeded to try out a variety of tactics. A few attempted, almost always without success, to educate their critics on the distinctions between Darwinism and other forms of evolutionary theory, including theistic evolution. Ellwood took this route, responding to his attackers with extended explanations of the differences between materialistic and theistic versions of evolution, and assuring them "beyond a shadow of a doubt that there is no contradiction or antagonism between the doctrine of evolution and Christianity."[73] Others tried to downplay the influence of evolutionary theory, pointing in particular to its failure to make much of a mark on the thinking of students. Minnesota's sociologists preferred this argument, repeatedly assuring administrators that evolutionary ideas had little influence on campus, and that "nobody seems to have found any students discussing them."[74] The most troubling response, however, came in the form of self-censorship, as social scientists began recasting, rephrasing, and in some cases simply removing references to evolution from their classrooms and textbooks. Here they followed a strategy similar to that used by authors of some of the most popular biology texts of the 1920s, who were at this time systematically replacing references to evolution with terms such as "change," "development," or "growth," removing charts or diagrams that showed humans as part of the evolutionary process, and relegating discussions of evolutionary theory to the end of the book, or simply removing them altogether.[75] Indeed, the changes carried out by some of the social scientists were even more extreme. Thus

G. S. Dow, whose references to evolution in his introductory sociology text had led to his resignation at Baylor, made a point of removing most of them in later editions of the book, deleting all discussions of human origins, playing down the importance of the fossil record, and describing primitive man as "essentially as he is to-day."[76] Similarly Emory Bogardus, the third edition of whose Introduction to Sociology had become fodder for Norris's tirades, went out of his way in the fourth edition to replace his definition of evolution as a "biological law" with a more benign treatment of it as "a descriptive term" that was synonymous with "progress or at least change."[77] Most striking of all, Stuart Chapin, forced to defend his textbook from attacks in Minnesota and elsewhere, extensively rewrote it, deleting chapters on heredity, the struggle for existence, and natural selection; removing diagrams of Haeckel's evolutionary embryos and photos comparing the hands of humans and chimpanzees; and adding a discussion of the differences between biological, psychological, and cultural development in which he made it clear that "each follows different laws of change."[78] In fact, not only did Chapin rename the book, changing its title from Social Evolution to Cultural Change, he also replaced its frontispiece, a photo of Neanderthal Man, with a picture of the Chicago Tribune Tower, explaining that the modern skyscraper "epitomizes and summarizes the chief theory of this book—that cultural change is primarily accumulative."[79] Nor were these writers exceptional, since over the course of the decade many of the most popular social science textbooks, including those written by Charles Ellwood, Edward Cary Hays, and Wilson D. Wallis would all see similar revisions.[80] Writing in 1927, Maynard Shipley of the Science League of America went so far as to say that "most of the writers of public school text-books on sociology" were "discreetly omitting references to evolution in their texts." It was, he observed, a course of action that was "safe and sane if not wholly candid."[81]

At the same time that they were deleting Darwinism, social scientists were seeking alternative models of scientific research. Particularly in the research universities, scientizers seemed determined to remake their disciplines in the image of the natural sciences, calling for more experimentation, quantification, and objectivity in social science research. Here they emulated changes that their biologist colleagues had carried out a decade earlier, embracing them with sometimes even greater fervor.[82] Yet for many, the attraction of newer models of experimental science was never far removed from their fears of continuing debates over

evolution. In this regard, social scientists were encouraged by natural scientists themselves, as when University of Missouri zoologist W. C. Curtis advised members of the American Sociological Society at their 1922 meeting to assume a more scientific stance when presenting evolutionary theory. Evolution was a touchy subject, said Curtis (he would later be called as an expert witness to testify at the Scopes trial), requiring presentation with what he called "decent consideration for the feelings and prejudices of uninformed and conscientious folk." Under the circumstances, the most effective way to present it was inductively, to "begin with facts" that were "remote from human concern and widely accepted." From those facts, he continued, conclusions would irresistibly follow in the form of "overwhelmingly reasonable inferences." In short, Curtis cautioned the sociologists to replace their advocacy of evolutionary theory with empirical demonstrations of evolutionary facts, since "the line of least resistance" ran "from unquestionable facts to unavoidable conclusions."[83] For worried social scientists, the advice was attractive, providing a way to defend their views as purely scientific, meaning that they were based on empirical evidence rather than the biases of their own opinions or values. Minnesota's L. D. Coffman was eager to apply the argument, assuring critics that "we are making a conscious effort at the University to avoid the teaching of facts or theories with such an emphasis or in such a way as to produce biased or prejudiced minds."[84] Writing to his friend Charles Ellwood, George A. Coe, a professor of religious education at Union Theological Seminary, embraced the empirical stance as "a question of tactics," advising Ellwood to "pile up indubitable facts of the kind that will reveal the moral issue; with the facts in hand, other people will draw the conclusions even if you do not."[85] And when Howard Odum came under fire, his immediate response was to claim that the Journal of Social Forces was a purely scientific publication, a "technical" and even "super-technical journal" that was "intended only for specialists."[86] His claims were entirely disingenuous, since everyone associated with the journal knew that it carried, as Barnes had complained, "twice as much thoroughly pious material as it does scientific articles."[87] Nevertheless, even while knowing that his journal was far from scientific, Odum went to work to make it so, explaining to his editors that from that time he expected all articles to consist entirely of "scientific fact."[88] Although himself ambivalent about scientific social science, Odum realized that taking such a stance would be an expedient response to a strained political situation. "It is very clear," Odum wrote to a

sympathetic observer, "that we have got to choose between a scientific and popular journal, and of course we will chose the scientific."[89]

The scientization of social science did not always come easily. With the organization of the Social Science Research Council, funded in the 1920s by the Laura Spellman Rockefeller Memorial, social scientists found a generous source of support for efforts to emulate the kind of research that was taking place in the natural sciences. But there were tensions even within the SSRC itself, where advocates and critics of this new kind of social science were sometimes at odds.[90] The tensions appeared already in 1925, when Howard Odum, acting at the invitation of SSRC President Charles Merriam, presided over the first of what would become several decades of summer conferences held on the campus of Dartmouth College in Hanover, New Hampshire. Convened in August, the meeting came only a month after the conclusion of the Scopes trial at Dayton, Tennessee, which Odum himself had driven down to watch. Deeply disturbed by the trial, and troubled by the apparent inability of social scientists to understand it, Odum came to Hanover prepared to report on the events at Dayton and to suggest a set of proposals for research that would provide a more comprehensive understanding of what he called "the social-religious-moral attitudes of the great mass of people"[91] On arrival, however, his plans evaporated. As for his report on the trial, records show that it was never given. Even more telling was that his agenda of proposed research, a lengthy list of several hundred research topics (notably including "an exhaustive study of the manifestations of fundamentalism") was met with open scorn by many at the meeting, who not only dismissed the proposals as old fashioned and unscientific but also pushed through motions to see to it that the SSRC would not conduct any research of its own, acting instead as a clearing house to encourage the newest methods of scientific study.[92] Defeated and personally humiliated, Odum returned from Hanover to reassess his views in an article on the lessons of the Scopes trial for American social scientists.[93] In his "Duel to the Death," published in the September issue of the Journal of Social Forces, he depicts the trial as less comical than tragic, revealing a great gulf of misunderstanding between social scientists and the people they study. Chiding scholars for being "honestly surprised" by the antievolution campaigns, he challenges them not to dismiss such expressions of popular protest with ridicule and satire, but to face them seriously as threats to American society. "Where is the

courage and unified action," he asks, "of the more highly educated groups?" Yet in addressing the protests, Odum calls not for active reform but for objective research, for "hard scientific inquiry, earnest efforts toward wise social policy, and a frank facing of the facts." Coming in the wake of the SSRC meetings, the article in effect announces that the role of social scientists in response to the antievolution movement should consist of studying it scientifically, since "if the social sciences expect to function in the newer epoch as the physical sciences have in the old, they must at least conform to the scientific standards set for the new social studies and programs." Having learned at Hanover that American's leading social scientists would not actively confront antievolutionism, or even seriously study the reasons for it, Odum had retreated, calling for the social sciences to disengage from the events of the day and take instead a more detached and objective stance. "May we not therefore propose a truce from dueling; a peace without victory, a generation of social study and research? Better a decade of research," wrote the resigned Odum, "than a cycle of futility."[94]

PROFESSIONALIZATION

The debates over evolution would contribute not only to changing the way social scientists thought about religion and science, but also to changing the way they thought about themselves, as social scientists. Throughout the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries, the founders of the modern social sciences had begun to construct distinctive disciplinary identities, together with the institutions to support them, creating professional organizations, peer reviewed journals, and degree programs in their respective academic fields. By the 1920s, their efforts had begun to pay off, as social scientists increasingly saw themselves as specialists, practitioners not of a generalized social science, but of a steadily growing complex of more specific social sciences.[95] In colleges and universities, introductory courses in social science, popular from the 1870s on, were by the 1920s being replaced by those in specialized topics, leaving behind the notion that the social sciences could serve as the foundation of a liberal moral education.[96] Teaching was giving way to research, as academics across the social science disciplines, encouraged by grants from private foundations, turned their attention to advancing scientific knowledge and establishing programs of specialized training.[97] Professional standards were becoming more important, allowing professors to exercise more academic independence from

the oversight of administrators and boards of trustees.[98] As described by Mark C. Smith, most of the early disciplinary histories describe these changes in distinctively Whiggish terms, as a steady development of academic autonomy, expertise, and influence. Although subsequent scholars like Mary Furner and Thomas Haskell would show the process to be considerably more contested, they place those contests almost entirely within the earliest social science professional organizations, principally the American Social Science Association. Even Dorothy Ross, whose careful work contains some consideration of the larger political context in which professionalization took place, tends to tell the story as an anxious search for status amid the changes of the postwar world.[99] Yet for many social scientists of the time, professionalism was less about academic status than political security. Put simply, for those who became targets of antievolutionists and their conservative colleagues at this time, professionalization was sometimes the best politics.

For antievolutionists, professionalism was a big part of the problem. As early as 1921, William Jennings Bryan had announced what came to be known as the "hired man" theory, the idea that while teachers had a right to their own opinions, they ultimately were employees responsible for conveying the views of their employers, including—in the case of teachers in public schools—the public itself. Over the next decade, antievolutionists would return to the theory regularly, insisting (in what became a sort of slogan for the movement) that "the hand that writes the pay check rules the school."[100] As for academic credentials, they evinced little respect. In his letter to University of Minnesota President Coffman calling for removal of the sociologist Luther Bernard, antievolutionist E. A. Freeman admitted that Bernard was "a man who knew his subject and could teach it," but that he had "no appreciation of his obligation to the good name of the university."[101] Arguments for academic freedom were dismissed out of hand. "'Academic freedom' works both ways," wrote the Baptist Biblical Recorder in a frequently heard refrain, "a teacher has his liberty in holding heretical views, but the trustees have the liberty to say that he shall not teach in an institution for which they are responsible."[102] Freedom of speech was called into question. After all, as William Bell Riley would explain, the greatest proponents of free speech were not the professors but their publishers, "the representatives of the big book concerns" who "were making their thousand out of these books." Eventually antievolutionist arguments always came around to the issue of public control. Speaking to an unruly crowd at

the Kenwood Armory in Minneapolis in 1927, Riley reminded his listeners that the professors at the state university worked for them—the public—and not for themselves. Once again singling out the sociologists, reading "quotations galore" from Chapin, Ellwood, Ross, and Parmelee, he pressed the point, while his audience responded in angry cadence:

> That is the teaching you are getting in the University of Minnesota. Do you want it? (VOICES: No, no.) Then don't have it. You don't have to. Whose university is it over here, will you tell me? Does it belong to a dozen regents? (A VOICE: no, sir.) … No, sir. Does it belong to fifty or seventy-five or a hundred professors? Does it? (VOICES: No.) No. Not while I pay taxes. (Laughter and applause.)

His voice rising, Riley pulled out all the stops in working the crowd toward a furious conclusion, combining piety with patriotism in calling on them to make their voices heard:

> Speak now, and speak in no uncertain terms. Tell those of us who make up the Anti-Evolution League that you are back of us; that we can depend upon your fellowship in our fight for the faith of Americanism; …that you will…stand at our side for Americanism that it may not perish out of America, and that…neither a dozen regents nor a hundred deceiving, and faithless professors shall be the owners or controllers of the University of Minnesota. If you will back us up in a fight for the God-fearing majority, say so. Will you do it? (VOICES: Yes, yes, yes.) [103]

Battered by such criticism, social scientists looked to their professions for protection. Throughout the early twentieth century, academics in the social sciences had been particularly susceptible to political pressures, as seen in the firings of the sociologist E. A. Ross at Stanford, the psychologist James McKeen Cattell at Columbia University, and the political economist Scot Nearing at the University of Pennsylvania. Thus it was not surprising to find leading social scientists of the time acting vigorously to put their academic associations on record in support of academic freedom, while also playing prominent roles in the creation of the American Association of University Professors.[104] But in the 1920s, amid antievolutionist attacks, they looked even more to those organizations for support, teaming up with natural scientists to make a common case that antievolutionism had become, in the words of AAUP President Joseph V. Denny, "the most sinister force that had yet attacked the freedom of teaching."[105] As early as 1923, the historian James Harvey Robinson was urging members of the American Association for the Advancement of Science to create a

campaign to educate the public about the importance of evolution.[106] A year later the AAUP issued the report of its special "Committee M" on "Freedom of Teaching in Science," affirming that the doctrine of evolution was an essential principle "not only in the biological sciences, but in psychology, sociology, education, ethics, political science, philosophy, and many other fields of human knowledge," and declaring that attempts to suppress it were both un-scientific and "un-American."[107] At about the same time Charles Ellwood, acting as president of the American Sociological Society, established a committee to investigate the impact of antievolutionism on the teaching of the social sciences, announcing that he wanted the "situation torn wide open."[108] Acting along similar lines, members of the American Historical Association, reeling from the criticism of both antievolutionists and conservative patriotic groups, would pass a resolution insisting that any criticism of history texts be based only "upon grounds of faithfulness to fact as determined by specialists or tested by consideration of evidence."[109] Across the social sciences warnings went out, with scholars taking every opportunity to sound the alarm over threats to their academic professions. Thus in an essay entitled "Progress in Political Research," published in the American Political Science Review, Charles Merriam described the growing dangers to the future scholarly progress of political science, citing both New York's anti-teacher Lusk laws and Tennessee's Scopes trial as examples of a "widespread popular tendency toward political fundamentalism" that had already resulted in "indirect, or even direct, suppression of liberty of speech or inquiry."[110] "If we lose freedom of speech in the quest for scientific truth," he warned his fellow political scientists, "our descendants will find it necessary to retrace some painful steps over a flinty way."[111] Amid such public warnings, the scholars huddled among themselves, conferring privately on how to act to stem the antievolutionist tide. "American political scientists," Merriam confided in a letter to Harvard's William Bennett Munro, had been "too tame," and as a result, "we are allowing currents of thought to set which the next generation will have difficulty in directing intelligently."[112]

In turning to their professions, however, social scientists paid a price. Beset by political pressures, determined to establish and enforce their own professional standards, encouraged by academic administrators and foundation officials to avoid controversial topics, many had come to the conclusion that it was time to abandon their traditional role as social and political reformers in favor of newer professional norms of

neutrality.[113] The antievolution debates served as a catalyst for the change. A case in point came in 1924, when Ellwood decided that it was time for sociologists to take a stand on the teaching of evolution. Tapping Duke University's Hornell Hart to lead the American Sociological Society's Committee on the Teaching of Social Sciences in an investigation of the issue, Ellwood made it clear that he expected a hard hitting report, telling Hart to "have the courage to handle these questions without gloves."[114] Although Hart was known for his strong evolutionist views, the two were at once at odds, for while Ellwood insisted that the report take a strongly reformist position, describing the teacher of sociology as "a moral as well as an intellectual leader" who had a duty to "assist us in solving practically the problems of our civilization," Hart argued instead for the importance of objectivity, saying that it was sometimes better for the teacher to "hold a certain aloofness in his private life on issues greatly in conflict."[115] The issue did not get any easier for the committee itself, as over the course of the following year members struggled to arrive at some agreement, going back and forth between an activist call to defend evolution and a more cautious set of suggestions on the responsibilities of teachers when treating controversial subjects.[116] The final report, delivered to the organization's annual meeting at the end of the year, was at best equivocal. The committee began by announcing that the social sciences were facing unprecedented challenges, citing reports of censorship and dismissals from ten states, and concerns "in almost every school" about the ability of educators not only to teach evolution but also to express any of their own "attitudes toward religious, patriotic, racial, and industrial problems." It went on to state its support for teaching such controversial subjects, advising teachers to treat these topics without preconceived prejudices, being "faithful to the scientific spirit, no matter what the cost." The report then turned sharply toward a more defensive position. As for taking any action, the committee advised against it, because "direct conflict is not always the best method," and since "the sociologist may well query whether his own science justifies the attempt to conquer intolerant groups by aggressive attacks." Instead the report called on teachers to adopt methods "which arouse the least emotional antagonism," counseling them to refrain from making "sweeping generalizations," or even using words that have become "symbols for emotional conflict, such as 'evolution,' 'God,' 'miracles,' 'socialism,' 'capitalistic,' 'Jew,' 'negro,' 'America,' sex terms, and the like." In concluding, it advised that when controversy could not be avoided, they "should

nevertheless go forward fearlessly and take the consequences." Even so, the main message was clear, that academic professionals should avoid advocacy, eschew conflict, and steer clear of making political statements. After all, wrote the committee, "as scientists we must adopt the objective pragmatic attitude."[117]

Ultimately, antievolutionism required a reassessment of the role of social science in democratic politics. Having seen at first hand the dangers of democracy, social scientists began at this time to develop a new conception of their place in democratic politics, one in which experts brought social scientific research to bear in controlling and directing democratic society.[118] Writing in the aftermath of the Scopes trial, the social critic Walter Lippmann spoke for many in suggesting that the antievolution movement had called into question the character of American democracy. In his American Inquisitors, Lippmann presented a series of imaginary conversations, including one between Bryan, Jefferson, and Socrates, in which the participants argued among themselves about the meaning of freedom of thought, the civic responsibilities of teachers, and the power of the majority in democratic societies. Allowing all of the participants to state their positions, Lippmann acknowledged that each held defensible views, and that it would be difficult to arrive at any agreement on such issues. Even so, he ended his work with a warning, that for all its advantages, majority rule can be dangerous, leading to arbitrary and absolute power, and that "it may well be that to limit the power of majorities, to dispute their moral authority, to deflect their impact, to dissolve their force, is now the most important task of those who care for liberty."[119] Spurred on by the spectacle of the Scopes trial, social scientists of the time were coming to the same conclusion. Popular majorities could be deeply intolerant. "The popular mind," said Ellsworth, "is credulous, uncritical, impatient, intolerant, fearful of intellectual changes, conventional, and controlled by personal interest."[120] Political institutions provided little in the way of defense. "The voters undoubtedly have a clear right to determine what doctrine shall be taught in the public schools," Merriam wrote, "and the courts neither can nor will stop them."[121] Democratic politics was dangerous, devolving easily into what Odum called "the popular ruthless passion to make all the rest of the world confirm to the misguided prejudice of a restricted place and time."[122] Nonetheless, conflicts like those over evolution would have to be contained, and if democracy were to survive, they would have to be contained in democratic ways. For social scientists of the 1920s, sobered by the experience of the evolution

wars, the task was no longer to reform democracy but to control it. Even more, it was to convince the public of the desirability of an altogether different kind of democracy, one in which social science experts played a part in checking the power of popular majorities. The task, admitted Odum, would be "at best a long and hard road."[123]

CONCLUSION

By the close of the 1920s, American social science had been transformed. From its earliest mission as a movement of Christian social reform, it had systematically been recast as a distinctive set of academic disciplines committed to increasingly secular, scientific, and professional purposes. Along the way its evolutionism had been apparently all but eliminated, as across the social sciences faith in progress came to be replaced by a more cautious scientific stance. By decade's end, most social scientists were ready to declare the evolution debates to be over.[124] A sign of the times came in December of 1928 when Harry Elmer Barnes, himself never one to declare an end to any debate, addressed a joint meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science and the New York Academy of Medicine on the topic of "Medical Science versus Religion as a Guide to Life." Speaking as vice president of the AAAS's History of Science Section, Barnes proceeded to contribute another installment in what had become a continuing personal crusade against religious orthodoxy, calling for the creation of a more highly evolved form of rational religion that would be compatible with modern scientific views. Reported prominently first in New York City newspapers and then around the country, the speech created a small firestorm, with one historian observing that it had received more lines of print than any similar event with the exception of the Scopes trial itself.[125] Although most of the criticism came from an enraged public, including hundreds of letters from local religious leaders, some of the most vocal critics were American scientists, led by AAAS president Henry Fairfield Osborn, who argued that a scientific meeting was not a proper place to discuss religious or philosophical matters.[126] According to one source, most of the scientific community agreed that the speech was an example of "poor tactics," in that it was certain to attract controversy at a time when many scientists were eager to avoid being seen as enemies of religion.[127] But it was in the aftermath of the speech, when Barnes continued to press the

same points in lectures, magazine articles, and his 1929 book The Twilight of Christianity, that social scientists expressed their views, dismissing the work in distinctively disciplinary terms. For even as religious and scientific figures continued to argue about Barnes's claims, social scientists almost totally ignored them. Among their academic journals, only the American Journal of Sociology saw fit to even publish a review, written by Vanderbilt University's Alva W. Taylor, which described the book as "largely negative and destructive." Beyond disliking the work, however, Taylor dismissed it as a polemical tract that was not in keeping with the standards of professional sociology. The problem, he wrote, was that Barnes lacked "scientific temper."[128]

In truth, even as social scientists sought to distance themselves from the theory, evolution remained a presence in their thinking. Adopted from biology into culture, concealed in concepts like "adaptation" and "adjustment," subsumed into a bland terminology of change and development, evolutionary theory nonetheless refused to go away. Throughout the social sciences, its amorphous presence would continue to be felt: in studies of social change undertaken by sociologists from Sorokin to Parsons; in the modernization theories made popular by mid-twentieth century political scientists; and in the activist history practiced by the New Left historians of the 1960s. More recently, with the emergence of sociobiology and related forms of behavioral evolutionary science, social evolutionism has reappeared in biocultural studies across the social sciences from anthropology and economics to social psychology.[129] But even in the 1920s, as social scientists took on secular, scientific, and professional disciplinary identities, there were those—among them some who had borne the brunt of antievolutionist attacks—who held fast to older ideas of evolutionary progress. Thus as social science secularized, the aging Charles Ellwood continued to preach a social gospel version of sociology, convinced that its mission was in the end "the saving of mankind."[130] Watching his fellow social scientists retreat into unreflective scientism, Howard Odum warned of the danger of them becoming detached from social development, cautioning that "few people are more dogmatic and unscientific towards human society than the pure scientists."[131] And as social scientific research became increasingly rigid in its objectivist orthodoxy, distancing itself from social reform, Emory Bogardus continued to make the case for social reconstruction, championing the achievements of social welfare reformers and insisting that all of social

science be "transformed into an agency for social good."[132] Evolution did not disappear. Indeed as early as 1929, the sociologist Dorothy P. Gary could contend that in spite of attempts of contemporary scholars to ban theories of social evolution from the study of American culture, "a reaction to this general anti-evolutionary position seems to have set in." For that matter, Gary went on, there was little reason to think that their criticism had really done much damage, since "the majority of American students of culture, especially those known as sociologists and historians, have always held to the theory of social evolution."[133]

Yet while the theory of evolution may not have disappeared from American social science, the memory of the struggles surrounding it was almost entirely lost. By the close of the 1920s, the antievolutionist movement, divided and financially failing, had largely retreated from active protest into what would become a long period of rebuilding. At the same time, American social scientists were retreating and rebuilding too, as over the 1930s they concentrated on creating an institutional infrastructure that would ensure the survival of their disciplines. Under the circumstances, antievolutionism no longer seemed so threatening, having been reduced, as Lippmann scornfully put it, to a movement of "the isolated, the inexperienced, and the uneducated."[134] More important, however, was that for American social scientists the debates over evolution constituted in retrospect a deeply disquieting episode. For those such as G. S. Dow or Charles Ellwood, the events of the 1920s must have felt like a mark of their failure, a testament to the battles they had lost in the fight against their antievolutionist enemies. For those like Stuart Chapin and Howard Odum, the experience may have been more an embarrassment, a witness to their willingness to succumb to popular political pressures by rewriting their textbooks and censoring their journals. And for those many unnamed teachers and scholars who had suffered in silence, or watched from the sidelines, or simply stopped teaching what they believed, the whole episode can only have been a reminder of a painful past that was just as well forgotten.[135] Thus American social scientists showed few reservations in rewriting their histories. Frank Hankins told his story in triumphal terms, describing the fight over the Journal of Social Forces as an intellectual victory in which the social scientists and their allies had "stood up nobly against the low brows."[136] Howard Odum, writing in his history of American sociology, chose to downplay the same events, mentioning the battle over Social Forces in a single sentence where he described it as a minor academic disagreement

leading to the publication of a critical "brochure."[137] Writing in 1950, William F. Ogburn went even further, removing not only antievolutionism but evolution itself from the story, claiming that by 1922, when he wrote his classic work Social Change, "fifty years of writing and discussion of 'social evolution' was coming to a close."[138] It was as if it all had never happened.

But it had happened: antievolution campaigns did take place throughout the 1920s, and they have continued to take place from that time to our own. Although aimed primarily at the biological sciences, they have included extensive efforts to prevent the teaching of theories of evolution in the social sciences as well. In fact, over the last century antievolutionists have consistently conflated biological and social evolution, maintaining that the real danger of Darwinism lay in its effect on social behavior. Thus from the 1930s on, activists have contended that that evolutionary theory was destructive of traditional values, leading to moral laxity and social breakdown, as seen in everything from rising rates of divorce and teen pregnancy to labor agitation and civil rights protests.[139] In the 1970s, with the introduction of MACOS (Man: A Course of Study), a social studies curriculum for middle school students funded by the National Science Foundation, protests took place across the country, led by parents and grassroots groups opposed to its biocultural approach to the study of human behavior.[140] Over the next several decades, antievolutionists would be active in campaigns to censor textbooks that denied absolute values, emphasized open ended problem solving, or included treatments of controversial topics such as religion and reproduction.[141] More recently, the "Wedge Document," written by creationist Phillip E. Johnson and supported by the Discovery Institute's Center for the Renewal of Science, laid out a strategy for defeating not only evolutionism in the biological sciences but also the "moral relativism" of the social sciences which "undergirds much of modern economics, political science, psychology and sociology."[142] And in 2009, an antievolution majority on the Texas State Board of Education, failing to include a requirement to teach the "strengths and weaknesses" of evolutionary theory as part of that state's science curriculum, successfully proceeded to revise social studies textbook standards to stress the superiority of American capitalism, question the founders' commitment to separation of church and state, and present conservative political philosophies in more positive ways. With federal education statutes now requiring regular updating of state education standards, there is every reason to believe that such efforts

will continue. "We plan to fight back," says Don McLeroy, former chair of the Texas Board, "and, when it comes to textbooks, we have the power to do it. Sometimes it boggles my mind the kind of power we have."[143]

Nevertheless, in the continuing fight over evolution, social scientists have played only a minor role. Their absence stands in start contrast to their colleagues in the natural sciences, who have consistently taken the lead in organizing against antievolution legislation in states across the country. Indeed, with the exception of American historians, who mobilized in the mid-1990s to defend the first set of national standards for the teaching of history, social scientists have had almost no organized presence in recent debates over educational standards.[144] Secure in the secular, scientific, professional disciplinary identities they have crafted and maintained for themselves over the past century, most hardly notice the debates that continue to roil the public schools. When it comes to social science, the antievolutionists of the 1920s appear to have won after all.

ENDNOTES

[1] J. A. O. Stub to Lotus D. Coffman, 7 January 1927, Lotus D. Coffman Papers, Office of the President #841, Box 14, University Archives, University of Minnesota. Studies of the antievolution movement include Norman F. Furniss, The Fundamentalist Controversy, 1918-1931 (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1954); Dorothy Nelkin, The Creation Controversy: Science or Scripture in the Schools (New York: Norton, 1982); Raymond A. Eve and Frances B. Harrold, The Creationist Movement in Modern America (Boston, MA: Twayne Publishers, 1991); Christopher P. Toumey, God's Own Scientists: Creationists in a Secular World (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1994); Jon H. Roberts, Darwinism and the Divine in America: Protestant Intellectuals and Organic Evolution, 1859-1900 (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1998); Paul K. Conkin, When All the Gods Trembled: Darwinism, Scopes and American Intellectuals (Lanham, MD.: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 1998); Edward J. Larson, Summer for the Gods: The Scopes Trial and America's Continuing Debate over Science and Religion (New York: BasicBooks, 1997); Ronald L. Numbers, Darwinism Comes to America (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1998); Edward J. Larson, Trial and Error: The American Controversy Over Creation and Evolution, 3rd ed. (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2003); Ronald L. Numbers, The Creationists: The Evolution of Scientific Creationism from Scientific Creationism to Intelligent Design, Expanded ed. (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2006); and Michael Lienesch, In the Beginning: Fundamentalism, the Scopes Trial, and the Making of the Antievolution Movement (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007).

[2] See Mary O. Furner, Advocacy and Objectivity: A Crisis in the Professionalization of American Social Science, 1865-1905 (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1975); Thomas L. Haskell, The Emergence of Professional Social Science: The American Social Science Association and the Nineteenth-Century Crisis of Authority (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1977); Dorothy Ross, The Origins of American Social Science (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1991). See also David A. Hollinger, "Inquiry and Uplift: Late Nineteenth Century American Academics and the Moral Efficacy of Scientific Practice," in Thomas L. Haskell, ed., The Authority of Experts: Studies in History and Theory (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1984), 142-156; Mark C. Smith, Social Science in the Crucible: The American Debate Over Objectivity and Purpose, 1918-1941 (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1994); and Julie A. Reuben, The Making of the Modern University: Intellectual Transformation and the Marginalization of Morality (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1996).

[3] See Roscoe C. Hinkle, Jr. and Gisela J. Hinkle, The Development of Modern Sociology: Its Nature and Growth in the United States (New York: Random House, 1954); Gene M. Lyons, The Uneasy Partnership: Social Science and the Federal Government in the Twentieth Century (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1969); William F. Fine, Progressive Evolutionism and American Sociology, 1890-1920 (Ann Arbor, MI: UMI Research Press, 1979); Robert C. Bannister, Sociology and Scientism: The American Quest for Objectivity, 1880-1940 (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1987); Peter Novick, That Noble Dream: The "Objectivity Question" and the American Historical Profession (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1988); Cecil E. Greek, The Religious Roots of American Sociology (New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1992); Donald Fisher, Fundamental Development of the Social Sciences: Rockefeller Philanthropy and the United States Social Science Research Council (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1993); John M. Jordan, Machine-Age Ideology: Social Engineering and American Liberalism, 1911-1939 (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1994); Jon H. Roberts and James Turner, The Sacred and Secular University (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2000); and Christian Smith, "Secularizing American Higher Education: The Case of Early American Sociology," in Christian Smith, ed., The Secular Revolution: Power, Interests, and Conflict in the Secularization of American Public Life (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003), 97-159.

[4] See Smith, "Secularizing American Higher Education," 98.

[5] An exception is Myer S. Reed, Jr., "After the Alliance: The Sociology of Religion in the United States from 1925 to 1949," Sociological Analysis 43 (1982), 189-204.

[6] For Habermas's conception of "scientization," see Jürgen Habermas, "The Scientization of Politics and Public Opinion," Toward a Rational Society: Student Protest, Science, and Politics, trans. Jeremy Shapiro (Boston, MA: Beacon Press, 1979), 62-80.

[7] On Bryan, see "The Menace of Darwinism," The Commoner (April 1921), 7. See also Ferenc Morton Szasz, The Divided Mind of Protestant America, 1880-1930 (University, AL: University of Alabama Press, 1982), 107-116. For a discussion of the adoption of the evolution frame, see Lienesch, In the Beginning, 68-76.

[8] See Fine, Progressive Evolutionism, 1-13.

[9] See Reuben, Making of the Modern University, 133-175. See also R. Laurence Moore, "Secularization: Religion and the Social Sciences," in William R. Hutchinson, ed., Between the Times: The Travail of the Protestant Establishment in America, 1900-1960 (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 233-234. On the development of social science "overview" or survey courses that centered on evolution, see Reuben, Making of the Modern University, 163-167. A standard sociology course is outlined in Willard W. Beatty, "A Normal-School Course in Sociology Introductory to Work in the Social Studies," American Journal of Sociology 26 (1921), 573-580. It should be noted that among American academics of the time, the meaning of "science" and "scientist" was surprisingly expansive, with the American Association for the Advancement of Science containing sections on anthropology, psychology, "the social and economic sciences," and "the historical and philological sciences." See Summarized Proceedings of the American Association for the Advancement of Science…June, 1921 to June, 1925 (Washington, DC: AAAS, 1925).

[10] For a discussion of the field of "civic biology," see Adam R. Shapiro, "Civic Biology and the Origin of the School Antievolution Movement." Journal of the History of Biology 41 (2008), 409-433. On "social biology" see Howard W. Odum and Katharine Jocher, An Introduction to Social Research (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1929), 56. Some scholars of the time considered biology a social science. See Howard Madison Parshley, "Biology," in Harry Elmer Barnes, ed., The History and Prospects of the Social Sciences (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1925), 106-155.

[11] See Steven Turner, "A Life in the First Half-Century of Sociology: Charles Ellwood and the Division of Sociology," in Craig J. Calhoun, ed., Sociology in America: A History (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2007), 135.

[12] One example is Charles Ellwood's Sociology and Modern Social Problems, which over several decades sold over 300,000 copies at a time when college enrollment was still relatively small and the college textbook market undeveloped. See ibid., 134.

[13] William Jennings Bryan, "God and Evolution," New York Times (26 February 1922).

[14] J. Frank Norris, "Prof. Dow and Baylor University," Searchlight (11 November 1921), 1. On Dow, see Numbers, The Creationists, 60-62. On Norris, see C. Allyn Russell, "J. Frank Norris: Violent Fundamentalist," Southwestern Historical Quarterly 75 (1972), 271-302; Patsy Ledbetter, "Defense of the Faith: J. Frank Norris and Texas Fundamentalism, 1920-1929," Arizona and the West 15 (1973), 45-62; and Barry Hankins, God's Rascal: J. Frank Norris and the Beginnings of Southern Fundamentalism (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1996).

[15] "Prof. Dow Resigns," Searchlight (16 December 1921), 4: Dow's resignation letter expressed regrets that "fragments were taken out of context" and promised that such "construction will be improved in the next edition."

[16] "The Fight Against Darwinism," The Commoner (January 1922), 3. See also J. B. Cantrell, "The Baptist General Convention of Texas," Western Recorder (29 December 1921), 4.

[17] Charles Gallaudet Trumbull, "Fundamentalists Expose Modernism in the South," Searchlight (25 May 1923), 1.

[18] J. Frank Norris, "Evolution Is Now Taught in Baylor University," Searchlight (12 October 1923), 2; Norris, "Take the Fight of Evolution to the Common People," Searchlight (2 November 1923), 2.

[19] Norris, "Evolution Is Now Taught in Baylor University," 3.

[20] T. T. Martin, Hell and the High Schools: Christ or Evolution Which? (Kansas City, MO: The Western Baptist Publishing Company, 1923), 152. Similar stories were reported by many of the state and local leaders of the antievolution campaigns. See for example J. W. Porter, Evolution—A Menace (Nashville, TN: Sunday School Board, Southern Baptist Convention, 1922), 84-85. On Bryan's campaign against the state universities, see Lienesch, In the Beginning, 59-82.

[21] "Report on the University of Tennessee," Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors 19 (1924), 217. On the Sprowls case, see James Riley Montgomery, Threshold of a New Day: The University of Tennessee, 1919-1946 (Knoxville, TN: University of Tennessee Record, 1971), 21-36. See also Kimberly Marinucci, "God, Darwin, and Loyalty: The University of Tennessee and the Great Professor Trial of 1923," History of Intellectual Culture, 1 (2001), 1-15.

[22] On the Bryan-Birge confrontation, see Irvin G. Wyllie, "Bryan, Birge, and the Wisconsin Evolution Controversy, 1921-1922," Wisconsin Magazine of History 35 (1951), 298-301. On the resolutions of the Wisconsin Council of Catholic Women's Organizations, see "Catholic Club Women Score UW Leaders," Milwaukee Sentinel, 9 June 1921.

[23] For details, see Willard B. Gatewood, Jr., "Embattled Scholar: Howard W. Odum and the Fundamentalists, 1925-1927," Journal of Southern History 31 (1965), 375-92. See also Wayne D. Brazil, Howard W. Odum: The Building Years, 1884-1930 (NY: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1988), 408-467. Compare Michael James Milligan, The Contradictions of Public Service: A Study of Howard Odum's Intellectual Odyssey (Ph. D. thesis, University of Virginia, 1994), 33-93.

[24] William Bell Riley, "Evolution: Shall We Tolerate Its Teaching?," 24, in David Swenson Papers, Box 1, University Archives, University of Minnesota. A published version of the speech is William Bell Riley, "How and Why I Was Denied a Building on the University of Minnesota Campus for an Address on Evolution," Baptist Beacon (April 1926), 3-7. Riley and his allies demanded that other books be removed from the university as well, including H. G. Wells's Outline of History, Hendrick W. van Loon's Story of History, Charles Ellwood's Sociology and Modern Social Problems, and E. A. Ross's Social Psychology. Riley made similar demands that Henry Reed Burch and S. Howard Patterson's American Social Problems be removed from Minnesota high schools. See Ferenc M. Szasz, "William B. Riley and the Fight Against Teaching of Evolution in Minnesota," Minnesota History 41 (1969), 201-216. On Riley, see William Vance Trollinger, God's Empire: William Bell Riley and Midwestern Fundamentalism (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1990).

[25] At the University of Kentucky, it was reported that a student was "caused to fail an examination because he refused to write out the pseudo-philosophical theories" found in his textbook, Walter T. Martin's History of European Philosophy. According to the Western Recorder, a Kentucky Baptist publication, the textbook included a discussion of human origins that placed the origin of man "many tens of thousands of years" earlier than that of Genesis, while also

suggesting that man "sprang from a brute ancestry." Writes the Recorder, "The book throughout accepts the 'inner light' subjectivity of Kant and rejects the objective authority of God…. We have given this space to the book, not because it differs from scores of other textbooks used in our American schools, but because it is substantially like them." "The Bible Versus Pagan Philosophy in Education," Western Recorder (8 September 1921), n.p.

[26] Riley, "Evolution: Shall We Tolerate Its Teaching?," 27.

[27] On the criticism directed at Carl Taylor of the sociology department at North Carolina State and Dean Edmund D. Soper of Duke's School of Religion, see Willard B. Gatewood, Jr., Preachers Pedagogues and Politicians: The Evolution Controversy in North Carolina, 1920-1927 (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1966), 193. Also coming in for criticism for his "outspoken rejection of the Bible" was economist Albert S. Keister of the State College for Women at Greensboro. See ibid, 120-121.

[28] Robin Jeanne Sellers, Femina Perfecta: The Genesis of Florida State University (Tallahassee, FL: Florida State University Foundation, 1995), 145. For a description of the events at Florida State, see ibid., 142-150. See also Mary Duncan Faunce, "'A Year of Monkey War:' The Anti-Evolution Campaign and the Florida Legislature," Florida Historical Quarterly 44 (1975), 156-77. Thanks to Brandon Haught of Florida Citizens for Science for bringing the events at Florida State to my attention.

[29] Turner, "A Life in the First Half-Century of Sociology," 128. Commenting on the lynching, Ellwood would write the National Urban League's Eugene K. Jones, "I am at loss to say what can be done. If I did very much, a certain element here would run me out of town. In fact, they would like to do so right now." Ellwood to Jones, 5 May 1923, Charles A. Ellwood Papers, Box 1, University Archives, Duke University. Two years later, he would still be describing attacks by the Ku Klux Klan, "chiefly directed against me and my department, because of my determined stand for liberalism." Ellwood to Harry B. Hawes, 18 April 1925, Ellwood Papers, Box 2.

[30] See Doug Hunt, "A Course in Applied Lynching," The Missouri Review 27 (2004), 122-170.

[31] The full story is recounted in Lawrence J. Nelson, Rumors of Indiscretion: The University of Missouri "Sex Questionnaire" Scandal in the Jazz Age (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2003).

[32] See Ellwood to Hornell Hart, 16 February 1924, Ellwood Papers, Box 1. Writing on sensitive sociological subjects, Ellwood took criticism from many sides. In the same letter, he described the situation to Hart: "A case of a different sort was the exclusion of my book from use in the public schools of Philadelphia Pennsylvania, upon petition of the Association for the Advancement of Colored People because of its alleged unfairness to the negro….. It is curious to know that in a couple of schools in Georgia the book was excluded because it was too favorable to the negro." Ibid.

[33] A detailed review of controversies surrounding history texts at this time is Howard K. Beale, Are American Teachers Free? An Analysis of Restraints Upon the Freedom of Teaching in American Schools (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1936), 261-319. See also ibid., 199, 231-232, 237. For reports from other states, see Maynard Shipley, The War on Modern Science: A Short History of the Fundamentalist Attacks on Evolution and Modernism (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1927), 126, 157-158, 205.

[34] Gerald R. Winrod, "Filthy Dreamers," The Defender (April 1928), 5. As early as 1925 George F. Washburn and his Christian Crusaders were protesting the use of geography and history texts in Florida schools because of their tendency to "foster disrespect for the Holy Bible." See "Protest Is Made on Books in Florida Schools," The Crusader's Champion (25 December 1925), 18. Florida Texts included A. E. Frye's Higher Geography and Hutton Webster's Early European History. See also Shipley, War on Modern Science, 334.

[35] "College in Evolution Row," Los Angeles Times (July 26, 1925). See also Shipley, War on Modern Science, 331.

[36] Frederick W. Sardeson, "Defeat of Anti-Evolution in Minnesota," Science 65 (1927), 447.

[37] See George M. Marsden, The Soul of the American University: From Protestant Establishment to Established Nonbelief (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994), esp. 113-218. See also Roberts and Turner, Sacred and the

Secular University, 19-71. On the concept of secularization, see José Casanova, Public Religions in the Modern World (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1994).

[38] Smith, "Secularizing American Higher Education," 97-159. See also Moore, "Secularization," 233-240.

[39] On the disappearance of articles associated with religion published in journals of sociology, see Reed, "After the Alliance," 191. The decline in the number of members of the American Sociological Society who reported a major interest in religion from 1928 to 1931 is described in H. G. Duncan and Winnie Duncan, "Shifts of Interest of American Sociologists," Social Forces 12 (1933), 209-212. On similar changes taking place in psychology, see Moore, "Secularization," 236-239, and in economics, see Bradley W. Bateman, "Reflections on the Secularization of American Economics," Journal of the History of Economic Thought 30 (2008), 1-20. On the increasing isolation of religious studies at this time, see D. G. Hart, "American Learning and the Problem of Religious Studies," in George M. Marsden and Bradley J. Longfield, eds., The Secularization of the Academy, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992), 202-03.

[40] See Reed, "After the Alliance," 193.

[41] E. A. Freeman to Coffman, 6 April 1923, in Coffman Papers, Box 14. Freeman continued: "Nor does my criticism of Dr. Bernard stop with this. He was about equally given to commenting upon moral problems facetiously and without good reason for their introduction, as he was on religious problems." Ibid.

[42] "Bring All Atheists Into the Open," North Carolina Christian Advocate (26 February 1925), 2. See also W. P. McCorkle, "The Creed and Program of Modern Sociology," Biblical Recorder (25 March 1925), 4; and "Teaching Irreligion at Public Expense," Watchman-Examiner (23 April 1925), 517. "From all which it appears that sociology of the modern type proposes to overthrow the Christian church and Christian civilization, abolish monogamy, introduce 'pluralism' by law, do away with prohibition altogether, and bring back into the world all 'the glory that was Greece.'" McCorkle, "Creed and Program of Modern Sociology," 4.

[43] Ellwood to Mabel Katherine Howell, 18 April 1925, Ellwood Papers, Box 2. See also Ellwood to Glenn Frank, 5 November 1923, and Ellwood to Percy Stickney Grant, 5 December 1923, Ellwood Papers, Box 1.

[44] Bryan, "The Modern Arena," The Commoner (June 1921), 3. See James H. Leuba, The Belief in God and Immortality: A Psychological, Anthropological and Statistical Study (Chicago, IL: Open Court Publishing Co., 1921), 213-280.

[45] Charles E. Merriam to John Merriam, 10 July 1925, Charles E. Merriam Papers, Box 35, Folder 20, Special Collections Research Center, University of Chicago Library.

[46] Franklin H. Giddings to Odum, 17 March 1925, Howard Washington Odum Papers #3167, Box 4, Southen Historical Collection, Wilson Library, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. Giddings writes: "The situation through large areas of our country is a bit serious. Professor [William Pepperell] Montague who was recently in Texas tells me that things are worse there than anywhere else. There is a probability of the enactment of an idiot-and-ignoramus law in that state more drastic than any heretofore proposed elsewhere." Ibid.

[47] Frank L. McVey, The Gates Open Slowly: A History of Education in Kentucky (Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1949), 292. The public statement is included as an appendix to his autobiography. See also "U.K. Does Not Teach Monkey-Man Theory," Lexington Leader (12 February 1922), where McVey also assures citizens that his professors were members of churches and officials of Sunday Schools. Similar statements are in "Battle Over Evolution Bill in House," Lexington Leader (9 March 1922).

[48] F.J. Kelly to Mabel Toogood, 22 July 1925, Coffman Papers, Box 14.

[49] Cited in Sellars, Femina Perfecta,146. See also Faunce, "A Year of Monkey War," 172.

[50] "The university exists to orient the students in the world of human thought, as well as in the world of natural fact," wrote Coffman, "and to ignore completely controversial questions would emasculate all instruction in the humanities

and to come extent the natural sciences as well." Minneapolis Tribune (4 April 1923). See also Szasz, "William B. Riley," 206.

[51] F. Stuart Chapin to Coffman, 1 May 1923, Coffman Papers, Box 14. "No complaint from any student on the score of religious or moral teachings has come to my attention," Chapin assured Coffman, "although I have several times asked all the instructors in this course to inform me in such a case." Chapin also noted that his own textbook "has been used widely in denominational colleges all over the country." Ibid. Responding to a separate request from Coffman, Luther Bernard tried to reassure him by pointing out that in his History of Social Theory course he assigned "the Bible as textbook material," along with selections from Luther and Calvin. L. L. Bernard to Coffman, 26 March 1923, Coffman Papers, Box 14. Commenting on his class, Bernard estimated that "about ¼ of these students have some criticism of evolution on religious grounds." Ibid.

[52] Swenson's correspondence with Riley is in Swenson Papers, Box 6. On the debate, see Szasz, "William B. Riley," 213.

[53] Ellwood to John Lofty, 3 January 1921, Ellwood Papers, Box 1.

[54] Ellwood to R. K. Maiden, 3 November 1925. Ellwood Papers, Box 2.

[55] For Odum's claims of religious orthodoxy, see Odum to Johnston Avery, 4 March 1925, Odum to Jno. L. Caldwell, 4 March 1925, Odum to Charles R. Brockman, 9 March 1925, Odum to James A. Gray, 23 March 1925, all in Odum Papers, Box 5. See also Brazil, Howard W. Odum, 454. "Until recently, at least," he wrote to one group of Greensboro ministers, "many of my best friends and most intimate associates have been ministers of the gospel." Odum to Harry Lee Canfield, H. M. Marley, S. Harding Hughes, and L. B. Hayes, 11 May 1925, Odum Papers, Box 5. On his credentials as a Southerner, see Odum to D. V. Howell, 25 February 1925, Odum to A. W. McLean, 6 March 1925, Odum to L. R. Varser, 6 March 1925, Odum to Walter Murphy, 6 March 1925, Odum to J. S. Foster, 7 March 1925, Odum to S. J. Ervin, 10 March 1925, all in Odum Papers, Box 4. In a letter to Luther Bernard written at the same time, he described himself as "a regular orthodox, almost professional, Southerner." Odum to Luther L. Bernard, 7 March 1925, Odum Papers, Box 4. See also Wayne D. Brazil, "Social Forces and Sectional Self-Scrutiny," in Merle Black and John Shelton Reed, eds., Perspectives on the American South: An Annual Review of Society, Politics, and Culture (New York: Gordon and Breach Science Publishers, 1984), 73-104. For invitations to meet with his critics, see Odum to W. C. Barrett, 5 March 1925 and Odum to Livingston Johnson, 21 March 1925, Odum Papers, Box 4, and Odum to William P. McCorkle, 18 September 1925, Odum Papers, Box 5. His invitation the octogenarian McCorkle to submit an article to the journal can be found at Odum to McCorkle, 30 September 1925, Odum Papers, Box 5.

[56] Barnes to Odum, 28 September 1925, Odum Papers, Box 5. Odum received similar advice at the same time from University President Harry W. Chase. See Harry W. Chase to Odum, 26 September 1925, Odum Papers, Box 5. Writing from Dartmouth, John M. Mecklin expressed similar sentiments: "I realize that you men on the spot must 'walk circumspectly before the Lord.'" John M. Mecklin to Odum, 18 April 1925, Odum Papers, Box 5.

[57] On Morgan, see "Report on the University of Tennessee," 216. Day is cited in Upton Sinclair, The Goose-Step: A Study of American Education (Pasadena, CA: Published by the Author, 1923), 285. Other administrators took a more direct approach. Confronted with demands to remove books from the classroom, University of Florida's Murphree and Florida State President Edward Conradi refused to remove them completely, but agreed to restrict their use to faculty members and selected students by placing them in a locked recess of the library, where they would be accessible to those who "need to combat the evil propaganda now being broadcast over the country." Sellars, Femina Perfecta, 147.

[58] George W. Benton to Ellwood, 1 March 1926, Ellwood Papers, Box 2. On Benton's role in the censoring of Hunter's Civic Biology, the text that was at issue in the Scopes trial, see Adam R. Shapiro, Losing the Word: The Scopes Trial and the Evolution of Biblical Literalism (Ph.D. thesis, University of Chicago, 2007), 196-229.

[59] Emory S. Bogardus, Introduction to Sociology, Fourth Edition (Los Angeles, CA: Jesse Ray Miller, 1928), 62. See also another comment on Christianity: "In Christianity, also, religion finds intolerant, dogmatic, and vicious expressions; but at its best, it rises to greater social possibilities than any other religion. In this latter phase it is the vibrant religion of Jesus of which we are thinking rather than of formal Christianity." Ibid., 325. Neither of the statements are in the previous edition. Compare Emory S. Bogardus, Introduction to Sociology, Third Edition (Los Angeles: University of Southern California Press, 1922).

[60] Odum to Barnes, 7 March 1925, Odum Papers, Box 4. See also Odum to Frank H. Hankins, 13 March 1925, Odum Papers, Box 4.

[61] Odum to Hankins and Barnes, 21 September 1925, Odum Papers, Box 5. On Odum's editing, see Hankins to Odum 16 March 1925 and Hankins to Odum, 30 March 1925, Odum Papers, Box 4. In what may have been an attempt to avoid controversy, Barnes and Odum agreed at this time on a plan for reviewing only "the more scientific books." Odum to Barnes, 23 June 1925, Odum Papers, Box 5.

[62] Howard W. Odum, "Editorial Notes," Journal of Social Forces 1 (1922), 58. In what must have seemed like a veiled threat, the Reverend McCorkle advised Odum not to "indulge in any further complaints about the Fundamentalists…. As a friend of the University, I would urge, as I have done heretofore, that University publications ought to keep out of religious controversy. I feel sure this course will commend itself to your sense of propriety if you think about it long enough." McCorkle to Odum, 12 November 1925, Odum Papers, Box 6. On the removal of Barnes and Hankins, see Brazil, Howard W. Odum, 465.

[63] Odum to Barnes, 8 November 1925, Odum Papers, Box 6. Odum's actual request to Barnes was "to leave as many of the sex and religious books out as possible." Ibid.

[64] Charles A. Ellwood, "Intolerance," Papers and Proceedings of the Nineteenth Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Society 19 (1925), 2; 3; 4. See Richard Hall to James O. Whelchel, 29 December 1923, Ellwood Papers, Box 1.

[65] Read Bain, "Tends in American Sociological Theory," in George A. Lundberg, Read Bain, and Nels Anderson, eds., Trends in American Sociology (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1929), 112.

[66] Beale, Are American Teachers Free?, 221.

[67] See Ross, Origins of American Social Science, 390-470; Bannister, Sociology and Scientism, 3-11; 111-127; 144-160; and Hamilton Cravens, "The Abandonment of Evolutionary Social Theory in America: The Impact of Academic Professionalization Upon American Sociological Theory, 1890-1920," American Studies 12 (1971), 5-20.

[68] Norris, "Prof. Dow and Baylor University," 1.

[69] Norris, "Evolution is Now Taught in Baylor University," 2.

[70] Norris, "Take the Fight to the Common People," 2. On Bryan's views, see Bryan, "The Modern Arena," 3.

[71] William Bell Riley, Inspiration or Evolution (Cleveland, OH: Union Gospel Press, 1924), 71; 70. See also ibid., 71-77. "The argument of this text book," says Riley of Chapin's Social Evolution, "is another illustration made by one of our educators recently that an educated man can make any philosophy appear plausible. Plausibility is one thing; proof is another." Ibid., 77.

[72] On the influence of Boas, see Cravens, "Abandonment of Evolutionary Theory in America," 11-15. See also Herbert S. Lewis, "Boas, Darwin, Science and Anthropology," Current Anthropology 42 (2001), 381-394.

[73] Ellwood to Lofty, 3 January 1921, Ellwood Papers, Box 1.

[74] Coffman to John Talmage Bergen, 3 April 1923, Coffman Papers, Box 14. Reporting to UNC President Chase, North Carolina's Odum made the same case, assuring him that "not a single student on the campus" had ever read the Journal of Social Forces. Odum to Chase, 25 February 1925, Odum Papers, Box 4.

[75] On the censorship of biology texts at this time, see Judith V. Grabiner and Peter D. Miller, "Effects of the Scopes Trial," Science 185 (1974), 832-837; Gerald Skoog, "Topic of Evolution in Secondary School Biology Textbooks: 1900-1977," Science Education 63 (1979), 621-640; and for a different view, compare Ronald P. Ladouceur, "Ella Thea Smith

and the Lost History of American High School Biology Textbooks," Journal of the History of Biology 41 (2007), 435-471.

[76] Grove Samuel Dow, Society and Its Problems: An Introduction to the Principles of Sociology, Third ed. (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company Publishers, 1929), 304.

[77] Bogardus, Introduction to Sociology, Third Edition, 56; Bogardus, Introduction to Sociology, Fourth Edition, 62. In the Fourth edition, Bogardus describes evolution as a process best understood by thinking about how "the oak evolves from the acorn." Ibid.

[78] F. Stuart Chapin, Cultural Change (New York: The Century Co, 1928), 20. Compare F. Stuart Chapin, Introduction to the Study of Social Evolution: The Prehistoric Period (New York: The Century Co., 1913), esp. 3-101.

[79] Chapin, Cultural Change, frontispiece. Compare Chapin, Introduction to the Study of Social Evolution, frontispiece.

[80] Compare Charles A. Ellwood, Sociology in its Psychological Aspects (New York: D. Appleton, 1912), 133 ("human society rests upon instincts established by natural selection during the long prehuman stage of man's evolution") to his The Psychology of Human Society (New York: D. Appleton, 1925), 58 (where the sentence is revised to emphasize how the "peculiar endowments of man become the basis for a new type of social evolution"). Compare Edward Cary Hayes, Introduction to the Study of Sociology (New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1915), esp. 474-489 to Edward Cary Hayes, Sociology (New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1930), esp. 540-558. In addition to making spot changes (references to "natural selection" become "selection"), Hays adds new material to the 1930 edition distancing his work from earlier evolutionary theories: "We may look for similarities between social evolution and biological evolution. This analogy used to be emphasized a generation ago by most students of primitive societies. As used by them, it carried with it an assumption that the processes of social development are directly derived from or strictly comparable to the laws of biological evolution. That assumption is no longer accepted and at one time led to grave fallacies." Ibid., 542. Compare Wilson D. Wallis, An Introduction to Anthropology (New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1926), 10, where anthropoid apes are described as man's "nearest relations" to Wilson D. Wallis, Culture and Progress (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1930), 3, which replaces evolutionary theory with the concept of "culture development." In Wallis's 1930 re-titled revision, all of prehistory gets three pages, as opposed to ninety pages in the 1926 version.

[81] Maynard Shipley, The War on Modern Science: A Short History of the Fundamentalist Attacks on Evolution and Modernism (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1927), 157.

[82] Reuben, Making of the Modern University, 179-182. See also Ross, Origins of American Social Science, 390-393. A contemporary statement of scientism was Lundberg, Bain, and Anderson's Trends in American Sociology. "Especially we are pleased to note," wrote the editors, "that the dominant note throughout the book is its emphasis upon the fact that social phenomena are natural phenomena, that sociology is a natural science…. We believe that this is becoming the outstanding characteristic of American sociology." Lundberg, Bain, and Anderson, eds., Trends in American Sociology, xi-xii. The book, written to highlight to views of "the rising generation of sociology," was part of F. Stuart Chapin's Harper's Social Science Series.

[83] W. C. Curtis, "Presentation of the Doctrine of Evolution in the Social Sciences," Papers and Proceedings of the Seventeenth Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Society 17 (1922), 50.

[84] Coffman to A. J. Ziskovsky, 12 April 1923, Coffman Papers, Box 14.

[85] George A. Coe to Ellwood, 11 June 1922, Ellwood Papers, Box 1.

[86] Odum to Governor [A. W.] McLean, 10 March 1925; Odum to Thedore Patrick, Jr., 4 March 1925; Odum to D. V. Howell, 23 Febraury 1925, all in Odum Papers, Box 4. In a coordinated campaign, Odum made the same point in identical letters sent to sympathetic editors, ministers, and local leaders. See Odum to E. H. Davis, Herschell V. Rose, C. V. Tillett, Jr., Walter West, B. E. Phillips, J. L. Burgess, Charles E. Raynal, and Edgar C. Cooper, 23 February 1925, all in Odum Papers, Box 4.

[87] Harry Elmer Barnes to Howard Odum, 10 March 1925, Odum Papers, Box 4. Odum was not helped by the public comments of UNC Professor of Geology Collier Cobb, who reacted the flap at the Journal of Social Forces by declaring that the problem with social scientists was that they "are not scientific men—they know nothing at first hand of the natural sciences, zoology, botany, and geology. One said to me a few days ago that they were at least semi-scientific; and, if that is true, the other half is sheer nonsense." "Thinks We Take It to Seriously," Biblical Recorder (25 March 1925), 3.

[88] Odum to Barnes and Hankins, 5 October 1925, Odum Papers, Box 5. See Brazil, Howard W. Odum, 463-365. See also Odum to Hankins and Barnes, 21 September 1925, Odum Papers, Box 5. The changes in editorial policy are well documented. See Milligan, Contradictions of Public Service, 20; Brazil, "Social Forces and Sectional Self-Scrutiny," 97-98; Daniel J. Singal, The War Within: From Victorian to Modernist Thought in the South, 1919-1945 (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, l982), 128-29; and Michael O'Brien, The Idea of the American South, 1920-1941 (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1979), 46-47.

[89] Odum to Glenn R. Johnson, 18 March 1925, Papers of the North Carolina Conference for Social Service, Archives of the State of North Carolina, Raleigh, NC, cited in Brazil, Howard W. Odum, 441. On the importance of keeping "a good scientific poise," see Odum to Barnes and Hankins, 10 October 1925, Odum Papers, Box 5. On Odum's ambivalence about the application of approaches form the natural sciences to the social sciences, see Milligan, Contradictions of Public Service, 111-114.

[90] On the SSRC, see Smith, Social Science in the Crucible, 3-48. On conflicts within the organization, see Jordan, Machine-Age Ideology, 155-165. On the Rockefeller Foundation's desire to encourage the development of "a spirit of objectivity," see "Memorial Policy in Social Science, extracts from various memoranda and dockets October 1922 to July 1924," 21, Laura Spellman Memorial Archives, Series 3.06, Box 68, Rockefeller Archive Center, Sleepy Hollow, New York. See also A. F. Kuhlman, "The Social Science Research Council: Its Origin and Objects, Journal of Social Forces 6 (1928), 583-588.

[91] Odum to Charles E. Merriam, 19 June 1925, Odum Papers, Box 5. See also Odum to Guy Stanton Ford, 22 June 1925, Odum Papers, Box 5.

[92] Howard W. Odum, "Tentative Agenda, Dartmouth Conference, 8-24 to 9-5, 1925," 14, in Merriam Papers, Box 135A. Odum's report included no fewer than 268 proposed areas of study, ranging from climate, demography, and economics to "native wit and wisdom." Among his suggestions were studies of the wages and earnings of mill workers, vocational opportunities for women in rural and small communities, the development of labor unions, and child labor in cotton mills. For the reaction of those in attendance, see "Report of the Joint Conference of the Committee on Problems and Policy of the Social Science Research Council," 3 September 1925, LSRM, Series 3.06, Box 53, RAC. Copies of the report are also available in the Merriam and Odum Papers. For background see Brazil, Howard W. Odum, 455-459.

[93] On Odum's humiliation, see Odum to Merriam 7 October 1925, and Odum to Beardsley Ruml, 7 October 1925, Odum Papers, Box 5. More than twenty five years later he would still feel the sting: see Odum to Sydnor Walker, 25 August 1952, Odum Papers, Box 34. See also Milligan, Contradictions of Public Service, 134-138.

[94] Howard W. Odum, "The Duel to the Death," Journal of Social Forces 4 (1925), 189; 190; 189; 194. See also Brazil, Howard W. Odum, 460-462.

[95] See Burton J. Bledstein, The Culture of Professionalism: The Middle Class and the Development of Higher Education in America (New York: W. W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1976), 287-331.

[96] Julie Reuben has described the trend away from social science surveys. Yale University's introduction to the social sciences, introduced in 1925, was discontinued two years later. Even Chicago's freshman orientation course on "Man and Society," a model for such surveys, fell apart after a few years, the victim of increasing specialization and conflict between different disciplines. Reuben, Making of the Modern University, 205-206.

[97] On the role of the foundations in creating a "culture of professionalism," see Smith, Social Science in the Crucible, 22.

[98] See Reuben, Making of the Modern University, 193-201. See also Richard Hofstadter and Walter P. Metzger, The Development of Academic Freedom in the United States (New York: Columbia University Press, 1955).

[99] See Smith, Social Science in the Crucible, 3-5; Furner, Advocacy and Objectivity, 278-312; Haskell, Emergence of Professional Social Science,190-210; and Ross, Origins of American Social Science, esp. 393-400.

[100] William Jennings Bryan, "Darwinism in Public Schools," The Commoner (January 1923), 2. On his "hired man" theory, see Bryan, "The Modern Arena," 3.

[101] Freeman to Coffman, 6 April 1923, Coffman Papers, Box 14. For other antievolutionist views see "Have We a Right to Criticise Evolution?," Western Recorder (9 November 1922), 11, and "The Despotism of Scholarship," Gospel Witness (11 October 1923), 8-9.

[102] "Academic Freedom," Biblical Recorder (5 November 1924), 6. T. T. Martin put the case more bluntly: "'But you are persecuting us professors!,' "Ah! Sissie! You have played the high-brow long enough. Now stand up and take your medicine." T. T. Martin, Hell and the High Schools: Christ or Evolution Which? (Kansas City, MO: Western Baptist Publishing Company, 1923), 15. See also W. B. Riley, "The Question of Academic Freedom," Western Recorder (25 January 1923), 3-4, and "Academic Freedom," Baptist and Reflector (17 December 1925), 3.

[103] W. B. Riley, "Evolution: Shall We Tolerate Its Teaching," delivered at Kenwood Armory, Minneapolis, 7 March 1926, 22; 20; 25-26; 34, Coffman Papers, Box 14. He concluded the speech by asking the audience to stand with him to sing "My Country, "tis of thee." Ibid., 34.

[104] On the origins of the AAUP and the idea of academic freedom, see Hofstadter and Metzger, The Development of Academic Freedom, 468-506; Marsden, Soul of the American University, 292-316; Reuben, Making of the Modern University, 193-20. See also Matthew W. Franklin and Robert C. Post, For the Common Good: Principles of American Academic Freedom (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2009).

[105] Joseph V. Denny, "Presidential Address," Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors 10 (1924), 88. In an earlier letter to the Moderator of the Conference of Northern Baptist Churches, Denny had described antievolution as "an attack on manhood in teaching." J. V. Denney, "Freedom of Teaching in Science," Bulletin of American Association of University Professors 8 (1922), 66.

[106] Robinson's speech is reported in "Carbon from the Air Baffles Scientists," New York Times (28 February 1923).

[107] S. J. Holmes, "Report of Committee M, Freedom of Teaching in Science," Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors 11 (1925), 95; 94. A similar statement was issued by the Society for Science and the Public. See "Anti-Evolution Protest," The Science News-Letter 15 (1929), 13-14. On resolutions of the Association of American Colleges, see Marsden, Soul of the American University, 325.

[108] Ellwood to Hornell Hart, 7 January 1924, Ellwood Papers, Box 1.

[109] The report is cited in "Attacks Thompson for History Fight," New York Times (5 December 1927). See also "Prisons for the Mind," Nation (27 February 1924), 222.

[110] Charles E. Merriam, "Progress in Political Research," American Political Science Review 20 (1926), 3. Merriam commented on the implications of this fundamentalism for the study of political theory: "I have sometimes thought it would be worthwhile to write a history of political unreason, folly and prejudice, in order to balance sundry discourses on political theory, and to offset the possible conclusion from them that all political action is likely to follow the lines of thought indicated by the great masters of systematic political speculation." Ibid., 5.

[111] Ibid., 4. For a similar statement directed at both social scientists and philosophers, see also William Pepperell Montague, "The Social Sciences and Philosophy," in William Fielding Ogburn and Alexander Goldenweiser, eds., The Social Sciences and their Interrelations (Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1929), 479.

[112] Merriam to William Bennett Munro, 13 October 1926, Merriam Papers, Box 36. Here Merriam is agreeing with a statement of Fabian socialist Graham Wallas. See also Merriam's letter to his well-connected brother John, who at the time was president of the Carnegie Institution, suggesting that in establishing an educational campaign to defend evolution, "it might be very advantageous for you to talk to Mr. Hoover and Mr. George Barr Barker." Merriam to John Merriam, 10 July 1925, Merriam Papers, Box 35. At the time, Herbert Hoover was Secretary of Commerce. According to Merriam, Hoover advisor George Barr Baker "understands the art of publicity perhaps better than any one in the United States." Ibid.

[113] On the pressures to move from "applied" to "pure" research, see Smith, Social Science in the Crucible, 13-48; Jordan, Machine-Age Ideology, 129-154; and Reuben, Making of the Modern University, 176-210. See also Clarke Chambers, Seedtime of Reform: American Social Service and Social Action, 1918-1933 (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1963), 83-86.

[114] Ellwood to Hart, 7 January 1924, Ellwood Papers, Box 1.

[115] Ellwood to Hart, 13 May 1924; Hart to Ellwood, 7 May 1924, Ellwood Papers, Box 1. "Specifically," Hart wrote to Ellwood, taking a strongly objectivist position, "I should question whether a teacher of sociology ought to join the Ku Klux Klan or to join any organization opposed to that movement, whether he ought to be either pro- or anti- soviet, whether he ought to take any active advocacy of either side in any particular strike, and the like." Hart to Ellwood, 7 May 1924, Ellwood Papers, Box 1. See also Hart to Ellwood, 20 May 1924, Ellwood Papers, Box 1.

[116] See Hornell Hart, "Memorandum Submitted by the Chairman for Criticism by the Committee," n.d. [1924], Ellwood Papers, Box 10.

[117] "Report of the Proceedings of the Committee on the Teaching of Social Studies in the Schools," Papers and Proceedings of the Nineteenth Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Society 19 (1924), 213; 214.

[118] See Smith, Social Science in the Crucible, 27.

[119] Walter Lippmann, American Inquisitors: A Commentary on Dayton and Chicago (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1928), 111. For a discussion, see Marsden, Soul of the American University, 327-328.

[120] Ellwood, "Intolerance," 5.

[121] Charles Merriam to John Merriam, 10 July 1925, Merriam Papers, Box 35.

[122] Howard W. Odum, Man's Quest for Social Guidance: The Study of Social Problems (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1927), 563.

[123] Odum to R. Clyde White, 5 October 1926, Odum Papers, Box 8.

[124] See E. Doyle McCarthy and Robin Das, "American Sociology's Idea of Itself: A Review of the Textbook Literature from the Turn of the Century to the Present," History of Sociology 5 (1985), 21-43. The change was announced most forcefully in William F. Ogburn's 1929 presidential address to the American Sociological Society. "Sociology as a science is not interested in making the world a better place in which to live," observed Ogburn, "in encouraging beliefs, in spreading information, in dispensing news, in setting forth impressions of life, in leading the multitudes or in guiding the ship of state. Science in interested directly in one thing only, to wit, discovering new knowledge." William Fielding Ogburn, "The Folk-Ways of a Scientific Sociology," Scientific Monthly, 30 (1930), 300-301. See ibid., 300-306.

[125]Frank Hamilton Hankins, "The Contribution of Harry Elmer Barnes to Religious Knowledge and Discussion," in Arthur Goddard, ed., Harry Elmer Barnes, Learned Crusader: The New History in Action (Colorado Springs, CO: Ralph Myles, Publisher, Inc., 1968), 658. See ibid., 656-665.

[126] "Dr. Osborne Rebukes Barnes for Urging New Concept of God," New York Times (2 January 1929).

[127] quoted from the Cleveland Plain Dealer in Hankins, "The Contribution of Harry Elmer Barnes," 658.

[128] Alva W. Taylor, review of Harry Elmer Barnes, *Twilight of Christianity*, American Journal of Sociology 36 (1930), 489; 488. The following year Barnes resigned his academic position to pursue a career as a public lecturer and columnist for the Scripps-Howard news syndicate. See Clyde R. Miller, "Harry Elmer Barnes' Experience in Journalism," in Goddard, ed., Harry Elmer Barnes, 681-692.

[129] Joseph Lopreato, "From Social Evolutionism to Biocultural Evolutionism," Sociological Forum 5 (1990), 187-212. For an overview, see Heinz-Jürgen Niedenzu, Tamás Meleghy, and Peter Meyer, eds., The New Evolutionary Social Science: Human Nature, Social Behavior, and Social Change (Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers, 2008).

[130] O. E. Brown, "Preface," in Charles A. Ellwood, Man's Social Destiny in the Light of Science (Nashville, TN: Cokesbury Press, 1929), 8.

[131] Odum to Gerald Johnson, 14 September 1927, Odum Papers, Box 10. See Milligan, Contradictions of Public Service, 33-43; 60-63; 111-114.

[132] Emory S. Bogardus, A History of Social Thought, Second Edition (Los Angeles: Jesse Ray Miller, 1929), 657.

[133] Dorothy P. Gary, "The Developing Study of Culture," in Lundberg, Bain, and Anderson, eds., Trends in American Sociology, 211.

[134] Walter Lippmann, A Preface to Morals (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1929), 31.

[135] Still another consideration may have been the desire to avoid calling attention to their critics. As early as 1925, Howard Odum had advised one correspondent to forego plans for a study of the antievolution movement, not wanting to "give cheap publicity to this sort of thing." Odum to Mecklin, 21 April 1925, Odum Papers, Box 5.

[136] Hankins, "The Contribution of Harry Elmer Barnes," 656.

[137] Howard W. Odum, American Sociology: the Story of Sociology in the United States Through 1950 (New York: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1951), 187.

[138] William F. Ogburn, Social Change With Respect to Culture and Original Nature, new ed. (New York: Viking Press, 1950), 369.

[139] As one North Carolina creationist told anthropologist Christopher Toumey, "The homosexual gay rights movement is very evolutionary. The women's movement is very evolutionary. The civil rights movement is very evolutionary. All these things have their roots in evolution." Christopher P. Toumey, God's Own Scientists: Creationists in a Secular World (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1994), 203.

[140] See Nelkin, The Creation Controversy, 39-53; 57-70.

[141] See Christopher P. Toumey, "Evolution and Secular Humanism," Journal of the American Academy of Religion 61 (1993), 275-301. See also Lienesch, In the Beginning, 212-219.

[142] Center for the Renewal of Science and Culture, "The Wedge," (1998) at "The Wedge Document," National Center for Science Education 14 October 2008, http://ncse.com/creationism/general/wedge-document.

[143] McLeroy quoted in "Revisionaries: How a Group of Texas Conservatives Is Rewriting Your Kid's Textbooks," Washington Monthly, January/February 2010, http://www.washingtonmonthly.com//features/2010/1001.blake.html. See also James C. McKinley, Jr., "In Texas, a Line in the Curriculum Revives Evolution Debate," New York Times (21 January 2009) and "Texas Conservatives Win Curriculum Change" New York Times (12 March 2010).

[144] See Gary B. Nash, "The History Standards Controversy and Social History," Journal of Social History 29 (1995), 39-49.