

Historical Papers Communications historiques



Carl Dawson and the Research Ideal: The Evolution of a Canadian Sociologist

Marlene Shore

Volume 20, Number 1, 1985

Montréal 1985

URI: <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/030932ar>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7202/030932ar>

[See table of contents](#)

Publisher(s)

The Canadian Historical Association/La Société historique du Canada

ISSN

0068-8878 (print)

1712-9109 (digital)

[Explore this journal](#)

Cite this article

Shore, M. (1985). Carl Dawson and the Research Ideal: The Evolution of a Canadian Sociologist. *Historical Papers / Communications historiques*, 20(1), 45–73. <https://doi.org/10.7202/030932ar>

Article abstract

Carl Dawson's development as a sociologist reflected a general trend in sociology's evolution out of theology and social work. Trained as a minister, Dawson rejected the religious vocation at some point after World War I to become a social scientist. Appointed to McGill in 1922, he strove to establish research as the foundation for understanding society, questioning the efficacy of social reform. His convictions stemmed from his Maritime Baptist background, wartime experience and education at the University of Chicago.

In 1914, Dawson left the Maritime region where he had been born and raised to attend the divinity school of the University of Chicago. In so doing, he was following a well travelled route: poor economic conditions drove numerous people out of the Maritime provinces between 1910 and 1929, and the lack of doctoral programmes in Canada compelled many students to attend American graduate schools. With its strong reputation for research, the University of Chicago was a popular choice. Its divinity school, a Baptist stronghold, was attractive to adherents of that faith. That a number of its faculty members were Canadians also attested to the institutional ties that had long linked Baptists in Canada and the northern United States.

In 1918, Dawson recessed from graduate studies for war service and resumed his studies in 1919 - his interests now sharply turned towards sociology. This shift was partly influenced by the Chicago divinity school's close ties with the sociology department - a result of the historic link between the social gospel and sociology generally - but was also the product of the school's position as a leader in liberal and radical theological doctrine. The modernists within the institution stressed that all studies of society, including religion, must accord with modern empirical methods. That, in addition to their acceptance of the ideas of John Dewey and the Chicago School regarding social development, led some to the conclusion that religion itself was but a form of group behaviour.

In reflecting all those currents of thought, Dawson's Ph.D. thesis, "The Social Nature of Knowledge," hinted at the reasons for his departure from the ministry for a career in social science. Showing that all culture and knowledge, morals and ideals had social origins, Dawson concluded that even fact was not fixed truth but represented the decision of individuals to agree on certain points and issues. This explained why Dawson believed that research - a collection of facts - would aid in understanding society. The thesis was also marked by an opposition to social action, stemming from what Dawson had witnessed during the war and the upheaval which followed, but also, it must be argued, from the antiauthoritarian and antihierarchical strain in the Baptist faith. The fact that Dawson eschewed social action in much the same way as did Harold Innis, another Baptist educated at Chicago, suggests that there exists a tradition in the development of Canadian social science quite different from the one which Brian McKillop has traced in *A Disciplined Intelligence*, and it was that legacy which Dawson's brand of sociology represented.

Carl Dawson and the Research Ideal: The Evolution of a Canadian Sociologist*

MARLENE SHORE

Résumé

Carl Dawson's development as a sociologist reflected a general trend in sociology's evolution out of theology and social work. Trained as a minister, Dawson rejected the religious vocation at some point after World War I to become a social scientist. Appointed to McGill in 1922, he strove to establish research as the foundation for understanding society, questioning the efficacy of social reform. His convictions stemmed from his Maritime Baptist background, wartime experience and education at the University of Chicago.

In 1914, Dawson left the Maritime region where he had been born and raised to attend the divinity school of the University of Chicago. In so doing, he was following a well travelled route: poor economic conditions drove numerous people out of the Maritime provinces between 1910 and 1929, and the lack of doctoral programmes in Canada compelled many students to attend American graduate schools. With its strong reputation for research, the University of Chicago was a popular choice. Its divinity school, a Baptist stronghold, was attractive to adherents of that faith. That a number of its faculty members were Canadians also attested to the institutional ties that had long linked Baptists in Canada and the northern United States.

In 1918, Dawson recessed from graduate studies for war service and resumed his studies in 1919 — his interests now sharply turned towards sociology. This shift was partly influenced by the Chicago divinity school's close ties with the sociology department — a result of the historic link between the social gospel and sociology generally — but was also the product of the school's position as a leader in liberal and radical theological doctrine. The modernists within the institution stressed that all studies of society, including religion, must accord with modern empirical methods. That, in addition to their acceptance of the ideas of John Dewey and the Chicago School regarding social development, led some to the conclusion that religion itself was but a form of group behaviour.

In reflecting all those currents of thought, Dawson's Ph.D. thesis, "The Social Nature of Knowledge," hinted at the reasons for his departure from the ministry for a career in social science. Showing that all culture and knowledge, morals and ideals had social origins, Dawson concluded that even fact was not fixed truth but represented

*This paper is part of chapter III ("Carl Dawson and the Chicago School") of my University of Toronto doctoral thesis, "The Science of Society: Sociology at McGill University, 1918-1939" (1985). The research for the study was supported by a doctoral fellowship from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.

the decision of individuals to agree on certain points and issues. This explained why Dawson believed that research — a collection of facts — would aid in understanding society. The thesis was also marked by an opposition to social action, stemming from what Dawson had witnessed during the war and the upheaval which followed, but also, it must be argued, from the antiauthoritarian and antihierarchical strain in the Baptist faith. The fact that Dawson eschewed social action in much the same way as did Harold Innis, another Baptist educated at Chicago, suggests that there exists a tradition in the development of Canadian social science quite different from the one which Brian McKillop has traced in A Disciplined Intelligence, and it was that legacy which Dawson's brand of sociology represented.

* * * *

L'évolution de Carl Dawson en tant que sociologue reflète une tendance générale dans le développement de la sociologie à partir de la théologie et du travail social. D'abord ministre du culte, Dawson rejette sa vocation religieuse après la Première guerre mondiale pour devenir sociologue. Nommé à l'université McGill en 1922, il s'efforce d'établir la recherche comme base pour comprendre la société, mettant en doute l'efficacité des réformes sociales. Sa conviction provient de ses antécédents, baptiste des provinces Maritimes, l'expérience de la guerre et ses études à l'université de Chicago.

En 1914, Dawson quitte les maritimes, où il est né et a été éduqué, pour étudier à la Divinity School de l'Université de Chicago. Les conditions économiques forcèrent plusieurs personnes à quitter les provinces Maritimes entre 1910 et 1929, et le manque de programmes au niveau du doctorat au Canada obligea un grand nombre d'étudiants à aller poursuivre leurs études aux États-Unis. Grâce à sa bonne réputation, l'Université de Chicago était un choix populaire. Son école de théologie, une forteresse baptiste, était particulièrement intéressante pour les personnes de cette croyance. Plusieurs membres de la faculté étaient des canadiens, ce qui confirme les liens institutionnels entre les baptistes du Canada et ceux du nord des États-Unis.

En 1918, Dawson abandonne temporairement ses études pour faire son service militaire. Il retourne aux études en 1919, s'intéressant maintenant plus particulièrement à la sociologie. Ce changement de cap a été influencé par les liens étroits entre l'école de théologie et le département de sociologie de l'université de Chicago, résultant du lien historique entre l'évangélisme social et la sociologie en général, mais aussi de la position de l'école en tant que chef de file de la doctrine théologique libérale et radicale. Les modernistes de l'institution insistaient sur le fait que toute étude de la société, incluant la religion, devait se conformer aux méthodes empiriques modernes. Ceci, en plus de leur acceptation des idées de John Dewey et de la Chicago School à l'égard du développement social, a amené certains à conclure que la religion n'était elle-même qu'une autre forme de comportement de groupe.

En méditant sur tout ces courants de pensée, la thèse doctorale de Dawson, "The Social Nature of Knowledge", laisse entrevoir les raisons pour lesquelles celui-ci a quitté le culte pour faire carrière en science sociale. En montrant que la culture et la

connaissance ainsi que tous les idéaux et toutes les morales avaient des origines sociales, Dawson en arriva à la conclusion que même les faits n'étaient pas pure vérité mais résultaient plutôt de la décision de plusieurs personnes de s'entendre sur certaines questions. Ceci explique pourquoi Dawson croyait que la recherche, une cueillette de faits, pouvait aider à comprendre la société. Cette thèse était aussi marquée par son opposition à l'action sociale, découlant de ce dont Dawson avait été témoin pendant la guerre et du soulèvement qui s'ensuivit. Cependant, on peut également soutenir que cette position découlait de la tendance anti-autorité et anti-hiérarchique de la doctrine baptiste. Le fait que Dawson se soit éloigné de l'action sociale comme l'a fait Harold Innis, un autre baptiste ayant étudié à Chicago, laisse croire à l'existence, dans l'évolution des sciences sociales au Canada, d'une tradition bien différente de celle définie par Brian McKillop dans A Disciplined Intelligence. C'est cet héritage que représente l'approche de Dawson face à la sociologie.

In the United States, sociology evolved as a discipline out of theology and social work, becoming a distinct subject in the 1880s. The first course in the field was taught at the University of Kansas in 1889 but by the end of 1892, at least nineteen other institutions offered instruction in the area. Prime among them was the University of Chicago which, though newly established itself, could boast of having the first department of sociology in the world. The discipline's swift development in the United States during the late nineteenth century owed much to the increasing popularity of utilitarian education but its widespread acceptance was attributable to the social unrest which arose from the rapid urban and industrial growth of the period. Concerned with the nature of society and its problems and invoking Christian guidance and philanthropy, sociology appealed to a generation who witnessed the labour disturbances of the 1890s with alarm and worried about the effects of industrialization and urbanization.¹

Throughout the initial period of its existence, sociology maintained strong ties with social work, a situation facilitated by the fact that many social workers, particularly those who were involved in the settlement movement, took university degrees in sociology. Moreover, they heard the pioneer sociologists — Albion Small of the University of Chicago, Franklin Giddings of Columbia, Charles Cooley of the University of Michigan, and E.A. Ross of Stanford — emphasize the relationship between social work and sociology. All of these stressed that while each discipline was distinct, both dealt with human beings and their social relationships. Sociology was concerned with the laws and principles governing those relationships; social work provided the data to formulate and test the theories. When the process of specialization intensified and standards of research rose within the university in the early twentieth century, however, this alliance weakened. As sociologists began to criticize social workers for being too value-oriented and lacking in objectivity, social workers charged that sociologists were too theoretical and not sufficiently practical to deal with social problems.²

-
1. Fred Matthews, *Quest for an American Sociology* (Montreal and Toronto, 1977), pp. 90–2.
 2. Walter I. Trattner, *From Poor Law to Welfare State: A History of Social Welfare in America*, 2nd ed. (New York, 1979), pp. 194–5.

In Canada, sociology also developed out of theology and social work in response to the problems created by urbanization, though it did not gain status as an independent subject until a much later period — in some universities, not until the 1960s. The mistrust of specialization in Canadian institutions of higher learning and Canada's slower rate of urban and industrial growth did not give the discipline a fertile breeding ground. If sociology were offered at all, it tended to be taught in theological colleges or under the aegis of political science departments. McGill, however, was an exception. There, Carl Dawson was hired as an assistant professor of social science and director of the university's social work programme in 1922; by 1925, he had succeeded in establishing an independent department of sociology.

Dawson's appointment to McGill has been seen as portending the end for social work at that institution, the first step in a process which culminated with the closing of the school for social workers in 1931.³ This interpretation is not entirely correct, for social workers who trained under Dawson frequently commented that he gave them a sense of being involved in an emerging profession. Indeed, Dawson was instrumental in establishing the Canadian Conference on Social Work and the Canadian Association of Social Workers. Moreover, when McGill officials closed the department of social service in 1931 and forced it to operate independently, Dawson remained on its board of directors until it reintegrated with the university in 1945. The difference between Dawson's approach and that of his predecessor, Howard Falk, was that Dawson emphasized the primacy of research in gaining an understanding of social conditions and institutions in Canada. It was something he stressed from the very beginning of his tenure at McGill, not only to his students but also to the groups which had been instrumental in establishing McGill's social work programme. One of his earliest functions at McGill, for instance, was to address the Alumni Conference of the Presbyterian College of Montreal — the theological colleges affiliated to McGill had been major financial supporters of the social work programme. A former minister and a specialist in practical theology while a student at the University of Chicago, Dawson had lost interest in a religious vocation at some point after World War I. Yet, what he had to say to the Presbyterian College alumni in October 1922 struck a responsive chord. He asked his audience to remember that they were just as much members of a city as they were of a church. "Though we know that evil cannot ultimately prevail over the righteous," he proclaimed, "yet it is true that vice can vitiate the virtuous. It is our task not only to redeem man but to redeem the forces that will help men realize the best ends of life."⁴ While Dawson may have appeared to be invoking the social gospel, he was

-
3. See for example, Harry H. Hiller, "Paradigmatic Shifts, Indigenization, and the Development of Sociology in Canada," *Journal of the History of the Behavioural Sciences* 16 (July 1980), p. 266. A more extensive discussion of the McGill social work programme and the traditions and educational philosophy which shaped it can be found in Shore, "The Science of Society," chapter 2, "Social Service and the Origins of Sociology."
 4. C.A. Dawson's speech to the Alumni Conference of the Presbyterian College, Montreal, October 1922 on "The Church and Social Service," reported in the United Church Archives, "Synod of Montreal and Ottawa," *Presbyterian Witness*, 26 October 1922, p. 2.

actually advocating something more subtle than that. He did not think that social reform was the most effective means for improving social conditions; it was his belief that social research — the extensive investigation of urban and rural communities — would provide men and women with the insight to create a better society.⁵ He told Montreal social workers much the same thing, reiterating, shortly after his arrival at McGill, a complaint they had been making for some years regarding the expense of reform. To them, he held out the promise that research would make such measures unnecessary. "Reform and cure are costly," he said. "I wish we could develop such scientific understanding of life that it could be controlled and directed according to standards and ideals making [them] unnecessary. A resolute, patient, and extensive search for concrete and definite facts about Canadian communities is a fundamental need."⁶

When Dawson arrived at McGill, there was little understanding in Canada as to what social research entailed. Dawson was well aware of the problem: he complained that even those who supported the idea of social research tended to confuse it with "practical programmes for doing good." The social surveys and studies of crime, vice and delinquency with which Canadians had some familiarity, he noted, lacked depth, focused too much on the pathological, and were too closely connected with reform causes to constitute "an objective and scientific quest for facts." While he conceded that all research must eventually serve some useful purpose, he insisted that it could only be effective if it were carried out in detachment from practical ends. Work in the natural sciences, he asserted, demonstrated the value of research pursued for its own sake.⁷

Dawson spent many of his early years at McGill explaining what social research was, shifting the work in social service in that direction, and destroying the widely held assumption that sociology was a reformist discipline. He was, in this respect, more than the founder of modern sociology at McGill but one of a handful of Canadian academics who in the 1920s laid the foundation for the kind of investigation not taken seriously in Canada until the Great Depression, when governments turned to institutions of higher learning for assistance in dealing with the economic and social crisis.⁸ Unlike some of the academics who became members of the League for Social Reconstruction,

5. Carl Dawson, "Research and Social Action," *Social Welfare* 5 (February 1923), pp. 93–5.

6. *Ibid.*, p. 95.

7. C.A. Dawson, "Social Research in Canada," *Social Welfare* 9 (July 1927), p. 470.

8. Such literature as exists on the development of social science in Canada — Barry Ferguson and Doug Owrarn, "Social Scientists and Public Policy, 1920–1945," *Journal of Canadian Studies* 15 (Winter 1980–81), pp. 3–17; "Harold Innis: The Search for Limits," pp. 85–111; Carl Berger, *The Writing of Canadian History* (Toronto, 1976); Michiel Horn, "Academics in the Depression and the War Years," *Journal of Canadian Studies* 13 (Winter 1978–9), pp. 3–10 — tends to focus on the issue of academic involvement in (and opposition to) formulating public policy during the depression years, culminating in the Rowell–Sirois Commission. The depression is seen as the instrument which impels academics into that arena but there is no analysis of the origins of their convictions, nor of those who opposed political activism but still thought that social research could be an aid to solving the problems of the period.

however, Dawson opposed political activism even then, still adhering to the belief that solutions would emerge out of detached research and investigation. His ideas were rooted in his education, his early career in the ministry, and the years spent at the University of Chicago. An examination of those aspects of his life not only illustrates how Dawson's appointment to McGill reflected sociology's general pattern of development from theology and social work, but provides some insight into the origins of social science in Canada.

i

Carl Addington Dawson was born in 1887 in Augustine Cove, Prince Edward Island,⁹ then a small farming community consisting of about fifteen families.¹⁰ He was raised in a strongly religious home: his parents were devout Baptists,¹¹ and his great-grandfather, a Scotsman who had settled in Prince Edward Island in 1803, had been the first Methodist minister in the British North American colony.¹² Dawson's decision to enter the ministry was not an immediate one. After attending Prince of Wales College and the Normal School in Charlottetown, he taught for three years.¹³ He then enrolled in a bachelor of arts programme at Acadia College in Wolfville, Nova Scotia, where he took a few courses useful for a prospective minister — Bible study, which was compulsory for all first-year and sophomore students at that institution, sacred oratory, and theology.¹⁴ Why Dawson chose not to pursue a B.D. at Acadia is unclear. Part of the reason might have been that the Faculty of Theology offered an irregular course for the certificate: by the early 1920s, it had reportedly granted the divinity degree to no more than a dozen students.¹⁵ Nevertheless, upon his graduation in 1912, Dawson was sufficiently qualified to serve as pastor of a Baptist church in Lockeport, Nova Scotia. He remained there only until 1914 when he decided to pursue his theological education further at the School of Divinity of the University of Chicago.

Once in Chicago, Dawson did not devote all his time to academic pursuits.¹⁶ The university operated on a four-quarter system, enabling mature students to take their degrees part-time,¹⁷ and from 1915 to 1917 Dawson was an assistant pastor at

9. "C.A. Dawson," *Acadia Record*, n.d., p. 110.

10. Helen (Dawson) Strachan to D.W. Magill, 21 March 1979. I am extremely grateful to Professor Dennis Magill, Department of Sociology, University of Toronto, for allowing me to read and use his correspondence with C.A. Dawson's family, students, and colleagues especially since information on Dawson's personal background is sketchy: he apparently left no papers and the McGill University Archives has only an incomplete collection of sociology department papers.

11. Helen Strachan to M. Shore, 1 February 1981.

12. Strachan to Magill, 21 March 1979.

13. "The Citation for Professor Dawson," read at Convocation when Dawson received an honorary D.C.L. from Acadia University, 14 August 1956.

14. C.A. Dawson's B.A. transcript, Acadia University.

15. William S. Learned and Kenneth C.M. Sills, *Education in the Maritime Provinces of Canada* (New York, 1922), p. 22.

16. "Dawson," *Acadia Record*, p. 110; Strachan to Shore, 1 February 1981.

17. Matthews, *Quest for an American Sociology*, p. 38.

Englewood Baptist Church.¹⁸ In 1918 he recessed from graduate studies for war service, and as a member of the Canadian contingent of the YMCA Transatlantic Staff was in charge of organizing shipboard educational and recreational activities for the Europe-bound troops, as well as helping to transport some of the men back to Canada when the war was over. It was a job which entailed twelve crossings of the Atlantic.¹⁹ Dawson resumed his studies at the University of Chicago in 1919 but by then it was clear that his interests had veered sharply towards sociology. Chicago's strongly service-minded divinity school was, for reasons to be discussed below, closely tied to the department of sociology. Divinity students were permitted not only to enrol in an array of courses offered by that department,²⁰ but to take sociology as an elective for the B.D. and as the major subject for the doctorate.²¹ Dawson followed that option, and completed his B.D. in 1921 and Ph.D. in 1922, both with a concentration in sociology.²² Furthermore, while appointed a Fellow in Practical Theology for the academic session 1920–21, he chose to work as a teaching assistant in the department of sociology, and then as head of the sociology department at Chicago's YMCA College.²³ By the time he arrived at McGill, he no longer considered himself a minister, though he would always feel that his background had been valuable for his career as a sociologist.²⁴

Why Dawson turned from the ministry to sociology seems never to have been recorded, but it would seem logical to point to factors in his background similar to those of many of the pioneering sociologists who made the same decision. Like Dawson, many of the advocates of the new discipline — Small, Giddings, and Ernest Burgess — came from rural, pious homes.²⁵ Witnessing in the growing American cities of the late nineteenth century a social disintegration that conflicted with the values with which they had been raised, they turned their attention to the study of society.²⁶ Some championed reform or, wishing to build a sense of community in the urban setting, analyzed social institutions to find substitutes for those that had given

18. "Dawson," *Acadia Record*, p. 110.

19. *Ibid.*, p. 110; MUA (McGill University Archives), Acc. 641, Box 290, "Academic Record of Carl Addington Dawson;" John Dawson to D.W. Magill, 5 June 1979; Strachan to Shore, 1 February 1981.

20. University of Chicago, *Divinity School Announcements*, 1921, pp. 81–3.

21. Daniel Meyer (Archives Research Specialist, Special Collections, Joseph Regenstein Library, University of Chicago) to M. Shore, 28 October 1982; University of Chicago, *Divinity School Announcements*, 1921, pp. 81–3.

22. "The Citation for Professor Dawson;" Meyer to Shore, 28 October 1982.

23. MUA, Acc. 641, Box 290, "Academic Record of Carl Addington Dawson;" "Dawson," *Acadia Record*, p. 110.

24. Strachan to Shore, 1 February 1981.

25. Dorothy Ross, "The Development of the Social Sciences," in *The Organization of Knowledge in Modern America, 1860–1920*, eds. Alexandra Oleson and John Voss (Baltimore and London, 1979), p. 115.

26. *Ibid.*; Ellis W. Hawley, *The Great War and the Search for a Modern Order: A History of the American People and Their Institutions, 1917–1933* (New York, 1979), p. 150.

rural society its cohesiveness.²⁷ Dawson's rural upbringing left a similarly strong imprint on his pursuits. All his life he was an avid gardener: in Chicago, he kept a vegetable patch in the backyard of his Drexel Avenue home and grew pumpkins practically on the doorstep of the university. In Montreal, he prided himself on having the largest garden in his Victoria Street neighbourhood. When not away on field trips, he spent the summers swimming and fishing, and the winters skiing, in the Laurentians with his family.²⁸ His academic interest in rural sociology and in the development of social institutions in marginal areas of settlement reflected his enduring concern with rural life. Then, too, while he abandoned his commitment to the ministry, his advocacy of social research and the faith he placed in its results evinced an almost religious zeal. Anyone who knew Dawson at McGill marvelled at his tireless efforts to establish sociology as a scientific discipline, worthy of respect from the Canadian academic community. Several of his former students have remarked that the atmosphere of the sociology department in the early days was almost militant because of Dawson's insistence upon research and investigation.²⁹ Dawson was "like a man who received the call to expound the doctrine of sociology," S.D. Clark once commented. "He never wavered, no matter how hostile the reception, in his assertion of the claims of sociology." What bothered Clark, however, and turned him into a critic of his former supervisor, was that Dawson followed, as Clark put it, the "teachings" of the University of Chicago.³⁰

It is true that Dawson's theories regarding Canadian society were derived from Chicago sociology. The ideas and teachers with which he came into contact at the University of Chicago were indisputably strong factors contributing to his decision to become a sociologist. Moreover, at the time he became involved with Chicago's sociology department, efforts to make it scientific were intense and he took part in laying the groundwork for some of those approaches. It was not surprising that Dawson employed the same ideas in his work at McGill. While he never quite freed himself from the Chicago influence, it is not entirely correct to see the discipline he established as an American "import," as has so often been charged. McGill sociology grew out of traditions which differed from those that influenced the mainstream of Anglo-Canadian thought but it was a Canadian product nonetheless. The circumstances that impelled Dawson to Chicago, and to sociology, reveal that there are deeper connections between the University of Chicago and the development of at least one aspect of Canadian social science than have been recognized.

-
27. Ross, "Development of the Social Sciences," p. 115; Jean B. Quandt, *From the Small Town to the Great Community: The Social Thought of Progressive Intellectuals* (New Brunswick, N.J., 1970), pp. 1-3 and passim.
 28. Strachan to Shore, 1 February 1981.
 29. Oswald Hall to D.W. Magill, 27 February 1979, p. 5; Charles Young to D.W. Magill, 15 February 1979.
 30. S.D. Clark, "Sociology in Canada: an historical overview," *Canadian Journal of Sociology* 1 (Summer 1975), p. 227.

When Dawson departed for the United States in 1914, he was following a well-travelled route. The poor economic conditions which had always intermittently afflicted the Maritime provinces reached the peak of their intensity in the early twentieth century, and from 1910 to 1929 a steady stream of people left the region in search of better prospects to the south. During the same period, the lack of doctoral-level programmes in certain fields at Canadian universities compelled many students to attend graduate schools in the United States. Because of its strong reputation as a research centre, the University of Chicago was a popular choice for many of them, but the divinity school was particularly attractive to those of the Baptist faith. The University of Chicago was formally a Baptist institution: it had been founded in 1892 by the American Baptist Education Society with the assistance of a large endowment from John D. Rockefeller.³¹ Although the Baptists did not exercise a great deal of control over the university once it opened — as soon as sufficient operating funds were secured, it was given financial autonomy, no religious tests were imposed on faculty and students, and the first president, William Rainey Harper, ensured that interference in the curriculum was minimized³² — the divinity school was a Baptist stronghold and remained so until the middle of the twentieth century.³³ It was also an influential school, providing theological educators for many other Baptist seminaries. More significant in the context of this discussion was that it included a large number of Canadians. Four of them were Baptists, appointed to teaching positions after receiving their doctorates from the institution. They included Allan Hoben, a native of New Brunswick (who taught a sociology course on the rural church while Dawson was at Chicago); Shirley Jackson Case, another New Brunswicker who taught at the academy level in New Brunswick and New Hampshire before being appointed to Chicago; Archibald G. Baker, who was born in Ontario and educated at McMaster; and Charles T. Holman, who was born in England but did his preparatory collegiate work at McMaster. In addition to these men, several other Canadians who received their doctoral degrees from the University of Chicago taught at the Baptist-affiliated Rochester Theological Seminary and Crozer Theological Seminary.³⁴

The strong representation of Canadians within Chicago's divinity school reflected the institutional ties that linked Baptists in Canada and the northern United States: the University of Rochester and Rochester Theological Seminary were founded in 1850 partly with funds contributed by Baptists in Canada West, and the first Baptist institution of higher learning in the United States — the College of Rhode Island (Brown University) — was intended to serve members of the denomination on both sides of the

31. Richard J. Storr, *Harper's University. The Beginnings* (Chicago, 1966), pp. 9–10.

32. *Ibid.*, pp. 41–2.

33. Robert T. Handy, "The Influence of Canadians on Baptist Theological Education in the United States," *Foundations: A Baptist Journal of History and Theology* 23 (January–March 1980), p. 43.

34. *Ibid.*, p. 54.

border.³⁵ For cultural and historical reasons the bonds between Canadian and American Baptists were, however, strongest in the Maritimes. Many of the region's inhabitants were converted to the Baptist faith in the eighteenth and nineteenth century religious revivals that originated in the United States. Thereafter, the statements of faith adopted by the Maritime Baptist churches were based on American examples, and the educational institutions founded by members of the denomination in the nineteenth century were patterned on those in existence in the neighbouring American states: for example, Colby College in Maine, Albion Small's alma mater, providing the model for Acadia.³⁶

This deep influence persisted for many years. In 1921, two investigators commissioned by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching to survey educational conditions in the Maritimes, found that Acadia offered a better balance of instruction than all the other outlying institutions in the region, having separate chairs in economics, history, psychology, education and social service.³⁷ They commented, as some ten years later did Robert Falconer, president of the University of Toronto, that it was in that respect, highly influenced by American trends.³⁸ That Acadia had so strong an American character was understandable, given its origins. Most of the early settlers in western Nova Scotia came from Massachusetts and Connecticut and were primarily of the Baptist faith. Feeling themselves excluded from King's College in Windsor, which was founded on Church of England traditions, they petitioned for a charter to establish their own institution at Wolfville. In spite of strong opposition in the legislature, they were successful, and opened Horton Academy, a preparatory school, in 1829, and Acadia nine years later.³⁹ Throughout its history, moreover, Acadia maintained close relations with institutions of higher learning in the United States, particularly with Yale, which was only a short journey from Yarmouth, and with Harvard, where many prospective faculty members were encouraged to study.

Perhaps the strongest example of American influence at Acadia was the college's course offerings in the modern fields of political science and economic history. Throughout the 1890s, for instance, the course in economic history covered such topics as railroads, commerce, and bimetallism in the United States. (Bimetallism was

-
35. Withrop S. Hudson, "The Interrelationship of Baptists in Canada and the United States," *Foundations* 23 (January–March 1980), pp. 27–8.
 36. George Edward Levy, *The Baptists of the Maritime Provinces 1753–1946* (Saint John, 1946), pp. 103–5.
 37. Sills and Learned, *Education in the Maritime Provinces*, pp. 21–2. The authors also commented that "the educational institutions of the Maritime provinces cannot be understood apart from the denominational religious life which created them and still definitely fosters them." *Ibid.*, p. 14.
 38. Robert A. Falconer, "American Influences on the Higher Education of Canada," *Transactions and Proceedings of the Royal Society of Canada* 24 (1930), p. 26.
 39. Sills and Learned, *Education in the Maritime Provinces*, p. 21; Falconer, "American Influence," p. 26. On the beginnings and objectives involved in the opening of a Baptist institution, see Barry Moody, "The Maritime Baptists and Higher Education in the Nineteenth Century," *Repent and Believe: The Baptist Experience in Maritime Canada*, ed. Barry Moody (Hantsport, N.S., 1980), pp. 82–102.

dropped from the calendar description after 1898, however, obviously in response to the defeat of the Populist cause.) Acadia also offered instruction in sociology at a somewhat earlier date than most Canadian universities. In 1898, lectures on sociology and the ethics of citizenship comprised the course in moral philosophy; required reading included *The Ethical Import of Darwin* (1888), written by Jacob Gould Schurman, an Acadia graduate and political science instructor who went on to become president of Cornell University.⁴⁰ In 1900, however, sociology was offered as the honours course for seniors under the rubric of "Economic Science" — significantly, the same name Albion Small attached to it when he first taught the subject at Colby College. It was taught by John Freeman Tufts, a professor of history who had largely been responsible for introducing the modern subjects at Acadia after returning from a year's study at Harvard in 1874.⁴¹ While reflecting some of the traditional concerns of moral philosophy, the new course seemed to be more oriented to problems of a pressing nature: it examined social evolution, poverty, cooperation, socialist theory and contemporary socialism.⁴² During the years that Dawson attended Acadia, it was mandatory for senior students to take a half-course in both sociology and political economy. The subject matter of those combined courses continued to reflect a concern for contemporary problems, dealing with such issues as social tendencies, conditions of human progress, the function of reason and religion in the evolution of society, western civilization, modern socialism, labour organization, cooperation, profit-sharing, panics and depression.⁴³

Along with two other Baptist-affiliated institutions, Brandon and McMaster, Acadia was one of the first universities in Canada to include a form of sociology in its curriculum.⁴⁴ It probably took its lead from the American Baptist colleges for they were also among the first institutions in the United States to offer instruction in the field. While sociology emerged in response to the problems created by urbanization and industrialization as a subject in the United States during the late nineteenth century, its rapid acceptance into the college curriculum between 1890 and 1920 stemmed from the demands that urban reformers, settlement house workers and social gospel ministers placed upon institutions of higher learning to deal with those problems.⁴⁵ Because of their large endowments, private institutions could initially afford to resist such pressure but land-grant institutions,⁴⁶ and colleges affiliated with the Congregational, Baptist, Methodist Episcopal and Presbyterian denominations acted quickly to introduce courses in social science, social welfare and sociology.⁴⁷ Those denominations were

40. Acadia College, *Calendar, 1898-9*, p. 23.

41. D.C. Masters, *Protestant Church Colleges in Canada* (Toronto, 1966), pp. 130-1.

42. Acadia College, *Calendar, 1900-1*, p. 21.

43. Acadia College, *Calendar, 1910-11*, pp. 53-4; *Calendar, 1911-12*, p. 61.

44. V.A. Tomovic, "Sociology in Canada: An Analysis of its Growth in English Language Universities, 1908-1972," Ph.D. diss, University of Waterloo, 1975, pp. 85 and 89.

45. Hamilton Cravens, *The Triumph of Evolution: American Scientists and the Heredity-Environment Controversy, 1900-1940* (Philadelphia, 1978), pp. 123-4 and 135.

46. *Ibid.*, pp. 123-4.

47. Graham Morgan, "The Development of Sociology and the Social Gospel in America," *Sociological Analysis: A Journal in the Sociology of Religion* 30 (Spring 1969), p. 48.

the ones most influenced by the progressive religious ideas of the late nineteenth century, and the early implementation of sociology in their colleges illustrates how closely the discipline was linked to the rise of the social gospel.

That many of the pioneering sociologists were ministers or sons of ministers is only a partial explanation of the relationship that existed in the United States between sociology and the social gospel. More important was the fact that both sociologists and social gossellers formulated similar solutions to the problems of the late nineteenth century. Social gossellers placed great store in the socially applicable utterances of the Old Testament prophets and in the teachings of Jesus. They also adhered to an evolutionary view of history which included a belief in progress and in the immanence of God in the historical process. Like the early sociologists, they were convinced that through the social sciences they would be able to understand their society and perhaps create an improved social order. Moreover, both groups assumed that because man was a being shaped by social forces and customs, social conditions could be ameliorated through rational plans.⁴⁸ Their faith in that regard stemmed from the popularity of certain collective theories during that period: some people pointed to Herbert Spencer's depiction of society as an organism governed by the law of the survival of the fittest to justify the existence of poverty but for others there were such examples as Henry George's *Progress and Poverty* (1877) which utilized the same organic, evolutionary concepts to argue in favour of social reform.⁴⁹ Struck by the scale of hardship created by urbanization and industrialization, some religious leaders were convinced that sin, rather than being a product of an individual's shortcomings, was a condition forced upon him by his position in society.⁵⁰ They accordingly emphasized the need for churches to shift their attention away from individual salvation towards the improvement of social conditions. In the realm of social action, the majority of social gossellers advocated economic and social justice and the alleviation of distress in the cities, the areas where the greatest hardship existed. Some of their efforts were channelled into the settlement movement, where social gossellers worked hand-in-hand with sociologists for basically the same ends. The first generation of American sociologists may have regarded themselves as theoreticians but they were strongly interested in applying their findings in such a way as to ease the social crisis. That is why most sociology courses offered before World War I emphasized social problems and pathology.

The link between the social gospel and sociology in Canada has been traced, to some extent, by Brian McKillop in *A Disciplined Intelligence*. Focusing primarily on the Queen's tradition, McKillop illustrates that the social gospel as formulated by George M. Grant, John Watson, George Blewett and S.D. Chown, laid the foundations for social service. The "Queen's spirit" of the 1890s inspired numerous individuals — among them, Adam Shortt and O.D. Skelton — to become civil servants; it also influenced the ideas of Salem Bland, though he was radicalized later by what he saw

48. *Ibid.*, pp. 43, 45 and 51; Cravens, *Triumph of Evolution*, pp. 123–4 and 127.

49. See for example the discussion in E.R. Forbes, "Prohibition and the Social Gospel in Nova Scotia," *Acadiensis* 1 (Autumn 1971), p. 13.

50. Morgan, "Sociology and the Social Gospel," pp. 43 and 52.

in Winnipeg. It is McKillop's basic contention, however, that the gospel of active social service as developed by Grant was directed towards a spiritual end — moral elevation — and that Chown similarly hoped that the establishment of a systematic sociology would usher in the perfect moral state.⁵¹ This argument comprises part of his more general hypothesis about the nature of Canadian social theory — that it developed within the moral philosophy tradition as derived from Great Britain, and continued to reflect the influences of that tradition well into the twentieth century.

While McKillop's analysis holds a certain validity with regard to the development of sociology, it is based entirely upon an examination of the social gospel as advocated by Presbyterians and Methodists in central Canada, and does not take into account ideas expressed by other denominations in different parts of the country. Unfortunately, no comprehensive treatment of the Baptists' involvement in the social gospel exists, and the extent of their social concern is minimized in the general literature on the subject,⁵² but there is sufficient evidence to suggest that they also placed an increasing emphasis upon the social gospel as a solution to the economic and social problems of the late nineteenth century, and yet adhered to a different conception of it. In his examination of *The Canadian Baptist*, the official journal of the denomination, John Moir found that the Baptists displayed an awareness and sympathy for the social gospel as early as the 1880s but adopted a far more pragmatic and less idealistic view of it as an instrument for social reform, more like the Presbyterians than the Methodists. They thought of it, and frequently called it, "practical Christianity."⁵³ They talked about improving the social environment as a way of preventing the production of criminals; they advocated prison reform, sabbatarianism, prohibition and justice to native Canadians. They also argued for inner city missions, purity in politics, protection for children and women's rights.⁵⁴

In an article dealing with the prohibition movement in Nova Scotia, Ernest Forbes demonstrated the strength of the social gospel in the Maritimes — another aspect of the social gospel in Canada which has been overlooked. He found that the success of the prohibition movement in that region was attributable to the widespread acceptance of social gospel ideas: prohibitionists in Nova Scotia, he argued, were primarily motivated by a desire to eliminate the roots of human unhappiness and to create a society in which crime, disease, and social injustice no longer existed.⁵⁵ As proof he pointed

51. A.B. McKillop, *A Disciplined Intelligence: Critical Inquiry and Canadian Thought in the Victorian Era* (Montreal, 1979), pp. 217–20 and 226.

52. See for example Hudson's comments in "Interrelationships between Baptists," p. 38. Relative to their numbers, he argues, the Baptists played a major role in the social gospel. The Methodists were more prominent as leaders because they were more numerous but in proportion to their numbers, the Baptists do not seem to have lagged behind.

53. John S. Moir, "The Canadian Baptist and the Social Gospel Movement, 1879–1914," *Baptists in Canada: A Search for Identity Amidst Diversity*, ed. Jarold K. Zeman (Burlington, 1980), p. 147.

54. *Ibid.*, pp. 149 and 155.

55. Forbes, "Prohibition in Nova Scotia," pp. 11 and 14.

to the fact that the Maritime Synod of the Presbyterian church adopted the social gospel and prohibition simultaneously.⁵⁶ The Baptists similarly linked temperance and the social gospel: in 1903, the Temperance Committee of the Maritime Baptist Convention issued a report which viewed the temperance problem in social gospel terms. " 'Christ's mission,' it stated, was both 'to save souls' and 'to save society'. 'Christ was the greatest social reformer that the world has ever seen'."⁵⁷ Forbes attributed the rise of the social gospel in the Maritime region to the economic and social dislocations of the Laurier era. While that argument has some merit, it is also clear that the social conscience of the Maritime Baptists was also awakened by the contact of some of the younger ministers with exponents of the social gospel in American theological schools, as well as from the widely read writings of those same men. Walter Rauschenbusch of the Rochester Theological Seminary was perhaps the most important of those individuals but others included George Burman Foster (who taught at the University of Chicago), Washington Gladden, Franklin Giddings and Albion Small.⁵⁸

The argument could be made that with respect to their educational and religious ideas, the Maritime Baptists — and the Baptists of northern North America more generally — developed an intellectual tradition which differed from the one McKillop has traced, and it was that legacy which Dawson's brand of sociology reflected. He was a minister in the Maritimes at the height of its economic and social difficulties, at a time when interest in the social gospel was at its peak. It made a certain amount of sense for him to go to the University of Chicago. As his involvement in the YMCA and his appointment as a Fellow in Practical Theology indicate, he was interested in "practical Christianity," and Chicago was noted for its work in that area. It was also a prominent institution, where Canadians of his faith had been welcomed and had fared well. Unlike some of his countrymen, however, Dawson did not become an eminent theological educator. In the aftermath of World War I, he abandoned the ministry because of the inherent logic of some of the ideas he came into contact with at the University of Chicago. His transition to sociology is impossible to understand without tracing those ideas and the particular reasons for their development at that institution.

iii

In attending the divinity school of the University of Chicago, Dawson found himself at an institution which was at the forefront of change in theological doctrine. The northern branch of the American Baptist church produced many liberal and radical

56. Ibid., p. 16.

57. Quoted in *ibid.*, p. 17 from Maritime Baptist Convention, *Year Book*, 1903, p. 22.

58. Various pieces of evidence attest to the American influence on the Maritime Baptists. See for example Hudson, "Interrelationship between Baptists," pp. 32–3. In the early months of 1903, *The Canadian Baptist* was full of stories about the University of Chicago, including a front-page editorial on the university; in April of the same year, the principal speaker at McMaster commencement was William Rainey Harper, president of the University of Chicago. See also Levy, *Baptists of the Maritime Provinces*, pp. 298–9 and Tumovic, p. 89.

theologians, and their leadership was centered at the University of Chicago, where the major journal for the propagation of their ideas, *The Christian Oracle* (later renamed *The Christian Century*), was published.⁵⁹ Under the presidency of William Rainey Harper, a biblical scholar who encouraged a critical approach to the study of the scriptures, and the influence of the dean, Shailer Mathews, the divinity school had become, by the time Dawson arrived, a centre for liberal Christianity, higher criticism of the Bible and social service.⁶⁰ Prominent among the ranks of the more liberal faculty were the Canadian members and none was more influential than Shirley Jackson Case. Appointed in 1908, he went on to become an eminent social gospeller and the author of numerous books and articles, including *The Social Origins of Christianity* (1923). He also served as chairman of the department of church history, in which capacity he gathered around him a strong group of liberals, and was dean of the divinity school between 1933 and 1938.⁶¹

The emergence of the divinity school as a leader in progressive religious thought was inextricably bound up with the factors which shaped educational philosophy at the University of Chicago in general. From its very opening, the institution was dedicated to discovering social needs and solving social problems through research and investigation. For that reason, it developed not only a strongly service-minded divinity school but influential social science departments as well. The service ethos stemmed partly from the university's Baptist origins and from Harper's attempts to build a graduate school that combined scholarship with community service. It acquired even more importance because the university was situated in a booming metropolis which had a multitude of ethnic groups and suffered all the consequences of rapid industrialization and urbanization. Ironically, it had been Harper's intention to create an institution that was strong in the traditional areas but when he failed to attract established scholars in classics, semitics and philosophy, he hired men whose careers were just on the rise, in addition to some eighty department heads from various colleges. In the invigorating atmosphere of a new institution, that particular congregation of scholars would produce a very different kind of scholarship from what Harper had envisioned, but he tried during his presidency to combine the old and new learning in the service of religion.⁶²

Upon the tenth anniversary of its founding in 1903, the University of Chicago issued a series of publications explaining its work and philosophy in a number of fields. An article on practical theology contained the clearest statement of the theories and concerns which shaped the university's philosophy of service. It explained that the

59. Darnell Rucker, *The Chicago Pragmatists* (Minneapolis, 1969), pp. 113–4; William R. Hutchison, *The Modernist Impulse in American Protestantism* (Cambridge and London, 1976), pp. 114–5.

60. Rucker, *Chicago Pragmatists*, pp. 107 and 130; Mathews, *Quest for an American Sociology*, p. 89.

61. Handy, "The Influence of Canadians on Baptist Theological Education," pp. 43–5.

62. Much of the information on Chicago's educational philosophy is based upon Mathews, *Quest for an American Sociology*, pp. 88–9; Rucker, *Chicago Pragmatists*, p. 158; and Storr, *Harper's University*, p. 304.

object of practical theology was to formulate Christian truth in such a way as to emphasize its value for life. Accordingly, rather than dwelling on the archaeological, historical and speculative elements of Christianity, practical theology was dedicated to uncovering its spiritual meaning and applying it to the problems of life. The article indicated that approach was only partly necessitated by the pressing nature of contemporary social problems, however. The other major concern was to ensure that Christianity was aligned with scientific thought. In order to be genuinely scientific, the author insisted, practical Christianity must address itself to the present world, "not an outgrown cosmos." Only in that way, he continued, could the minister embody "the ripest conclusions of theological scholarship" in his preachings, and guarantee that practical Christianity "did not suffer the reproach of crudity and of failure to stand before the bar of scientific criticism."⁶³ The argument demonstrated the importance of science at Chicago, the way in which scientific investigation became an integral part of its educational philosophy and the conviction that seemed to be widely held at the institution, that only with the "ripest conclusions" of scientific research could the community be served. It also revealed the strength of modernist ideas within Chicago's divinity school.⁶⁴

Modernism was an international religious movement that developed in the late nineteenth century and attempted to reconcile historical Christianity with the findings of modern science. Although it could be argued that it comprised a set of ideas within liberal Protestantism, its implications were potentially more damaging to religious faith. Liberal theology expressed a general humanistic optimism about the world: it emphasized the presence of God in nature and in human nature and stressed the universal religious sentiments in the scriptures. Modernism stressed the immanent rather than the transcendent nature of God and held that human society was moving towards the realization of God's kingdom. In that regard, its tenets not only gave a certain legitimacy to the analyses of society and culture on the part of theologians, but required that the study of religion accord with modern empirical methods.

Modernist ideas were accepted, at least in part, by the Baptist, Congregational, Presbyterian and Methodist Episcopal denominations in the United States but nowhere during the early twentieth century was the empirical approach to the study of religion more popular than at the University of Chicago.⁶⁵ The presence within the divinity school of such eminent modernist scholars as Shailer Mathews and George Burman Foster only partly explained the importance which modernist theories acquired at Chicago.⁶⁶ More integral were the ideas that the divinity school and social science

63. Gerald Birney Smith, "Practical Theology: A Neglected Field of Theological Education," in *The Decennial Publications of the University of Chicago* (1903), p. 86.

64. Hutchison, *Modernist Impulse*, pp. 4–6.

65. Rucker, *The Chicago Pragmatists*, p. 131.

66. Hutchison, *Modernist Impulse*, pp. 277–8. In 1924, Shailer Mathews published his *Faith of Modernism* in which he argued that modernism was the determination to use scientific, historical, and social methods to understand and apply evangelical Christianity to the needs of human beings; see Rucker, *Chicago Pragmatists*, p. 131.

departments shared regarding the development of human society, culture, and morals.⁶⁷ In 1927, J. Davidson Ketchum, a University of Toronto psychologist, visited the University of Chicago in the hope of finding in the social science departments ideas he could employ back in Toronto. He was impressed by much of what he saw — the trip, he said, marked his “conversion” to the sociological point of view — but what particularly struck him was the large degree of cooperation and mutual interest that existed among the social scientists. Each department went its own way, he noted, but there was a strong feeling among all the faculty that they were attacking social problems as a group and could count on as much assistance as any of their colleagues were able to render in solving social problems. “Whether this is to be put down,” he commented, “to the general ‘social’ influence or to the beneficent influence of the Baptist faith, I do not know.”⁶⁸

The “social influence” to which Ketchum referred was the cluster of ideas regarding human psychology that members of the Chicago philosophy department had been formulating since 1894. So adaptable were their theories to the study of society, and so in keeping with the science and service philosophy of the university, that they were influential in several departments and were branded “the Chicago school.” Although the term applied to the work of numerous academics in philosophy, political science, economics, sociology and divinity, the nucleus of the Chicago school consisted of John Dewey, who came to the University of Chicago in 1894 as head of the department of philosophy, his former University of Michigan colleagues, George Herbert Mead, James Hayden Tufts and James Rowland Angell, and Edward Scribner Ames, a theology student who received the first Ph.D. from Chicago’s philosophy department.⁶⁹ Their ideas constituted part of the revolt against formalism which became prevalent in American intellectual life in the late nineteenth century, particularly among academics battling against entrenched humanistic studies and the dominance of the patrician universities on the eastern seaboard. In contrast to the old physiological psychology which had argued that mental life had a material basis in the nervous system and the brain and that the human mind was a fixed structure which arrived at truth through logic or intuition, the Chicago philosophers upheld a theory of mental development that implied, first of all, constant change, and secondly, that there was no distinction between mind and material things. They argued that mind and society were two factors in a process and that both constantly evolved in conjunction with one another towards ends that were neither fixed nor absolute but ever-changing.⁷⁰ Although a form of pragmatism, they preferred to label their philosophy “functionalism”

67. Rucker, *Chicago Pragmatists*, pp. 131 and 159.

68. University of Toronto Archives, Acc. A-66-003, Office of the President (Robert Falconer Papers), J. Davidson Ketchum, “Journal and Impressions of a Visit to Chicago,” October 1927, p. 14.

69. Rucker, *Chicago Pragmatists*, p. 4.

70. *Ibid.*, p. 28; see also the discussion on “the revolt against formalism” in Eric Goldman, *Rendezvous with Destiny* (New York, 1955), p. 120 and Cravens, *Triumph of Evolution*, p. 7.

or “instrumentalism,” in the belief that such terms more adequately conveyed the sense of activity or process that was so integral to their theories.⁷¹

The Chicago philosophers derived their ideas regarding evolutionary and organic change from Darwin, and they regarded themselves as his true intellectual heirs. It was well known, John Dewey proclaimed in an essay, “The Influence of Darwin on Philosophy” (1910), that publication of *The Origin of Species* marked an epoch in the development of the natural sciences. It also embodied an intellectual revolt, he went on to argue, by introducing the phenomenon of transition into life. Dewey explained that the idea of movement or change had been accepted in the physical sciences ever since the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries owing to the work of Newton, Galileo, Copernicus, and Kepler. But in the natural sciences, species continued to be regarded as a fixed and final form until Darwin undercut that argument. In doing so, Dewey contended, Darwin allowed the philosophy of fixity as it applied to human life and philosophy to be questioned.⁷²

Although other philosophical schools accepted Darwinian concepts of evolutionary change, they did not carry them to the same conclusions as did members of the Chicago school. Some American and British idealists adopted pragmatic concepts but still insisted that there was a fixed absolute which was distinct from the activities of life.⁷³ William James, for example, employed the idea of process to attack philosophies of fixity but did not go as far as Dewey and his followers,⁷⁴ to argue that man was himself capable of changing the world for the better. Dewey believed that the inherent logic of Darwinian knowledge introduced *responsibility* into intellectual life.⁷⁵ “If all organic adaptations are due simply to constant variation and the elimination of those variations which are harmful in the struggle for existence that is brought about by excessive reproduction,” he once said, “there is no call for a prior intelligent causal force to plan and preordain them.”⁷⁶ Since there was no higher order which planned and preordained things, Dewey concluded, and ends were always subject to change, then it was possible for men and women to manipulate their environment to meet their needs.

The inherent logic of the Chicago school of philosophy demanded a new approach to the study of society and culture: its organic and evolutionary precepts required that society be seen as an organism whose members were socially constituted, not as a collection of individuals who were somehow externally connected. The individual primarily responsible for working out these ideas was George Herbert Mead, a social

71. Rucker, *Chicago Pragmatists*, p. 5.

72. John Dewey, *The Influence of Darwin on Philosophy and Other Essays in Contemporary Thought* (New York, 1910), pp. 1–11.

73. Rucker, *Chicago Pragmatists*, p. 28.

74. Goldman, *Rendezvous with Destiny*, pp. 122–3.

75. Dewey, *Influence of Darwin*, p. 17.

76. *Ibid.*, p. 11–2.

psychologist who greatly influenced the sociologists.⁷⁷ Mead explained that the behaviour of an individual could be understood in terms of the social group of which he was a member, and therefore moral ideas similarly developed out of a social matrix. Morals and ideals, he insisted, were not imposed from some external source by man or God but were responses to problems and their particular circumstances. Whether religious, aesthetic or political, they were erected by man as objectives, considered valuable to invoke in the hopes that by acting upon them, more promising circumstances might come about — but that was all.⁷⁸ “Democracy is preserved in the form of our political institutions,” he pointed out, “though it is never achieved. . . . The religious goal of the brotherhood of man is maintained in our churches full in the face of man’s inhumanity to man.”⁷⁹

As this statement revealed, the Chicago philosophers acknowledged the role that religion played as the bearer of certain principles. But apart from that, they were reluctant to deal with it: religious doctrine and culture were too close to ways of thinking from which they were trying to dissociate themselves, it has been argued, to permit them to examine it intensively.⁸⁰ Nevertheless, in his annual course on the psychology of religion, and in his book, *The Psychology of Religious Experience*, published in 1910, Edward Scribner Ames formulated a set of arguments to explain religion’s social origins and functional purposes. He explained that religion was related to the evolutionary life process and that it grew out of the social development of a people and constituted one of the ways in which they adapted themselves to their environment and their environment to themselves. It was the primary means by which they promoted their highest ideals and attempted to make their lives richer. As such, he argued, religion should be analyzed as representing the most important group interests of a particular time.⁸¹

In a book outlining the contribution which the Chicago school had made to social thought, Ellsworth Farris once commented that Ames’ work, which dealt with the social character of religious behaviour, “added a strong structure to the tower of the temple.” Farris noted that “when religion is defined as the consciousness of the highest social values, there is made possible a study of religious experience through social psychology that was not previously available.”⁸² Such advances in social psychology also explained modernism’s efflorescence at Chicago. The theories of the Chicago philosophers, especially their conviction that there were no fixed or absolute ideals, accorded

77. Rucker, *Chicago Pragmatists*, p. 29.

78. *Ibid.*, pp. 43–4.

79. Quoted in *ibid.*, p. 44.

80. *Ibid.*, pp. 50–1.

81. *Ibid.*, p. 51 and Hutchison, *Modernist Impulse*, pp. 107–8, 109 and 111. Hutchison points out that another Chicago philosopher, Frederick G. Henke, explained in his *The Psychology of Ritualism* that the functional view of religion attempted to relate it to the total life process. It represented the way in which man adapted himself to his environment; *ibid.*, p. 110.

82. Ellsworth Farris quoted in Rucker, *Chicago Pragmatists*, pp. 137–8.

with the desire of modernists to shift their attention away from the doctrinal aspects of Christianity to study its cultural origins and purposes from the standpoint of modern empirical methods.

The strength of modernism and social psychology at the University of Chicago were to influence C.A. Dawson's attitude towards religion profoundly. While never rejecting religion outright, he came to believe that research, which allowed one to see behind the values that particular societies held dear at certain times, presented the best possibility for social improvement. His faith that research would provide man with the potential to realize his highest ideals was inherent in the Chicago philosophy: as we have seen, one of its basic tenets was that it was possible for man to understand and change the world. "The world men strive to know and to bring under their control is no longer an array of indeterminate objects outside the minds of men, towards whose external order men's ideas move by accident or magic," John Dewey once said. "The world, as known, is a product of knowing activity. That activity moves forward to meet new problems raised by data, and the world as known changes."⁸³ It was that precept which led Dewey to conclude, and others (including C.A. Dawson) to concur, that philosophy could be used for reformist ends. "Philosophy must in time become a method of locating and interpreting the more serious conflicts that occur in life, and a method of projecting ways for dealing with them," Dewey argued, "— a method of moral and political diagnosis and prognosis."⁸⁴

iv

The University of Chicago had been founded in a decade when admiration for German *Wissenschaft* — the emphasis upon research and investigation rather than teaching — was at its height in the United States.⁸⁵ Throughout the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, most scientific departments at the university were dedicated to research and investigation. The central preoccupation of Chicago philosophy with ascertaining the origin and function of certain social beliefs made the research orientation equally popular in a variety of nonscientific fields. This was the atmosphere which Dawson encountered when he first arrived at Chicago in 1914 and, when he returned after fulfilling his wartime duties, the research emphasis was even stronger. The war had generated a great deal of support for nationally approved scientific research, and in the postwar decade, private and public funds continued to pour into institutes supporting scientific endeavours.⁸⁶ In some quarters, the unrest and turmoil caused by the war led many people to question whether "action" was the most efficacious method for dealing with social problems: the managerial revolution of the prewar years had been channelled into wartime management, and a number of academics thought the same efficiency techniques could be successfully employed to achieve social progress during

83. Dewey, *Influence of Darwin*, p. 17.

84. *Ibid.*

85. Ross, "Development of the Social Sciences," p. 114.

86. Hawley, *Search for a Modern Order*, p. 156.

peacetime.⁸⁷ For those reasons, not to mention their desire to divert some of the wealth and attention away from the sciences and towards themselves, social theorists were all the more determined to make their disciplines scientific in the postwar years in order to prove that they could halt social fragmentation by means of scientific investigation. Therefore, along with engineers, social workers and scientists, they strove to make their own activities more productive; they undertook team investigations and publicized their findings, hoping that they would be noticed by governmental agencies and institutions.⁸⁸

When Dawson became involved with the University of Chicago's sociology department, its members were beginning to lay the groundwork for such scientific endeavours. Indeed, in 1921 Robert Park wrote that sociology was just being transformed from a philosophy of history into a science of society by entering into a period of research and investigation.⁸⁹ Although Albion Small and Charles Henderson, the pioneers of the department, had been advocates of research, they had been too preoccupied with promoting the discipline to do much in the way of specialized research themselves. Then, too, they had seen sociology as an instrument for social reform, and while they argued that the success of reform measures depended upon the availability of reliable scientific knowledge, they were still basically concerned with applied sociology and with the construction of a more cooperative society.⁹⁰ Albion Small had worked closely with Shailer Mathews and had been impressed by the work of the Chicago philosophers. He had found Dewey's educational and social theories particularly useful for the study of society, and published a few articles with the leading light of the Chicago school. But it was primarily the second generation of Chicago sociologists — William Thomas, Robert Park, Ellsworth Faris, and Ernest Burgess (a native of Tilbury, Ontario) — who developed a research orientation for the discipline and a theoretical framework that differentiated it from the other social sciences. Thomas had studied under Dewey and Mead, and his book on Polish peasants set out an approach for immigration studies that dominated Chicago sociology for some years. Park, on the other hand, was responsible for creating the research programme which the department followed throughout the 1920s. Taking up a suggestion that Small had made prior to World War I, he decided that Chicago should be used as an area for investigation.⁹¹ Prior to his appointment to Chicago, however, Park had worked as a journalist. Witnessing at first hand how social surveys and investigations had failed, either because they were too concerned with social problems or too influenced by practical ends, he told his students that they could not be activists or crusaders. Moral and political commitments, he warned them, would make them incapable of empathizing with all kinds and conditions of men.⁹²

87. Ibid., pp. 6, 226 and 229.

88. Ibid., pp. 157–8.

89. Matthews, *Quest for an American Sociology*, p. 103.

90. Cravens, *Triumph of Evolution*, pp. 123–4.

91. Matthews, *Quest for an American Sociology*, pp. 101 and 104, and in greater detail in Chapter 5, "The City as Symbol."

92. Ibid., pp. 103–4.

C.A. Dawson was intimately connected with the efforts of Park and his colleagues to work out a new approach for sociology. He belonged to the Community Studies Executive Committee, an organization formed at Park's suggestion to map out plans and ideas for urban research. Dawson was also a teaching assistant in the introductory sociology course where Burgess and Park first formulated the theories presented in their influential textbook, published in 1921. Finally, both at Chicago and the YMCA College, he taught a course on social research and the collection of data.⁹³

While not an example of urban research but a theoretical study, Dawson's Ph.D. dissertation, "The Social Nature of Knowledge" (1922), revealed how strongly Park's theories had come to influence his way of thinking. It opened with a paen to the Chicago school. Whereas eighteenth-century writers had depicted the individual "much more atomistically than present-day scientists treat the atom," Dawson said, the Chicago school and its followers recognized that man was not "a self-centred, self-contained unit, . . . the supreme architect of his own fortune and master of his own destiny." Industrial development, and the problems of social control occasioned by those advances, had given rise to the idea that human nature was a social product and that, in turn, stimulated a new interest in the social aspect of mental life. "It is now seriously considered," he attested, "that there would be no individual mind if it were not for social contact and interaction."⁹⁴ Then, in a discussion which ranged over politics, art, literature and religion, Dawson demonstrated that all culture and knowledge, morals and ideals, had social origins. He thereby laid the foundation for the crowning argument of his thesis, that even fact could not be regarded as apriori or fixed truth but, like everything else, stemmed from the common experiences of individuals who constituted a group or a society. Adopting his typology largely from Emile Durkheim's work on collective representation, Dawson explained that in a process which started with collective excitement and evolved into symbolic representation, facts represented nothing more than the decision of individuals to agree on certain points and issues. Carried to its logical conclusion, his argument implied that by undertaking research, itself a collection of "facts," it was possible to ascertain why a group of people behaved the way they did and, armed with such understanding, to help them realize their ideals.

In accepting the basic premises of Chicago philosophy, Dawson was compelled to dismiss any notions he might have had that religion was revealed to man by some divine authority. By the time he published his sociology textbook in 1929, he was quite forthright about religion's social origins and purposes. Religion, he said, was simply a form of behaviour born of insecurity: "Confronted by natural phenomena of a startling nature — life, death, the enigma of a future after death, defeat — or anything that inspired in him fear of the unknown," man "searched his environment for an answer to the problem and erected an ideal which, for the time being, was beyond the

93. Robert E.L. Faris, *Chicago Sociology 1920–32* (San Francisco, 1967), pp. 32 and 80; MUA, Acc. 641, Box 290, Gordon Laing to Sir Arthur Currie, 10 July 1922.

94. C.A. Dawson, "The Social Nature of Knowledge," Ph.D. diss., University of Chicago, 1922, pp. 1–2.

verification of science."⁹⁵ That ideal elevated the level of human conduct by giving man something to aspire towards; it also acted as an effective instrument for social control, but it was nothing more. As far as religious practice was concerned, it was to Dawson's way of thinking just another form of social behaviour. "Man was born into a worshipping community just as truly as he was born into a farming or industrial community," Dawson said. There was, then, no real difference between evangelical religions and those that were more orthodox. One might emphasize intense and individualistic religious expression, the other was more concerned with ritual, but both required conformity to an accepted pattern of behaviour.⁹⁶

In his thesis, Dawson similarly dealt with religion's social origins but focused primarily on the concept of inspiration and revelation. As far back as the 1860s Horace Bushnell, a Unitarian, had contended that, because it was obsessed with conversion, American evangelicalism had underestimated the role played by education and socialization in shaping religious behaviour; as part of their desire to treat religion scientifically, some modernists had been equally critical of revelation.⁹⁷ Dawson not only agreed with their convictions but argued that the entire notion of original inspiration was fallacious. He insisted that inspiration, whether religious, literary or artistic in nature, merely arose from the social rituals, attitudes and sentiments of the group in which the "gifted" individual was a member. "No man gets inspired with any very original conception," he said. "The voices that speak to him, the visions he sees, get their form and content very largely from the community about him."⁹⁸ Sensitive to life about him, stirred by the defeats and futilities of others, an inspired person simply puts himself in "a highly emotional and suggestible mental state by brooding over them in isolation." When he voices his ideas, he is sometimes regarded as a prophet revealing the proclamations of the unseen and the eternal, but in fact is merely prophesying what is already in the popular consciousness in inarticulate form — the hopes and fears of other people.⁹⁹ That conviction necessarily carried Dawson to the conclusion that religious inspiration, possession and spiritualism were all the same thing. All were products of group life. Whether they assumed a divine or diabolical form simply depended upon the temper of the time in which an individual lived, for that was what determined the sentiments that emerged in his character.¹⁰⁰ In the Middle Ages, Dawson explained, people were highly influenced by the conventionalized terms, God, Spirit and Devil, but because so many ordinary human motives were repressed and attributed to Satan, conditions were ripe for "the contagious phenomenon of diabolical possession."¹⁰¹

95. C.A. Dawson and W.E. Gettys, *Introduction to Sociology* (New York, 1929), p. 696.

96. *Ibid.*

97. Hutchison, *Modernist Impulse*, p. 104.

98. Dawson, "Social Nature of Knowledge," p. 65.

99. *Ibid.*, p. 65.

100. *Ibid.*, p. 62.

101. *Ibid.*, p. 63.

Dawson saw an inherent danger in all spiritual and inspirational phenomena. Their very "impersonality" — the belief that they stemmed from some supernatural source — could lead to tyranny. He explained that when in the throes of diabolical possession or religious ecstasy, people were controlled and directed by an urgency so novel that they did not attribute it to their own personal capacities. They believed that they were being driven into strange missions by alien powers.¹⁰² As the contagion spread, others yielded to it, and were often drawn into the vortex against their wills.¹⁰³ "However sophisticated," Dawson said, "we have all had some feel of it in movements of great collective emotion. 'Seizure by the war spirit,' is a modern personalization of collective excitement on a large scale and few escaped during the Great War. They were ushered into a strange and compelling experience."¹⁰⁴

It was particularly in the allusion to war hysteria that "The Social Nature of Knowledge" revealed Dawson's reasons for departing from the ministry to pursue a career in social science. His decision was obviously prompted by something more than just the influence of the modernists and social psychologists. Underlying his negative attitude towards social action is a war-weariness and a fear that collective action will lead to tyranny and violence. Because of what he witnessed during the war and the upheaval which followed, Dawson probably found Chicago philosophy appealing: it suggested that social progress was inherent in the evolutionary process and simply had to be nurtured through rational observation and investigation.

For Dawson, the war presented the starkest example of how people could be swept up in a tide of emotion to participate in something of which they had little understanding. It was an argument which he and his McGill colleague, Warner Gettys, elaborated more fully in *An Introduction to Sociology*. Believing that war was ineffective and utterly wasteful, they nevertheless pointed to the commonly held view that it was a biological necessity and political inevitability. The problem, as they saw it, was that the literature on war was voluminous and stories relating to the glory of battle were entrenched in many cultures.¹⁰⁵ In addition, there were the powerful rituals and dogmas of war: an emphasis on military training that had turned into national fetishes; propaganda, bogies and alarms which endowed militarism with all the fervour of a religious cult; and patriotic organizations which aroused people's fears by taking up and popularizing myths, legends, slogans and symbols of patriotism, hymns of national sentiment and hymns of hate. "In modern times," Dawson and Gettys argued, "The war cult has become a way of escape from the morbid subjectivism of everyday life. People find release and satisfaction in the pomp, splendour and parade of militarism and thrill and adventure in time of war."¹⁰⁶ The antidote, as Dawson and Gettys presented it, was to probe beneath "the superficial romance" of war and discover its causes. The roots of

102. Ibid., pp. 57, 64 and 69.

103. Ibid., p. 58; Dawson and Gettys, *Introduction to Sociology*, p. 774.

104. Dawson, "Social Nature of Knowledge," p. 60.

105. Dawson and Gettys, *Introduction to Sociology*, pp. 328–9.

106. Ibid., p. 341.

war, they contended, stemmed from institutions and customs of long standing, personalities, international intrigue and hatreds, the breakdown of inhibitions, economic tensions and population pressure.¹⁰⁷

Despite his negative comments about collective excitement, Dawson was not entirely critical of crowd behaviour; he could not be if he believed that man was essentially a social being. He merely wanted to demonstrate that knowledge could develop out of a crowd that *thought* rather than one that acted. In that respect, his arguments were an extension of Robert Park's work on the crowd and the public, first formulated in his thesis, *Masse und Publikum* (1904). As Fred Matthews has explained in *Quest for an American Sociology*, Park attempted in *Masse und Publikum* to generalize crowd theory into a social psychology that would demonstrate the way in which men were influenced by the contagion of others. He thought this was a phenomenon that was ever-present but sometimes submerged or channelled into more acceptable forms, such as social rituals and institutions.¹⁰⁸ Most nineteenth century European and American crowd psychologists believed that individuals were transformed by joining crowds and, while Park drew heavily on their work, he did not share their antipathy to crowd behaviour. He believed that the crowd and the public could be "the crucible of a new order." As he saw it, the social unrest expressed by the crowd would eventually manifest itself in an organized movement and, when that movement petered out, it would leave behind its essence in the form of an institution.¹⁰⁹ Since Dawson formulated his theories upon the foundation laid by Park, he frequently employed the same arguments. He, too, criticized nineteenth century crowd psychologists, particularly Gustave Le Bon, for assuming that when people met, they necessarily became a two-thousand-headed monster. A crowd could be noble or vicious, Dawson contended, depending upon the reasons for its existence.¹¹⁰ During a crisis, a crowd would unite for common action, its aim ephemeral. But when the same individuals met repeatedly, customs, traditions and folkways developed. These traditions, in turn, formed the vantage ground from which symbols were erected from time to time to arouse emotions that had been submerged. They could take the shape of objects, myths or rituals. Frequently, usually earlier on in the social development of a people, these symbols were highly emotion-laden, and could be utilized to incite the crowd to action once again. For instance, Dawson explained, the Bastille incited the fury of the French mob, but a myth, slogan or word could be employed to the same effect. A modern example was the orator "who metaphorically waves the flag and demands with unctious, 'that the World Be Made Safe for Democracy'."¹¹¹ When symbols were that highly emotionalized they were too close to an individual's experience to be analyzed; there was still a tendency to identify life with the symbol — it called out a wealth of sentiments, provided a sense of security and a place in the sun, "just as the native with his totem." But when finally abstracted, stripped of their colour and vividness, Dawson

107. *Ibid.*, pp. 330–1.

108. Matthews, *Quest for an American Sociology*, pp. 50–6.

109. Dawson, "Social Nature of Knowledge," p. 55.

110. *Ibid.*, pp. 7–9 and 12.

111. *Ibid.*, pp. 10, 56, 83–88 and 94.

concluded, symbols became “the coldly precise objects of science.”¹¹²

Much of Dawson’s thesis concentrated on explaining the mechanism by which knowledge, or science, emerged out of a crowd. The most important factor therein was man’s ability to communicate vocally. In their capacity to be stimulated and controlled by collective excitement, Dawson said, humans were similar to animals. He alluded to the buffalo herds on the western plains who merely “milled,” seeking an outlet for their discontent. A flash, a sound or a disturbing smell would plunge them into the rush of a stampede.¹¹³ The same thing could happen with a human crowd, but because man had the ability to communicate, that “biological variation” allowed for the emergence of common meaning. Through words and symbols, human beings were able to put their experience in terms that others could understand and, by such means, they built up a community of experiences. Their experiences were thus transformed into symbols of common meaning, and the existence of those symbols allowed man to express his feelings with reference to something that was relatively impersonal or objective. Therefore, even when experiences lost their original concreteness, they could still be identified with because they were a common product. And that product — or “social objectification,” as Dawson called it, using Durkheim’s terminology — was culture and science.¹¹⁴ It was that logic which permitted Dawson to argue that fact, which constituted the body of science, also represented common understanding and agreement. All objects of scientific research, he insisted, were observed and stated in terms of experience. “The world is broken up into objects which are the products of experience. They emerge as common denominators out of the interplay of conflicting experiences.” Once agreed upon, however, the experiences become facts.¹¹⁵ “Fact is a common agreement that has arisen out of conflicting interests and points of view. In the matching of stories and pooling of relevant experiences, statements of fact get clipped, pared down to certain definiteness . . . Fact is just so much the rigid selection of incidents,” Dawson concluded. “Time is taken to make them square with every possible situation and known exception. They are pursued to the limit in order that there may be a consistency and completeness to their establishment.”¹¹⁶

The emergence of fact was dependent upon one more element that Dawson was compelled to explain: facts could only develop out of a public, not a crowd. Picking

112. *Ibid.*, p. 168.

113. *Ibid.*, p. 19. Dawson extracted the analogy of the buffalo herd from Robert E. Park and Ernest W. Burgess, *Introduction to the Science of Sociology* (1921; reprint ed., with an introduction by Morris Janowitz, Chicago and London, 1969). They, in turn, adopted it from D.L. Sharp, “The Spirit of the Herd,” *Atlantic* 113, pp. 338 ff.

114. Dawson, “Social Nature of Knowledge,” p. 16. For much of his discussion on man’s vocal mechanism, Dawson cited the influence of George Herbert Mead’s lectures and articles; he did not give specific citations. On the development of symbols and common meaning, he was influenced by John Dewey’s *Human Nature and Conduct: An Introduction to Social Psychology* (London, 1922), p. 60 and Emile Durkheim, as quoted by Park and Burgess in *Science of Sociology*, p. 39; the quotation is from Ghelke’s translation, “Emile Durkheim’s Contribution to Sociological Theory,” *Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law* 63, p. 30.

115. Dawson, “Social Nature of Knowledge,” p. 170.

116. *Ibid.*, pp. 156–7 and 178.

up from Park's hypothesis once again, Dawson explained that to be a member of a crowd, one needed only to feel and to empathize, but to be a member of a public, one had to participate in a rational discussion.¹¹⁷ A public was composed of individuals who criticized one another, whose opinions clashed and then were modified. The process of criticism and modification, however, had to be continuous or the public would degenerate into a crowd. That said, Dawson made sure his readers understood the difference between a public and a school of thought. A school of thought, he explained, started "under the influence of some original genius," who, "mulling over the knowledge of the time hit upon a new slant — a different concept."¹¹⁸ He preached it to his friends and followers who embraced it with enthusiasm. The problem with a school of thought, however, was that it was a reaction against something and so usually contained a great deal of dogma of its own. He cited as an example the enlightenment school of free thinkers whose members strove to detach themselves from the religious doctrines of their time, but fell victim to their own dogmatism.¹¹⁹ His attitude towards pragmatism was more favourable. While a purely philosophical school of thought, pragmatism was not specifically dedicated to fighting against "antique religion." It was a reaction against the absolute in philosophy, and therefore a point of view for dealing with the whole field of knowledge.¹²⁰ Schools of thought nevertheless served a useful purpose by serving with conflicting schools of thought as "conflict parties" in "that most disinterested of publics — science." Only those ideas which ran the gauntlet of criticism and were accepted by common agreement, Dawson insisted, could be regarded as science. "Science has no crows to pick," he concluded. "It stands for precise analysis and description. It is remote from bickerings and rests upon the integrity of its facts in the face of the widest possible publicity."¹²¹

His veneration for science and fact, and the process of continual discussion and criticism out of which they emerged, reveal why Dawson preferred research to social action as a method for solving social problems. Facts were for him "an emancipation from immediacy." It is through fact "that we get hold of ourselves under disturbing circumstances. Fact guides us beneath the surface stimuli of superficial opinion and suggestion which tend to call out precipitate responses."¹²² By contrast, he believed that reform movements were based upon false assumptions and mobilized people for action by invoking myths, usually in the form of historical predictions. At the time Dawson wrote his thesis, the Winnipeg General Strike was probably fresh in his mind, and so he pointed to the general strike as an example of such travesty. "The General Strike envisions a time when the proletariat will be so prepared that they will have the power to take over and administer economics and social affairs and their wishes will be clothed in a new kingdom of humanity . . . This hope is clothed in vivid and arousing imagery. It spontaneously appeals to and formulates the experiences of the

117. Ibid., pp. 31–3. Once again, Dawson cited the influence of Park's *Masse und Publikum*, n.p.; Dewey, *Human Nature and Conduct*.

118. Dawson, "Social Nature of Knowledge," p. 165.

119. Ibid., p. 166.

120. Ibid., pp. 166–7.

121. Ibid., p. 168.

122. Ibid., p. 185.

working class They have been through many strikes and these conflicts have left painful memories and desires."¹²³ Once at McGill, Dawson attacked all manner of Utopian thinking in a similar way and for similar reasons. The writers of apocalyptic literature — and he included Marx — envisioned history as broken up into a series of stages, principally for the purpose of getting to the next stage ahead. They depicted the present stage as a period of crisis, the next as an inevitable outcome of the preceding, and continued on in that pattern until Utopia was achieved. "That wished-for new era is idealistically pictured From the confusion and bitter suffering of the present, a new and utterly different day will be spectacularly ushered in." Dawson insisted that such reform movements were doomed to failure because they had their impetus in times of disturbance and defeat and, more fundamentally than that, their basic assumptions were unsound. They were not products of scientific observation and cautious investigation but the outcome of feeling and wishing.¹²⁴ "Utopias have generally gone to pieces because they are based too much on idealization and too little in a knowledge of human nature Much precious idealism is poured out without stint to be broken on the rocks of cynicism on the morrow because facts did not have a sufficient place."¹²⁵

The roots of Dawson's arguments about research and social action went back to the very origins of sociology. A product of the French Revolution, sociology as formulated by Auguste Comte was a meliorative, predictive discipline intended to establish social stability. The maxim attached to it then, "savoir pour prévoir pour pouvoir," continued to influence later forms of the discipline. Chicago theorists believed that social progress would be the natural result of the evolutionary process but thought that sociologists would have to discover, by observation and investigation, the laws of that process and aid in its development. "The final stages of evolutionary development would have thrown off the irrationalities of previous stages and be in tune with the teachings of science."¹²⁶ It was for that reason that Dewey and Park, taking their cue from Emile Durkheim, attached so much importance to reflection, discussion and deliberation. As far as they were concerned, those were the things that would facilitate social progress and ensure the wellbeing of democracy.¹²⁷ Dawson's devotion to social research, not simply on pathological social conditions, but into every aspect of Canadian life, was dedicated to the same ends. "Democracy can come into its own on a basis of fact," he insisted, "for it is related to facts at every step, not only facts as to how the other half lives but also as to how this half lives What will serve the social and democratic cause in this connection — provided we are zealous and earnest in our quest and service — will be a conservative and unshaded presentation

123. Ibid., p. 96.

124. Dawson, "Research and Social Action," p. 94.

125. Ibid., p. 94.

126. Matthews, *Quest for an American Sociology*, p. 38; see also *George Herbert Mead in Social Psychology, Selected Papers*, ed. and intro. Anselm Strauss (rev. ed., Chicago and London, 1969), p. xix: As species disappear and evolve, so do institutions and societies. In man, evolution can be directed through intelligent action, itself made possible by the purely human capacity for symbolization. "Science is the finest instance of intelligence at work and represents the hope of mankind for the solution of social problems."

127. Raymond Aron, *Main Currents in Sociological Thought II*, trans. Richard Howard and Helen Weaver (New York, 1970), p. 26.

of facts — all the facts.”¹²⁸

Another Canadian social scientist who shared Dawson's convictions about social research, and would have concurred with his statement that facts represented “an emancipation from immediacy,” was Harold Innis. The similarity in their views was no mere coincidence. Like Dawson, Innis was a Baptist who went to the University of Chicago to study political science after wartime service. There, he undoubtedly came into contact with some of the influential ideas of the Chicago school. The affinity in Dawson's and Innis' outlook lends credence to the argument that the Baptists played an important role in the development of social science in North America during the early twentieth century. It also confirms that it was Dawson's Baptist faith that influenced his antipathy towards collective excitement and turned him towards Chicago sociology. There was a strong antiauthoritarian and antihierarchical strain in the Baptist faith which William Learned and Kenneth Sills, for instance, noted about Acadia in their report on education in the Maritime provinces for the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.¹²⁹ It was also something of which Innis was intensely aware: in his preface to *The Letters of William Davies* (1945), he stressed that there were differences among the Protestant denominations in Canada and that the significance of the Baptist faith lay in its individualistic and nonconformist traditions.¹³⁰ That tradition may have caused academics like Dawson to eschew political involvement but it did not lead to their absolute abandonment of social concern. While individualism was at the heart of the Baptist faith, there was also a tendency within it to communitarianism. It developed in the Maritimes during the period of social disintegration which followed the American War of Independence: the New Light faith of Henry Alline caught hold of the popular imagination at a time when traditional institutions and forms of authority were collapsing. Though it emphasized individualism, its acceptance manifested a kind of community-seeking. In the period after 1820, this religious culture was transformed into one concerned with social reform but it emphasized that social regeneration could be achieved by freeing individuals from institutions and precedents.¹³¹ The years following World War I constituted a period of wide-scale social upheaval, also marked by a questioning and rejection of traditions and institutions. The new science of sociology, particularly the brand being developed at Chicago, offered an individual detachment from active social concern while at the same time providing the observer with the opportunity to analyze and understand the forces that led to social fragmentation and social cohesiveness. It was not surprising that it attracted a man like Dawson.

128. Dawson, “Research and Social Action,” pp. 95–6.

129. Learned and Sills, *Education in the Maritime Provinces*, p. 14; see also Masters, *Protestant Church Colleges*, p. 207; Samuel J. Mikoslaski, “Identity and Mission,” in Zeman, ed., *Baptists in Canada*, pp. 1–20. On the competency of the individual in the Baptist faith and the role accordingly played by laypersons in establishing and spreading the faith in the Maritime region, see Esther Clark Wright, “Without Intervention of Prophet, Priest or King,” *Repent and Believe*, pp. 66–74.

130. H.A. Innis, preface to *Letters of William Davies, Toronto: 1854–1861*, edited with an introduction and notes by William Sherwood Fox (Toronto, 1945), pp. vii–viii.

131. G.A. Rawlyk, *Ravished by the Spirit: Religious Revivals, Baptists, and Henry Alline* (Kingston and Montreal, 1984), pp. 80 and 103–4.