"... he [Spencer] was peculiarly sensitive to the pitfalls to which the student of sociology is subject, taking the form of the several biases he devoted so much of the book to; in this respect he may be considered to be a more important forerunner of the field currently called the sociology of knowledge than he has generally been credited with being." (Talcott Parsons, Introduction to The Study of Sociology by Herbert Spencer, pp. v-x, The University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor, 1961. P. vi)


Yet this contribution of Spencer's is generally unrecognized. Thus, for example, in his article on the "Sociology of Knowledge" in the recently published International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences (Vol. 8, pp. 428-435), Lewis Coser makes no mention at all of Spencer's The Study of Sociology.

Sixty-five years after it was written, the distinguished historian Allen Nevins was still able to say: "The ablest treatment of bias in relation to historical evidence is still that given in Herbert Spencer's Study of Sociology." (Allen Nevins, The Gateway to History, D. C. Heath and Company, Boston, 1938. P. 199)

(For a recognition of Spencer's role in the sociology of knowledge, see Talcott Parsons' "Introduction," The Study of Sociology, Ann Arbor, p. vi.)

"When the Spencerians disbanded in 1882, after the death of Morgan had removed the respected arbiter of their discussions, most of those who were not already members of the Pundit Club determined to organize a new dinner club on that model, taking the name Fortnightly." (p. 322) "Most of the papers during the first two decades of the Fortnightly Club were devoted to the analysis of Spencer's doctrines and those of his followers or critics. It would be enlightening to know how he appraised the argument between Spencer and Lester F. Ward, whose Dynamic Sociology supplied the topic for Robert Mathews in 1884. Apparently several of the Fortnightly members were keenly interested in this new issue, for the titles of their papers approached this subject again and again. The natural sciences were attracting less interest, as in the Pundit Club, but the emerging social sciences, or at least many of the problems with which they dealt, received more attention here than from the Pundits." (Blake McKelvey, Rochester, The Flower City, 1855-1890, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1949)

Lewis H. Morgan's "... provocative volume Ancient Society... attracted the special interest of the Spencer Club during its later sessions, many of them held in the aging scholar's own library, its shelves overflowing with nearly three thousand books." (Blake McKelvey, Rochester, The Flower City, 1855-1890, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1949. P. 320)
"... the three phases through which human opinion passes—the unanimity of the ignorant, the disagreement of the inquiring, and the unanimity of the wise...." (Herbert Spencer, *Education: Intellectual, Moral, and Physical*, John A. Alden, Publisher, New York, 1885. P. 87)

Although he proposed a typology that amounted to *stages*, he was more interested in process than in *stages*.

Spencer was not much preoccupied with *stages*. He asserted that pastoralism was not a necessary precursor of agriculture. (See "Classical Evolution," p. 81)

Spencer's dislike for "stages" is shown in his rejection of the three Comtean stages in the development of any science, and the assertion that all sciences change in the direction of becoming more heterogeneous.

"The origin of the State, he [Spencer] thinks, was the necessity of a centralized neural apparatus, to coordinate the military activities of the organism-society against other societies. The more plausible explanation, that it was required as the instrument of domination of one class over the other, does not occur to him. As the peasants correspond to endoderm, so the king's council correspond to the medulla." (Joseph Needham, "Integrative Levels: A Revaluation of the Idea of Progress," in *Time: The Refreshing River*, pp. 233-273, George Allen and Unwin, London, 1943. P. 249)

"In spite of his elaborate treatment of the origin and development of the different branches of political organization, Spencer nowhere gives a clear picture of the evolution of the state and sovereign power as a related whole, and this failure doubtless contributed to a large degree to make Spencer unable to grasp the real significance of the state." (Harry Elmer Barnes, "Some Typical Contributions of English Sociology to Political Theory," *The American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 27, pp. 289-324, 1921. P. 309)
"The Pundits promptly turned a more searching eye on Spencer. Professor Morey, a new member, read a paper in May, 1878, on "Herbert Spencer and His Predecessors," in which he maintained that the evolutionary or developmental concepts were by no means new with Spencer and his associates. Morey concluded that Spencer, by returning to the materialistic philosophy of the ancients, had abandoned the truths discovered by the philosophers of the last thousand years, thus demonstrating his folly. William C. Morey, "Herbert Spencer and His Predecessors," MS, University of Rochester. Augustus E. Strong likewise read a paper that year on the "Philosophy of Herbert Spencer" in which he no doubt amplified his attack on Spencer as a Humist, an idealistic materialist, as he had recently expressed it in a lecture at Colby College. Dr. Edward Mott Moore, defender of Darwin, may have taken a more sympathetic view in his paper on "Biology, Spencer, and Haeckel," read before the club a year later." (Blake McKelvey, Rochester, The Flower City, 1855-1890, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1949. P. 319)


"Spencer's fulfillment of this task in the section of his Principles of Sociology dealing with "Political Institutions," and in numerous essays dealing with "Political Institutions," and in numerous essays and parts of other works, is doubtless among the most extensive treatments of political problems which any sociologist, with the possible exception of Gumplowicz and Ratzenhofer, has attempted." (Harry Elmer Barnes, Some Typical Contributions of English Sociology to Political Theory, The American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 27, pp. 289-324, 1921. P. 302)

"Drawing vigor from raw facts of science, they tried to master them until the rapid increase of knowledge made their quest unrealistic. In 1860, therefore, the /Pundit/ Club laid plans to found an academy of science in Rochester, but the war interrupted the enterprise. They met again after the war, then to probe the theories of Darwin and Herbert Spencer, as well as to consider the increasingly impressive research of their own Lewis Morgan. By then the Club's reputation had grown beyond the city's limits. "There is a good deal of good thinking being done in Rochester," wrote Andrew D. White of Cornell. "They have the best social club for discussing literary, political and scientific questions that I know of in the United States." (Carl Resek, Lewis Henry Morgan: American Scholar, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1960. P. 64)
"It would be difficult to overestimate the importance of the Academy of Science [Incorporated in 1881] in its early years. Encouragement was given to individuals in all scientific fields, even to those who raised philosophical questions or battled doctrinaire traditions. Both Myron Adams and Newton Mann were honored by election as president, while Robert Mathews, who likewise held that post one year, devoted his annual address to an exposition of Spencer's philosophy. Yet the prevailing atmosphere was one of detached scientific investigation, rather than philosophical speculation or debate." (Blake Mc Kelvey, Rochester, the Flower City, 1855-1890, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1949, P. 322)

Declining an invitation to either the Spencer Club, or the Fortnightly Club, which succeeded it in 1882, Spencer wrote to Robert Mathews: "I am moreover, obliged to limit the amount of serial excitement which I undergo--much conversation, especially late in the day, being fatal to my sleep, which under the best conditions is always more or less bad; & the avoidance of undue excitement is practically not possible when standing in the relation of guest." (Letter from Herbert Spencer to Robert Mathews dated March 11, 1882. As transcribed by Mina Aprill from a source unknown to me at Rush Rhees Library at the University of Rochester)
"R. L. S.'s father [Thomas] writes to Sidney Colvin, ca. 1880, that worry about his son has brought a recurrence of an illness he had the preceding summer. He adds: It is very sore upon a man come to my time of life to have all this to put up with ... I lay all this at the door of Herbert Spencer. Unsettling a man's faith is indeed a very serious matter." (Edwin J. Beinecke, A Stevenson Library Catalogue, 4 Vols., Yale University Press, New Haven, 1958. Vol. 4, p. 1835)

"As his [Robert Louis Stevenson's] custom was, he specially established friendly relations with the natives [of the Hawaiian Islands, where RLS arrived in 1889], in particular with Kalakaua, "the last of the Hawaiian kings," a picturesque, dusky viveur, with a good fund of common sense, more of human nature, and culture enough, notwithstanding his colour, to discuss Herbert Spencer intelligently." (J. A. Steuart, Robert Louis Stevenson, Man and Writer, 2 Vols., Sampson Low, Marston & Co., Ltd., London, 1924. Vol. 2, pp. 142-143)

"Close upon the back of my discovery of Whitman, I came under the influence of Herbert Spencer. No more persuasive rabbi exists, and few better. How much of his vast structure will bear the touch of time, how much is clay and how much brass, it were too curious to inquire. But his words, if dry, are always manly and honest; there dwells in his pages a spirit of highly abstract joy, plucked naked like an algebraic symbol, but still joyful; and the reader will find there a caput-mortuum of piety, with little indeed of its loveliness, but with most of its essentials; and these two qualities make him a wholesome, as his intellectual vigour makes him a bracing, writer. I should be much of a hound if I lost my gratitude to Herbert Spencer." (Robert Louis Stevenson, "Books Which Have Influenced Me," first published in The British Weekly, in The Works of Robert Louis Stevenson, Vol. 16, pp. 272-278, Chatto and Windus, London, 1912. Pp. 274-275)


"One of these chapters [In Spencer's The Study of Sociology] was entitled "The Theological Bias," and we are informed that this was considered by some of the faculty so objectionable as to render the volume unfit to be put into the hands of the Yale seniors." (Edward L. Youmans, "Sociology and Theology at Yale College," The Popular Science Monthly, Vol. 17, pp. 265-269, 1880. P. 266)

"Its [The Study of Sociology's] aims were altogether social and political, and it never occurred to me that it might have any theological influence." (Letter from Herbert Spencer to W. A. H. C. Freemantle, dated October 29, 1890. Quoted in David Duncan, Life and Letters of Herbert Spencer, 2 Vols., D. Appleton and Company, New York, 1908. Vol. Vol. 1, p. 397)

"Herbert Spencer's Study of Sociology ... is a book as suggestive, as thoughtful, and as entertaining as one could wish to read ...." (Unsigned review of Herbert Spencer's The Study of Sociology, The Atlantic Monthly, Vol. 33, p. 238, 1874. P. 238)

"The Study [Of Sociology] has passed through eleven English editions, and has proved nearly as popular as its author's Education." (John Fiske, Edward Livingston Youmans, D. Appleton and Company, New York, 1894. P. 294)

"... The Study of Sociology--a sort of prolegomenon to the subject, and still an indispensable introduction ...." (Harry Elmer Barnes, "Some Typical Contributions of English Sociology to Political Theory," The American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 27, pp. 289-324, 1921. P. 297)

"In nothing Spencer has written about human society is the principle of causation more clearly or more forcefully presented than in The Study of Sociology." (James P. Lichtenberger, Development of Social Theory, The Century Co., New York, 1923. P. 330)
"... it [The Study of Sociology] also contains much that is surprisingly modern and relevant to our own time." (Talcott Parsons, Introduction to The Study of Sociology by Herbert Spencer, pp. v-x, The University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor, 1961. P. v)

"The Study of Sociology at 10s. 6d. had sold more than 20,000 copies /in England, no doubt/ by 1900, and the cheap edition of his /Spencer's/ tract on Education nearly 50,000 ...." (Peter B. Medawar, The Art of the Soluble, Methuen & Co. Ltd, London, 1967. P. 39)

"The views [expressed by Spencer in the installments of The Study of Sociology] have been reproduced and commented upon extensively by the press, who have generally recognized their importance ...." (Edward L. Youmans, "The Study of Sociology," The Popular Science Monthly, Vol. 4, pp. 242-244, 1873. P. 244)


"... its [The Study of Sociology] chapters are so packed with observation and reflection, so stamped with ordering thought, that even the dissentient reader is forced to confess its comprehensive power." (J. M. Robertson, Explorations, Watts & Co., London, n.d. (ca. 1923). P. 124)

Franklin H. Giddings found Spencer's The Study of Sociology "... delightfully written ...." (Franklin H. Giddings, "Modern Sociology," The International Monthly, Vol. 2, pp. 536-554, 1900. P. 543)

Spencer stresses the necessity of avoiding becoming enamored of facts themselves, rather than looking for the meaning of facts. (The Study of Sociology, Ann Arbor, pp. 87, 90.)

"And yet that the properties of the units determine the properties of the whole they make up, evidently holds of societies as of other things." (Herbert Spencer, The Study of Sociology, D. Appleton and Company, New York, 1891. P. 51)
The chapter on "The Theological Bias" in The Study of Sociology is actually very moderate in tone, and fully as many pages are spent on confuting the anti-theological bias.

In The Study of Sociology, Spencer makes the obstacles to a social science seem overwhelming.

It cannot be denied that in The Study of Sociology Spencer's writing style rises to great heights of expressiveness and vigor. See, for example, pp. 177-183, Ann Arbor edition.

A lot of the content of The Study of Sociology seems to be plucked from the pages of the daily press. There is too much "grinding it out."

In The Study of Sociology, Spencer presents the organic analogy clearly, forcefully, and convincingly. (See pp. 301-305 of the Ann Arbor edition.)

In The Study of Sociology Spencer stresses the operation of causation in society, as elsewhere. (See, for example, p. 296 of the Ann Arbor edition.)

Spencer's arguments help us to understand why it is that certain contemporary (modern) sociologists have proclaimed that objective social science is impossible. What they are really saying is that their own commitment to social or political views is such not to allow them to be objective. (The Study of Sociology, Ann Arbor.)

Spencer's frequent use of very recent newspaper quotations shows he was writing the book ad hoc, rather than drawing on long accumulated material, following a master plan, as in the volumes of the Synthetic Philosophy. (That is, in The Study of Sociology.)

"THE STUDY OF SOCIOLOGY"

"The "Independent" says of the "Study of Sociology": "Theologically it is probably the most objectionable book Spencer has written, making no secret of its contempt for believers in the Christian religion, who are told that they must lay aside their faith if they wish to study sociology." " (Edward L. Youmans, "Sociology and Theology at Yale College," The Popular Science Monthly, Vol. 17, pp. 265-269, 1880. P. 268)

"... when we mark his attempts to sweep away from our world all that ennobles human existence; when we notice his efforts to grasp all knowledge and impose his dicta on mankind, we cannot but think the Papacy of Materialism has transferred its throne to London." (Anonymous, Review of Herbert Spencer's The Study of Sociology, International Review, Vol. 1, pp. 407-413, 1874. P. 412)

"It [The Study of Sociology] is hence not to be regarded as a treatise upon sociological science, but rather an introduction to it." (Edward L. Youmans, "The Study of Sociology," The Popular Science Monthly, Vol. 4, pp. 242-244, 1873. P. 244)

"If we might use an expression which is a seeming contradiction, we would say that his book [Spencer's The Study of Sociology] was the forerunner of a Gospel of Atheism." (Anonymous / possibly the editor of the International Review, Review of The Study of Sociology, by Herbert Spencer, International Review, Vol. 1, pp. 407-413, 1874. P. 411)

"In fact, in such works as J. S. Mill's System of Logic and Herbert Spencer's brilliant and much neglected Study of Sociology, the problem of objective social knowledge has received forthright and comprehensive treatment." (Louis Wirth, Preface to Ideology and Utopia, by Karl Mannheim, pp. xiii-xxi, Harcourt, Brace and Company, New York, 1949. P. xix) (Indeed, The Study of Sociology can be considered the pioneer work in the sociology of knowledge.)

"Of this chapter on the "Theological Bias" we have only to say, as of many passages scattered through the volume, that it is difficult to determine whether it gives more decided evidence of ignorance, narrowness, conceit, or virulence." (Noah Porter, "Herbert Spencer's Theory of Sociology: A Critical Essay," The Princeton Review, Vol. 56 (6 n.s.), pp. 268-296, 1880. P. 291)

The Study of Sociology presents "... a theory of Sociology which to all intents and purposes is substantially atheistic. There are many who believe that bad as atheism may be in physics, it is immeasurably more dreaded in political and social science." (Noah Porter, "Herbert Spencer's Theory of Sociology: A Critical Essay," The Princeton Review, Vol. 56 (6 n.s.), pp. 268-296, 1880. P. 295)
"Chapter V [of The Study of Sociology] has just come, and it is splendid. This series is going to do a grand work; it hits us every time exactly where we live. The papers as they appear will be extensively read, and, although we are in the midst of a presidential convulsion, they are already attracting great attention. The volume cannot fail to do sharp execution. Have you any definite idea of its extent?" (Letter from Edward L. Youmans to Herbert Spencer, dated August 21, 1872. In John Fiske, Edward Livingston Youmans, D. Appleton and Company, New York, 1894. P. 303)

"The Study of Sociology, with its treatment of social institutions as ossified social forces, of history as a process of mutual aggression and defense among forces and institutions, its coordination of structure and function, its analysis of the nature of social facts, its masterly working out of the flow of unanticipated consequences, its conception of functional differentiation as the defining attribute of modernity, its elaborate / account of the intellectual hazards of sociological inquiry, is perhaps the most successful textbook of general sociology yet produced in Britain. But because it is also a sustained polemic against ameliorism it was virtually unusable in Britain for three-quarters of a century." (Philip Abrams, The Origins of British Sociology: 1834-1914, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1968. Pp. 72-73)

"No one escapes the lash. In The Study of Sociology all men are convicted of folly, until at last, when you end Mr. Spencer's interesting four hundred and odd pages, you are led to the conclusion that all men are fools ...." (Anonymous (A. V. Dicey), "Herbert Spencer's Polemics," The Nation, Vol. 18, pp. 63-64, 1874. P. 63. A review, of sorts, of The Study of Sociology)

After reading Spencer's The Study of Sociology, William Graham Sumner! "At once he formed a class for the reading and discussion of Spencer's book, which, he says, was probably the first course in sociology ever given in an American college." (Harris E. Starr, William Graham Sumner, Henry Holt and Company, New York, 1925. P. 387.)

"He is going very thoroughly through the Study of Sociology, revising it with a view to style, proposing to make it his most perfect work in this respect. It is funny that a volume which I bullied him into preparing should be chosen for this honour. It is interesting to look over the volume and see what thorough work he is making with it; every page is blackened with erasures and slashings." (Letter from Edward L. Youmans to William J. Youmans dated October 12, 1877. Quoted in John Fiske, Edward Livingston Youmans, D. Appleton and Company, New York, 1894. P. 337)
"THE STUDY OF SOCIOLOGY"

The Study of Sociology, "... which I bullied him to write ..." (Letter from Edward L. Youmans to his sister, Eliza A. Youmans, dated December 2, 1871. Quoted in John Fiske, Edward Livingston Youmans, D. Appleton and Company, New York, 1894. P. 290) "This work has been written at the instigation of my American friend, Prof. Youmans." (Herbert Spencer, "Preface," The Study of Sociology.)

"Spencer's side projects on the Sociology [The Study of Sociology] are amazingly interesting. He has been afraid of their being stolen and has kept them shady, but he will show them to me." (This was in connection with the International Scientific Series.) (Letter from Edward L. Youmans to his sister, Eliza A. Youmans, dated June 15, 1871. Quoted in John Fiske, Edward Livingston Youmans, D. Appleton and Company, New York, 1894. P. 272)


"Spencer's "Study of Sociology" is to this day an unsurpassed gymnastic for all who are willing to think out the practical problems of the social life ...." (J. M. Robertson, Modern Humanists Reconsidered, Watts & Co., London, 1927. P. 188)

In The Study of Sociology, as elsewhere, Spencer stressed the continuity and gradualness of evolution, than any revolutions or discontinuities.

"He [Spencer] does not actually lay the foundations of that science here [in The Study of Sociology], but he invites his readers to assist him in clearing the ground on which those foundations may subsequently be laid." (Viscount Amberley, Review of Spencer's "The Study of Sociology," The Examiner, January 10, 1874, pp. 37-38. P. 37)

"If we have really succeeded in penetrating to the heart of the great enterprise contemplated by Mr. Spencer, we would say that its design is to develop a new Social Science from the theory of Evolution." (Anonymous, Review of Herbert Spencer's The Study of Sociology, International Review, Vol. 1, pp. 407-413, 1874. P. 408)

For Spencer's reasons for writing The Study of Sociology see his Autobiography, Vol. II, pp. 252-255. Here he discusses the distinction between history and sociology, and indicates how making this distinction was one of the objectives of his book.
The freedom and unfairness with which it attacks every Theistic Philosophy of society and of history, and the cool and yet sarcastic effrontery with which he assumes that material elements and laws which any scientific man can recognize, seem to me to condemn the book as a textbook for a miscellaneous class in an undergraduate course." (P. 346) "... the use of it [Spencer's The Study of Sociology] will inevitably and reasonably work serious havoc to the reputation of the college." (P. 347)


"It was the publication in 1873 of Mr. Spencer's delightfully written little book on "The Study of Sociology," which first awakened in England, America, France, Italy, and Russia a wide general interest in this subject. From that time on sociological study has been pursued with great activity, and a great sociological literature has accumulated." (Franklin H. Giddings, "Modern Sociology," The International Monthly, Vol. 2, pp. 536-554, 1900. P. 543)

"We cannot but infer this universal wreck of the attempt to abolish God ... to divest man of his immorality," etc., to be his aspiration, if not his expectation, and we are confident that most disastrous would be the result to thousands of our people, if the International Scientific Series should succeed in obtaining a wide circulation for the works of Herbert Spencer alone." (Anonymous, Review of The Study of Sociology, by Herbert Spencer, International Review, Vol. 1, pp. 407-413, 1874. P. 411)

"... the offences against good taste and decency [in Spencer's The Study of Sociology] ... are almost unparalleled in modern controversial literature." (P. 270) "The twelfth chapter [of The Study of Sociology], which follows, on the "Theological Bias," has attracted special public attention rather on account of its offensive and contemptuous illustrations than because of any novelty in the opinions expressed." (p. 287) (Noah Porter, "Herbert Spencer's Theory of Sociology: A Critical Essay," The Princeton Review, Vol. 56 (6 n.s.), pp. 265-296, 1890)

"We may say in conclusion that never had atheism such an opportunity. Christian publishers give to the world its theories of materialism. Christian booksellers vend them. Christian people buy them. How generous and sublime this confidence in the truth! The occupant of the citadel furnish the artillery for its overthrow. That particular battery we have been examining consists of guns which, under the flying colors of Popular Science, have been during a year making their monthly discharges." (Anonymous, Review of The Study of Sociology, by Herbert Spencer, International Review, Vol. 1, pp. 407-413, 1874. P. 413)
"How Spencer's Study of Sociology came into my hands I cannot recollect, though it exercised a profound influence in suggesting that social institutions could rightly come within the ambit of interesting study. Possibly the knowledge that Spencer was himself born and reared in Derby [as was Hobson] stimulated my curiosity. For, as a boy in my early teens [Hobson was born in 1858], I used to meet Spencer walking into town with a man named Lott, a bank manager and a close friend of his. But while I had some slight acquaintance with Lott, I never exchanged a word with Spencer, though some quarter of a century later we interchanged letters upon the subject of the Boer War." (J. A. Hobson, Confessions of an Economic Heretic, The Macmillan Company, New York, 1938. P. 23)

"The truth is Mr. Spencer has attempted impossibilities, and seems / amusingly ignorant of the immense difficulties of his task, and his own incompetency for its accomplishment. The work he contemplates is both a Cyclopaedia in the area of facts, and in the extent of its principles a Universal Philosophy. It embraces all history, all science, all theology. It comprehends man in every individual and social relation. It would set aside God, Creation, Providence, Christianity. It would formulate and tabulate every phenomenon of body and of spirit in equations of force and matters. It implies the mastery of all subjects, abstract and concrete, within the possible range of the human intelligence. The audacity which could conceive such a work is stupendous. The credulity which can glorify such a teacher is astounding." (Anonymous, Review of The Study of Sociology by Herbert Spencer, International Review, Vol. 1, pp. 407-413, 1874. Pp. 410-411)
"He [Havelock Ellis about the age of 127] was being deeply impressed by Spencer's Study of Sociology." (p. 99) (Houston Peterson, Havelock Ellis, Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, 1928.)
Frank Lloyd Wright wrote that Louis Sullivan "venerated none except Adler [his partner], Herbert Spencer, Richard Wagner, Walt Whitman, John Edelman, and himself." (Frank Lloyd Wright, Genius and Mobocracy, Duell, Sloan & Pearce, New York, 1949. P. 54)

"But the practical effect of the bridges [ambitious new bridges then being built across the Mississippi and Kentucky rivers] was to turn Louis' mind from the immediate science of engineering toward science in general, and he set forth, with a new relish, upon a course of reading covering Spencer, Darwin, Huxley, Tyndall, and the Germans, and found a new, an enormous world opening before him, a world whose boundaries seemed destined to be limitless in scope, in content, in diversity. This course of reading was not completed in a month, or a year, or in many years; it still remains on the move." (Louis H. Sullivan, The Autobiography of an Idea, Dover Publications, Inc., New York, 1956 [originally published in 1924]. P. 249)

"In Darwin he [Sullivan himself] found much food. The Theory of Evolution seemed stupendous. Spencer's definition implying a progression from an unorganized simple, through stages of growth and differentiation to a highly organized complex, seemed to fit his own case, for he had begun with a simple unorganized idea of beneficent power, and was beginning to see the enormous complexity growing out of it, and enriching its meaning while insistent-ly demanding room and nurture for further growth, until it should reach that stage of clarity through the depths of which the original idea might again be clearly seen, and its primal power more fully understood." (Louis H. Sullivan, The Autobiography of an Idea, Dover Publications, Inc., New York, 1956 [originally published in 1924]. Pp. 254-255)

Charles Sumner was an admiring reader of your Social Statics, and boasts that he had the first copy in this country. He acknowledges large indebtedness to it, but his former bad health and the pressure of public duties, he regretted to say, had prevented him from following up your subsequent publications." (Letter from E.L. Youmans to Herbert Spencer dated November 23, 1863. Quoted in John Fiske, Edward Livingston Youmans, D. Appleton and Company, New York, 1894. P. 163)
"I myself think Sumner the foremost student of the science of society who has yet lived. I think him much better informed and much sounder than Spencer, his nearest rival."


"Although not a typical Spencerian product by virtue of its cautions concerning the biological transmission of cultural patterns, it [Sumner and Keller, The Science of Society] is heavily committed to analogy with bio-evolution."


"The rather widespread opinion that Sumner was a disciple of Herbert Spencer is more than half false. He neither owed as much to Spencer nor was in as close agreement with him as is generally assumed."

(Harris E. Starr, William Graham Sumner, Henry Holt and Company, New York, 1925. P. 392.)

President Porter's first letter to Sumner objecting to the latter's use of The Study of Sociology in class was dated December 6, 1879. (Harris E. Starr, p. 346)

"At any rate, he [Sumner] was not nearly as outspoken on religious matters as was Spencer, and his justification of himself for presuming to use Spencer's books against the opposition of Dr. Porter does not really join issue on religious grounds at all, unless championship of academic freedom can be so construed."

(Albert G. Keller, Reminiscences (Mainly Personal) of William Graham Sumner, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1933. P. 105)

"... Sumner voluntarily withdrew the offending textbook on the ground that, because of the agitation, its usefulness was gone."

(Charles Schuchert and Clar Mae LeVene, O. C. Marsh: Pioneer in Paleontology, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1940. P. 245)

"The "Christian Intelligencer" says: "Herbert Spencer's Sociology has been introduced as a text-book. The faculty are divided in regard to the use of such a work. The President, it is said, opposes the study of a book essentially infidel. There should be no difference, no discussion among honest men upon such a matter. Yale College has been endowed by the gifts of Christian men almost exclusively. To use the foundation they have established for the propagation of skepticism is a breach of trust and is no better than burglary or forgery.""

When the resolution of the corporation of Yale asserting the right of the President to veto use of any textbook was not presented, Sumner "voluntarily withdrew the book on the ground that because of the agitation its usefulness was gone, since the students were chiefly interested to find what was objectionable in it." (Cornelius Howard Patton and Walter Taylor Field, Eight O'Clock Chapel, Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, 1927. P. 101)

"I got this morning the two copies of the New York Times, and read with amusement and satisfaction the account of the row at Yale College that has been produced by the introduction of the Study of Sociology as a textbook. Very probably this local fight will set going a general fight, which will be highly advantageous no doubt." (Letter from Herbert Spencer to Edward L. Youmans dated April 19, 1880. Quoted in John Fiske, Edward Livingston Youmans, D. Appleton and Company, New York, 1894. P. 364)

"Spencer, he [Sumner] said, gave him his start in social science; that he was a great analytic mind. I said that his autobiography seemed to reveal him as a kind of old maid. "That's exactly what he was," Sumner confirmed. "We entertained him when he came over here. An old maid from the word go." I remarked how different Darwin was. "Yes," said Sumner, "he was a man, a great and good one. I must read that Life of him by his son again pretty soon."" (Albert G. Keller, Reminiscences (Mainly Personal) of William Graham Sumner, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1933. P. 75)

"Probably it would not be too much to say that Sumner was the Moses who led the institution [Yale] out of that Egyptian darkness." (Henry Holt, Garrulities of an Octogenarian Editor, Houghton Mifflin, Boston, 1923. P. 87)

"While I was a tutor at Yale, beginning in the fall of 1866 I read Herbert Spencer's 'First Principles'—at least, the first part of it— but it made no impression upon me. The second part, as it dealt with evolution, did not then interest me. I also read his 'Social Statics' at that period. As I did not believe in natural rights, or in his 'fundamental principle,' this book had no effect on me." (William Graham Sumner, "Sketch of William Graham Sumner," The Popular Science Monthly, Vol. 35, pp. 257-268, 1889. p. 265.)

"The Yale College flurry is over, so far as exciting public criticism is concerned, but the antagonism is deep, and will quietly deepen still more." (Letter from Edward L. Youmans to Herbert Spencer, dated May 11, 1880. Quoted in John Fiske, Edward Livingston Youmans, D. Appleton and Company, New York, 1894. P. 364)
"The thesis which is expounded in these two chapters [the first two chapters of Folkways] is: that the folkways are habits of the individual and customs of the society which arise from effort to satisfy needs; they are intertwined with goblinism and demonism and primitive notions of luck (sec. 6), and so they win traditional authority. Then they become regulative for succeeding generations and take on the character of a social force. They arise no one knows whence or how. They grow as if by the play of internal life energy. They can be modified, but only to a limited extent, by the purposeful efforts of men." (William Graham Sumner, Folkways, Ginn and Company, Boston, 1907. P. iv)

"It was Spencer's demonstration of the possibility of a science of society, his method and data, and not his particular conclusions, which commanded Sumner's respect." (Harris E. Starr, William Graham Sumner, Henry Holt and Company, New York, 1925. P. 345.)

"Unquestionably it is to the great philosophy which has now been established by such ample induction in the experimental sciences, and which offers to man such new command of all the relations of life, that we must look for the establishment of the guiding lines in the study of sociology. I can see no boundaries to the scope of the philosophy of evolution. That philosophy is sure to em/brace all the interests of man on this earth. It will be one of its crowning triumphs to bring light and order into the social problems which are of universal bearing on all mankind. Mr. Spencer is breaking the path for us into this domain. We stand eager to follow him into it, and we look upon his work on sociology as a grand step in the history of science." (William Graham Sumner, "The Science of Sociology," Speech at the Farewell Banquet to Herbert Spencer at Delmonico's Restaurant, New York, November 9, 1882, in The Forgotten Man and Other Essays, edited by Albert Galloway Keller, pp. 401-405, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1918. Pp. 404-405)

"As a young man he [Sumner] was captivated by Herbert Spencer and felt that here at last was an intellectual emancipation and a satisfaction not before experienced. Filled with the zeal of the truth-disseminator, he prevailed at length against conservative opposition and / began to teach social science or sociology of the Spencerian type, becoming the pioneer in America of sociological instruction." (pp. 832-33) "Briefly, he was of the school of Spencer; his great initial inspiration came from the Study of Sociology. With Spencer he reckoned Lippert as an influence of the highest significance in his sociological thinking; and at one time he added Ratzenhofer to these two, but later, I think, was inclined to rate him less highly, and to believe that Spencer and Lippert were the dominant influences upon his own work." (p. 834) (Albert G. Keller, "William Graham Sumner," The American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 15, pp. 832-835, 1909-10)
"The Christian at Work" remarks of William Graham Sumner: "... We trust the accomplished Professor will himself see the wisdom of deferring to a very proper feeling which we believe unmistakably exists on the part of the Christian public, that nothing should be allowed, however otherwise excellent in itself, which will in the slightest degree unsettle the minds of the young by giving them a bias toward a pernicious, dangerous sociology..." (Edward L. Youmans, "Sociology and Theology at Yale College," The Popular Science Monthly, Vol. 17, pp. 265-269, 1880. P. 268)

"I do not find Sumner, or Spencer either, deserving of all the epithets aimed at them by self-constituted champions of "progress." Each of these men was fighting all his life, and, what is more, studying and working, for the betterment of social conditions through the correct understanding of what they had been and were. I challenge anyone to name a prominent so-called advocate of laissez-faire who was not active against the abuses of his time. The instructed reformer ought to enshrine the memory of these traduced men of sense; an assault upon them merely indicates the kind of mind the attacked possesses. Spencer was something of an old maid and perhaps a little feline now and then; he may pall on one a little." (Albert G. Keller, Reminiscences (Mainly Personal) of William Graham Sumner, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1933. P. 55)

"That stanch exponent of the spirit of orthodoxy, the "New York Observer," makes up a sharp issue between Christianity and social science as follows: "The traditions of the college (Yale) are all in favor of the Christian religion, and the public may be assured that the faculty and trustees will never consent to have the atheism of Spencer offered to the students. They can find enough of that without going to college to find books in which Christianity is argued against and ridiculed. We are glad that President Porter stands firm, and we may also add that the resignation of any professor who has sympathies with Herbert Spencer will be a great advantage to the college." (Edward L. Youmans, "Sociology and Theology at Yale College," The Popular Science Monthly, Vol. 17, pp. 265-269, 1880. P. 267)
Spencer was the first to employ the term "superorganic," though with a different meaning from the one now current in anthropology. He didn't quite see—or at least failed to express—the categorical distinctiveness of culture. (Principles of Sociology, 2nd ed., Vol. 1, pp. 3-7).

"... whether society be conceived of as an organism, or as an aggregate which is better described by another phrase that Mr. Spencer has applied to it, / namely, super-organic ...." (Franklin H. Giddings, "Modern Sociology," The International Monthly, Vol. 2, pp. 536-554, 1900. Pp. 542-543)

"... super-organic structures .... being, as they are, objective products of subjective processes ...." (Herbert Spencer, First Principles, 6th ed., Watts & Co., London, 1937. P. 337)


"All organized results of social action--all super-organic structures, pass through parallel phases. Being, as they are, objective products of subjective processes, ...." (Herbert Spencer, First Principles, 4th edition, D. Appleton and Company, New York, 1890. P. 374)

"While they [Folkways] are in vigor they very largely control individual and social undertakings, and they produce and nourish ideas of world philosophy and life policy. Yet they are not organic or material. They belong to a superorganic system of relations, conventions, and institutional arrangements. The study of them is called by their social character, by virtue of which they are leading factors in the science of society." (William Graham Sumner, Folkways, Ginn and Company, Boston, 1907. P. iv)
"More general altruism [than that among parents and offspring] is probably a simple extension by reinforcement of the primary, selectively favorable / altruism practiced on close relatives. Thus, we should not be taken in by Spencer's glib "survival of the fittest." In fact this phrase has no place in modern evolutionary theory. Selection favors those genotypes who leave more progeny in the remote future, no matter by what devious mechanism this is accomplished." (R. C. Lewontin, "Selection in and of Populations," in Ideas in Evolution and Behavior, edited by John A. Moore, pp. 297-311. The Natural History Press, Garden City, N.Y., 1970. Pp. 304-305)

"In politics-cum-sociology, Herbert Spencer proposed the origin of the State in violence and warfare. The nineteenth century believed it all. In biology and politics ... the doctrine of the survival of the fittest raised dog-eat-dog to the level of a scientific morality ...." (Paul Bohannan, Social Anthropology, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York, 1963. P. 203)

"The unlucky substitution of 'survival of the fittest' for 'natural selection' has done much harm in consequence of the ambiguity of 'fittest'—which many take to mean 'best' or 'highest'—whereas natural selection may work toward degradation vide epizoa." (That is, parasites) (Thomas Henry Huxley, Life and Letters of Thomas Henry Huxley, ed. by Leonard Huxley, D. Appleton and Company, New York, 1901. 2 Vols. Vol. 2, p. 284)

"Some authors, like Dobzhansky, go so far as to call differential reproductive advantage "Darwinian fitness," although Darwin never used fitness in this sense, and although it was Herbert Spencer who first introduced the term 'evolutionary theory by his unfortunate phrase The Survival of the Fittest, which Darwin did not employ in the earlier editions of the Origin of Spe ces." (Julian Huxley, Evolution: The Modern Synthesis, 2nd edition, 1963. [P. of Introduction])

"Also in 1851, Herbert Spencer published his book Social Statics, that included the explanatory phrase "survival of the fittest" (which Charles Darwin himself later used)." (H. James Birx, Interpreting Evolution, Darwin and Teilhard de Chardin, Prometheus Books, Buffalo, N.Y., 1991. P. 139)
"In the first two editions of The Origin of Species (November 1859 and January 1860), Darwin used the phrase 'survival of the adapted', and it is only in the third (April, 1861), and subsequent editions, that he followed: 'I have called this principle, by which each slight variation, if useful, is preserved, by the term Natural Selection ...' with 'But the expression often used by Mr Herbert Spencer of the Survival of the Fittest is more accurate, and is sometimes equally convenient.' The expression was added, with the exception of sub-headings and the title of the fourth chapter, twice more to the original text, and provided Darwin with a catch-phrase (at least in print), but not necessarily with an improvement. (Milo Keynes, footnote to G. Ainsworth Harrison, "Introduction", in Evolutionary Studies, A Centenary Celebration of the Life of Julian Huxley, ed. by Milo Keynes and G. Ainsworth Harrison, pp. 1-8, Macmillan, London, 1989. P. 1n.)

"Here I must digress a moment to discuss the concept of evolutionary fitness. The biological avant garde has chosen to define fitness as 'net reproductive advantage,' to use the actual words employed by Professor Medawar in his Reith Lectures on The Future of Man. Any strain of animal, plant or man which leaves slightly more descendants capable of reproducing themselves than another, is then defined as 'fitter.' This I believe to be an unscientific and misleading definition. It disregards all scientific conventions as to priority, for it bears no resemblance to what Spencer implied or intended by his famous phrase the survival of the fittest. It is also nonsensical in every context save the limited field of population genetics. In biology, fitness must be defined, as Darwin did with improvement, 'in relation to the conditions of life'—in other words, in the context of the general evolutionary situation. I shall call it evolutionary fitness, in contradistinction to the purely reproductive fitness of the evangelists of geneticism, which I prefer to designate by the descriptive label of net or differential reproductive advantage."

(over)

"It is now well established that [American] business leaders of the Gilded Age only rarely defined their success as "survival of the fittest," arguinit instead that success came through a combination of hard work and Christian stewardship." (George E. Webb, The Evolution Controversy in America, University Press of Kentucky, Lexington, Ky., 1994. P. 38)

Wrote George Macloskie, Professor of Biology at Princeton University: "... are very like Darwin's 'survival of the fittest' ..." (Quoted in The Life of James McCosh, edited by William Milligan Sloane, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1896. P. 122)

"On a summer excursion I travelled from Glasgow to Oban with Herbert Spencer, one of my earliest friends in England. There were many English tourists on the barge, and barefoot children trotted beside it with the hope of having pennies thrown to them. A good many were thrown, as the scrambles were amusing. The little Scots long continued their pursuit, but presently the smaller ones weakened, especially the girls. "There," I said to Spencer, "is an example of the survival of the fittest or 'fleest';" the weaker fall behind and are getting no pennies." "Yes, for the moment," he said, "but soon the force of compassion will work for their benefit." And so it was; pennies were showered on the tired toddlers, and equality was established between the weak and the strong." (Moncure Daniel Conway, Autobiography, Memories and Experiences, 2 Vols., Houghton, Mifflin and Company, Boston, 1904. Vol. 2, p. 351)

"Now the basic law of organic growth is the Darwinian notion of the survival of the fittest." (Crane Brinton, English Political Thought in the Nineteenth Century, Ernest Benn, Ltd., London, 1933. P. 229)

"No less misleading is the expression "survival of the fittest," which Herbert Spencer unfortunately coined to describe the operation of natural selection, and which became associated with something like the image of the Nietzschean superman. Now, fitness in the evolutionary sense, or adaptive value, as it is better called, does not necessarily connote even a superior ability of an individual to survive, and a lack of fitness in this sense is not synonymous with weakness or frailty. A superior adaptive value of one genotype over another simply means that the carriers of the former leave, on the average, more surviving progeny than do the carriers of another genotype in the same environment. This superiority may result from the fact that individuals of one genetic type are stronger and more resistant to environmental hazards, and live longer than individuals of other genetic types. Or one type may be more sexually active or more fecund than another. Individual vigor and fecundity are not necessarily correlated, and a superior fecundity may compensate or even overcompensate for deficient vigor." (Theodosius Dobzhansky, "Heredity, Environment, and Evolution," Science, Vol. 111, pp. 161-166, 1950. Pp. 164-165)
SURVIVAL OF THE FITTEST

"This laissez-faire attitude coloured Herbert Spencer's later attempt to take an organic view of society, and Darwin's "struggle for existence" and "survival of the fittest" were seized upon by a whole school of so-called evolutionists ...." (T. K. Penniman, A Hundred Years of Anthropology, Gerald Duckworth & Co. Ltd., London, 1952. P. 62)

"T. H. Huxley's criticism of "survival of the fittest" was very much to the point. What many biologists and most Social Darwinists overlooked was the fact that "fitness" is related to the current environment of a group and is not either necessarily or usually a capacity or function that enables the group or the organism to adapt itself to all environments. Failure to recognize this fact led to the conversion of "fittest" into "best" under all conditions. The fact is that "fitness" is a relative function, a function of the organism in relation to a particular environment." (Ashley Montagu, Darwin, Competition & Cooperation, Henry Schuman, New York, 1952. Pp. 57-58)

"There was a time when it was argued that Herbert Spencer's epigram 'the survival of the fittest' was tautological, since the characterization of the fittest was that they survived. Such objections melt like snow before the objective and positive proof provided by modern work carried out in the field, showing that on the average the organisms that do not survive are those which are demonstrably least well adapted to their environment." (Sir Gavin de Beer, Foreword to Charles Darwin and Alfred Russel Wallace, Evolution by Natural Selection, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1958. Pp. 21-22)

"Darwin wrote that evolution occurs through natural selection acting on organisms so that survival of the fittest results. The phrase "survival of the fittest" has always aroused much discussion. We now prefer to speak of this as Darwinian fitness, adaptive value, or selective value. Darwinian fitness of a population of organisms is measured as the reproductive capacity of the population. A population is "fit" relative to natural selection if it can maintain or increase its numbers from generation to generation." (John Buettner-Janusch, The Origins of Man, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 1966. P. 10)

"Herbert Spencer, another of Darwin's friends, suggested that "survival of the fittest" was better than natural selection as a title for Darwin's theory. Darwin accepted survival of the fittest, much to the disgust of Huxley. It was a very poor term since it gave a "tooth and claw" idea of evolution. The term has resulted in a lot of misunderstanding of Darwin's theory. But it made a good heading for newspaper stories, and it persisted." (Aaron E. Klein, Threads of Life; Genetics from Aristotle to DNA, The Natural History Press, Garden City, N.Y., 1970. P. 38)
"One of the chief reasons I had for venturing to substitute another formula /the survival of the fittest/ for the formula of Mr. Darwin, was that "Natural Selection" carries a decidedly teleological suggestion, which the hypothesis to be formulated does not in reality contain; and a good deal of the ad /verse criticism which the hypothesis has met with, especially in France, has, I think, arisen from the misapprehension thus caused. The expression, "Survival of the Fittest," seemed to me to have the advantage of suggesting no thought beyond the bare fact to be expressed; and this was in great part, though not wholly, the reason for using it. Just before this passage Spencer had objected to the apparent transmutation by E. D. Cope of survival of the fittest into preservation of the fittest by saying: "... the expression "Preservation of the Fittest" is objectionable, because in... it supposes an act of preserving--a process beyond, and external to, the physical processes we commonly distinguish as natural; and this is a supposition quite alien to the idea to be conveyed." (p. 263) (Herbert Spencer, "The Survival of the Fittest," Nature, Vol. 5, pp. 263-264, 1872)

"... the survival of the fittest is not always the survival of the best." (Herbert Spencer, "Evolutionary Ethics," The Athenaeum, No. 3432, pp. 193-194, August 5, 1893. P. 193)

In "Mr. Martineau on Evolution" in discussing the survival of the fittest, Spencer pointed out that the fittest are not necessarily the best.

"I have been much interested by your letter, which is as clear as daylight. I fully agree with all that you say on the advantages of H. Spencer's excellent expression of 'the survival of the fittest.' This, however, /had not occurred to me till reading your letter. It is, however, a great objection to this term that it cannot be used as a substantive governing verb; and that this is a real objection I infer from H. Spencer continually using the words, natural selection." (Letter from Charles Darwin to Alfred Russel Wallace dated July 5, 1866. Quoted in The Life and Letters of Charles Darwin, edited by His Son, Francis Darwin, 2 Vols., Basic Books, Inc., New York, 1959. Vol. 2, pp. 229-230)

"I have called this principle, by which each slight variation, if useful, is preserved, by the term Natural Selection, in order to mark its relation to man's power of selection. But the expression often used by Mr. Herbert Spencer of the Survival of the Fittest is more accurate, and is sometimes equally convenient." (Charles Darwin, The Origin of Species, 6th edition, John Murray, London, 1890. P. 49) (This passage may appear in the fifth edition, but not in the fourth.)

"The law that Mr. Herbert Spencer desires society to adopt is simply Darwin's law--"the survival of the fittest."" (Emile de Laveleye, "The State versus The Man: A Criticism of Mr. Herbert Spencer," The Contemporary Review, Vol. 47, pp. 485-508, 1885. P. 490)
"This preservation, during the battle for life, of varieties which possess any advantage in structure, constitution, or instinct, I have called Natural Selection; and Mr. Herbert Spencer has well expressed the same idea by the Survival of the Fittest. The term "natural selection" is in some respects a bad one, as it seems to imply conscious choice; but this will be disregarded after a little familiarity. No one objects to chemists speaking of "elective affinity," and certainly an acid has no more choice in combining with a base, than the conditions of life have in determining whether or not a new form be selected or preserved." (Charles Darwin, The Variation of Animals and Plants under Domestication, 2 Vols., 2nd ed., D. Appleton and Company, New York, 1892. Vol. 1, p. 6)

"But the special power of it [The expression "the survival of the fittest"] lies in this, that it sounds as if it expressed a true physical cause. It gets rid of that detestable reference to the analogies of mind which are inseparably associated with the phrase of natural selection." (The Duke of Argyll /George Douglas Campbell/, Organic Evolution Cross-Examined, John Murray, London, 1898. P. 3)

"He [Spencer] is the author of that other phrase, "the survival of the fittest," which has almost superseded Darwin's own original phrase of "natural selection." Nothing could be happier than this invention for the purpose of giving vogue to whatever it might be supposed to mean. There is a roundness, neatness, and compactness about it, which imparts to it all the qualities of a projectile with immense penetrating power. It is a signal illustration of itself. It is the fittest of all phrases to survive." (The Duke of Argyll /George Douglas Campbell/, Organic Evolution Cross-Examined, John Murray, London, 1898. P. 2)

"... there is a suggestion about it [The phrase "the survival of the fittest"]--not easily dismissed--that it is tautological. The survival of the fittest may be translated into the survival of that which does actually survive." (pp. 2-3) "Yes, but this [The phrase "the survival of the fittest"] is a mere restatement of certain facts under an altered form of words which pretends to explain them, whilst in reality it contains no explanatory element whatever. The survival of the fittest? Fittest for what? For surviving. So that the phrase means no more than this, that the survivor does survive." (p. 93) (The Duke of Argyll /George Douglas Campbell/, Organic Evolution Cross-Examined, John Murray, London, 1898)

"This is styled by Spencer the "survival of the fittest"; an expression both comprehensive and exact." (E. D. Cope, The Origin of the Fittest, D. Appleton and Company, New York, 1887. P. 15)

Frank Norris, at the end of The Octopus, wrote: "... the individual suffers, but the race goes on. Annixter dies, but in a far-distant corner of the world a thousand lives are saved. The larger view always and through all shams, all wickedness, discovers the Truth that will, in the end, prevail, and all things, surely, inevitably, resistlessly work together for good." (Complete Works of Frank Norris, Vol. 2, p. 361)

Those were the words of a disciple of Spencer; the law of the survival of the fittest was a law that sometimes bore hard on the individual but was of the greatest importance for the race. Like Spencer and his followers Norris saw only the group, the nation, the world as the unit of survival, favoring the belief that the species counted for more than the individual." (Lars Åhnebrink, The Beginnings of Naturalism in American Fiction, 1891-1903, Russell & Russell, Inc., New York, 1961. P. 230)

"We raise questions of conduct in this matter [eugenics] very different from those raised by Mr. Herbert Spencer and the other first hasty generalizers about evolution, who seemed to suggest that if shopkeepers were encouraged to compete for business and clergymen for congregations, a process of the "survival of the fittest" would automatically set in, which would rapidly improve the race...." (Note Wallas' narrow conception of Spencer's evolutionism.) (Graham Wallas, Men and Ideas, George Allen & Unwin Ltd, London, 1940. P. 90)

"Spencer was alive and active throughout this period, and so was his cosmic conception of evolution. A rival view was that of the social Darwinists who turned from the process of differentiation (basic in Spencer's thought) to stress the mechanisms of natural selection and survival of the fittest, whether individuals, groups, or social norms." (Nicholas S. Timasheff, Sociological Theory; Its Nature and Growth, 3rd edition, Random House, New York, 1967. P. 127).

"The process of natural selection is, in fact, dependent on adaptation—it is all one, whether one says that the competitor which survives is the "fittest" or the "best adapted."" (Thomas Henry Huxley, "Obituary of Charles Darwin," Darwiniana, p. 280)
"SYNTHETIC PHILOSOPHY"

"In the explanatory note inserted in the preface to 'First Principles' (p. xiv) he simply states that the application of these principles to inorganic nature is omitted [from the Synthetic Philosophy], but this gives no intimation as to how this application would have been made. He does, indeed, refer in at least two other places to these omitted volumes ('Principles of Biology,' Vol. I., Appendix, pp. 479, 480; 'Principles of Sociology,' Vol. I., p. 3), and in the second of these he says that one of the volumes would have dealt with 'Astrogeny' and the other with 'Geogeny.' These appear to be the only hints that he gave out on this point, and few readers probably ever noticed them. But in one of his letters written in 1895 he entered much more fully into this subject and set forth clearly just what his whole system would have been had it been fully written out.* *See SCIENCE, N.S. Vol. III., February 21, 1896, p. 294 [consulted: of no value]; 'Pure Sociology,' pp. 67-69. (Lester F. Ward, "Herbert Spencer's Autobiography," Science, Vol. 19, pp. 873-879, 1904. P. 877)

"The actual effort demanded in the construction of the synthetic philosophy was nothing short of heroic. The struggle through so many years of neglect and failure, the persistence, through failing health, in poverty, at the cost of a final nervous collapse, is an achievement for which the world is richer, which should go down to the future as one of the great triumphs of human resolution over circumstance." (C. F. B. Masterson, "Spencer and Carlyle," in In Peril of Change, Essays Written in Time of Tranquility, pp. 74-96, B. W. Huebsch, New York, n.d. Pp. 81-82)

"I dare say you were surprised to find that I had not adopted the new title for the serial [Synthetic Philosophy] as I proposed. I discussed the matter with both Huxley and Tyndall, and though I do not think that the objections raised were such as to outweigh the manifest advantages, still there doubt / less are objections, and in the midst of conflicting considerations I eventually became so far undecided as to let the matter stand as it was." (Letter from Herbert Spencer to Edward L. Youmans, dated January 22, 1868. Quoted in John Fiske, Edward Livingston Youmans, D. Appleton and Company, New York, 1894. Pp. 249-250)

"In joining the signatories to this address [a congratulatory address from his contemporaries on the occasion of finishing the Synthetic Philosophy in 1896], Mr. Gladstone most aptly expressed the general feeling as to Spencer's unselfish labours... "I beg that you will, if you think proper, set me down as an approver of the request to Mr. Spencer, whose signal abilities and, rarer still, whose manful and self-denying character are so justly objects of admiration."" (Unsigned, "Herbert Spencer" [Obituary], Knowledge & Illustrated Scientific News, Vol. 1, p. 13, 1904. P. 13)

"SYNTHETIC PHILOSOPHY"

Spencer Baynes, later Professor of English at St. Andrews University in Scotland and editor of the Encyclopaedia Brittanica, and Francis Pigott, later Examiner of Plays /?/ were, in the 1850's, journalists in London. "Baynes and Pigott were living together and both were intimate with Spencer, who not unfrequently called at their rooms. This he did a day / or two after the publication of his prospectus, or syllabus, or summary, of what he proposed to achieve in his philosophic and scientific survey of sociology and the universe generally. Pigott was writing at a table when Spencer came in, and Baynes went forward alone to greet him. Baynes congratulated the philosopher heartily on the great effort he was about to make, said it was one that was well worthy of his life's work and added that if there was any man living who was capable of adequately covering so wide and difficult a field, he was the writer specially qualified for the task. When Baynes had finished Pigott arose and going up to Spencer, said, "I quite agree with Baynes, you will certainly carry out your magnificent programme and, exhausted with your successful labours, will retire to your rest. This will be the epitaph we shall have inscribed upon your tomb: 'In seven days the Lord made the earth and on the eighth Herbert Spencer wrote it down.'" (Henry Mayers Hyndman, The Record of an Adventurous Life, Macmillan and Co., Limited, London, 1911. Pp. 95-96)

"... the Synthetic Philosophy has already taken its place among the world's greatest works ..." (David Church Somervell, English Thought in the Nineteenth Century, 5th ed., Methuen, London, 1947. P. 6)

"The real modern era may be said in a way to begin with the publication of the System of Synthetic Philosophy; and that fact has been recognized in almost every nation in Europe." ("W.", "Herbert Spencer," The Athenaeum, No. 3972, pp. 794-795, December 12, 1903. P. 795)

"More than the first half of The Synthetic Philosophy was originally issued in portions of 80 pages to subscribers, who paid ten shillings for every four numbers.... On completion of the 44th number I decided to publish the remaining volumes in the ordinary way." (Herbert Spencer, Facts and Comments, D. Appleton and Company, New York, 1902. P. 153n.)

"So long as there is no other title in use to express a philosophy formed of organized scientific knowledge, one cannot expect people to discriminate. Another title, therefore, is evidently extremely desirable, and will, I think, in many respects yield positive as well as negative advantages. I have decided upon the title Synthetic Philosophy, which, on the whole, seems the most descriptive. I am intending to make the issue of / this second edition of First Principles the occasion for introducing it, and propose that each successive volume shall bear this general title on its back in addition to its special title." (Letter from Herbert Spencer to Edward L. Youmans dated April 8, 1867. Quoted in John Fiske, Edward Livingston Youmans, D. Appleton and Company, New York, 1894. Pp. 233-234)
"SYNTHEIC PHILOSOPHY"

"It is nearly ten years since, mainly with the view of checking the tendency to confusion with Positivism, I concluded it was desirable to give a special and distinctive name to the System of Philosophy. I took the advice of friends upon the matter, and by their remarks was led so to hesitate that I did not then take the step I thought of taking: an effect of advice which I have since seen good reasons for regretting. Had I suspected that this hesitation in giving my own specific name would have ended in another naming it for me, I should probably not have hesitated; still less should I have hesitated had I foreseen that the specific name I prefaced would be over-ridden.

"When, at the time you gave your lectures, I found that my objections to the title "Cosmic Philosophy" had no weight with you, I decided upon taking the only available course—that namely of forthwith giving the specific name I had intended. I had half-titles printed to all the successive volumes of the English and American edition; and I had the words "Synthetic Philosophy" Vol. I, II, III &c [sic] printed on the backs of the covers. And I concluded that this would set the question at rest.

"I will not re-discuss the question of the appropriateness of the titles: it will suffice simply to suggest that you ask an opinion [earlier in the letter Spencer had suggested Lewes or Huxley for this] respecting the general fitness of the step you are taking. Quite apart from any criticisms on the word "cosmic" considered, intrinsically, the use of it will, I think, naturally raise the criticism that the giving to the Philosophy of Evolution a name which I am known to disapprove, and which I finally gave my own name for the purpose of excluding, is a somewhat strange step."
(Letter from Herbert Spencer to John Fiske dated December 22, 1873. Henry E. Huntington Library Cat. No. HM 13733. Unpublished)

"I have decided within these few days to use a specific title for the whole series of volumes that I am issuing. Originally, when drawing up the programme, I contemplated doing so, and was very nearly using the title Deductive Philosophy; but I was dissuaded, and finally fell back upon the indefinite title of a System of Philosophy. There are decided evils, however, in the absence of a distinctive name, and I have had these evils just now thrust before me afresh. At the close of his new edition of his History of Philosophy Lewes persists in claiming me as one of his school, saying that "Mr. Spencer is unequivocally a positive philosopher, however he may repudiate being considered a disciple of Comte," ...." (Letter from Herbert Spencer to Edward L. Youmans dated April 8, 1867. Quoted in John Fiske, Edward Livingston Youmans, D. Appleton and Company, New York, 1894, P. 233)

"... his [Spencer's] great system of philosophy ... [is] no mere logical castle built of air and definitions, and assuming in its premises, like the systems of the Metaphysicians, the very difficulties to be explained, but as a great granite pile sunk deep in the bed-rock of the world, each stone a scientific truth, and all so compacted and dovetailed together that it was difficult to find anywhere a logical flaw among their seams." (John Beattie Crozier, "Mr. Herbert Spencer and the Danger of Specialism," The Fortnightly Review, Vol. 75, n.s., pp. 105-120, 1904) (P. 106)
"SYNTHETIC PHILOSOPHY"

"Plato spun a system of thought before speculation was yet curbed by the knowledge of Nature; Spencer has constructed a philosophy out of the inflexible materials furnished in all the fields of modern investigation. His system is not a digest, but an organism; not merely an analytic dissection, but a grand synthetic construction; not a science, but a coördination of the sciences; not a metaphysical elaboration, but a positive body of doctrine conforming to verifiable facts, and based upon the most comprehensive principle of Nature yet arrived at by the human mind." (Edward L. Youmans, "Herbert Spencer and the Doctrine of Evolution," Appendix to Mr. E. M. Cazelles, Outline of the Evolution-Philosophy, Translated from the French by Rev. C. B. Frothingham, D. Appleton & Company, New York, 1875. P. 150)

"Notwithstanding the claims of his [Spencer's] "Synthetic Philosophy" to rank as a system, it is not itself in strictness such, though a somewhat systematic, and certainly very able, coördination of the greater part of all known truth. But it is expository, not constructive. This gives it a character of great solidity and respectability." (Lester F. Ward, Dynamic Sociology, 2 Vols., D. Appleton and Company, New York, 1894. Vol. 1, pp. 217-218)

"I can quite understand that you were disappointed that I did not use the general title of Synthetic Philosophy, as I had thought of doing. I discussed the matter at considerable length with both Huxley and Tyndall, and though the objections they raised were not, to my thinking, adequate, still they had weight, and though I thought, and continue to think, that on the whole this general title would be desirable, my conviction was not sufficiently decided to lead me to make the change in spite of adverse opinions. I see that you have been speaking of this proposed title, and that Mr. Alger has been making use of it. [Rev. W. R. Alger] To this I see no objection; and, indeed, it strikes me that this habitual application of it by those who write reviews in America will be the most desirable way of establishing its use, if no reason to the contrary should hereafter arise." (Letter from Herbert Spencer to Edward L. Youmans dated May 3, 1868. Quoted in John Fiske, Edward Livingston Youmans, D. Appleton and Company, New York, 1894. P. 254)

The Philosophical Club of Bryn Mawr College in March of 1897 held a celebration meeting to mark the completion of Herbert Spencer's "Synthetic Philosophy." James Mark Baldwin was invited to deliver a lecture on the occasion, but sent a letter instead. (James Mark Baldwin, "Mr. Spencer's Psychology," The American Naturalist, Vol. 31. pp. 553-557, 1897. P. 553)

"The very circumstances which won for the Synthetic Philosophy such contemporary renown—the fact that it was a systematic guide to the rapidly developing biological and social sciences—now 'date' it badly." (John Passmore, A Hundred Years of Philosophy, A Pelican Book, Penguin Books, Harmondsworth, 1968. P. 42)
Grant Allen called the "Synthetic Philosophy" "... this highest and widest product of the human scientific and philosophical intelligence." (Grant Allen, Review of "An Epitome of the 'Synthetic Philosophy,'" by F. Howard Collins, The Midland Naturalist, Vol. 12, pp. 259-260, 1889. P. 260)

Compayré called Spencer's Synthetic Philosophy "... the most stupendous investigation into the universality of phenomena ever attempted and carried out by human intellect." (Gabriel Compayré, Herbert Spencer and Scientific Education, translated from the French by Maria E. Findlay, Thomas Y. Crowell & Co., New York, 1907. P. 4)

"... his Synthetic Philosophy, that heroic effort to combine, in a Philosophy of Evolution, the whole range of physical, mental, and social science." (D'Arcy Wentworth Thompson, On Aristotle as A Biologist & with A Proemion on Herbert Spencer, Herbert Spencer Lecture for 1913, 31pp., The Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1913. P. 5)


"His Spencer's fertility of mind was as astonishing as his independence. This is shown by almost every page of his Synthetic Philosophy ...." (William Henry Hudson, An Introduction to the Philosophy of Herbert Spencer, revised edition, Watts & Co., London, 1906. P. 25)

In the Preface to the last volume of Principles of Sociology Spencer wrote: "Doubtless in earlier days some exultation would have resulted at reaching the end of his Synthetic Philosophy; but as age creeps on feelings weaken, and now by chief pleasure is in my emancipation. Still there is satisfaction in the consciousness that losses, discouragements, and shattered health, have not prevented me from fulfilling the purpose of my life." (Dated August, 1896. Principles, Vol. III, p. vi. N.Y., 1909)

"For Huxley was never simply a Darwinian biologist. Rather, he was a philosopher of evolution on the grand scale. His vision of the progressive development of nature and society was arguably the nearest thing we have had in the twentieth century to the nineteenth-century evolutionary philosopher Herbert Spencer's so-called 'Synthetic Philosophy.'" (John R. Durant, "Julian Huxley and The Development of Evolutionary Studies," in Evolutionary Studies, A Centenary Celebration of the Life of Julian Huxley, ed. by Milo Keynes and G. Ainsworth Harrison, pp. 26-40, Macmillan, London, 1989. P. 38)
"Gibbon lived to relinquish his pen in triumph at the end of years of devotion to his "History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire"—Mr. Spencer planned the history of the rise and growth of a mightier, a more magnificent, and more beneficent Empire—that of Universal Law—and for forty years he pursued his mighty story in every vicissitude of strength with unfaltering purpose, and lived to complete it amid the applause of the world and the gratitude of all who have the grand passion to understand Nature, and advance the lofty destiny of humanity." (George Jacob Holyoake, Bygones Worth Remembering, 2 Vols., T. Fisher Unwin, London, 1905. Vol. 2, pp. 22-23)
TELEOLOGY


"The welfare of the organism, or of the species, is in every case the end to further which a structure exists; and the difference between a legitimate and an illegitimate teleology is that, while the one explains its existence as having gradually arisen by furthering the end, the other gives no explanation of its existence other than that it was put there to further the end—a final cause of the "barren virgin" sort." (Herbert Spencer, "Replies to Criticisms on The Data of Ethics," Mind, Vol. 6, pp. 82-98, 1881. P. 83)

THERMODYNAMICS

"We have already seen that the Second Law of Thermodynamics proclaims a process in precisely the opposite direction [as Spencer's evolution], ending in the maximum of homogeneity. But Spencer and his contemporaries were judicially blind to the doom / thus proclaimed to their romantic hopes." (William Ralph Inge, God and The Astronomers, Longmans, Green and Co., London, 1933. Pp. 134-135)

"Within a finite period of time past the earth must have been, and within a finite period of time to come the earth must again be, unfit for the habitation of man as at present constituted, unless operations have been, or are to be performed, which are impossible under the laws to which the known operations going on at present in the material world are subject." (William Thomson [Lord Kelvin], "On a Universal Tendency in Nature to the Dissipation of Mechanical Energy," Proceedings of the Royal Society of Edinburgh, Vol. 5, No. 42, pp. 139-142, 1851-52. P. 142. [Thomson's paper was read on Monday, April 19, 1852])

"From Herbert Spencer's references, during the last years of his life, to current scientific controversy, I gathered that he was profoundly disturbed by some of the newer hypotheses of the physicists; but as I had neither knowledge of nor interest in, these questions I failed to understand the cause of this unrest. In answer to my inquiry, my friend Bertrand Russell suggests the following explanation: "I don't know whether he was ever made to realize the implications of the second law of thermodynamics; if so, he might well be upset. The law says that everything tends to uniformity and a dead level, diminishing (not increasing) heterogeneity.... This law used to worry optimists about the time when Spencer was old," (Letter from Bertrand Russell to Beatrice Webb dated June 4, 1923. Quoted in Beatrice Webb, My Apprenticeship, Longmans, Green and Co., London, 1926. P. 88n.)
"As regards the origin of totemism, I suggested that it originated from the practice of naming, first individuals, and then their group, after particular animals. A group, for instance, which was called after the bear would come to look on that animal first with interest, then with respect, and at length with a sort of awe. Mr. Herbert Spencer almost simultaneously, and I believe independently, arrived at a similar explanation. The principal difference was that my suggestion had no reference to nicknames." (Lord Avebury /Sir John Lubbock/, The Origin of Civilisation and the Primitive Condition of Man, 7th edition, Longmans, Green and Co., London, 1912. P. xiii)

"Amongst the first to enter the field in offering a theory to account for the origin of totemism was Herbert Spencer. His view was that totemism originated in a misinterpretation of nicknames. He thought that the imperfections of primitive speech prevented savages from clearly distinguishing between things and their names, and that accordingly ancestors who had been nicknamed after animals, plants, or other natural objects on the ground of some imaginary resemblance to them, were confused in the minds of their descendants with the things after which they had been named; hence from revering his human progenitors the savage came to revere the species of animals or plants or other natural objects which through an ambiguity of speech he had been led to identify them.2 ("This theory was put forward first and most clearly by Herbert Spencer in an essay entitled "The Origin of Animal Worship," which was published in The Fortnightly Review for May 1870. The essay, suggested by J.F. McLennan's recent papers on "The Worship of Animals and Plants," was afterwards republished by Spencer in his Essays, Scientific, Political, and Speculative, vol. iii. Third edition (London, 1878), pp. 101-124. The substance of the theory was afterwards embodied by the author in his large work The Principles of Sociology, vol. 1 §§ 169-176, 180-183 (pp. 331-346, 354-359, Third Edition, 1904). (pp. 43, 43n.-44n.) "The fundamental objection to both these theories including a similar one by Lord Avebury/ has already been stated. They attribute to verbal misunderstandings far more influence than verbal misunderstandings ever seem to have exercised." (p. 44) (James G. Frazer, Totemism and Exogamy, 4 Vols., Macmillan and Co., Limited, London, 1910. Vol. 4)
"Evolution was chiefly responsible for the abandonment of transcendentalism and the formulation of a new philosophy known variously as empiricism, instrumentalism, or pragmatism. Transcendentalism had, indeed, served its purpose and served it well. Rooted in the eighteenth century, resting upon basic assumptions not susceptible to proof, cherishing truths that were intuitive rather than experimental, subjective rather than objective, employing inductive rather than the inductive method, it admirably expressed the faith set forth in the Declaration of Independence, that reformers of the early nineteenth century endeavored to apply. Transcendentalists lived in a paradise of absolutes, where truths were 'self-evident,' laws immutable, right and wrong clear-cut. Their universe was fixed, not growing; their philosophy constant, not dynamic; their morals absolute, not relative. Such a philosophy was obviously irrelevant to the kind of universe announced by Charles Darwin and described by Herbert Spencer. It was necessary to elaborate a new philosophy which would conform to and explain an organic world and a dynamic society," (Samuel Eliot Morison, The Growth of the American Republic, 2 Vols., Oxford University Press, New York, 1942. Vol. 2, pp. 269-270)

"No other philosophic works have, I suppose, been translated into so many languages as his [Spencer's]. Versions of at any rate a great part of the Synthetic Philosophy exist in French, German, Italian, and Russian." (William Henry Hudson, An Introduction to the Philosophy of Herbert Spencer, revised edition, Watts & Co., London, 1906. P. 24n.)

"In the autumn of this year [1936] the Trust which had been established by the will of Herbert Spencer in 1903 came to an end.... Our [Keith's] and the other trustees' business was to spend the income from Spencer's capital on publications specified in his will; this done, his estate was to be divided among certain scientific societies, the British Association and Anthropological Institute being on the list of Spencer's favoured societies. The trustees, believing that the period of utility of the Trust had come to an end, met at the B. [Jackstone] B. [Crowne] P. [Arm] in Downe on October 28, 1936, to hold its last meeting." (Sir Arthur Keith, An Autobiography, Watts & Co., London, 1950. Pp. 633-634)
"On the 18th of September, 1874, my section of the Orientalist Congress, the Archaeological, met, and I delivered an address. In the evening, Mr. Tylor, Herbert Spencer, the Max Müllers, Lubbock, Sir Louis Mallet, and others came to dine at Queen's Gate Gardens (Grant Duff's house), to meet Prince Charles of Roumania." (Sir Mountstuart E. Grant Duff, Notes from a Diary 1873-1881, 2 Vols., John Murray, London, 1898. Vol. 1, p. 82)

"Unlike Herbert Spencer, who, with all his gifts, was incapable of realising the importance of things, and especially of human products as a raw material for scientific classification, Tylor, like a field-worker, kept his eyes on the ground." (Stanley Casson, The Discovery of Man, Readers Union Limited with Hamish Hamilton, London, 1940. P. 237)

Tylor pointed out in his review of Vol. 3 of Descriptive Sociology that "Negrito" should be "the proper Spanish form Negritos, i.e., 'little negros.'" (E. B. Tylor, Review of Vols. 2 and 3 of Descriptive Sociology, The Academy, Vol. 6, p. 298, Sept. 12, 1874. P. 298)


"Tylor's reputation has never faded as much as Spencer's, but for all that I think his importance today is much less." (Donald G. MacRae, "Darwinism and the Social Sciences," in S. A. Barnett, editor, A Century of Darwin, pp. 296-312, Heinemann, London, 1958. P. 308)

"Tylor is great on primitive man--greater than Lubbock--but he may not be able to leave his present publisher." (Letter from Edward L. Youmans to his sister, Eliza A. Youmans, dated August 11, 1871. Quoted in John Fiske, Edward Livingston Youmans, D. Appleton and Company, New York, 1894. P. 279)


Tylor also asserted the independency of his work from the ideas of Darwin and Spencer. (See the Preface of the second edition of Primitive Culture.)
"Anthropology ... [is] the science which, in its strictest sense, has as its object the study of man as a unit in the animal kingdom. It is distinguished from ethnology, which is devoted to the study of man as a racial unit, and from ethnography, which deals with the distribution of the races formed by the aggregation of such units. To anthropology, however, in its more general sense as the natural history of man, ethnology and ethnography may both be considered to belong, being related as parts to a whole." (Edward B. Tylor, "Anthropology," Encyclopaedia Britannica, 11th ed., Vol. 2, pp. 108-119, 1910. P. 108)

"Sociology and the science of culture are concerned with the origin and development of arts and sciences, opinions, beliefs, customs, laws and institutions generally among mankind within historic time; while beyond the historic limit the study in continued by inferences from relics of early ages and remote districts, to interpret which is the task of pre-historic archaeology ...." (Edward B. Tylor, "Anthropology," Encyclopaedia Britannica, Vol. 2, pp. 108-119, 1910. P. 108)

"Herbert Spencer's work, on the other hand, was much broader both in point of view and in its influence [than that of Tylor and Morgan]." (George W. Stocking, Jr., Race, Culture, and Evolution. The Free Press, New York, 1968. P. 117)

"The enquirer who seeks ... the beginnings of man's civilization must deduce general principles by reasoning downwards from the civilized European to the savage, and then descend to still lower possible levels of human existence ...." (E. B. Tylor, "Wild Men and Beast-Children," Anthropological Review, Vol. 1, pp. 21-32, 1863. (pp. 21, 32)

"And while the circle of his [Tylor's] influence widened, he retained the profound and growing respect of his professional colleagues. Even with the irreverent group of American fieldworkers who turn up their noses at the classical school of ethnologists his prestige remains undiminished ...." (Robert H. Lowie, "Edward B. Tylor," American Anthropologist, Vol. 19, pp. 262-268, 1917. P. 262)

"And as to Spencer, one can only note that Tylor later engaged him in a rather extended and vitriolic polemic in which he was at great pains to deny any intellectual debt, and to assert his own priority in the formulation of the idea of animism, as well as to acknowledge its 18th century origins. In the process, he came very close to accusing Spencer of plagiarism." (George W. Stocking, Jr., "Cultural Darwinism" and "Philosophical Idealism" in E. B. Tylor: A Special Plea for Historicism in the History of Anthropology," Southwestern Journal of Anthropology, Vol. 21, pp. 130-147, 1965)

"Dr. Tylor, who, describing my method as being that of deducing all men's customs "from laws of nature," alleges that my inferences are vitiated by it, contends that the skin-marks are all record-marks, when not deliberately decorative. Whether the inductive basis for this conclusion is wider than that for the conclusion drawn by me, and whether the superiority of Dr. Tylor's method is thereby shown, may be judged by the reader who refers to his essay." (The essay in question is E. B. Tylor, "The Study of Customs," Macmillan's Magazine, Vol. 46, pp. 73-86, 1882) (Herbert Spencer, The Principles of Sociology, Vol. 2, D. Appleton and Company, New York, 1899. 2nd ed. P. 231*)

"It may have struck some readers as an omission, that in a work on civilization insisting so strenuously on a theory of development or evolution, mention should scarcely have been made of Mr. Darwin and Mr. Herbert Spencer, whose influence on the whole course of modern thought on such subjects should not be left without formal recognition. This absence of particular reference is accounted for by the present work, arranged on its own lines, coming scarcely into contact of detail with the previous works of these eminent Philosophers." (Edward B. Tylor, Preface to the Second Edition Dated September, 1872, Primitive Culture, 2 Vols., Sixth edition, John Murray, London, 1920. Vol. I, p. vii)

"Mr. Tylor's "Animism," which he has elaborated with great ability in his "Primitive Culture," was a very distinct adumbration of the general truth underlying the whole subject, and really amounts to a history of the development of the conception of Deity. It lacks only the initial idea that all worship is the worship of the ghosts of dead men, perhaps not universally true, to make it cover in a manner the whole ground of Mr. Spencer's argument. The general student of ethnography is surprised at not finding here a more definite recognition of Mr. Tylor's services in this respect. Mr. Spencer's treatise certainly contains enough that is original." (Lester F. Ward, Dynamic Sociology, 2 Vols., D. Appleton and Company, New York, 1894. Vol. I, p. 208)
"But the more difficult it is to account for observed facts in this way [by independent invention], and the more necessary it becomes to have recourse to theories of [cultural] inheritance or transmission to explain them, the greater is their value in the eyes of the Ethnologist. Wherever he can judge that the existence of similar phenomena in the culture of distant peoples cannot be fairly accounted for, except by supposing that there has been a connexion by blood or by intercourse between them, then he has before him evidence bearing upon the history of civilization and on the history of mankind, ..." (Edward B. Tylor, Researches into the Early History of Mankind, second edition, John Murray, London, 1870. P. 374)

In his little-known article, "The Study of Customs" (Macmillan's Magazine, Vol. 46, pp. 73-86, 1882, esp. pp. 73-79) E. B. Tylor reviews, after a fashion, Spencer's Ceremonial Institutions, which had just been published. He correctly (I would say) criticizes Spencer for his un-substantiated and conjectural explanations of the origin of a variety of ceremonial practices (e.g., the Japanese practice of wearing two swords). He offers his own alternative explanations for a few of these practices which seem sounder, and based on a broader and deeper knowledge of the facts involved. But Tylor reveals himself as a dedicated culture historian par excellence, and a rather picayune one at that. There is no discussion, or even mention, of Spencer's sociological generalizations, and no attempt on Tylor's part to propose any himself. Tylor is strong where Spencer is weak, and weak where Spencer is strong. One man is the epitome of facts, the other the epitome of theory.
"It was in 1851 and 1852, just as this career of work in London was beginning, that Tyndall became acquainted with Spencer, who, as already observed, was about his own age, and with Huxley, who was five years younger. This was the beginning of friendships of the most intimate sort; the mutual respect and affection between the three was always charming to contemplate. On all sorts of minor topics they were liable to differ in opinion, and they never hesitated a moment about criticising or attacking each other. The atmosphere of the room in which those three men were gathered was not likely to be an atmosphere of monotonous assent; the enlivening spice of controversy was seldom far away; but the fundamental harmony between them was profound, for all cared immeasurably more for truth than for anything else. It was no small intellectual boon in life, no trifling moral support, for either of those men to have the friendship of the other two." (John Fiske, "John Tyndall," pp. 241-248, in Essays Historical and Literary, 2 Vols., The Macmillan Company, New York, 1902. Vol. 2, p. 243)

"In those days Tyndall kept bachelor's hall, and it was his regular habit, year after year, to dine with Spencer and Hirst at the Athenaeum Club." (John Fiske, "John Tyndall," pp. 241-248, in Essays Historical and Literary, 2 Vols., The Macmillan Company, New York, 1902. Vol. 2, p. 243)


"Spencer's condition causes me the gravest anxiety. He has sent me a full description of his present state. Matters have taken a turn for the better, but nobody can say whether this improvement will continue. He is terribly liable to be overthrown." (Letter from John Tyndall to Joseph D. Hooker dated December 27, 1892. Quoted in Life and Work of John Tyndall by A. S. Eve and C. C. Creasey, Macmillan & Co. Ltd, London, 1945. P. 277)

"It was, I think, in 1852 that Professor Tyndall gave at the Royal Institution the lecture by which he won his spurs: proving, as he then did, to Faraday himself, that he had been wrong in denying diamagnetic polarity. I was present at that lecture; and when introduced to him very shortly after it, there commenced one of those friendships which enter into the fabric of life and leave their marks. Though both had pronounced opinions about most things, and though neither had much reticence, the forty years which have elapsed since we first met witnessed no interruption of our cordial relations." (Herbert Spencer, "The Late Professor Tyndall," The Fortnightly Review, Vol. 61, pp. 141-148, 1894. P. 141)
"Bishop Ellicot is here. He came up on Saturday—frail but fresh. He is one of the most pleasant companions, but at the same time one of the purest Sadducees that I have ever met. He takes parties of young ladies upon the glacier, and thus adds to the mere physics of his holiday the emotional factor which Spencer deems so important." (Letter from John Tyndall to Thomas Henry Huxley dated August 22, 1886. Quoted in Life and Work of John Tyndall by A. S. Eve and C. H. Creasey, Macmillan & Co. Ltd, London, 1945, P. 247)

"Tyndall's naturally strong constitution and stout courage enabled him to make quick recovery [from an attack of phlebitis] and on the sofa he began to work again on "a book I had on the stock before I broke down", as he wrote to Hirst on February 12th [1891]. About this time Spencer remarked to Hirst during lunch at the Athenaeum that "Tyndall lives, and has lived, unwisely". To which in the Journal Hirst remarks of Spencer, "How pedantic he is!" (A. S. Eve and C. H. Creasey, Life and Work of John Tyndall, Macmillan & Co. Ltd, London, 1945, P. 270)

At a farewell banquet for John Tyndall, and at other lectures he had given in the United States, including one at the "Presbyterian College of Yale" at New Haven, Tyndall had made some remarks which were interpreted by orthodox clergymen as offensive to religion. An article in the Christian Intelligencer for February 13, 1873, warmly criticized Tyndall for "attacking ... our religious faith," and sought to uphold "the religion he had wantonly assailed." (John Tyndall, "A Correction.--Letter from Prof. Tyndall." The Popular Science Monthly, Vol. 3, pp. 241-243, 1873. P. 242)

The first volume of the "International Scientific Series" was John Tyndall's Forms of Water, which was published in 1872. Other scientists who wrote volumes for the series included Darwin, Liebig, Helmholtz, and Huxley.
"By the aggregation of some simple societies, compound societies arose; through further aggregation of compound societies, doubly compound societies arose; by aggregation of doubly compound societies, trebly compound societies arose. A simple society consists of families, a compound society of families unified into clans, a doubly compound society finds clans unified into tribes, and the trebly compound societies, such as our own, are those in which tribes have been brought together into nations or states." (Nicholas S. Timasheff, Sociological Theory; Its Nature and Growth, Random House, New York, 1967. Third edition. P. 40)

"But the utility of the classification [Spencer's classification of political types into simple, compound, etc.] appears less when it is realized that the first three social types comprise only primitive societies, while all civilized societies are grouped together in the fourth class, which includes, according to Spencer, Ancient Mexico, the Assyrian Empire, the Roman Empire, Great Britain, France, Germany, Italy and Russia." (T. B. Bottomore, Sociology, A Guide to Problems and Literature, 2nd ed., Pantheon Books, Random House, New York, 1971. P. 118)
"This classification of societies (simple, compound, etc.) constitutes an important contribution to ethnography, as we have only to glance over the tables to determine the true social position of any given tribe or race." (Lester F. Ward, Dynamic Sociology, 2 Vols., D. Appleton and Company, New York, 1894. Vol. I, p. 210)

As interested in the classification of societies in general as anthropologists have been, no one seems to have picked up and commented on Spencer's rather interesting and useful classification of societies on the basis of levels of integration. (Vol. I, pp. 551, 552, 554).

"The Spencerian classification (of autonomous political units) puts into one class such groups as ancient Mexico, the Assyrian Empire, the Egyptian Empire, Great Britain, France, Germany, and Russia. The absurdity of this speaks for itself." (Pitirim A. Sorokin, Sociological Theories of Today, Harper & Row, Publishers, New York, 1966. P. 575n.)

"Spencer ... considers societies organized as clans or villages as "simple societies" and those in which the clans or villages are organized into tribes as "compound societies." His "doubly compound societies" correspond to tribal federations and states, above which are the "trebly compound" modern (sic) nations and empires. Additional complications in respect to degree of stability of headship and sedentary or nomadic character are also introduced." (Quincy Wright, A Study of War, 2 Vols., The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1942. Vol. I, p. 66n.)

"Spencer proposed to distinguish four types of society: (i) simple societies, (ii) compound societies, (iii) doubly compound societies, and (iv) trebly compound societies. The types are distinguished primarily in terms of scale (or size), but also in terms of associated phenomena such as the more extensive division of labour, more elaborate political organization, developed ecclesiastical hierarchy, social stratification, etc. But the utility of the classification appears less when it is realised that the first three social types comprise only primitive societies, while all civilized (sic) societies are grouped together in the fourth class, which includes, according to Spencer, Ancient Mexico, the Assyrian Empire, the Roman Empire, Great Britain, France, Germany, Italy and Russia." (T. B. Bottomore, Sociology, George Allen & Unwin Ltd, London, 1962. P. 114)