

thought. Change was "reified" in the thought of Hegel, Marx, Spencer, and Darwin. Society was "thingified" by a line of thinkers that includes Burke, Comte, Marx, and Mosca. Psyche began to assume its modern proportions for Schopenhauer, Nietzsche, Freud, Adler, and Jung. These ideas were picked up and extended by such Americans as Frederick Jackson Turner, James Harvey Robinson, William Graham Sumner, Charles A. Beard, Lester Frank Ward, John Dewey, William James, Thorstein Veblen, and Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr.

The story of this transmigration of ideas — of Americans traveling to Europe, of their becoming enamored particularly with German thought, of the visits of European scholars in America, of the founding of schools in America based upon European ideas — is much too extended and complex even to be summarized here. Suffice it to say that such events occurred, and that American thinkers frequently followed paths very similar to their European counterparts. As a result of this interchange, American intellectuals embraced and expounded a "new reality."

Three sorts of explanations can be made from the vantage point of this new reality: historical, sociological, and psychological.

Three specialized intellectual "disciplines" were developed in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries to make these explanations: history, sociology, and psychology.

History a Tool for Change

Of course, history was not new to the nineteenth century. It had been consciously written since the time of Herodotus in ancient Greece, and had in fact been written and told long before that. Students had studied and learned it through the ages — but not as a separate "discipline." Prior to sometime in the nineteenth century, students learned history as a kind of bonus from the study of literature or "grammar," and men read and wrote it as the spirit moved them to do so. There was no distinct profession which had history in its keeping or was responsible for it. In the course of the nineteenth century, the study and writing of history was specialized and professionalized. And, as we have seen, in the early twentieth century the older history was defamed and a New History advanced. History was cut loose from its foundation in an enduring order and turned into an instrument for reshaping the society for the future.

There was no problem of re-making sociology. There had been no such study or discipline for

traditional scholarship. It was only developed after some thinkers began to believe in the reality of society. Its founding is usually ascribed to Auguste Comte, but it can be traced through a host of thinkers in its development. At any rate, sociology became the "discipline" to deal with society.

Psychology was a traditional study; it was a branch of philosophy historically. It has already been noted that the house of philosophy fell apart in the wake of the labors of Hume and Kant. Even so, psychology had to be wrested from the hands of philosophers who tried to cling to it before it could be "independent." The assault was upon introspective psychology (which was, in turn, innate psychology), and the effort was to make psychology scientific, or so its proponents claimed. The New Psychology was shaped by Wilhelm Wundt, Sigmund Freud, William James, John B. Watson, and others. Many different schools of psychology emerged, but they all shared a common faith in the New Psychology.

The initial effort, then, was to make history, sociology, and psychology separate intellectual disciplines, to get them recognized as a part of the curriculum of education, and, usually, to get them recognized as sciences in their own right. But in the twentieth

century there has been a considerable movement to "integrate" these studies. Those who want this have probably had their greatest success in the public schools, where, in some instances, they have been merged into social studies courses. But where they have retained some separation, as is usual, a great deal of "integration" has taken place. For example, sociological and psychological explanations now pervade much of the writing of history. There is a kind of inherent logic to this movement to merge these studies. If they could be joined, a New Philosophy might emerge to deal with the "new reality." Actually, of course, this New Philosophy has already emerged and is used to make explanations of developments. Such explanations are, of course, historical, sociological, and psychological.

All Social Science Affected

It may be objected at this point that history, sociology, and psychology do not deal with the whole of reality for contemporary intellectuals, even if they are supposed to deal with part of it. There are, after all, a great many other studies and approaches to learning. The above named do not even include all of the "social sciences." What of economics, of political science, of anthropology? It is in