

WILLIAM GRAHAM SUMNER, 1840-1910: HIS LIFE AND WORK

ROBERT C. ARNE



CAREER: Tutor (1866-1869), professor, Yale University (1872-1909); editor, *The Living Church* (1869-1870); rector, Church of the Redeemer (1870-1872); alderman, city of New Haven (1873-1876); member, Connecticut Board of Education (1882-1910); president, American Sociological Association (1909-1910).

William Graham Sumner, stigmatized by Richard Hofstadter as a “Social Darwinist,” was the Gilded Age’s most renowned teacher of social science and an indefatigable defender of liberalism and republicanism. Balancing justice, sympathy, and self-interest, this follower of Adam Smith made public causes the unforsaken duty of his life: academic freedom, practical education, voluntarism, hard money, honest government, peaceful foreign relations, and free trade. Sumner’s political economy applied his science of society to complex problems of money, banking, tariffs, democracy, and social welfare.

MAN OF PURPOSE

Sumner was born in Paterson, New Jersey, on October 30, 1840. His father, Thomas Sumner, was a sturdy, self-educated, Lancashire yeoman who embodied the austere virtues William Sumner later defended: honesty, integrity, industry, frugality, and independence. Thomas Sumner, a railway engine repairman, and his English wife raised their son in Hartford, Connecticut. The serious, self-righteous youth relished critical thinking. He never abandoned the “conceptions of capital, labor, money, and trade” he had learned as a boy from Harriet Martineau, the famous English popularizer of *laissez-faire* economics. As an exceptionally bright working-class boy with an adequate education and money saved diligently by his father, Sumner enrolled at Yale. He expected to rise to the ministry. Yale educated him in the classics. Described as “reserved and repellent in manner,” he graduated Phi Beta Kappa. His concern for social responsibility and self-actualization was already apparent: “Life ... im-

plies the recognition of all those high purposes and vast capabilities to which our existence is but a subordinate circumstance. The man of purpose alone truly lives.”

Sumner did not think he could serve society best by fighting the Civil War. Hiring a draft substitute, he went to Europe in 1863 to advance his theological studies. He was deeply affected by the dedication of his underpaid Göttingen theological tutors. From their biblical criticism he learned “rigorous and pitiless methods of investigation and deduction.” Because he preferred an intellectual theology, Sumner was less impressed by the Oxford theology he studied in 1865-1866 and by the emotionalism of American religion. He returned to Yale in 1866 to tutor subjects as diverse as mathematics, Greek, and philosophy. Biographer Harris E. Starr wrote that the vigorous practicality of Sumner’s teachings fascinated hundreds of students in his widely attended classes and affected their characters years later. Neatly groomed, with a gruff voice and reserved manner, Sumner “walked with great strides and the air of self-confidence and power.”

Sumner left Yale in 1869 to accept a position as rector of the Morristown, New Jersey, Church of the Redeemer. Hoping to reconcile science and theology, he published a short-lived Episcopalian paper defending rational theology (*The Living Church*). Distaste for ministerial social duties, however, underscored the fact that he had chosen the wrong calling. As he struggled to become a completely rational scientist, as he put nature in God’s place as the force governing man, Sumner lost his faith. But Robert Green McCloskey has concluded that Sumner’s entire scholarly career was affected by his religious conception of “human virtue”: “The good man was chaste, frugal, industrious, and devoted to duty; he walked alone, secure in the certainty of rectitude, and mended his own fences.” Living without scandal, Sumner always upheld those ethical standards. To perfect his life, for instance, he abandoned cigars when he realized what they cost his family, and he read few novels because they detracted from his work schedule. Late in life he bicycled resolutely when his doctor ordered him to keep in shape.

Between 1872 and 1909 Sumner served Yale as a professor of political and social science. Connecticut clergymen and legislators then governed Yale and defended its classical curriculum. “Let Yale condescend to become worldly wise,” responded Sumner, who soon seemed radical to his colleagues. The “Young Yale” movement of the 1870s, led by alumni such as Sumner, slowly forced the college to teach more practical subjects: natural and social science, history, modern languages, and political philosophy. The movement initiated a palace revolution that forced Yale to elect its Corporation from the alumni. Yale students loved to watch a “fearless fighter” like Sumner, a strong-willed iconoclast who shared their modern educational philosophy and, often, their love of free trade.

Putting everything “butt end foremost,” Sumner refused to conceal any truth. Though he disliked the metaphysics of Herbert Spencer’s

Libertarian Heritage No. 6

ISSN 0959-566X ISBN 1 85637 111 5

An occasional publication of the Libertarian Alliance,
25 Chapter Chambers, Esterbrooke Street, London SW1P 4NN
www.libertarian.co.uk email: admin@libertarian.co.uk

© 1992: Libertarian Alliance; Robert C. Arne.

This essay first appeared in Larry Schweikert, ed., *The Encyclopedia of American Business History and Biography*, Bruccoli, Clarke, Layman & Co./Facts on File, 1990, and is reprinted with permission.

Robert Arne is currently completing a PhD at the University of Chicago, having formerly been editor of *The Objectivist Scholar*.

The views expressed in this publication are those of its author, and not necessarily those of the Libertarian Alliance, its Committee, Advisory Council or subscribers.

Director: Dr Chris R. Tame

Editorial Director: Brian Micklethwait Webmaster: Dr Sean Gabb

FOR LIFE, LIBERTY AND PROPERTY



First Principles (1863), he admired Spencer's conceptions of sociology, social forces, evolution, militancy, the industrial, and the survival of the fittest. In 1879 Yale president Noah Porter condemned Sumner's teaching of Spencer's *Study of Sociology* (1874) because it "attacks every Theistic philosophy of society" and would "bring intellectual and moral harm to the students." Breaking promises to Sumner, who threatened to resign if he could not choose his own texts, Porter attacked Sumner's use of Spencer behind his back before Yale's Board of Trustees. The press magnified the conflict: the *New York Observer* called for the resignation of professors sympathetic to Spencer. Sumner, advocating academic freedom, maintained that he was "not defending agnosticism, he was resisting obscurantism." When he explained his beliefs to colleagues, most urged him to remain at Yale. He stayed.

In spite of his teaching commitment, Sumner was elected to the New Haven City Council in 1873. Soon Republicans forced him from office for favoring the Democratic opponent of Republican machines, Samuel Tilden, in the 1876 presidential election. Sumner's subsequent renunciation of politicking did not preclude his membership on the Connecticut Board of Education from 1882 until his death. While inspecting schools around the state, he "enjoyed talking to the pupils, speaking to them about their 'sums' and what school signified. Those who heard him say that he was always simple, clear, and sympathetic." Contemporaries thought him still more humane when they witnessed the tenderness of his affection for his two sons and his semi-invalid wife, Jeannie.

A CIVILIZATION OF CAPITAL AND FREE TRADE

William Graham Sumner's essays won him fame and infamy: he published political, economic, and sociological articles in dozens of American journals. He wrote whenever the folly of American policy upset him enough to leave the academy and engage lustily in public debate. The essays made few original contributions to theoretical economics. They were well-written polemics that applied classical economic argument against protectionism to American conditions. Thinking that his economics was completely empirical, Sumner opposed radical social innovation based on *a priori* theory. He intended his theory merely to assess causal relationships between facts.

Favoring the "organic" social order created by individuals acting without central direction or purpose, he rejected the protectionist's "artificial or mechanical" conception of society as a product of social engineering. Sumner feared the "social quackery" of "amateur social physicians" who preferred "remedies" like bimetallism or alcohol prohibition to scientific observations of man's evolutionary progress. He concluded, "whenever we try to get paternalized we only get policed." To Sumner, *laissez-faire* meant "Let us manage for ourselves." He wanted a diverse, integrated society to prosper in accordance with the infinitely complex ramifications of thousands of human decisions and actions. Rejecting the dogma that *laissez-faire* was a "rule of science," he willingly deviated from this "maxim of policy" in education, the maintenance of a gold standard, and other matters.

When Sumner criticized Attorney General William M. Evart's protectionist stance in 1883, the *New York Tribune* declared that Sumner was "unworthy of Yale" and fabricated a story that Sumner's students had rebelled against him. Tariffs were the federal government's largest source of income in the late nineteenth century and its greatest departure from *laissez-faire* principles. Republican representatives of northern manufacturers supported the tariffs while agriculturalists - who were exporting grain to the world - generally opposed them. Sumner became vice-president of the American Free Trade League. He wrote many pamphlets and a widely read 1885 booklet, *Protectionism: The -ism Which Teaches That Waste Makes Wealth*. The booklet illustrates Sumner's general point that regulation must "follow custom" if it is to do anything positive; government may legitimately maintain the gold standard that custom and market experience had proven sound.

Sumner argued that the evolution of free trade paralleled the anti-slavery struggle, legal reformism, and the separation of church and state. He accused protectionists of creating an anti-evolutionary, unethical, and science-negating theory that "*national wealth can be produced by taxes and cannot be produced without them.*" Industry

and intelligence create wealth, wrote Sumner, not protectionist laws that create businesses in one place by harming consumers elsewhere. Sumnerian free-trade policy called for tariffs large enough to divert capital from uses consumers most desired. What would happen if, without tariffs, America ceased to be a manufacturing nation? Sumner answered that "Prosperity is no more connected with one form of industry than another." What would happen if Americans imported everything and sold nothing abroad? "If so," Sumner explained, "foreigners would make us presents and support us."

Sumner always concerned himself with the neglected victims of regulatory policy. He reasoned that the consumer was actually hurt by the discovery of iron in America, since tariffs then raised prices on iron from Europe. He expressed concern for the effect of tariffs on workers. He calculated that independent sewing women had to work 15 additional minutes a day to support the Willimatic Linen Company because that company obtained a tariff that raised the price of cheap foreign thread. Tariffs hurt the working class because wage earners in one industry in effect paid taxes to support workers elsewhere. If foreign wages were lower than American wages, Sumner's opponents asked, could Americans compete? Sumner answered that farm laborers in Iowa earned three times the wages of English farm laborers, yet American farm products were competitive in England. He thought that was possible because the price of a product depended on many factors, not just the price of labor.

Sumner's criticism of tariffs illustrates his general view that the possibility of market failure must be compared with the likelihood that government might betray the common good in the name of "the selected and favored producer." He feared that "under protectionism the government gives a license to certain interests to go out and encroach on others." That favoritism, he argued, caused undesirable governmental growth: "Tax A to favor B. If A complains, tax C to make it up to A. If C complains, tax B to favor C ... Tax them as long as anybody complains, or anybody wants anything. This is the statesmanship of the nineteenth century." He argued that Congress lacked both the will and the knowledge to regulate properly: "If now, it were possible to devise a scheme of legislation which should, according to protectionist ideas, be just the right jacket of taxation to fit this country to-day, *how long would it fit?* Not a week ... Every day new lines of communication are opened, new discoveries made, new inventions produced ... and the consequence is that the industrialist system is in constant flux and change."

Sumner thought capital made civilization possible. He defined capital as "any *product* of labor which is used to assist production." It is labor "multiplied unto itself - raised to a higher power." He considered the savings bank depositor to be a "hero of civilization" because "every social gain, educational, ecclesiastical, political, aesthetic or other," depends upon saved capital. Sumner argued, for instance, that his reforms at Yale depended upon capital contributions. He justified the concentration of capital in few hands on grounds that few could invest capital as well as Rockefeller, Carnegie, and Morgan had. Sumner defended their riches against the "cupidity" of the "legal plunderer" because defending the institution of property was the only way Sumner could defend his family's property.

The socialism of Upton Sinclair, Sumner suggested, would waste capital by divorcing property from private interests. Laws that protected capital limited population while preserving its means of subsistence. Using Malthusian logic, he thought that welfare programs increased population and lowered wages. If laborers did not too rapidly propagate, if they did not make too many demands upon capital for wages, wage rates would rise. High profits would augment the capital that paid laborers. Sumner thought capital growth was gradually abolishing poverty and increasing the "dignity of labor": "the power of capital ... has set women free from the drudgery of the grain-mill and the spinning-room."

THE FORGOTTEN MAN

Sumner worried that capital would be squandered if America abandoned the post-1873 gold standard: "the best system of coinage yet devised." Many American farmers believed that cheaper money would reduce their debt payments and give them more dollars for their crops. When Congress abandoned greenbacks (Civil War

paper currency), debtors and speculators favoring inflation turned to the palliative of bimetalism. Congress responded by passing silver purchase acts in 1878 and 1890. Indignantly aroused, Sumner thought that this fiscal irresponsibility caused the Panic of 1893. In the 1890s Sumner made himself the most conspicuous opponent of bimetalism; he spoke frequently before large and sympathetic eastern audiences in famous clubs and before smaller audiences of mid-western hecklers. Sumner and the Republicans successfully defended gold against William Jennings Bryan, the Democrats, and the Populists.

Sumner hoped that history would teach prudence. His books *A History of American Currency* (1874) and *A History of Banking in the United States* (1896) provide detailed investigations of capital flows and bank failures that simultaneously illustrated the folly of contemporary American money and banking policies. The books, which contain less economic theory and fewer statistics than do today's economic histories, were well received by contemporaries. Sumner thought banks should merely transfer capital to producers at market interest rates. He tried "to expose the errors involved in mistaking credit currency for money, and money for capital." Americans had repeatedly sought capital from banks and gained only speculation and unsound notes. Exemplifying those bad experiences with the story of the Second Bank of the United States, Sumner argued that banks must back notes and loans with a 100 percent specie reserve. Disguising "false credit" as real credit made banking a "high class confidence operation." He considered the Bank of the United States to be nothing less than a "swindle" by which government obtained "other people's capital": "They print notes which have no security and make the public use them as money."

Sumner's *History of Banking* argued that the law against usury had kept banks from making their profits purely from high interest rates; banks could stay in business only by issuing high volumes of "false credit" at low interest rates: "Nine-tenths of the evil practices of banks were due to attempts to evade that law in obtaining rates which were legitimately theirs by the operation of the market." Sumner conceded that "false credit" could temporarily stimulate investment and exports, but that process consumed unprofitable capital investments in "successive periods of production." Overextending credit to risky businesses exposed the entire economy, normally a healthy organism, to commercial crises. Variations in the gold stock or foreign exchange could be magnified into a depression. The liquidation of debts, banks, and enterprises and the lowering of nominal wages was then necessary as a "severe remedy" for past folly.

The greatest loser was not the politician or the "Money Shark" who profited from fluctuating monetary values; it was the "Forgotten Man" who minded his business and lost his savings. Bimetalism could not work, Sumner argued, because the metals had different and fluctuating prices on the world market. People would pay debts with the undervalued metal and trade it in for the overvalued metal if both were legally exchangeable for paper dollars. Sumner distrusted banks and government too much to favor paper currency. Irredeemable paper could lead to national disaster. Meddling with the indicators of a complex financial system - "prices, the rate of discount, and the foreign exchanges" - was tantamount to "tampering with the ... steam gauge of a locomotive."

Sumner hesitated to endorse the Interstate Commerce Commission's regulation of railroad monopolies after 1887. He advised against hasty regulation lest responses to present difficulties create laws "unwisely adopted in the first place, but now regarded as a 'bulwark of society.'" The lack of "internal cohesion" in trusts made them less threatening than was often thought. Reserving final judgment on the ICC, he feared that attacking capital would "arrest the industrial forces in their development on which our social well-being depends." Among Sumner's papers, Bruce Curtis found an unpublished 1909 manuscript, "On the Concentration of Wealth." The manuscript suggests that Sumner favored regulating monopolies. Apparently his longstanding concern that big business might corrupt republican government finally overrode his misgivings about economic regulation.

Sumner thought most big companies earned legitimate profits because they used productive means to acquire wealth. However, other firms in the late nineteenth century had sought tariffs, land

grants, and concessions for public works. Tammany boss William Tweed and other machine politicians controlled city governments and politicized public works. Sumner denounced government by wealth, calling it "Plutocracy." The plutocrat used his capital to get legislative privileges such as artificial monopolies: "he practices upon the industrial vices, makes an engine of venality, expends his ingenuity, not on processes of production, but on 'knowledge of men,' and on the tactics of the lobby."

In a monumental war of "numbers versus capital," Sumner saw democracy arrayed against plutocracy: "An organized interest forms a compact body, with strong wishes and motives, ready to spend money, time, and labor; it has to deal with a large mass, but it is a mass of people who are ill-informed, unorganized, and more or less indifferent." The supreme test of government was whether it could stop those distributional "cliques." Democracies, fraught with financial scandals, had failed to do so. Sumner thought that only "institutions and guarantees" that separated state and market would "cut the ground from under plutocracy."

Those constitutional guarantees might also protect property from democracy. Sumner dreaded the tendency of democracy to promote "equality" at the expense of the "Forgotten Man." Protectionists ignored consumers; trade unionists ignored workers outside their trade when they regulated apprenticeship; welfare enthusiasts forgot the taxpayer. "Their schemes," Sumner wrote, "may always be reduced to this type-that A and B decide what C shall do for D ... I call C the Forgotten Man, because I have never seen that any notice was taken of him in any of the discussions." Drunkenness, silliness, inefficiency, shiftlessness, and imprudence all inflicted penalties. Sumner refused to deflect those penalties to "the industrious and prudent as a responsibility and a duty." With the amoral logic of a natural scientist, he concluded: "Let it be understood that we cannot get outside this alternative: liberty, inequality, survival of the fittest; non-liberty, equality, survival of the unfittest."

NOT A SOCIAL DARWINIST

Did those precepts, damned even by Sumner's contemporaries, mean that he wanted poor men to starve? In *What Social Classes Owe To Each Other* (1883), he argued that, as a matter of "patriotism and civic duty," Americans owed each other the mutual redress of grievances, the "chance" for self-help. Sumner's "law of sympathy" suggested the need for *voluntary*, direct assistance to others: "It is the common frailty in the midst of a common peril which gives us a kind of solidarity of interest to rescue the one for whom the chances of life have turned out badly just now." "Idiots, insane persons, cripples, etc., are weak and society has to support them," wrote Sumner. Aware of the progress of modern culture, he mitigated the mercilessness of natural selection in unpublished manuscripts, which claimed that "the struggle for comfort has taken the place of the struggle for existence." After 1884 Sumner refused even to use the term "survival of the fittest."

Evidence of Sumner's humanitarianism suggests that Sumner was not the "Social Darwinist" Richard Hofstadter portrayed in *Social Darwinism in American Thought* (1955). Social Darwinism means the application to social theory of Darwinian concepts of the struggle for existence, individual variation, and the survival of the fittest. It seems more likely that Sumner acquired the harshest of his worldviews from David Ricardo and Thomas Malthus, whose economic ideas were well represented in the Martineau tales he had read as a boy. Malthus's "man-land" ratio pervades his social thought. Donald Pickens argues that Sumner's use of Adam Smith and the Scottish moral philosophers, who emphasized the unintended results of individual action, was mistaken for "Social Darwinism." Because the Spencerian evolutionism Sumner admired was Lamarckian and because it also justified altruistic behavior, Spencer could not have led Sumner to strict Social Darwinism. Sumner admired Darwin greatly for his empirical method but did not accept his evolutionism until 1875. Sumner's emphasis upon voluntary cooperation proved strong enough and his references to Darwinian biology weak enough that portrayal of him as a Social Darwinist is misleading unless that term is defined broadly enough to include all forms of social evolutionism.

Sumner, like Spencer, certainly did not call for military struggle. His preference for peaceful industrial development and classical re-

publican self-government drew the damnation of jingoists favoring the Spanish-American War of 1898. Sumner's 1899 article, "The Conquest of America by Spain," argued that America had adopted the militarist, imperialist, and absolutist policies of its vanquished opponent. "National vanity and national cupidity" made America degrade itself with the "dominion and regulation" of foreign territories while it taxed domestic citizens extra for naval protection of these colonies. When a society was relatively unfit for international struggle, as primitive societies were, Sumner believed that it deserved protection from developers.

Sumner thought men had no more natural rights "than a rattlesnake" because no man should demand anything from anyone else as a matter of right. Yet he favored a "civil liberty" that guaranteed every man "the use of all his own powers exclusively for his own welfare." Man's civil rights include a right not to be murdered and a right to the pursuit of happiness, which meant "the right to live one's life out in one's own way." Civil liberty lets each man realize the energy within himself as society "profits by the expansion and evolution of all the power there is in it." Sumner's ideal government was a "republic" which guaranteed civil rights: a governing body with "temporary and defeasible" tenure. He thought every ruling class should seek a "Golden mean" between the preservation of its rights and the practice of its duties - particularly its duty not to exploit other classes. His ideal citizen rises to the concept of liberty by submitting to no servitude. Viewing workers as free men, Sumner admonished them to realize their own powers by accepting the duty of standing up for their own rights - perhaps with union help.

Sumner surprised his colleagues, who thought of him as an economist, when the American Sociological Association elected him president in 1909. In 1907 Sumner had published *Folkways*, a scholarly anthropological study written as a prelude to *The Science of Society*. This four-volume work, a work that Sumner initiated and for which he had always lived, was completed in 1927 by Albert Galloway Keller. Sumner held that men were fundamentally similar beings whose struggle for the earth's resources determined their actions. Men could compete or cooperate to better their chances against nature. Rejecting metaphysical teleology and theology, Sumner thought that "The end of life is to live." Rationalistic as Sumner was, his sociology highlighted man's emotions: "The four great motives which move men to social activity are hunger, love, vanity, and fear of superior powers."

Sumner described folkways as "habits of the individual and customs of the society which arise from efforts to satisfy needs." Habitual behaviors emerged from an unplanned, competitive struggle. Folkways "are like products of natural forces which men unconsciously set in operation." "Mores" were folkways enforced by moral sanctions. "Mystery" sometimes reshaped folkways into "mores" as man's supernatural beliefs affected his actions. Tradition made the "mores" relatively fixed and coercive: they determined man's ideas and his morality. Only the ruling cliques of a society could alter the mores of the custom-bound "masses" to achieve certain ends, and they could do it only gradually (usually through ritual). That conservative doctrine suggests that social engineering is virtually impossible. Nevertheless, the "dissent and free judgement of the best reason and conscience" deserves protection lest men conform forever to irrational mores.

THE "REMEDIES" ARE THE PROBLEMS

Sumner stood as an effective advocate of intellectual freedom and economic liberty. His educational reforms seemed as radical to "the Puritan theological crowd" at Yale as his defense of free trade did to tariff-hungry capitalists. As he praised the unsung class of industrious middle-class workers and entrepreneurs, professional managerial expertise was coming to dominate increasingly large businesses. Sumner realized that the "path of greatest success" was becoming that of "distinguished service to the organization." "Progressive" reformers, "Democrats," and "Plutocrats" all exploited the "Forgotten Man" by using political organization. Sumner's science of society challenged them all by arguing that the social order was too complex to be managed by "amateur social physicians."

Sumner died of a stroke on April 12, 1910; his intellectual legacy was not great. Yale's "Sumner Club" fought the New Deal. Social scientists such as Alfred Marshall, F. Y. Edgeworth, Yves Guyot, and

Franklin Giddings acknowledged respect for aspects of Sumner's work. Twentieth-century economists, however, with their specialized, quantified methods and their concern for macroeconomic issues, soon lost interest in Sumner's qualitative, microeconomic essays. Only Sumner's *Folkways* has maintained its reputation as a classic of American social science. Sumner's admonitions to wait and see how social institutions resolved problems seem incomprehensible to modern social scientists and historians. Biographer Bruce Curtis, for example, has concluded that Sumner had "few or no specific and practical prescriptions that could be used to cure social ills a century or more later." Yet the "remedies" of professional politicians and social scientists - deficits, paper money inflation, tariffs, armies, and massive social spending - are themselves some of the problems Sumner discussed. His solutions - civil liberty, industrial cooperation, non-interventionism, and voluntarism - deserve a better hearing.

Selected Publications:

The Books of Kings, translated by Sumner, Scribner, Armstrong, New York, 1872.

A History of American Currency, Holt, New York, 1874.

Andrew Jackson as a Public Man: What He Was, What Chances He Had, and What He Did With Them, Houghton, Mifflin, Boston, 1883.

What Social Classes Owe To Each Other, Harper, New York, 1883.

Protectionism: The -Ism Which Teaches That Waste Makes Wealth, Holt, New York, 1885.

Alexander Hamilton, Dodd, Mead, New York, 1892.

A History of Banking in the United States, Journal of Commerce and Commercial Bulletin, New York, 1896.

Folkways: A Study of the Sociological Importance of Usages, Manners, Customs, Mores, and Morals, Ginn, Boston, 1907.

War and Other Essays, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1911.

Earth-Hunger and Other Essays, edited by Albert Galloway Keller, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1913.

The Challenge of Facts and Other Essays, edited by Keller, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1914.

The Forgotten Man and Other Essays, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1918.

The Science of Society, 4 volumes, by Sumner and Keller, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1927; Milford/Oxford University Press, London, 1927.

The Essays of William Graham Sumner, edited by Keller and Maurice R. Davie, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1934; Milford/Oxford University Press, London, 1934.

References:

Dominic T. Armentano, "The Political Economy of William Graham Sumner," Ph.D. dissertation, University of Connecticut, 1967.

Robert C. Bannister, *Social Darwinism: Science and Myth in Anglo-American Social Thought*, Temple University Press, Philadelphia, 1979.

Bruce Curtis, *William Graham Sumner*, Twayne, Boston, 1981.

Sidney Fine, *Laissez-Faire and the General Welfare State: A Study of Conflict in American Thought, 1861-1901*, University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor, 1956.

Richard Hofstadter, *Social Darwinism in American Thought*, Beacon, Boston, 1955.

Albert G. Keller, *Reminiscences of William Graham Sumner*, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1933.

Robert Green McCloskey, *American Conservatism in the Age of Enterprise*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 1951.

Donald Pickens, "William Graham Sumner As a Critic of the Spanish American War," *Continuity*, 11, 1987.

Mervin A. Sheketoff, "William Graham Sumner: Social Christian," Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University, Norman Erik Smith, "William Graham Sumner as an Anti-Social Darwinist," *Pacific Sociological Review*, July 1979.

Harris E. Starr, *William Graham Sumner*, Holt, New York, 1925.

Archives:

William Graham Sumner's papers are at the Yale University Library.