

the first professionally trained anthropologist for the Department, Loren Eiseley. This interest continually evolved with the employment of additional staff until finally there emerged a separate Department of Anthropology.

When Chandler Dean Malott was interested in the introduction of the case-method study of Human Relations he chose the most respected social scientist in the University to go to Harvard University for a year to become acquainted with it. When Carroll Clark came back enthused about it, I remember feeling that some of its ideas were rather strange but if Carroll Clark embraced them there must be something in it. This interest continued to grow until a half dozen K.U. faculty were teaching Human Relations courses. Eventually this work became a part of the Department of Speech.

Thus, throughout his career Dr. Clark was continuously probing into the frontiers of new areas of sociology. In this article written at the beginning of space exploration we see again his emphasis on the development of new aspects of knowledge and an effort to link it up with the evolutionary process of man's past.

Upon the occasion of his retirement from the University of Kansas in 1968 over one hundred colleagues and former students sent letters of expression of gratitude for the inspiration they had derived from his teaching and participation in the profession. A memorial fund was established which continues to provide cash awards to graduate students in the Sociology Department. The dominant theme in this memorial was the example he set of warmth, humanness, and intellectual inspiration.

The need for human adaptation to space exploration is thus emphasized once again in this early paper for the American Rocket Society. It is a need that will continue to develop as we resume our manned space flights.

Marston M. McCluggage  
Emeritus Professor of Sociology  
University of Kansas

## EARTH-BOUND ATTITUDES: SOCIAL RECONSTRUCTION NEEDED FOR THE SPACE AGE<sup>1</sup>

Carroll D. Clark  
*University of Kansas*

*Mid-American Review of Sociology, 1982, Vol. VII, No. 1:11-16*

Man stands on the threshold of perhaps the most audacious venture of his evolutionary career. It promises to outdo the feat of our forebears, when million of years ago, they terminated their arboreal apprenticeship and dared to struggle for survival on the ground. A chancy undertaking indeed that was, coming down out of the trees and pitting the frail primate physique against a ferocious fauna and countless unknown dangers. It may have been the boldest move so far. But today man is making one yet more daring, as he readies his machines to launch himself into outer space, there to begin exploration and discovery that promise to free him from his earth-bound status and open to him the greatest adventure of all.

Between these two epochal feats—the descent from the trees and the ability to escape from the earth's gravitational field—lie many another evolutionary step that has carried our race further away from the estate of our animal relatives, and has involved us every more complexly in modes of life and in problems that are uniquely our own. The earlier steps in the hominid direction were biological and therefore blind—our anthropoid ancestors could not foresee the consequences of mutant developments or other sematic changes such as the enlarged neopallium of the brain, or the pelvic and orthograde posture and bipedal locomotion. Saltatory genetic processes and the morphological plasticity of the primate stock give rise to the unique biological species, *Homo sapiens*, with no one aware of what was happening or pondering about what might lie ahead.

Scarcely less blind must have been the early forward steps in cultural evolution—the first fabrication of tools and weapons of wood or stone, the first art of fire-making, the first guttural

ejaculations that became consensually validated in the group as symbols for communication. As cultural, in addition to, biological evolution became the mode of his adaptations to, and successful transaction with, the environment, man became what Korzybski has called a "time-binding" creature. Through oral tradition and later through writing, the past became his parent and teacher, the future his child to anticipate and in some measure to control.

The technologies of communication and education since the invention of writing have made the time-binding process a mammoth pooling of knowledge and experience. With the growth and institutionalization of free and purposeful inquiry, first in the physical, then in the biological, and last in the behavioral sciences, it has become possible for us not only to understand and control the phenomena of nature, but to anticipate and direct, in some degree, the outcome of social and cultural events. Today, with space travel virtually at hand, it becomes of the utmost importance to foresee probable developments and problems that will arise, and lay tentative plans aimed at making the new venture maximally beneficial to the human race.

We can anticipate many problems likely to obstruct successful exploitation of the opportunities offered by space exploration, only a few of which can be treated here. Among the more serious, but by no means the most obvious, are social attitudes and sentiments that predispose man to what may be termed "planetary provincialism," or perhaps a sort of "cosmic isolationism."

Attitudes and sentiments are tendencies to act and feel in certain ways in certain types of situations. They are not inborn, but derived from learning in its broadest sense, or socialization. What particularly concerns us is the fact that the situational components of these action tendencies are all terrestrial settings, and hence, from the standpoint of the space venture, circumscribed. Few of us, indeed, have more than a relatively narrow access even to the cultures, social systems, geographic habitats, and other phenomena of this earthly environment. None of us, at this writing, has travelled into outer space or

had direct experience of what lies beyond earth's thin envelope of air and its constraining gravitational field.

One consequence of this condition can be fear, for man has always had a dread of the unknown. No doubt the vast majority of humans would shrink with fear from personally launching on a space journey even though rewards were great and safety factors approximated those of transoceanic air travel. Nevertheless, it seems less likely that fear will impede progress in exploitation of space than some other consequences of our "planetary provincialism." One of those is pretty sure to be an incapacity of the imagination, the inability to envisage the needs, possibilities, safeguards, adjustment requirements, and other factors that will arise in the space venture. This imaginative incapacity may be surmounted by those scientifically trained and organized to deal with space problems. Its more paralyzing effects will come from the great mass of the poorly informed and indifferent who nonetheless, in a free society, have a key part in the collective decision-making necessary to promote the space venture. The flood of science fiction, comic strips, and other mass-media material presenting imaginary space adventures should not deceive us on this point. While these have no doubt fanned popular interest and increased receptivity to the idea of space travel, they are not as a rule sufficiently grounded in facts to develop realistic understanding and the disciplined imagination needed for sound collective judgments on space issues.

Even more obstructive are those attitudes and sentiments that focus on a narrow nationalism and block the way to attaining effective international organization. Political evolution from the primitive tribe to the modern nation-state was a slow process, for the most part involving social forces moving at a secular pace. It moved forward through the organization and establishment of power structures that were grounded on principles of legitimacy, and were in some measure responsible to the emerging needs and values embraced in political goals. Technological, demographic, economic and cultural forces spurred the advances, but stable nationhood was only attained when underlying attitudes of tolerance, fairplay, belief in justice

through the rule of law, and the like, supplied a basic consensus within the nation-state.

Great as this achievement was, we are forced to recognize today that unbridled sovereignty of the nation-state becomes an anachronism in the space age. Our scientific and technological culture has rapidly outstripped the culture of our political organization, resulting in a culture lag of the most serious nature. The solution does not lie in scrapping the attitudinal consensus undergirding the nation-state, but in developing new attitudes appropriate to collective action in the international sphere.

This calls for social guidance and inventiveness on an unprecedented scale which challenge the concerted efforts of sociologists, social psychologists, cultural anthropologists, students of jurisprudence, political scientists, and other specialists in the behavioral sciences, who must supply the requisite knowledge.

So far as international organization is concerned, we can be fairly confident that the challenge will be met, and that intensive research will focus on the major problems involved. But even among professional scholars, we can expect strong resistant attitudes that may impede, especially at the outset, the mobilization of their knowledge and skills to deal with space problems and the drastic social reconstruction demanded by conditions of the space age. To many, such ideas as space migrations, the occupation and settlement of other planets, and commercial exploitation of their resources through interplanetary trade, seem too fantastic to merit serious consideration. Even scholars who accept the probability that these developments will come to pass within the life-time of the present generation, are likely to hesitate in displaying interest in them or their probable consequences, in advance of their actually happening.

It scarcely need be said that the attitude of scientific caution is well-grounded and indispensable in scientific work. As in the case of the natural scientist, the social scientist has been taught to frown upon purely speculative theorizing. Nevertheless, the social scientist cannot escape an obligation to project

from his base-line data any dynamic trends and logical developments that have potentially high social significance and a reasonable degree of probability. The imminence of excursions of man into outer space presents him both with an opportunity and a challenge. It puts a demand upon him to bring into play a disciplined imagination to the end of developing stochastic lines of inquiry—the projection of knowledge of behavioral uniformities under known conditions to the probable conditions under which men would act, given certain developments in the conquest of space.

Meanwhile, as we have said, the most obstructive attitudes and most serious culture lags that stand in the way of human security and progress in the unfolding era of space and the atom lie in the earth-bound realm of social relations. In their essence, these problems are not new, but are hoary with antiquity, and have badgered mankind throughout the course of cultural evolution. They involve the relationships of the individual and the group, the maintenance of social systems without stultifying abuses of power, the interrelations of groups and power structures, the resolution of destructive conflict within the between groups, the readjustment of social patterns to keep abreast of technological advances, and the like. Whether viewed morally or sociologically, we have had such problems all along the way. What is perhaps new is the compelling urgency they assume as we confront the atom and space venture. One need not be prescient to feel quite sure that human destiny today is at a turn where the stakes are unprecedentedly high, that the tortuous road ahead is not to be muddled through, and that time—the time available to put our human relations in order—is rapidly running out.

One hopeful generalization may be drawn from contemporary findings in the behavioral sciences. People's attitudes can be changed and social organization can be reconstructed on a scale and with a rapidity that was thought impossible only a few years ago. If other evidence were lacking, the speed with which modern technic-ways have replaced age-old folkways in Russia and in many parts of the Orient would serve to refute the Sumnerian view that, even under the impact of revolution,

mores and institutions can move only at a glacier-like pace and as a result of natural forces beyond purposive human control.

Can we master the agencies and instruments of guided social change that are available in the enlightened democracies of the free world and focus them upon the goals of social, economic, and political reconstruction demanded by the space age? Can we drive home to this generation the realization that neither the concept of war as we have known it in the past, nor the other principal means through which international peace and stability were formerly sought have any validity in the new era? Can we shift from the divisive, self-defeating attitudes of the ancient tribe to those of responsible concern for the rights and welfare of all humankind under the rule of international law? We must try, and only if we succeed can we rise from the status of hapless earthlings to become masters of the new world in space.

## CONSIDERATIONS ON A THEORY OF DESCRIPTIVE ACTIVITY

Jaber F. Gubrium  
*Marquette University*

David R. Buckholdt  
*Marquette University*

Robert J. Lynott  
*Loyola University*

Mid-American Review of Sociology, 1982, Vol. VII, No. 1:17-35

*From a working definition of description, the meaning of idealized representation is presented. It is suggested that, as a universal means of depiction, idealized representation stands in a contradictory relationship with the concrete conditions of its production, generating descriptive irresponsibility. Features of descriptive activity are presented, which serve as a basis for redefining the moral character of idealized representation.*

As a working definition, description might be said to be the process by which things, ideas, or events are represented. Our intention is first to briefly develop the definition along a conventional line in order then to make suggestions for a theory of descriptive activity, one that is social and informed by some current sociological approaches to it and that generally frames an ongoing program of related research. In the main, the suggestions are intended to be practical; they do not aim toward a final transcendent version of representation. Rather, they provide a means for analytically perusing the working affairs of those who concertedly engage in description. We shall argue that, as a universal means of depiction, conventional or idealized representation stands in a contradictory relationship with the concrete working conditions of its production, generating descriptive irresponsibility.