INTERNATIONAL SOCIAL SCIENCE BULLETIN

Second World Congress of Sociology

Liège, 1953

UNESCO

By mutual agreement, the *INTERNATIONAL SOCIAL SCIENCE BULLETIN* will serve as the official publisher of the proceedings and some other materials of each of the following international organizations:

The International Committee of Comparative Law

The International Committee for Documentation in the Social Sciences

The International Economic Association

The International Political Science Association

The International Sociological Association

The International Studies Conference

The Provisional International Social Science Council

The World Association of Public Opinion Research (WAPOR)

PRICE AND SUBSCRIPTION RATES

Single issue: $1.00; 6/-; 300 fr.
Yearly subscription: $3.50; 21/-; 1,000 fr.

Any of the distributors listed will be pleased to accept subscriptions; rates in currency other than the above will be supplied on application to the distributor in the country concerned. When notifying change of address please enclose last wrapper or envelope.

INTERNATIONAL SOCIAL SCIENCE BULLETIN

VOLUME VI — 1954

A s from the next volume, this bibliography will be published in London by Messrs. Stevens and Sons Limited.

It will continue to be available through your usual Bookseller, or it can be ordered direct from the publishers:

STEVENS and SONS LIMITED, 11 New Fetter Lane, LONDON, E.C. 4

from whom full particulars are available.

This transfer does not imply any change in the editorial policy or the format of the International Social Sciences Bibliographies, which continue to receive financial assistance from Unesco.

For all editorial matters, please apply to

INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR SOCIAL SCIENCES DOCUMENTATION, 27, rue Saint-Guillaume, PARIS-7e.

A PARTIR du prochain volume, cette bibliographie sera publiée par la Maison Stevens and Sons de Londres.

Elle continuera à être vendue par votre libraire habituel. Elle peut également être commandée directement à l'éditeur :

STEVENS and SONS LIMITED, 11 New Fetter Lane, LONDON, E.C. 4

qui fournira sur demande tous les renseignements utiles.

Ce changement n'implique aucune modification dans le contenu et la disposition des Bibliographies internationales de sciences sociales, qui continueront à bénéficier du concours financier de l'Unesco.

Pour tout ce qui concerne la rédaction, s'adresser au

COMITÉ INTERNATIONAL POUR LA DOCUMENTATION DES SCIENCES SOCIALES, 27, rue Saint-Guillaume, PARIS-7e.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

IV. OPEN FORUM

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS TO THE PRESENT ISSUE

Dr. U. G. Foa, Executive Director of the Israel Institute of Applied Social Research,
    Jerusalem.
Dr. M. Ginsberg, London School of Economics and Political Science.
Dr. D. V. Glass, University of London.
Dr. D. G. MacRae, London School of Economics and Political Science.
Dr. A. M. Rose, University of Minnesota.
Mrs. C. B. Rose, University of Minnesota.
Dr. J.-R. Tréanton, Centre d'Études Sociologiques, Paris.

PART I

THE SECOND WORLD CONGRESS OF SOCIOLOGY, LIÈGE, 1953

INTRODUCTION

The International Sociological Association held its Second World Congress of Sociology at the University of Liège from 24 to 31 August 1953, under the auspices, and with the support, of Unesco and the Belgian Government. There were 281 registered participants from 34 countries; among them 65 from Belgium, 34 from the United States, 32 from France, 28 from Germany, 23 from the United Kingdom, 22 from the Netherlands, 8 from Italy, 7 from Denmark, and 7 from India. Smaller contingents came from Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Ecuador, Finland, Gold Coast, Greece, Iceland, Israel, Japan, Lebanon, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, Union of South Africa, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia.

The opening ceremony was attended by His Excellency the Minister of Public Instruction, Mr. P. Harmel; by Mr. Giraud, representing the United Nations; by Mrs. Alva Myrdal, representing Unesco; by the Rector of the University of Liège, Mr. F. Campus; by members of the provincial and municipal governments, and by leading representatives of cultural and commercial organizations in Liège.

Professor J. P. Haesert, of the University of Ghent, chairman of the Belgian Organization Committee and honorary president of the congress, opened the session by welcoming the delegates and the representatives of governmental and international bodies to Liège. He expressed the hope that the congress would be fruitful, not only in contributing to the body of sociological knowledge, but also in strengthening the personal contacts between sociologists of different countries.

Professor Georges Davy, Dean of the Faculty of Letters of the University of Paris and Member of the Institut de France, vice-president of the International Sociological Association, spoke of the loss which the association had suffered since its first congress, held in Zürich in 1950, through the deaths of Professor Louis Wirth, the association's first president, and of Professor Theodor Geiger, a member of its Executive Committee and chairman of its Research Committee. Professor Davy referred to the outstanding energy and ability which the late Professor Wirth had devoted to the affairs of the association; the striking progress of the past three years was an indication of the association's indebtedness to his endeavours. He spoke of the scientific contributions of the late Professor Geiger, especially in the field of social stratification and social mobility, which continued to be one of the main research interests of the association. Finally, Professor Davy stated his view of the function of the sociologist, who no longer made vast claims to absorb or replace the other social sciences, and philosophy, but who tried to bring his

own contribution to the solution of urgent practical problems, such as the problems of conflict between classes, nations and cultures, problems which would have an important place in the discussions of this Second World Congress.

Professor Morris Ginsberg, of the London School of Economics, vice-president of the International Sociological Association, spoke of the important contribution to sociology made by Belgian scientists, which was often neglected in English textbooks; he referred to the pioneer work of Quetelet in the domain of social statistics, and to the valuable research carried out for many years by the Institut de Sociologie Solvay. Professor Ginsberg emphasized the truly international character of the congress, and contrasted it with pre-war congresses which, though called international, actually brought together representatives of relatively few countries. The present congress was also international in another sense, that is, in the content of the scientific papers. For example, in the section devoted to social stratification and mobility, there were reports of research which had been done in various countries on similar problems and using similar techniques, in accordance with the recommendations of an international working conference on problems of research in this field. It was a great step forward to get sociologists investigating similar problems and trying to collect comparable data. In conclusion Professor Ginsberg mentioned some of the difficulties connected with the professional activities of sociologists in a situation where they were increasingly required to give advice to governmental and industrial organizations, and stressed the importance of the section of the congress devoted to this question of professional activities and responsibilities.

Mrs. Alva Myrdal, Director of the Social Sciences Department of Unesco, read a message addressed to the congress by the Director-General of Unesco, in which he drew attention to the importance of the social sciences, and particularly sociology, to the work of Unesco, in its Technical Assistance Programme, and complimented the association for placing on its congress agenda the difficult problem of intergroup conflicts, thus tackling courageously 'the vital problem now facing mankind in its anxiety to find some way for the nations to live together in peace and prosperity'. The Director-General, recalling the valuable co-operation between the association and the Social Sciences Department of Unesco, concluded, 'I am convinced that this congress will give a fresh impetus to sociological research and that Unesco, in its work for science and peace, can only benefit from such progress'.

Mr. Giraud, of the United Nations Secretariat in Geneva, conveyed the good wishes of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, and expressed his pleasure in finding that the congress proceedings gave such a large place to that part of sociology concerned with political questions and able to provide knowledge of great value to the statesman.

In his address to the congress, Mr. Harmel, Minister of Public Instruction, said that the Belgian Government considered it an honour to welcome the sociologists of so many different countries. Belgium, a meeting place or different civilizations, had remained faithful to its mission of encouraging the great currents of ideas, and the town of Liège, in particular, had long been a crucible of profound social changes. In his opinion the objective study of social phenomena was of supreme importance in the contemporary world, and many organizations, governmental and others, would be particularly interested in the discussions of social stratification and of the recruitment of different professions.

The scientific sessions of the congress were organized in four sections; (a) Social Stratification and Social Mobility; (b) Intergroup Conflicts; (c) Recent Developments in Sociological Research; and (d) Professional Activities and Responsibilities of Sociologists. The papers and discussions in these sections are reported in four articles in this issue of the *Bulletin*.

Interest in the discussions was not confined to the congress delegates. The discussions, particularly those on social stratification, and on industrial and international conflicts, were widely reported in the Belgian press, and during the week Radiodiffusion Belge broadcast a recorded interview with a group of the leading participants in the congress, including Mrs. Myrdal, Professors Clémens, Davy, Ginsberg and König, and Mr. Stein Rokkan, executive secretary of the ISA.

The Belgian Organization Committee did not forget that sociologists are also social beings. The indefatigable secretary of this committee, Professor René Clémens, with the generous collaboration of municipal and cultural bodies in Liège, Spa, Chaudfontaine, and Maestricht (Holland), arranged an impressive variety of receptions and excursions. The hospitality of their Belgian hosts will be long remembered by those who attended the Second World Congress. At the end of the congress a resolution was passed expressing the gratitude of the council of the ISA to all the members of the Belgian Organization Committee for their devoted efforts on behalf of the Second World Congress of Sociology, in particular to Professor J. P. Haesert, the chairman of the committee, and above all to Professor René Clémens, its most efficient secretary-general.

ORGANIZATION AND MEMBERSHIP OF THE ISA

During the congress a number of meetings of the Council and the Executive Committee of the association took place. One of the first duties of the Council was to elect a new president, and new members of the Executive Committee, to replace those retiring in 1953. Professor Robert C. Angell, University of Michigan, was unanimously elected president for the term 1953-56. In his presidential address Professor Angell thanked the Council for the honour it had bestowed on him, and expressed the hope that he would be able to serve the ISA as ardently and effectively as its first president had done. The Council then elected five new members to the Executive Committee, which is now composed as follows. *President:* Prof. Robert C. Angell, University of Michigan. *Vice-presidents:* Dean Georges Davy, University of Paris, and member of the Institut de France; Prof. Morris Ginsberg, London School of Economics; Prof. Leopold von Wiese, University of Cologne. *Members at large:* Professors Pierre de Bie, University of Louvain; K. S. Busia, University College of the Gold Coast; L. A. Costa Pinto, University of Brazil; G. S. Ghurye, University of Bombay; Kunio Odaka, University of Tokyo; T. T. Segerstedt, University of Uppsala; H. Z. Ulken, University of Istanbul.

The Council appointed a Research Committee of 24 members under the chairmanship of Professor David Glass, London School of Economics, and a Committee on Teaching and Training, of 20 members under the chairmanship of Professor Gabriel Le Bras, University of Paris. A small Administrative Committee was also appointed, to be responsible for the day-to-day administration of the ISA, comprising the president and vice-presidents (*ex officio*),

Professor Pierre de Bie, from the Executive Committee, and Professors Georges Friedmann, René König and David Glass from the Research Committee.

The Executive Committee discussed the reorganization of the ISA secretariat consequent upon the resignation of the executive secretary, Mr. Stein Rokkan, who was unable to continue in this office after 31 August 1953, owing to his obligations to the University of Oslo and to the Institute for Social Research in Oslo. The Executive Committee appointed Mr. T. B. Bottomore, assistant lecturer in sociology at the London School of Economics and Political Science, as executive secretary of the ISA for the term 1953-56, and gratefully accepted the offer of the London School of Economics to provide accommodation for the secretariat in its research building, Skepper House, 13 Endsleigh Street, London, W.C.1. Miss Betty Kilbourn, assistant secretary of the ISA, also offered her resignation, and the Executive Committee approved the appointment of Miss Elizabeth Adorno as assistant secretary for the term 1953-56. The Executive Committee, and subsequently the Council, accorded a vote of thanks to Mr. Rokkan and Miss Kilbourn for their excellent work on behalf of the ISA, especially in the preparation of the Second World Congress.

The executive secretary's review of membership showed that the ISA had, at 1 August 1953, 43 regular members (26 national associations and 17 institutes), 7 associate members, and 53 individual members. At its sessions in Liège the Council admitted to membership one national association, three institutes, and one individual. The Council also discussed the relations between the ISA and the Institut International de Sociologie, and agreed to offer to the latter organization a choice between affiliation as a regular member of the ISA and informal collaboration, involving the exchange of scientific documents and consultation on the timing of congresses. The Institut International de Sociologie subsequently accepted the second alternative, and an exchange of documents has been arranged.

RESEARCH AND PUBLICATION PROGRAMME

The activities of the ISA in promoting research co-operation were concentrated during the period 1950-53, on studies of social stratification and social mobility. The value of these activities is shown by the large number of papers presented in Section I (Social Stratification and Mobility) of the congress, and by the growing amount of research in this field which is now being done in many different countries. It is proposed to hold, during 1954, a third working conference on social stratification, to discuss the present state of research, problems of cross-national comparisons, and an extension of the scope of this research.

The Council also considered new proposals for research collaboration, some of them in connexion with the Unesco programme. It was agreed that more research was needed on the recruitment of élites, particularly in underdeveloped countries, and that such research could be related to studies of the educational system, educational opportunity and the problems of youth.

In the period 1953-56 the ISA, in collaboration with the Social Sciences Department of Unesco, will give particular attention to the problems of underdeveloped countries, and it is hoped to organize in 1954 or 1955 a round-table conference of sociologists and administrators from such countries with Western sociologists to discuss these problems. It was also agreed by the Council that the third world congress (to be held in 1956) should have as its

general theme 'problems of social change' and that within this framework the problems of underdeveloped countries should receive special attention.

The Council received a report on *Current Sociology*, published by Unesco in collaboration with the ISA and the International Committee on Documentation in the Social Sciences. The first volume (1952-53) has now appeared, and the first two numbers of the second volume are in print. *Current Sociology* will continue to be published three times a year, numbers 1 and 4 containing trend reports, and a double issue (numbers 2 and 3) containing a classified bibliography. Among the subjects of trend reports already prepared or planned are urban sociology, the assimilation of immigrants, the impact of industrialization on underdeveloped countries, electoral sociology, sociology of the family, sociology of religion, criminology, industrial sociology, and rural sociology.

SOCIAL STRATIFICATION
AND SOCIAL MOBILITY

D. V. GLASS

Of the topics considered at the Liège congress, the broad field of social stratification and social mobility claimed the largest share of time and was responsible for the largest number of prepared papers. Four formal sessions were given over to the discussion which, since there were fifty or more papers, was nevertheless all too brief, and there were also two informal meetings of members of the congress most directly concerned with the problems involved in comparative research.

Interest in encouraging such comparative research had led the ISA to select social stratification and social mobility as a major theme for the 1953 congress. Under the chairmanship of the late Professor Geiger, the Research Committee of the ISA had in 1951 convened two small working conferences to discuss the needs and possibilities of new documentary and field studies of social stratification (see in particular, *First International Working Conference on Social Stratification and Social Mobility*, ISA/SSM/Conf. 1/1-8). And those conferences had envisaged a long-term programme which, beginning with inquiries by national groups, would lead to cross-national reports drawing together old and new material on the main aspects of stratification, comparing the situation between countries and examining trends over time. It was hoped that pre-liminary reports on some of the new studies might be available for the 1953 congress and be of importance not only in their own right, but also as providing a basis for the evaluation of current methodology and for the development of further and more adequately designed studies. But the initiation of com-parative research inevitably meets unanticipated theoretical and practical problems, and the programme proceeded rather slowly. The largest proportion of the papers presented to the 1953 congress represents the results of work other than that sponsored by the ISA. Nevertheless, ISA interest in this central area of sociology was itself a factor in encouraging individual sociologists to examine the problems from a fresh point of view. And even though few papers actually reported the results of new studies carried out as part of the ISA programme, there were many other papers which dealt with the methodology of stratification research. It was in fact this kind of question—from what bases should such research begin and with reference to what criteria should it be elaborated—which aroused most interest and provoked most discussion.

The actual distribution of the various papers between the four sessions was somewhat capricious—unavoidably, because the papers often dealt with several aspects of the general topic. In the present report, therefore, some regrouping of the papers has been done to make for a rather more systematic account, and the relevant discussion has been linked to the papers rather than to the sessions in which they were considered. The 53 papers have been

divided into the following groups: (a) general surveys of the social stratification of whole countries; (b) sectional studies dealing (i) with regions, and (ii) with particular occupations or sectors of the social structure; (c) papers discussing avenues and obstacles to social mobility; (d) studies of characteristics of stratification; (e) contributions on general or specific methodology. The papers reporting results of research carried out under the auspices of the ISA have been included under the last heading for, at the time of the Liège congress, the interest in them was methodological rather than substantive, and it was from such a viewpoint that, in the main, they were discussed. In preparing the account which follows, the commentaries of the three *rapporteurs* who opened the discussion at successive sessions—Professor R. Bendix (U.S.A.), Mr. T. B. Bottomore (U.K.) and Mr. A. Touraine (France)—proved particularly helpful.

Five papers have been listed under the first heading—over-all surveys of national stratification systems. Two of these deal with social structures which for centuries preserved powerful elements of continuity: India, whose caste system was examined by Professor R. Mukherjee (India), and China, in respect of which Dr. Shu-Ching Lee (U.S.A.) studied the role of the bureaucracy in maintaining social equilibrium. In India the caste system, reinforced rather than disrupted by the economic developments of the nineteenth century, has been found bearable not only through religious conviction, but also because outward-directed prejudice and discriminations provide psychological compensation within a given caste, and because of a wide, if specified, sharing in religious and local civic activities, so that, as Mukherjee puts it, 'in some measure even the watertight compartments leave the door open for participation in the more comprehensive goals and interests of the society'. In China, on the other hand, stability and hierarchy were facilitated by the system of bureaucratic recruitment. That even in good times the chances of becoming an administrator were very small was less important than the seeming opportunity to rise, regardless of social origins, on the basis of talent.

Distant though such structures may seem from our Western world, they nevertheless offer interesting comparisons and show how in both Asian and Western types of society the myth may be far more potent than the reality in maintaining 'peace' within the social system. The term 'myth' is perhaps less applicable to Uruguay, whose social structure was described by Professor I. Ganon (Uruguay). 'Nobody is better than anybody' is the phrase which, he said, is widely used in his country to epitomize general convictions regarding interpersonal and intergroup relations. That may be true of Professor Ganon's country, dominated by the middle class, and providing 'free secular education for all age levels, trades and professions'. But Uruguay, as Professor Olivier Brachfield (Venezuela) commented, is unique among South American countries. And so far as North America is concerned, Professors Lipset and Bendix (U.S.A.) made it clear in their survey of social mobility in the U.S.A. that ideological equalitarianism was in part a myth, often contradicted by a rather harsh reality, especially in the case of immigrant groups and of the coloured population. Yet the belief in equalitarianism itself facilitates social mobility. Individual ascent in social status becomes part of the aspirational pattern of the community, and there is no question of 'treason to one's class' —one of the points which, thinking of French syndicalists, Mr. Touraine (France) no doubt had in mind when he later criticized the use of occupational prestige scales as postulating a 'conservative' sociology—which the combination

of equalitarian ideology and the mobility resulting from the increasing dominance of tertiary, white-collar occupations in the U.S.A. helps to maintain the image of 'openness' in a society in which, as elsewhere, there are substantial differences in the degree of self-recruitment at the various levels of the status hierarchy.

The question of the 'openness' of a society was raised explicitly in the last contribution to this section. Mr. S. V. Utechin (U.K.), concerned with recent trends in social stratification and social mobility in the U.S.S.R., argued that, although there is still considerable opportunity for upward movement, the barriers are increasing and the society has become rather rigidly divided into three main 'classes', with numerous subdivisions. Mr. Utechin did not, however, draw attention to the fact that, as Professor John Hazard has shown elsewhere, the Soviet Union continues to prevent property ownership from becoming a primary source of power. As he put it, 'the faithful will be rewarded by many things, wealth, position, medals and privileges, but they will not be accorded an opportunity to become a new generation of landlords and industrialists'. Moreover, some of the subdivisions to which Mr. Utechin referred are of a rather special kind—created, for example, by awarding such titles as 'excellent quality worker'. In Western Europe, the use of comparable symbols might have the reverse effect of that inferred by Mr. Utechin—that is, lessen the rigidity of the society by providing alternative avenues to status as a supplement to the more customary and less widely available means of achieving social prestige.

Attempts to characterize the social structure of an entire country are, of course, fraught with difficulties, one of the most common being, as Professor Lipset (U.S.A.) defined it, that we often lack the 'simple book-keeping' information which should form the indispensable preliminary to any more detailed study of the causes or consequences of social mobility. Much of the material now obtainable only through (relatively costly) random sample inquiries should be provided, on a national basis, by censuses, or by other periodic governmental inquiries—material on the occupations of fathers and sons, on changes in the distribution of prosperity and income, on disparities in educational attainment, and on the differences in fertility, morbidity and mortality between the various socio-economic divisions of the population. Yet the effort to generalize must be made, for the sectional studies will be of relatively small value unless they can be set in a wider context. Moreover, sectional studies by themselves tend to get away from the fundamental notion of social class, of which, as Mrs. Floud (U.K.) emphasized in the subsequent discussion, stratification and mobility represent but one aspect.

The second group of papers, dealing with 'sectional' studies, covers a wide variety of topics and areas. Under the heading of regional or local inquiries, Professor G. Mackenroth (Germany) submitted an outline of the research now being carried out in Schleswig-Holstein, into changes in German social structure. The research is focused primarily upon the question of whether there is evidence of a shift from a class society to a 'levelled', middle-class community. But an extensive range of information is being collected, bearing upon many other aspects of stratification, including the question of the role of the family in the system of stratification.

Two other papers dealt with specifically rural areas or aspects. Professor E. W. Hofstee (Netherlands) considered the changing relationship, in Dutch rural society, between the small farmers and the agricultural labourers—a

problem which, though here set in a rural context, has its urban counterpart in the relation between the clerical and other relatively low income grades of white-collar workers, and the 'new rich' among the skilled manual workers. The Dutch agricultural worker now often has a larger income than the small farmer and no longer suffers from irregular employment. The agricultural worker thus begins to regrade his own social status, while the small farmer tries to maintain the previous hierarchy. The conflict may have important consequences both for the social structure and the economic organization of agriculture in the Netherlands. Somewhat similar problems were noted by Mr. H. Mendras (France) in his study of peasant society in a region of the south of France. Mr. Mendras was concerned chiefly with the bases of the social hierarchy, finding them (leaving aside the peasant aristocracy) primarily economic—linked to the number of oxen and horses possessed—though also related to the moral value attributed to particular families. But he noted that large proprietors with recently acquired prosperity do not fit into the traditional scale of values and tend to escape from the community, and that this is also the case of the small peasant proprietors. Many of the latter tend to fall into the lower group of landless agricultural workers and, like them, try to escape from the community.

A third local study, by Mr. S. Sariola (Finland), covered one industrial and one rural community in Finland. The object of this study is not to establish the present social structure of the communities, but to assess the criteria by which various judges rate the status of members of the communities. Yet perhaps the most stimulating part of the contribution is not the analysis of the rating approaches so much as the historical sketch of political development in Finland, and the reference to the wide incompatibility of norms in present Finnish society. This incompatibility is itself reflected in the approaches used in the two localities in classifying individuals, and especially by the tendency of some of the judges to use political affiliation as an immediate criterion. Perhaps this is not surprising in a society in which social transformation has largely been a product of the past 50 years.

The remaining local studies—of which there are five—attempt to deal with some of the questions with which Professors Lipset and Bendix were concerned on a national scale, namely the amount and direction of social mobility in the community. The papers might equally be considered in the section on methodology, for in some respects it is their methods which are of greater interest than their results. This is explicitly so of the pilot study by Professor G. Boalt and Dr. C. G. Jansson (Sweden) of social mobility in Stockholm, for the actual analysis of mobility is here largely confined to a comparison of the occupations (classified in three broad groups) of 24-year-old men in 1949 with the occupations held by their fathers in 1936. The special feature of the study is the use of I.Q. tests, so that achieved status may be looked at in terms of a cross-classification by father's status, and by education and I.Q. of the subjects. But from the substantive point of view, perhaps the most interesting, indirect, finding (apart from the general finding of almost all Western mobility studies, that there is considerable movement) is that migrants to Stockholm appear to be a primary source of recruits to the lowest status level. Having regard to the quantitative importance of internal migration in Western countries, far more attention should be given than hitherto to the specific social role of such migration, and it is thus worth emphasizing this particular point in the Boalt-Jansson study. It is also relevant to note that the

obverse of this question is dealt with by Dr. K. V. Müller in his study of selective migration from the Soviet zone of Germany. He finds that, compared with the native population of Western Germany, both the expellees and the self-selected migrants from the Soviet zone are higher in social status, and that their children are more 'able' than those of the native population. These results are certainly of interest, but perhaps Professor Bendix, in the discussion, placed too much emphasis on their special character. In particular, comparable differences in I.Q. between migrant and resident populations have been observed elsewhere—as, for example, in the second volume of analysis of the 1947 Scottish Mental Survey.

Evidence of considerable mobility—and of some of the disadvantages it may entail in present circumstances—was also given in two studies carried out in the Netherlands. A paper by Dr. W. A. Luijckx outlined the results of an inquiry among individuals engaged in retail trade and in certain crafts, while Dr. Ida van Hulten reported on her study of the employees of the Philips factory at Eindhoven. These Dutch studies were complemented by a paper by Dr. A. Lehner, reporting the preliminary results of an investigation, carried out under the direction of Professor L. Livi, into social mobility in Rome. The particular interest of Dr. Lehner's paper lies in the method employed to estimate the amount of mobility. Following Professor Livi's previous work in this field, actual self-recruitment within broad occupational categories is measured against a theoretical norm calculated by assuming that the probability of arriving at any point in the social hierarchy is the same for all members of the community. There is room for discussion of the specific method of calculation used by Professor Livi, but it is evident that some approach of this kind is necessary if a distinction is to be made between social mobility which is the result of total changes in the structure of a society, and the different chances which individuals of diverse social origins have of reaching a particular status level. Dr. Lehner's paper is the only one in which this distinction is taken into account.

The studies of particular groups of occupations, included here in the broad group of 'sectional' contributions, are by their very nature more immediately in line with the expressed interest of the ISA in comparative research. The operative word is 'immediately', since local studies, if undertaken to illuminate specified problems, would also be closely relevant. But inquiries into the professions, the main concern of the five papers discussed here, at once offer cross-national comparisons. Three of the papers give evidence of changes in the social origins of members of certain professions in Iceland, Britain and France. Different time periods are involved, and the professions treated in the study of Iceland exclude the higher civil servants from separate examination, while the papers on Britain and France are exclusively concerned with them. But there is nevertheless solid evidence in each case of a greater equality in recent years, as between the various social strata, in entry to the professions. Mr. R. K. Kelsall (U.K.), in his study of the higher civil servants of Great Britain, shows that in 1950 some 17 per cent were the sons of manual workers, as compared with only 9 per cent in 1929. Mr. T. B. Bottomore (U.K.), in a comparable study of the French higher civil service, suggests a similar, if less marked, trend since the 1945 reforms. Taking the liberal professions as a group, the study carried out by Mr. J. Nordal (Iceland-U.K.), dealing with developments in Iceland during the past century, provides statistics of substantial changes. Of professional men born in 1840-59, 48 per cent came

from professional families and only 4 per cent from the families of manual workers (excluding agriculture); the comparable figures for professional men born in the present century are 23 per cent and 13 per cent. Such statistics do not of themselves give any indication of the causes of change, which may differ significantly between countries. But the papers mentioned, and still more the larger reports of which they are brief abstracts, emphasize the historic context of the development. Mr. Bottomore, for example, examines the fall in the prestige of higher civil servants in France, suggesting as an explanation the use of alternative occupations, the change in social values, associating status more closely with wealth, and the absolute and relative fall in the incomes of the civil servants themselves. In Iceland, a decline in the relative prestige of the professions, as compared with business, is also adduced by Mr. Nordal.

The prestige of a profession, and the factors influencing it, are the focus of a study of the schoolteacher in England, presented by Mr. A. Tropp (U.K.). This is an example of the way in which government can influence the status of a profession by a deliberate policy of recruitment. On the supply side, at least, the British Government specified the status of the elementary schoolteacher in the nineteenth century by offering scholarships and grants, reducing the minimum educational qualifications, and drawing directly upon the children of artisans as recruits for the newly expanded profession. Circumstances have changed, and the responsibility and training of teachers have been raised persistently; yet certain stereotypes still remain and condition the prestige of the teacher, especially as viewed by members of other professions.

The last contribution in the group, that by Mr. Mattei Dogan (France), arrived too late for discussion. It deserves special mention here, however, for as an essay in the study of the social origins of parliamentary representatives in France, Britain and Rumania, it is an example of comparative research in its own right. Mr. Dogan is not simply interested in social origins as such, but in the different roles which apparently similar occupational groups play in various countries. Lawyers, for example, occupy an important position in the parliaments of the three countries considered. But in Eastern Europe, prior to World War II, they were the sons, sons-in-law or nephews of the landed proprietors whom, superficially, they appeared to replace. There is, indeed, much scope for further comparative research of this kind, examining the political roles of the various professions with reference to changing social origins and to the changing objectives and structure of political parties.

The third broad category of contributions mentioned at the beginning of this report relates to avenues of, and obstacles to, social mobility. Of the six papers listed under this heading, one, that of Professor E. O. Smigel (U.S.A.), is a general survey of post-war U.S. literature in the field of occupational sociology, two sections of the survey relating respectively to occupational choice and the factors affecting it, and to occupational status and mobility. The remaining papers deal with substantive questions and report the results of documentary and field research, mainly on the role of education.

The basis of the paper presented by Dr. P. C. Glick (U.S.A.) is the information on education and occupation collected by the 1950 U.S. census. As is almost invariably the case with census material, only a one-way analysis is possible, for paternal occupation is not recorded. But within those limits— excluding, that is, consideration of the differential access to various stages of

education—the census data confirm the fact that the probability of achieving white-collar as well as professional status increases with high school and university education. On the question of differential access to education, the paper by Mrs. Floud, Dr. F. Martin and Mr. A. H. Halsey (U.K.) provides an interim account of a continuing study of the process of educational selection in one area in England (in south-west Hertfordshire). The authors show how, since the 1944 Education Act and with the use of I.Q. tests as a primary criterion, the social composition of grammar school populations has changed very markedly. Nevertheless there still remain major problems of differentiation—for example, of the influence of parental aspirations and pressures upon the achievements of their children, and of the very low representation of the children of unskilled workers even after the 1944 Act.

The question of obstacles to social ascent via education is raised explicitly by Professor S. de Coster (Belgium). Drawing upon the results of investigations carried out by Mrs. A. Graffar-Fuss, Professor de Coster points to the strains caused by the process of social ascent and to the need for intensive psychological investigations to complement the more broadly sociological study of mobility. Further contributions from Belgium to this section include Mr. P. Minon's summary of research into the social origins of certain categories of students and of the factors influencing occupational choice. In addition to social origins, narrower occupational factors also play their part, and there are considerable differences between urban and rural families and, for the working-class groups, between different industries. Mrs. Graffar-Fuss, whose previous work has been referred to, presented another Belgian study, on the effect of family disorganization on the social status of the families concerned.

Though limited in scope, the papers in this third group focus upon some of the most important aspects of social mobility. They give precision to the difficulties involved in individual ascent and suggest the positive contributions which research can make to practical policy here. They also raise by implication the much broader question of the consequences of social mobility, a question taken up explicitly by Dr. S. N. Eisenstadt (Israel) in the examination of social mobility and intergroup leadership. The problem of intergroup tensions is involved here, and of the relation of the mobile individual to his group of origin. Without necessarily agreeing with Dr. Eisenstadt's generalizations, it is evident that he raises a series of points of practical as well as of theoretical interest, bearing, as in the case of some of the other papers in the section, on the need to overcome some of the personal and social disadvantages which individual mobility may entail, and the importance of considering group as well as individual mobility.

Studies of the characteristics of social strata form the smallest group of contributions to the congress and in the main they are notes on research rather than full studies. Mr. L. Brams (France) outlines a project for studying the working-class family in France, and Miss N. Xydias (France) gives a brief evaluation of the answers to questions on 'class-consciousness' asked in connexion with the Unesco study in the town of Vienne. A pilot study of class 'representation' and 'identification' is summarized by Mr. Chombart de Lauwe (France). Mr. F. A. Isambert (France) provides an interesting and cogent discussion of some of the difficulties involved in studying the relation between religious practice and social class in France—and points out the difficulties of using the results of public opinion studies. The obverse question, that of the historical relation between social class and religion, was discussed

by Mr. N. Birnbaum (U.S.A.) in a brief report on his continuing research in such contrasting German cities as Augsburg and Lübeck.

Two rather more extensive studies may also be referred to here. Professor Bendix (U.S.A.) presented a fairly elaborate paper on the legitimation of the entrepreneurial class, taking nineteenth century England as his case study—a paper relevant to this section in that the entrepreneurial class in question presented a constructed image of itself for imitation, in some respects at least, by the working classes. This documentary survey, on a national scale, does not in itself offer many new views. Yet many more contributions of this kind are needed, examining the nature of old and new ruling groups, and the behaviour patterns which they assume or hope the 'ruled' will accept. There is, indeed, a promising field of comparative research here. At the other end of the scale, there is also need for the kind of inquiry reported by Mr. T. Brennan (U.K.), studying social class behaviour in politics and social affairs at the local level. His own inquiry was carried out in an area in South Wales, predominantly working class in character and having strong traditions of religious activity and a long record of voluntary association activity in general. Leadership of 'cultural' organizations was largely middle class in character—a finding matched in other studies, not reported at the congress, which have recently been carried out in Britain. But leadership in political associations, especially of a more than local influence, was markedly working class. Whether this is a feature peculiar to South Wales, and reflecting the special character of inter-war economic developments in that area, is a question which calls for further study.

We come finally to the fifth group of papers, relating to the bases and methodology of research into social stratification and social mobility. For convenience in discussion here, those papers may be divided into two categories, the first consisting of reports on research in progress or plan—primarily research linked directly to the ISA programme—and the second, of contributions bearing more specifically on problems of methodology as such.

Under the first heading, reports were presented for the four countries in which new empirical research, linked to the ISA programme, has been or is being initiated. The most substantial report, in terms of sheer results, was that of Professor K. Odaka (Japan) who, speaking for the Japan Sociological Society, gave an account of the progress of the co-operative investigation in his country. So far the studies have been confined to a sample of some two thousand adult males drawn from the six largest cities, but the inquiries will be extended to smaller towns and to the rural population as soon as the necessary funds are available. The speed with which the first investigations were carried out is rather remarkable; the decision to initiate the research was taken in mid-June 1952 and the first results were available for discussion by the end of October of the same year. Equally striking is the wealth of information collected in the interviews and in the associated ranking inquiries, which include scaling by such objective indices as education, income and property; prestige ranking of occupations by respondents in the social sample investigation; and ranking by sociologists on the basis of a combination of 38 occupations, 3 educational categories and 4 income groups. The questionnaire proper covers the educational and occupational life histories of the subjects and their wives, and much information on the fathers and grandfathers—on certain aspects, considerably more material than was obtained by the studies in Britain. Professor Odaka's report did not go much beyond a presentation of certain

raw results—scarcely surprising, for the detailed analysis of this type of material is, as has been found in the British studies, extremely time-consuming. It should indeed be emphasized that in empirical studies of social mobility, the collection and initial tabulation of the basic data represent a very preliminary stage of research. At the same time, Professor Odaka had some interesting observations on the practical problems encountered in the Japanese study, especially as regards self-rating. There was a strong tendency for individuals to rate themselves as belonging to the 'lower class', and to describe their grandfather's generation as being 'better-off' than their own. In both cases, these expressed views reflect traditional behaviour rather than reality—the tradition of modesty, requiring a denial from the interviewer (not given, of course); and the tradition of filial piety, which prevents a man from slighting his ancestors. The general result which clearly emerges from the raw results is the very high occupational and substantial social mobility—in both cases higher than would have been expected. Certain regional differences in the prestige of occupations are also apparent and suggest the way in which inquiries of this kind may help to show variations in values within a community.

Professor F. van Heek (Netherlands) presented two papers on new research in his country, the first relating to the programme which is being undertaken through the Netherlands Institute for Social Research, and the second relating to a special type of investigation, the study of extremes of mobility. The main programme, which is directly linked to the ISA proposals, consists of three stages: a study of occupational prestige, already carried out on a sample of 500 individuals; a national sample investigation of mobility, comparable to the studies undertaken in Japan and Britain; and a series of studies of recruitment in specific occupations, chosen to cover a wide range of prestige levels and types of employment. The study of extreme types, referred to above, is intended as a complement to the major programme and would be particularly useful for inquiries in small communities. One such type, a highly immobile population, has already been studied in the town of Enschede, and it is proposed now to choose a socially highly mobile community and to examine the major factors—ecological, sociological, economic and political—which have facilitated this mobility.

At the time of the congress, the study of occupational prestige was the only one in which the field work had been completed, and in the discussion Professor van Heek indicated some of the main results which had so far been obtained. In the first place there was, as in Britain, substantial agreement between various individuals as to the social prestige of given occupations. Secondly, some occupations were placed at a lower level than might have been anticipated—civil servants and higher military personnel, for example, and the managers of large enterprises. On the other hand, skilled manual workers were placed above routine office workers. There were also some interesting differences between religious groups. Individuals holding positions of authority were given a higher ranking by Calvinists than by Catholics, the reverse being the case for workers in the catering trades, such as innkeepers and waiters. At the same time, comparison with the results obtained in Japan shows strong general similarities, of the kind also found in a number of other countries. This is the case, for example, in New Zealand, where a study was carried out by Mr. A. A. Congalton, who submitted a paper outlining the general research in his country in the field of social stratification.

The progress of new empirical research in Denmark was outlined by Profes-

sor K. Svalastoga both in a paper submitted to the congress and in the discussion itself. The paper deals primarily with methodology of a somewhat technical character, based on small pilot studies of occupational prestige. Apart from the technical questions, however, concerned with the development of prestige scores and with the 'double logistic' hypothesis on the relation between occupational prestige and income, certain points brought out have a more general bearing on criticism levelled against the use of prestige scales. Thus, as Professor Svalastoga observes, the element of 'artificiality' involved in ranking an occupation of which one has little if any personal experience may not in fact be more 'artificial' than the many decisions an individual is called upon to make in real life. Mr. Touraine suggested that the greater discriminating power of a question on the acceptability in marriage of an individual in a given occupation was due to the fact that this is a more 'concrete' question of a kind which an individual has probably encountered in his own experience. But the question is, in fact, not less artificial. Moreover, acceptability in marriage would not show a perfect positive correlation with the prestige of an individual's occupation, assuming that the latter could be established definitively.

In the discussion, Professor Svalastoga described his plans for substantive research. At least two main inquiries will be undertaken. The first, a stratified random sample inquiry among 2,000 men and 1,000 women, will cover prestige ratings, other attitudinal aspects of stratification, as well as the basic objective information on education, occupation, and marriage comparable with that obtained in Britain and Japan and included in the Netherlands programme. An attempt will also be made to ascertain the behaviour patterns acceptable in the various social strata. We may mention, in this connexion, the paper submitted by Dr. S. Lysgard (Norway) which, under the title of the 'deferred gratification pattern', deals with behavioural differences relevant here. In addition, it is proposed to take up some of the mobility aspirational questions which have been studied in the U.S.A. and in Britain. For this particular study, however, the subjects will be Danish conscripts, and it is hoped that the study will be a longitudinal one—that it will be possible later to compare achieved occupations with previous aspirations.

As in the case of Denmark the programme of research in France was reported both in a prepared paper and in the discussion at the formal sessions, Mr. A. Touraine acting as the channel of communication. There was a difference, however, in that the paper was prepared at a much earlier stage (September 1952) and for rather different purposes, so that it was Mr. Touraine's spoken contribution which was more indicative of the position and of the direction of interests of the French sociologists who are concerned with the ISA proposals. A second paper by Mr. Touraine, on the concept of social status in relation to comparative research, provides the theoretical background for the French projects.

It may be observed, to begin with, that French participation in the comparative research is still mainly at the planning stage. This is in part accidental. But it is also in considerable measure due to a desire to proceed in a somewhat different order and in a rather more comprehensive way. Social status is not regarded as a simple point of departure in the inquiries —as may seem to be the case in studies which start with a scale of occupational prestige—but as a social attitude or evaluation which has to be explained and which can only be explained as *the result* of comprehensive study. Hence

projected research is envisaged as simultaneously studying a wide series of characteristics and of observing the distributions obtained for each as well as the interrelationships between them. Or, to put it in a slightly different way, the aim is to establish a series of socio-professional categories as a point of departure for a sample investigation, the categories so constructed that each is homogeneous in respect of the hypotheses to be examined. It would then be possible to see the variations in social evaluation and social attitude in relation to such criteria (either separately or in combination) as income, education, power, position in the process of production and so on. Coupled with this objective is the desire to combine both extensive but inevitably rather superficial sample investigations with much more intensive studies, preferably to be carried out among sub-samples of the main sample, and to link together explicitly the analysis of territorial and of social mobility. Preparation on these lines has been undertaken during the past year, along with the collection of descriptive material which is not only of interest in itself but is also necessary for the formulation of the relevant categories in the main inquiries.

In addition to the basic investigations, certain supplementary researches are being, or have been initiated. These include a study of medical students, having regard not only to social origins as such but also to the way in which those origins influence the professional careers of the individuals. The teaching profession will be the subject of a separate study, especially because previous research has shown that teachers act as intermediate stages in the process of social mobility in France. It is probable, too, that before the main inquiry is finally launched, there will be a series of smaller, more intensive, local studies of an ethnographic character, utilizing both questionnaires and direct observation. Such studies would make it possible to examine individuals in their family and local community setting, and would also help in the design of the more extensive inquiry.

The theoretical and methodological contributions to this final group of papers vary considerably in generality and in direct applicability to the proposals made by the ISA for comparative inquiries. In the present report, however, attention is focused on communications most immediately relevant to those proposals, for it was a major purpose of the discussion to provide an opportunity for criticism and evaluation of what was being planned or undertaken.

Two papers from the U.S.A. examined the general theoretical problems of research into social stratification and social class. Professor H. W. Pfautz was concerned with the general relation of social stratification to sociology as a whole, the different types of social strata, and the implications of those different types for the ways in which social stratification operates in society. Professor Kurt Mayer, criticizing both Marxists who do not take status structure into account and present-day sociologists who define social class in terms of local prestige differences, argued that social stratification is multidimensional and must be studied from at least three viewpoints—class in the classical sense, status structure, and the distribution of power. A paper by Professor H. Schelsky (Germany) suggested that the notion of status, while not solely a methodological concept, corresponded perhaps only to a certain type of social structure, to the class-society of the nineteenth century. In present-day Western Germany—perhaps in contemporary society in general—there has been a levelling of classes and a domination of the structure by a middle class

which no longer has the character of a class of the earlier period. The groups which may be defined do not correspond to levels in a hierarchy; they exist in a society in which, in principle, there is full mobility and absolute insecurity of status. What used to be regarded as the problem of the middle classes, the inability to reconcile a bourgeois ideology with a proletarian type of income has, according to Professor Schelsky, become a problem of society as a whole. Yet, as Mr. Touraine pointed out, it might be rather unwise to construct a new theory of stratification (or its absence) on impressions which, in many Western societies at least, do not seem to be confirmed by the facts. Certainly there is little evidence that mobility even approaches completeness in such societies. On the other hand, it is clear that the bases and criteria of status vary between types of societies. As Dr. K. A. Busia (Gold Coast) showed in the discussion, a study of the recruitment of elites in West Africa would have to take special factors into account and to apply a somewhat different conceptual framework.

The memorandum submitted by Professor Nelson Foote (U.S.A.) and his colleagues is a summary of the results of discussions at a seminar convened by the Social Science Research Council to consider the range of alternatives in stratification research. The listing and discussion of 10 types of approach provide a useful bird's-eye view of lines of development. But the division appears a little sharp and the discussion in some of the sections rather over-simplified. Thus the section on 'individual mobility versus group advancement', illustrating the problem in the study of a society in which 'all members increase their economic well-being simultaneously and at the same rate', argues that 'according to the invidious implications of the ordinary concept of social mobility, there has been none [i.e. no mobility], despite the advancement of everybody'. It is difficult to believe that a practising sociologist, finding evidence of general upward movement through changes in the total social and economic structure, would disregard it. Nor is the dichotomy between individual or group movement (in the sense in which it is used in the paper in question) a valid one. Both aspects of mobility are relevant, and research into social mobility should and can plan to take both into account.

Of the remaining contributions, two dealt with rather specific points involved in stratification research. Mr. Marcel Bresard (France), drawing upon the experience gained by the inquiry into social mobility and fertility carried out by the National Institute of Demographic Studies (France), was concerned in particular with the criteria of prestige which might be used in classifying the individuals covered by such studies. He suggested, as a control technique, the construction of profiles for the various sub-groups homogeneous in respect of occupation, profiles based on a wide variety of criteria and making it possible to identify fairly broad similarities between those sub-groups. Mr. L. J. Lebret (France), on the other hand, envisaged a multi-dimensional classification as a first approximation, and an analysis which would proceed by cross-tabulations of pairs of dimensions—for example, style of life against occupational category, treating urban and rural populations separately.

The question of a multi-dimensional approach, though from a more theoretical point of view, was also the focus of the last two contributions which will be considered. For Dr. A. Miller, who views the degree of mobility as a clue to the boundaries between strata, the problem was to distinguish between statistical or 'artificial' strata, and 'natural' strata, the reality of social life. Even in dealing with statistical strata it would be necessary to proceed from

the level of mobility to the stratum defined by that level, rather than to begin with a series of constructed groups and then to measure mobility between them. Whether 'natural' strata can be defined with precision is a much more difficult question. But it is desirable to avoid blending together at the outset of the research two rather different problems—the problem of purely occupational classification and of occupational mobility on the one hand, and on the other the social prestige which may be attached to occupations and which is a far less objective characteristic. This, also, was in general the viewpoint of Mr. Touraine, for whom, as has already been pointed out, social status is to be regarded as capable of definition only at the end of a series of investigations, and who argues that such a definition would emerge from a study of the reference groups implied in the norms conditioning the attitudes and behaviour of individuals. Finally, as Mr. Touraine sees it, comparative studies of social stratification and social mobility should be less concerned with establishing comparable categories than comparable methods of analysis, and it is processes rather than categories which should be compared. Similar views were expressed in the discussion by Mr. G. H. Palmade (France). Comparing the approach of Mr. Touraine with that followed in the recent British studies, Mr. T. B. Bottomore mentioned the danger that, in concentrating on studies of individual mobility, the question of stratification itself might be eliminated.

There is not space here, nor would it be appropriate, to comment in detail on the problems and concepts discussed in so stimulating a manner by Mr. Touraine and Dr. Miller. Some of Mr. Touraine's queries as regards the use of occupational prestige scales were, however, replied to by Professor Van Heek. He pointed out that, in the countries in which the studies had been so far carried out, there is evidence of substantial agreement on the social standing of a wide range of occupations. Further, though it should be taken for granted that occupation is only one criterion—and many criteria need to be used—that single criterion is a very important one in modern industrial society, and may therefore provide a useful first approximation in examining both social mobility and social stratification. As for social prestige being subjective, it is not on that account less real.

Without going further into the question of alternative approaches, it is not out of place to refer to the expressed differences between Mr. Touraine and some of the other sociologists associated with the ISA research proposals in weighing up the results of this section of the Liège congress. Part of the difference in viewpoint was undoubtedly due to a difference in general orientation, and it is right and proper that this was made clear and subjected to discussion. But there were also differences resulting from two defects in planning—one in communication and the other in the organization of the sessions. On the first point, the position would have been made much more clear if, instead of the very brief note recommending new empirical research, the Research Committee of the ISA had prepared a more elaborate document, setting the proposals in their broader context. The present writer is criticizing himself in making this point. An attempt was made, in the opening remarks at the first session, to give the broader view, and it was then said explicitly that the ISA had no desire to impose an artificial uniformity on the studies undertaken in the various countries, and that the specific proposals were regarded as minimal core proposals which would need elaboration in the light of existing knowledge and of new pilot inquiries in each country

concerned. Nevertheless some of the subsequent criticism seemed to assume that prestige scales constituted the sole approach envisaged and even that only one kind of prestige scale was in question. The deficiency in organization consisted in the fact that the individuals planning or undertaking new research were not able to meet in a small conference before the main congress. Had such a meeting been held, some of the differences might have been resolved. It would at least have been evident, taking the British studies as a single example (the first volume will be published in the spring of 1954) that prestige scales do not produce an artificial continuum; rather, especially in connexion with data on vertical mobility, they reveal sharp breaks. It would also have been noted that some of the problems raised in the congress—of reference groups, and of differential aspirations and attitudes to mobility—had actually been examined on the basis of new research. Discussion would have shown, finally, that such studies were in any case regarded as the first stages of a long-term programme of research into social selection and social differentiation.

Because such a meeting did not take place, discussion at the formal sessions of the congress was not as informed as it might have been on these particular questions. And in that respect, for the individuals most directly interested in undertaking new research, it is possible that the two informal meetings held afterwards were more useful than the formal sessions. It is in any case intended, as a result of those two meetings, to convene a new working conference in 1954. But the formal sessions themselves nevertheless performed a very useful function. They stimulated the preparation of a large number of contributions of methodological and substantive interest and provided an opportunity for bringing to light both agreements and disagreements. Above all they made it clear to sociologists in the various countries that there is a substantial and continuing interest in studies of social stratification and social mobility. The knowledge that there is such an interest is in itself likely to provide a stimulus to further research.

INTERGROUP CONFLICT AND ITS MEDIATION

Arnold M. Rose, and Caroline B. Rose

The theme of 'conflict and its mediation' was chosen as a major one for the Second World Congress of Sociology, not only to express a major interest of sociologists, but also to provide a way-station to look back on the Unesco tension studies and to help plan a future programme of research on the mediation of conflict. The central concepts were deliberately not defined with precision, so as to allow contributors to bring to the discussion the widest of relevant interests. In general, conflict was taken to mean any sort of opposition between persons and/or groups, overt or covert, and mediation was taken to mean any effort to reduce conflict (although there was an effort to emphasize reduction by means of deliberate, overt efforts on the part of third parties,

which might be taken as a more precise definition of mediation). It was originally planned to have five sections within the framework of conflict and mediation, and sociologists throughout the world were invited to contribute papers falling within any one of these sections. Since no systematic allocation of topics and responsibilities could be made, the contributions were unevenly distributed: there were 7 previously-prepared papers in the section on 'General and Theoretical Considerations'; 10 on 'International Conflict and its Mediation'; 20 on 'Industrial Conflict and its Mediation'; 12 on 'Racial and Cultural Conflict and its Mediation'; and only one on 'Legal and Personal Conflict and its Mediation' (obviously no separate discussion could be held on the last-named, but its absence was noted and the topic was recommended for future consideration).

It could hardly be expected that 50 scholars from all parts of the world, not previously called together for exchange of views or allocation of responsibilities, would produce a harmonious and systematic analysis and study of any topic. Nevertheless, there was a remarkable coincidence of thesis running through a large proportion of the contributions in all sections. The gist of this may be described as an effort to identify a sociological approach to the study of conflict and its reduction, as distinguished from a social-psychological approach. The latter may be crudely defined as a search for the motivation to conflict in some condition (e.g. tension, aggressiveness) of the individual personality, and for the reduction of conflict in some change of attitudes or other 'cure' of the individual personality. The sociological approach, if one may be so bold as to generalize from a score of different statements of it, is that group conflict has its roots in the furtherance of logically incompatible interests, and that the problem of mediation is not one of reduction of the motivation to conflict, but rather one of accommodating or finding a compromise between conflicting interests so that the conflict does not take a violent form. The distinction between the two can be epitomized in the observation that conflict need not be motivated by tensions and that conflict can operate to reduce tensions. This theme, whether in the form of theoretical exposition, concrete research, or critiques of others' works, runs throughout almost half the papers. A few other papers were theoretical considerations of diverse sorts, while the remaining papers (approximately half) were descriptive studies of concrete conflict situations in different nations.

The clearest and most systematic exposition of the distinction between the sociological and social psychological approaches was presented in the general 'working paper' by Professor Jessie Bernard (U.S.). Surveying the recent literature on conflict, she found that most of the studies and analyses assume that group conflict rises from individual 'tensions', that is, they take a social-psychological point of view. She held that the concept of tensions is of doubtful value when used to explain intergroup conflict, as events show that man follows the power structure of his society. Another group of recent writings on conflict have a 'systemic orientation', and here, among others, Bernard considered mathematico-deductive systems (e.g. by Firey and Simon), studies of integration and co-operation, historical and criminological cases of conflict, and conflict in industry. Her survey next took up studies of strategy, with an orientation either in sociology or in the theory of games: for example, Heberle's study of strategy in social and political movements, and Selznick's study of defence against communism. The theory of games, of Neumann and Morgenstern, was especially recommended for cautious analysis as to its

possibilities for the study of intergroup conflict. Finally, there was consideration of studies in small, face-to-face groups, where the point was made that techniques of arriving at consensus in small groups cannot be generalized to the negotiation of large group conflicts (criticism is here made of Stuart Chase). The work of Kenneth Arrow, Elmore Jackson, R. Dennett and J. E. Johnson, and Philip Mosely is drawn upon. In her oral discussion, Professor Bernard emphasized that she was not against the social-psychological approach, but would urge the use of that approach only where it was appropriate and would advocate the better use of sociological concepts in the study of intergroup conflict.

Efforts to evaluate the role of a sociological approach to the study of conflict, made especially in the presentation of Professor Georges Davy (France) and Professor Arnold Rose (U.S.), brought out three limitations:

1. It is not enough merely to state that both the social-psychological and the sociological approaches have their distinct and proper uses. The integrative question remains: Under what social conditions do the individual psychological mechanisms operate? This also brings out the fact that the analysis of causes of a given conflict is not the same thing as a specification of the conditions necessary for satisfactory mediation of the conflict. (The latter point was later brought out in the discussion on international conflict by Professor Robert Angell).

2. Some participants held that the theory of games was meaningless when applied to concrete and realistic social situations. But here it is necessary to recognize that the theory of games is a mere mathematical tool, to be used when properly useful, and is not to be confused with scientific knowledge about conflict itself. In oral discussion, Dr. Otto Friedman (U.K.) suggested its application for understanding the failure of negotiations between Hitler and Chamberlain, and between the Czechs and the Russians.

3. One must agree with Professor Bernard that certain values are logically opposed to each other, and that those who uphold or benefit from one set are drawn into conflict against those identified with the other set. But the scientist must be extremely cautious in determining what values are logically opposed, and must be aware that opposition of values is often a matter of social definition (which is changeable) rather than of logic. At one point Professor Bernard herself, despite an admirable caution elsewhere, gave credence to a writer who states that minority groups wishing to follow certain distinctive values of minority culture must inevitably come into conflict with the majority group who follow the values of majority culture. This incorrectly assumes that all sets of group values are logically in opposition, that no set of values includes tolerance or appreciation of different values, and that all cultures tend to be uniformly followed by all participants.

The specification of a sociological approach to the study of conflict—in terms of an opposition of values—came out in the specific sections as well as in the general theoretical one. Among the papers on international conflict, those by Professors W. J. H. Sprott (U.K.) and Werner Levi (U.S.) are most relevant. Sprott argued for more studies of 'policy-makers'—men who, in various walks of life, are not solely concerned with their personal daily lives but also with the furtherance of their conception of group welfare and have the power to translate their conceptions into public policy. He held that it is the 'interests'

(thus broadly defined) of these men which determine public policy, and that opposition of interests among these men makes for group conflict. In presenting this position, Sprott held that the usual contemporary psychological approach to conflict is wanting. He raised the rhetorical question whether, if one wished to predict the prospects for peace or war, it would be of greater value to know what went on in the secret conferences in Moscow, Washington, and London, or to know all about the toilet training practices used by the general citizenry of those places. Sprott distinguished his viewpoint from the old 'great man theory of history' by indicating that any of the 'social forces' may influence, even determine, the interests of the policy-makers: his concern was not to criticize the approach to history through great impersonal forces but rather the approach through an understanding of the psychology of the common man.

Professor Levi was invited to the congress as a specialist in international relations to help the assembled sociologists to define research areas in the study of international conflict which might be especially amenable to study by sociologists. His knowledge of the circumstances surrounding the outbreak and settlement of wars led him to be critical of widely-held psychological and cultural theories of the causes of war. Public opinion studies of attitudes toward other nations would be of little direct value since history recorded many cases where popular opinion changed overnight and where there was a negative relationship between hostility of public opinion and the outbreak of war. Likewise, history recorded many instances of a negative relationship between cultural similarity and the maintenance of peace. The soundest approach to the causes of war was, he held, in terms of desire for national survival and opposition of interests, and insofar as sociologists could clarify this matter they would be making a contribution to knowledge about the causes and prevention of war. Sociologists might, for example, analyse the process of communication—in relation to group interests that lead to war, and between national leaders and the masses. Sociologists could also seek the answers to such questions as why certain techniques of mediation are employed at one time and not at another, why they are successful at one time and not at another, the influence of public opinion on the policy-makers. Professor Levi held that there was some value in transferring findings arrived at in studies of group conflict within a nation to the international scene, but he would emphasize some important differences between the two forms of conflict: (a) on the international scene, there was no one overwhelming power to maintain security and order; (b) each state must provide for its own survival; (c) there is no limit to conflict, and therefore no pressure on the winning side to compromise; (d) the only motives for compromise—fear of war and moral restraint—are not yet very strong in some states; (e) there is an emphasis on a trial of strength, and hence public emotion is aroused; (f) there is no super-government whose existence would be threatened by struggle among states.

The specification of a sociological approach to the study of conflict reached its most vigorous expression in the section on industrial conflict. This provided the focus of the papers and discussions to such an extent that we shall have to reserve full discussion of it for the special part on the industrial section. Suffice it here to state that the specification of the sociological approach came in two forms : (a) certain papers constituted critiques of what was called the 'human relations' approach to the study of industrial relations, and opted for a 'conflict of group interest' approach; (b) certain papers constituted studies of the statistics of industrial strikes and came out with interpretations in favour

of the viewpoint that strikes were characteristic of certain industries under certain circumstances and could be regarded as inevitable expressions of conflict of interests between management and labour rather than as a result of bad management policies in specific firms.

Since most of the papers in the section on race and culture conflicts were concrete descriptive studies of conflicts in various locales, there was less of theoretical interest presented in this section than in the others. Professor E. Franklin Frazier (U.S.), however, in his opening remarks as chairman, tied this section to the others by pointing out the limitations of such psychological studies of prejudice as those subsumed under the heading of the 'authoritarian personality'. Attitudes must be studied in a social situation: in the American South, for example, attitudes and stereotypes against the Negro were deliberately created, and these are changing now only because the social structure of the region is changing. It is also of interest to note that while many of the concrete studies reported were parts of the Unesco Tensions Project, they implicitly employed a sociological rather than a social-psychological concept of conflict.

While the sociological approach was paramount, some of the papers had a social psychological orientation. Professor Albin E. Gilbert (U.S.) on the basis of a survey of completed psychological researches on tensions, suggested some general means of reducing tensions. Dr. Charles Boasson (Israel), familiar with the same psychological literature, dealt with the 'focalization and fusion of fear in international tensions'. He held that fear, which may have either real or imaginary objects, is an important cause of tension. He recommended that, since the activities of the political arms of the United Nations evoked fear, they should be subordinated to the activities of the specialized agencies (such as Ecosoc, Unesco, FAO, WHO) which tend to reduce fear by eliminating concrete difficulties. Professor Kurt H. Wolff (U.S.) reported a study, based on analysis of group discussions, of German attitudes concerning the U.S.A. He found that there was strong suspiciousness and distrust of America; the Germans' very feeling of dependence on the United States and their recognition that America has superior power causes them to dislike it. The dislike often takes the form of applauding American weaknesses as justifying what are considered to be the few 'excesses' of the Hitler régime. The Germans interviewed were found to have little understanding of what the rest of the world thought of Germany and to have a *sub rosa* admiration for the Hitler government. Wolff used 10 categories for measuring attitudes and then did a factor analysis of his data. The result was three underlying factors which he named 'general appraisal of America', need for 'recognition', and 'distrust of the use of American power'.

Some of the papers in the section on race and cultural conflicts also consisted of attitude studies. Mr. Alain Girard (France) reported a survey, under the sponsorship of Unesco, of a representative sample of Frenchmen with respect to their attitudes toward immigrant groups in their midst. He found that the French were negative toward immigrants in general, especially in economic and political matters. But, on the positive side, he found that Frenchmen living in areas containing the most foreigners were least hostile, and that Frenchmen in certain age, occupational, and other categories were least hostile to foreigners in those categories. Selected groups of immigrants were also studied, and the following findings emerged: immigrants tend to be grateful to France, to become naturalized, to accept French ways while

retaining their own, to ignore French politics and concentrate on family life, to leave the Church but to give their children religious training, to become assimilated to the extent to which they have risen in social status. Another study of France, on the smaller scale of a single community study by Dr. Pierre Clément and Miss Nelly Xidias, confirms the previously-mentioned findings: over 60 per cent of the Frenchmen surveyed expressed negative attitudes towards immigrants; the economic activities of the immigrants was second only to intermarriage in displeasing the French; the order of acceptance of the immigrants actually in the community was along racial lines—the Italians and Spaniards being most accepted and the Indochinese least accepted. Another use of the social distance scale was reported by Professor Stuart C. Dodd and Keith S. Griffiths (U.S.). Studying attitudes toward Chinese, Japanese and Negroes in Washington State, they found a logarithmic relationship between degree of unfavourableness of attitude and intensity of attitude. They would generalize this into a law governing all pro-con attitudes, but in doing so they neglected Guttman's more general findings[1] of a characteristic U-shaped curve when favourableness of attitude in related to intensity of attitude: Guttman found that the J-shaped curve reported by Dodd and Griffiths is just a special case of the U-shaped curve where the more favourable attitudes were not adequately measured or the more favourable population was not present in sufficient numbers to be tapped.

The obvious need for more and better research on conflict with a sociological orientation, as well as the proved value of researches conducted with a social-psychological orientation, led the *rapporteur*, Professor Rose, to propose a rationale for both orientations. A survey of actual group conflict situations revealed that three sorts of motives underlay them: a desire for the acquisition of scarce values (which led to what he called political or power conflict), a desire to convert others to beliefs that are thought to be true and necessary for group welfare (called ideological conflict), and a desire to prevent social contact and amalgamation with what was believed to be a biologically inferior race (called racist conflict). Research using a sociological orientation would be especially valuable when the political motives were dominant (probably including most international and industrial conflicts), whereas the social-psychological orientation had proved most valuable when the racist motive was dominant (including many situations of race and cultural conflict). It was pointed out that if any given research orientation ignored the existence of any of these motives, it would lead to seriously inadequate results. Most deplorable was the failure of any group of social scientists to study ideological conflict.

Support for this last point came from another paper in an interesting manner. One of the non-sociologists invited to present a paper was Dr. Willard Johnson (U.S.), director of an organization attempting to promote better relations among groups within any nation. He reported on a survey made among his colleagues in similar action organizations in several parts of the world concerning the values and weaknesses—from a practical standpoint— they found in the studies of social scientists. One of the findings was that social scientists neglected religious conflicts and prejudices, which can be considered to be ideologically motivated. The need for studying the ideological

---

[1] Louis Guttman, in S. A. Stouffer *et al.*, *Measurement and Prediction*, Princeton, New Jersey, Princeton University Press, 1950. Chapters 2, 3, and 7.

element in international conflict was also pointed up by the widespread mis-understanding of Prime Minister Nehru's recent comment that the greatest danger in the current East-West conflict was the element of religious conviction motivating the leading parties and that the contenders were distorting their political aims with this religious element.[1] Johnson's study contained other findings that should be of interest to sociologists. While most of the action agency people reported themselves as greatly aided by research in general in their efforts to locate research findings that would have direct use in action programmes, they 'come away from their search with the feeling that the research people live and work in an ivory tower whose only reality is statistics'. Some concrete suggestions were to study the comparative effectiveness of different teaching methods, the effectiveness of the mass media programmes intended to reduce prejudice, the development of attitudes in the growing unification of Western Europe, the attitudes involved in U.S.-European relations.

The one paper which properly belonged in the abandoned section on personal and legal conflict, but which was included in the section on theory for lack of comparable contributions, was the interesting description, by Mrs. S. Van der Sprenkel (U.K.), of traditional procedures of mediation in China. The procedures are used to solve quarrels between persons, families, villages, business firms, and take the place of civil law courts in the West. The mediation is a success because, the author believes, the contending parties share certain common values, such as a belief in 'natural harmony' and a lack of confidence in formal legal processes. The larger society, of which both parties are members, sanctions acceptance of mediation and informally penalizes contestants who are intractable in mediation. Finally, there is a ceremony at the end of the mediation procedure which serves to re-weld both contestants into the society and to reinforce the sense of harmony.

Professor Heinrich Herrfordt (Germany) took up a similar matter in a Western context: What political conditions are needed to permit the state successfully to mediate group conflicts? He answers: When the rule of law is established, the state is successful; but when there is a belief in a natural and inevitable conflict of interest and there is a coincidence between interest groupings and political parties, the state can hardly enforce mediations and conflict becomes interminable. The success of mediation depends on the pattern of the social order, the structure of groups and relations between them, and the existence of authorities able to mediate (traditional ones or new ones created especially for that purpose). A similar subject was discussed by Professor H. Garcia-Ortiz (Ecuador) who considers conflict as part of the process of socialization, and points out that solving one conflict may produce another one. He holds that total suppression of conflict is impossible, and the most that can be hoped for is channelization of conflict through such means as education of the masses, state intervention and achieving high legal standards. A final contribution by Professor Alberto Baldrich (Argentina) took up certain recent developments in his country in the light of history.

Sociologists have not traditionally studied international conflict, and it is doubtful whether any sociologist has yet made a significant contribution to the understanding of that subject. If sociologists do begin realistic researches on war and other forms of international conflict they will have to abandon

---

For an example of misinterpretation, see the lead editorial in *Life* magazine, vol. 35, 28 September 1953, p. 36.

their usual assumption of a given cultural order. International conflict can be unlimited, to use a phrase offered by a discussant, Dr. M. E. Giraud (United Nations) and mediation may not be possible under such circumstances. Professors Angell and Levi also warned that any findings from the study of conflict and mediation *within* a society could not automatically be generalized to apply to the international situation.

Professor Angell (U.S.) posited four types of studies which seem both to be suited to the character of sociology and to have practical significance for the determination of policy: (a) research into the degree to which the moral norms of the major nations are compatible when they are projected outward into the arena of international relations; (b) research into the information and attitudes of policy-makers in different countries, especially the process by which attitudes of respect toward other cultures are generated in them; (c) research into historical situations similar to the one that the world now confronts or into analogous contemporary situations at lower levels of organization (e.g. research into the accommodation of national differences in newly created countries); (d) research on existing contacts among nations and peoples, and determination of which of them are helping to form the basis of a truly international society. More specifically here, there needs to be good sociological research into the effectiveness of educational programmes, mass communications activities, travel and residence abroad, participation in international governmental and non governmental associations.

Professor Barrington Moore, Jr. (U.S.) also provided a list of topics relevant to international conflict to which the sociologist may make a research contribution: (a) who are the policy-makers in each country, and to what degree do they have freedom to manœuvre independently of public opinion; (b) what are the values and goals of the policy-makers and of the culture as a whole; (c) what knowledge do policy-makers have of their own and of other countries; (d) what is the effect of ethical norms on policy-makers. Professor Rudolf Blühdorn (Austria) took up the same subject of sociological problems involved in international relations but did not make specific suggestions. In oral discussion, Professor Raymond Aron (France) expressed the hope that sociologists could study the power situation which was central to international conflict, the limitations on policy-makers, the formation of their opinions. He also pointed out some essential limitations in the role of the social scientist: the policy-maker cannot wait to make a decision until the scientists do their studies, and he cannot base action on the statements of mere probability which are all the scientists can provide him. The social scientists will have to have modesty and patience if they aspire to make a contribution to international peace.

Other contributions to the section on international conflict took up specific factors in the etiology of that problem. Dr. Boasson's discussion of fear has already been mentioned. Professor Henri Janne (Belgium) took almost the reverse position in suggesting that mutual suspicion among nations was a factor promoting their integration. A kind of community feeling grows up among traditional enemies, because each wants to know about the other and because respect arises out of envy and fear. In support of this novel position, Professor Janne alleged that France and Germany have developed this community feeling which in the long run limits conflict, whereas the United Kingdom and the United States have not. In the face of a common problem, the former nations are more likely to unite.

Professor H. C. Callis (U.S.) emphasized the significance of the cultural heritage in the etiology of international conflict, holding that culture determines the forms, means, and direction of aggression. As a result of being subject to aggression, a nation enters a period of aggression; then after a number of victories or defeats, it is no longer aggressive (e.g. Germany). Taking up what he considers to be the unique patterns of aggressivity in different cultures, Callis discusses America's new fears caused by the realization that the oceans and Britain are no longer a protection; Japanese pessimism and sense of duty expressing itself in colonialism; and Russian arrogance and verbal anti-imperialism. He suggests international conciliation through education, selection and training of leaders, formation of international political bodies representative of individuals rather than nations, reconciliation of divergent interests through demonstration that each interest is limited, training for acceptance of cultural diversity, abolition of sovereignty, development of great leaders, granting aid to nations only through international bodies. Mr. F. Tenhaeff (Neth.), in his paper on the history of co-operation among the Scandinavian nations, also considered cultural factors, but in a more specific way. He shows, for example, how relatively small groups of students in the nineteenth century began the movement toward Scandinavian integration, and how this integration developed more rapidly in the cultural than in the political sphere. In the discussion, Mr. Jörgen Jensen (Denmark) stated that public opinion in Scandinavia would never tolerate a war between nations in that area, and thus there was no threat to national survival. This threat must be removed for all small nations if they are to survive, and only a powerful international authority could do that.

In his remarks, Professor Aron had pointed out that cultural values were important as they moulded the minds of the policy-makers. Dr. Sergei Utechin (U.K.) challenged the cultural approach to an explanation of war, and stated that international conflict today was due to the existence of certain leaders who wished to build up their personal power to the maximum. He doubted that cultural values have a prime influence on totalitarian leaders, and stated that even the group around these top leaders was not very influential. The main problem for study, he held, was the selection of national leaders. Professor Rose pointed out that whether we accepted the cultural approach or not, there was undoubtedly a relationship between internal events within a state and the pattern of its relationships with other states, and that sociologists could study this. For example, the 'garrison state' now developing in democratic countries as a consequence of the 'cold war' is yet amenable to sociological research. Also, the conditions favouring the development of a community between two or more nations could be studied in several parts of the world—as it had been studied in Scandinavia by Mr. Tenhaeff—to determine at what stage formal political steps toward integration were likely to be most successful. Sociologists must take account of social structure.

In the industrial conflicts section, as in the general section and the international section, the distinction between the social-psychological and the sociological approach was clearly evident. Two papers attempted to point out the dangers and weaknesses of the psychological approach, particularly as it is exemplified by the 'human relations school'. On the other hand, there were a number of papers reporting useful findings obtained by this approach. In the discussion, a number of people attempted to point out those areas where

the study of 'human relations' was likely to be most successful and those where it had no relevance.

By far the greatest number of the 20 papers submitted for this section, however, used the sociological approach, seeing industrial conflict as a social process; distinguishing various types of conflict; describing the conditions under which they occur, specifying their effects on both the larger society and on labour and management; and analysing the methods used to avert and prevent industrial conflict. It was noteworthy that a number of investigators from different countries, using different data, arrived at the same conclusions. However, greatly different conclusions were reached by people studying countries where the economic and political situations differed greatly. We shall first discuss the 'sociological approach' papers, particularly those which confirm each other.

The industrial conflicts section was opened by its chairman, Professor Georges Friedmann (France). Professor Friedmann summarized the contributions pointing out in which areas original work had been done and noting particularly the various comparative studies. He urged an extension of this method for studying industrial conflicts by comparing different factories, varied working conditions and workers' backgrounds within a single country. Professor Friedmann also observed that in spite of the interest in industrial conflicts, very few studies from the strictly sociological point of view had been undertaken. A wide area for research is therefore open to sociologists. In a number of papers [those by Professor Clark Kerr (U.S.); Professor Robert Dubin (U.S.); Dr. K. G. J. C. Knowles (U.K.); Dr. Michel Crozier (France); Professor O. Kahn-Freund (U.K.)] industrial conflict is seen as inevitable in a democratic society where divergent interests are permitted. In contrast to much previous sociological analysis, in particular that of the 'human relations' school, conflict is not seen as a kind of social disorganization but rather as a means of constructive social change in a democratic society. The assumption was here made that in industrial conflict the amount of violence and the extent of conflict is limited by a common set of values between the contending parties (Dubin, Kerr); by law (Kahn-Freund); by equality of strength between the contestants [Professor Harold L. Sheppard (U.S.), Knowles, Dubin, Kahn-Freund]. It was in this assumption that international differences become evident. In countries where the labour movement is strong and integrated into the society, the assumption holds. In other countries where the labour movement is strong but common values are lacking, industrial conflict is not limited and so moves over into political conflict, social revolt and disorder. This point was made in discussion by Mr. Theo Pirker (Germany), Professor Nels Anderson (U.S.), and Father Joseph Schuyler (U.S.) in regard to Germany. In underdeveloped countries like India, where not only are common criteria lacking but also the labour movement is weak, conflict probably serves to develop union solidarity but has no great effect on the larger society (Professor R. N. Saksena, India).

A considerable number of the papers concentrated their attention on the causes of strikes and the possible ways of avoiding or averting them. Professor Kerr, reporting on a study of strike-proneness, discovered two extreme types of situations in which workers find themselves: (a) as members of an 'isolated mass', cut off from communication with the rest of society, usually geographically, and thrown into intimate and exclusive contact with their fellow workers; that is, in a situation where union and community are identical and

where work is likely to be unpleasant. Examples of such workers are miners, longshoremen, sailors, textile workers; (b) as integrated members of differentiated communities where organizations other than the union claim some of the loyalty and interest of the workers. The first type of group is much more prone to strike than the second type.

Dr. Knowles, working with British statistics, came to strikingly similar conclusions. He found strike proneness most common where bad working conditions exist in densely populated areas where people can easily combine for common action. Mr. Eric de Dampierre (France) presented a Unesco tensions study of a small rubber factory in an isolated French village which can be considered as a case study of the isolated type of worker situation. He pointed out, in addition, a number of tensions existing within such a community—between skilled and unskilled, young and old, foremen and engineers.

Dr. J. Haveman (Netherlands) presented a similar situation in his historical study of a rural area in Grōningen. Originally the farmers and workers formed an integrated village community. Later on, the farmers became wealthy and adopted the social and economic habits of the upper classes, thus disrupting community relations and setting the labourers apart in a separate and isolated group. Strikes of great violence resulted.

Two others papers are to be noted in this context. Professor P. Horion (Belgium) reported on the history of labour conflicts in Belgium and Dr. Dirk Horringa (Netherlands) on that in the Netherlands. Both indicated that labour conflict has been relatively mild in these countries and both gave reports of a labour movement well integrated into the community. For example, both spoke of the high degree of labour-management co-operation, particularly after the German occupation when it became necessary to rebuild these countries.

On the subject of the mediation of conflict, a great deal more divergence of opinion occurred. Professor Kerr distinguished between 'tactical' and 'strategic' mediation. Tactical mediation is defined as the intervention of a third party in a situation already given. The tactical mediator can do the following things: reduce irrationality; remove non-rationality; explore possible solutions; assist in the graceful retreat; and raise the cost of conflict. Strategical mediation, however, involves changing the situation itself and must be based on a knowledge of the situations leading to conflict. Thus conflict might he lessened by: integration of workers and employers into society; increasing the stability of society; increasing ideological compatibility between disputants; having secure and responsive relationship of leaders of a union to its membership; dispersion of grievances; structuring the game.

A number of people discussed the resolution of industrial conflicts in terms similar to several or all of these points made by Kerr. Dubin, for example, thinks of collective bargaining as a social invention which establishes the rules and limitations of industrial conflict. He says that in the United States now, collective bargaining can be thought of as antagonistic co-operation. In Kerr's terms, collective bargaining is one way of structuring the game and results in greater ideological compatibility between the disputants.

Sheppard drew similar conclusions after surveying several studies of strikes including, besides those by Kerr and Knowles, one by Ross and Irwin based on statistics from five countries. Sheppard stated that, to the extent that workers and unions become integrated into society, the propensity to strike is decreased, and as unions gain power, the duration of strikes is decreased.

Haveman pointed out that although government regulation of working conditions stopped strikes, in the rural area he studied, skilled workers continued to leave the land in large numbers. He recommended training in sociology and psychology in agricultural schools to change the farmer's mentality. He felt that only the re-establishment of some sort of community feeling could remedy the situation.

The role of law and of government intervention in mediating industrial conflict also received some attention. Haveman reported on the success of a tripartite (government, farm-owners, and labourers) regulatory association in preventing strikes. He indicated, however, that conflict has not ceased, but is expressed in other ways. For Belgium, Professor Horion reported that conciliation boards have been very successful. He added that laws guaranteeing liberty of association, including sanctions against any attempt to interfere with it, have served to lessen industrial conflict. Kahn-Freund described the role of law in regulating collective bargaining, especially in the American situation. In Britain more is left to collective bargaining than in the United States, but the law makes the privilege of collective bargaining conditional on non-discrimination. It is used in times of crises when industrial conflict affects the nation. Professor Saksena reported an interesting situation in India. The government's bill to encourage collective bargaining was withdrawn because of hostility on the part of unions to a clause forbidding strikes until after mediation.

Several investigators pointed out that in certain countries strikes are becoming less an instrument of union policy and more a revolt by the rank and file against certain frustrations. Kahn-Freund stated, for example, that the more 'responsible' the union and trade association are, the more the individual workers and firms will rebel against them. Knowles found a change in the nature of strikes with a change in the economic and social situation of the workers. Formerly, strikes were of a revolutionary nature; now they are sometimes against union leadership or (in Great Britain) against the friction caused by nationalization. Dr. Knowles felt that these strikes both provide a measure of the distrust felt by the rank and file to the system of regulation as a whole and point out the weaknesses in the working of the complex machinery regulating industry. In a discussion period, Mr. Henning Friis (Denmark) made a similar remark about the Danish situation, pointing out that the elaborate system of industrial controls were themselves a source of frustration. Mr. Kurt L. Törnqvist (Sweden) indicated that in Sweden social frustration has become a new cause of strikes. In Sweden the bigger the community and the union, the higher was the percentage of workers voting to strike.

A number of people pointed out that the strike is only one form of industrial conflict and often not the most costly or the most serious (Dubin, Kerr, Knowles). These other forms of industrial conflict received some attention. Pirker, on the basis of a two-year study of German iron and steel factories, reported that a general form of industrial disorder occurred when large plants were introduced into an area. Young people cannot get into the larger plants which offer more social services to their employees. Advancement comes only after 15 years; mobility between plants is regarded as a sign of unrest and as disloyalty. Professor E. Wight Bakke (U.S.) submitted a theoretical paper in which he assumed that the individual and the organization are each wholes. The simultaneous and mutual reconstruction of the organization and the individual in the process of their interaction, Bakke called the 'fusion process'.

Working within this theoretical framework, Friis reported on a pilot study of sources of conflict among functional groups in Danish industry. Surprisingly, they found that newly established production committees, organized to reduce conflict were themselves sources of conflict. Mrs. Madeleine Guilbert and Mrs. Viviane Isambert (France), reporting on the inequality of pay for women in France, indicated that the long tradition of inequality carries over into the present, despite recent laws requiring equality. Work done exclusively or mostly by women tends to be rated lower than work done by men. On piece work women tend to work harder, thus making it possible to lower the basic wage. In both these and other cases, tension and conflict is created between men and women workers.

Professor Alfred Bonné (Israel) pointed out how the social and political institutions of underdeveloped countries, particularly in the Orient, create industrial conflict. Certain institutions (the joint family, the tribal structure) and certain habits of thought (the ascetic-contemplative and the authoritarian) militate against economic change and thus generate conflict.

Most of the papers reported thus far have been concerned with the broader social and economic causes of industrial conflict. A few investigators, however, concerned themselves with the situation in one plant. Dr. Franca Magistretti (Italy) studied the conversation of workers in arbitrarily formed work groups with a view to ascertaining the causes of conflict on this level. She found that the subjects which determine leadership or isolation in general are politics, sports, and women—politics being more important for isolating an individual than for rendering him acceptable. Christian Democrats, for example, tend to be isolated in work groups that are predominantly communist or fascist. She also found that political interests vary inversely with the conditions of work; that religious interests vary inversely with political interests; and that interest in unionism is greatest where working conditions are neither best nor worst.

Another paper on the structure of the individual plant is that of Dr. F. van Mechelen (Belgium). He distinguished between the official hierarchy of the organization and the spontaneous hierarchy of the workers, and discussed how their relationship increased or decreased industrial conflict.

Horringa reported on a number of Dutch studies of this type: one by Ijdo on what constitutes job satisfaction; one by Kuyloars who suggested job enlargement to avoid discontent with oversimplified jobs; a continuing study by the Institute of Preventive Medicine of Leyden to deal with such symptoms of conflict as high turnover, low output, and inter-staff hostility. The state mines have already adopted a stabilization programme which includes techniques for placing workers with regard to inter-personal relations. This has measurably lowered turnover and absenteeism, and has raised production.

Professor Kunio Odaka (Japan) attempted to discover if worker identification with management precluded identification with the union and vice versa. He found that identification with both union and management was related except at one factory where a strike was in progress. He also reported that identification is positively related with length of service but not consistently so with type of work, wages, age, or education.

A considerable proportion of the meetings were devoted to discussions of the field of human relations. Sheppard characterized the 'human relations' approach as follows: (a) there is a systematic and often explicit denial of economic and political determinants of industrial peace; (b) the area of observation is limited to the factory itself; (c) the reduction of conflict can come

37

primarily by action of the employer in acquiring 'social skills' (i.e. by manipulating the worker's direction of hostility) rather than by some form of redistribution of power; and (d) industrial relations consist of person-to-person relations and the source of industrial conflict is to be found at this level. He then attempted to show that these assumptions are not borne out by field research or statistics of industrial conflict.

Crozier made a similar critique of the human relations approach. He said that that point of view which sees tensions as entirely within a single plant neglects the 'profoundly *natural* character' of workers' revolt. Crozier added that because the Marxists have abused this point of view does not exempt sociologists from studying the conditions of workers which give rise to strikes. Crozier also raised the interesting idea that sociologists should study the climate of opinion which made the human relations approach so widely and quickly acceptable. He suggested that the thirties and forties saw gains for workers, and intellectual leadership tended to be 'progressive'. Now business is attempting to regain leadership of the community, and the human relations' point of view has become part of its ideology.

In the discussion Professor Everett Hughes (U.S.) presented some of the history of the term 'human relations'. Originally the phrase was used to describe studies of the informal structure of institutions of any kind. The popularity of this approach and its exclusive application to management-worker relations was not expected by the original group of researchers and tends to support Crozier's criticism. He also distinguished between the aims of this group and those of the Mayo group. Hughes pointed out that sociology continually faces the problem of being used in this way. He adds that implicit in the human relations concept is the assumption that society without conflict is possible and desirable and agrees with Crozier that the development of public relations as a field of study has tended to spread this idea.

Professor Conrad Arensberg (U.S.) attempted to explain the difference between the uses of the term 'human relations' in the United States. Like Hughes he pointed out that researchers are often interested in the structure of institutions rather than industrial conflict, and that this is a legitimate field of sociological investigation, whatever criticisms may be levelled against human relations as a means of studying industrial conflict. Professor Frederick Pollock (Germany), on the other hand, pointed out that in Germany the study of human relations has been presented as a cure-all; also, that it is presented cynically, that is, management can use these techniques to keep the workers happy without changing real conditions. German employers, according to Pollock, resent any criticism by or concessions to workers. In this discussion the dangers of transferring either techniques or the content of an area of research from one country to another became readily apparent.

Mention should be made of two studies reported at the conference which dealt with subject matter somewhat different from that of the other participants. Professor Torgny Segerstedt (Sweden) reported on an excellent study of class consciousness. He found that, compared to office employees, workers have more class consciousness; have the strongest feeling of importance of class; are more active in unions and political parties, but less active in cultural and recreational activities.

In the discussion Professor David Glass (U.K.) reported on an English study by a colleague of his. Using the excellent mine accident statistics available, Dr. Glass's colleague found that an increase in the accident rate was followed

by either an outburst of discontent or a strike. The increase in accident rates thus served to indicate rising tension in the mines. Dr. Glass appealed for other studies of this type which offered the chance for good cross-cultural comparisons.

Most of the papers in the section on race and culture conflict were descriptive rather than analytical, although most of them used the best available techniques of research. Together they produced a sober picture of group conflict throughout the world, even in countries where race and cultural tension had not been publicized. Some of the dark spots are not so serious, perhaps, because they are temporary—arising out of dislocation of population after the war. Most countries with minority conflict have fortunately not developed the ideology of racism, while other countries have integrated this conflict into the very fabric of the whole culture.

Mention has already been made of the studies of attitudes toward minorities in France by Girard and by Clément and Xydias. Also Unesco-sponsored was a study reported by Miss Gabriele Wülker (Germany) of refugees in Germany from Soviet-dominated countries (especially Poles, Ukrainians and Baltic peoples). There are great difficulties in integrating these people as a large proportion are old and disabled, as they consider their exile as temporary and want to maintain national traditions (including language), as they are placed in camps in rural areas where unemployment is high and where there is little opportunity for social contact, as they have developed a psychology of dependence and refuse to work. A similar group was reported on in a study by Dr. Edmund Dahlström (Sweden): these were Esthonian refugees in a community on the outskirts of Stockholm. The Esthonians are a non-segregated minority of the community where secondary contacts are characteristic, so the Swedes do not perceive them as a group. On the other hand the Swedes favour economic and immigration restrictions against them. The Esthonians had been in middle class occupations in their native country and many were obliged to take an income cut when they fled to Sweden. On the other hand, they expected this and so did not feel bad about it. On the contrary, they —especially the older ones among them—are grateful for the haven and thus are 'satisfied' with their lower status. Nevertheless, very few expect to remain in Sweden; they all want to return to Esthonia when the Communists are driven out and most expect that this will be possible some day. About a half want to migrate across the Atlantic because they feel that there will be another war and either Sweden will be overrun by the Russians or it will be forced to turn refugees over to the Russians. The feeling of being in Sweden only temporarily reduces the motivation to adjust, as does the desire to preserve Esthonian culture. The younger members of the group have more contact with the Swedes than do the older ones, are more adjusted, but are also less grateful and more willing to criticize.

Professor René Clémens (Belgium) reported on his study of the assimilation of Italians and Poles in the Liège region. The earlier immigration was strictly for economic reasons, but since the end of World War II the Poles have come as political refugees. The housing shortage has caused recent immigrants to live in closed colonies, and the restriction of their occupation to mining and some heavy industry further segregates them. The older immigrants are assimilated in varying degree, depending on their social distance from the Belgians, on the family's encouragement or discouragement of contacts with the broader society, on affiliation with such organizations as trade unions. For Italians of the

early immigration, the following variables were not found to be associated with assimilation: age, length of residence, age at marriage, type of work in Italy, age of starting work. Correlated with assimilation are nationality of spouse, presence of children, continuity of work since immigration. Discriminatory attitudes by Belgians toward foreigners vary with social class, with number of foreigners in the community, with amount and kind of contact. Belgians are opposed to foreigners occupying high social positions as long as they are recognizable as foreigners. In general, the milieu is not hostile but definitely reticent.

Dr. Sidney Collins (U.K.) reported on a study of Negroes and Moslems in Great Britain. The Negroes are predominantly males who have lower status occupations. A good number of them marry white girls, live interspersed among whites, are oriented to the larger British society and have little group consciousness. When the white wife's status is equal to or higher than that of her husband, she is often estranged from her family and friends, at least at first. Offspring of these mixed marriages are generally accepted in British society: for example, one-fourth of the Anglo-coloured girls marry white men. The Moslems are in a different position: they deliberately maintain a segregated life and have strong group self consciousness. They do not marry British women, and thus there is no one to aid their assimilation. The British resist their assimilation. Thus, assimilation is not a function of colour caste, but of class status, intermarriage, and attitudes of group solidarity.

The study by Professor Radhakamal Mukerjee (India) considered the full range of intergroup conflicts in India. Caste tensions, always in existence in India despite much theorizing to the contrary, have become more serious during the present time of rapid social change. The lower castes want more equality of opportunity and privilege, they try to abandon their stigmatized occupations but meet resistance from the upper castes; they unsuccessfully try to break down residential segregation, and—in addition to this—they have a high birth rate and so their pressure is multiplied. Tensions between Moslems and Hindus had been declining until the nineteenth century when the British policy of segregating their voting and of encouraging competition between their intelligentsia led India toward renewed religious conflict. After the battles of 1948, tensions have been reduced and the government is seriously working to alleviate them, but the remaining Moslems in India are still touchy and resentful. The ten million displaced Hindus from Pakistan create a special problem as there is insufficient housing and occupation for them. Various forms of social organization have developed among them which does not enhance their popularity among the native Hindus. One happy change has been the weakening of caste restrictions among the refugees. Class tensions are also serious in India as there are rigid barriers against occupational mobility. The illiterate worker, no matter what his other abilities are, cannot rise above the position of jobber, and persons in the latter category tend to become arrogant, thus creating a triangular sort of class conflict. The government at first tried to handle the ordinary forms of industrial conflict by compulsory arbitration, but this proved to be so unpopular with both employers and workers that the government now favours the voluntary settlement of industrial disputes.

Some of the papers presented in the 'race and culture' section did not deal with conflict *per se*. Professor H. Z. Ülken (Turkey) advanced the hypothesis, based on a study of communities in Anatolia, that ethnic and religious hetero-

geneity have hastened modernization and hence cultural homogeneity. There had been a history of seriously bad relations between the various ethnic and religious groups of Asiatic Turkey. But there has been a gradual development of cultural homogeneity and a lessening of tension. The appearance of large-scale industry has had an enormous effect on the occupational aspects of ethnic barriers. Compulsory military service has broken down feudal ideas among peasants and has widened their horizon.

The paper by Professor Tadashi Fukutake (Japan) reported a systematic study of the consequences of heavy emigration on a fishing village. There has been a heavy loss of persons in the reproductive ages and hence the average size of family is smaller. The prime motive for emigration—the decline of the fishing ground—has also shifted the remaining inhabitants toward farming. There is considerable renting of small parcels of land at high rents, and hence there is over-use of the land. A decreasing number of the emigrants have returned to their native village where, because of accumulated savings, they live a life of relative ease. This has upset the status hierarchy since the emigrants originally consisted of poorer people and branch families. The non-migrant lower class, seeing the success of their emigrant friends, are dissatisfied because they would also like to emigrate but cannot because of immigration restrictions in Canada, the United States and other countries of past immigration. The patriarchal family has been seriously jeopardized by the emigration; many of the emigrants were heads of families and on their departure their wives assumed leadership in the family. Children born in Canada and now brought to Japan for their education are not like the Japanese-born; they are not deferential to their elders, they are wild and overtly aggressive, but they have an attractive self-confidence and ability to get along with each other. The Canadian-born children are healthier and have better sanitary and medical habits. The returned emigrants generally are less religious and superstitious, and more 'modernized' in every respect. While the older returned emigrants will probably live in the village until their death, most of their children look forward to returning to Canada when they grow up. This poses a problem for the village as the returned emigrants provided a source of wealth and social change, and their disappearance will leave the village in a bad position.

Mr. Pierre Fouilhé (France) presented a study showing how comic strips orient children toward conflict situations. The study is still in progress, and was the sole one in the section starting with analytic questions: To what extent do the comics reflect the norms of the group? What effect do the comics have on the imaginary life and conduct of children? Practically no difference was found between children in an upper class *quarter* and a lower class one in the extent of purchase of comic books (28-29 per cent) and in preferences as to content. The study will next examine such matters as racial attitudes, attitudes toward morality and science, and whether the books excite children or offer catharsis.

In the oral discussion, Mr. Leo Silberman (South Africa) described a study of social change in Mauritius as a consequence of colonization from the West. Mr. Anthony Richmond (U.K.) described a study of the adjustment of West Indians in Britain, with findings parallel to those of Collins.

Dr. Maharaia Winiata (U.K.) described race relations between the Maori and the Europeans in New Zealand. In many respects the Maori were benefited by the British and there was little discrimination. A major difficulty for the Maori was the maintenance of their cultural values. For example, while the

Maori stressed group values, the whites encouraged them to be individualistic and to assimilate. The possibilities for the future were hopeful if the Maori were allowed to retain some of their prized cultural values, since intermarriage is now practised and many common institutions exist.

A final general session, devoted to suggestions for future research that might aid international peace, closed the series on conflict and mediation. It was observed that many valuable topics for research had been suggested throughout the preceding sessions, notably the theory of games approach to group conflict, the selection of and influences on policy makers, the internationalizing effects of the mass media, changing attitudes accompanying the growing integration of Europe. Mrs. Alva Mydral (Unesco) suggested that there were three distinct levels of analysis, within which concrete research proposals could conveniently be grouped: (a) basic psychological and socio-logical causation of conflict; (b) effectiveness of various techniques intended to manipulate attitudes toward greater internationalism; (c) the decision-making processes in international conferences, mediation, etc. Professor Herrfardt suggested that two opposing assumptions underlay efforts to promote international peace, the universality of man and the uniqueness of nations. Dr. Boasson suggested studying the rise of international attitudes among children and the situation of conflict where the two sides had greatly different strength. Mr. Giraud and Professor Davy offered the topic of fatigue in international conferences. Davy also proposed a study of the relation between social mobility and nationalism. Professor H. P. Maiti (India) emphasized that sociologists could make their greatest contribution by studying the constellation of power forces, not attitudes which were primarily in the domain of the social psycho-logist. He also suggested that we need more 'action studies' of small groups as experiments in increasing mutual understanding. Professor Arvid Brodersen (Norway) raised the question as to how nationalism and internationalism could be made compatible. Professor Otto Friedman suggested that sociologists study to what extent and where there is distortion in the press; public opinion regarding the motivations of rulers of other nations; and the differences in newspaper treatment of the same items in different countries (e.g. Yugoslavia and a western European nation). Professor Morris Ginsberg (U.K.) proposed a study of how domestic policy is reflected in foreign policy, how internal tensions promote external ones. Professor Merton Oyler (U.S.) raised the questions: What is the newspaper's audience, what groups in the population are most influenced by the press, does the press create public opinion or reflect it? He also reported a Harvard University study of decision-making in hospitals. Professor Everett C. Hughes proposed a study of the leaders and movements that will create international problems in the future (e.g. in Africa); this will be valuable in future mediation. Dr. Andreas Miller (Switzerland), after describing a comparative content analysis study of newspapers, raised questions for research concerning the origin of the news and the kind of news. Mrs. Van der Sprenkel mentioned the possibility of studying the British practice of self-formed committees of experts 'waiting on' high government officials to inform and influence them. Mrs. Myrdal observed that most of the proposals for research made fell into the second category that she had mentioned at the outset of the discussion—namely, the mani-pulation of attitudes. She felt that sociologists had more to contribute to the study of the third category, policy-making.

It was clear from their discussion and from the scope of the papers and

discussions in the specific sections that sociologists were working on only a small proportion of the aspects of social conflict to the understanding of which they might make a contribution by their researches. The gaps were especially noticeable in the field of international relations. The descriptive character of the studies reported in the section on race and culture conflict, while valuable in itself, revealed, perhaps, the failure to use a sociological approach to questions requiring analysis in this field. Studies on industrial conflict were most successful, at least as reported at the Liège congress, in using a sociological approach to answer such questions. In all sections, however, the congress achieved a clearer definition of a sociological approach to the study of conflict and mediation which would complement the more developed but partially inadequate social-psychological approach.

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN SOCIOLOGICAL RESEARCH

D. G. MACRAE

The third section of the Second World Congress of Sociology, on 'Recent Developments in Sociological Research', met at Liège on Friday, 28 August 1953. The chairman of the section was Professor A. N. J. den Hollander, of the University of Amsterdam, and the *rapporteur*, Mr. D. G. MacRae of the London School of Economics and Political Science. At the time of the meeting 24 papers were available in bound form to the members of the congress, and three other communications had been made available separately. The session was, however, markedly different from those of the other sections in that discussion and contributions clung far less closely than elsewhere to the actual material submitted in advance. Much of the strength and interest of this section was due to this fact, and the range, variety and quality of the discussion proved most stimulating to all the participants. It is particularly unfortunate, therefore, that this report cannot fairly and fully represent the discussion owing to a series of technical failures of the recording apparatus throughout the session. As a consequence of these failures the transcriptions of the discussion are fragmentary and misleading, and not even all the names of those who spoke are available. The *rapporteur* apologizes for inevitable omissions and failures on this account, and hopes that at least something of the spirit of the affair survives.

It was clear from the first that this section represented what might be called a 'residual category'. Professor Parsons has long ago taught us that it is just in such categories that the strengths and weaknesses of a subject may be found, and one may perhaps feel that this was borne out in the proceedings of this section. Theoretically, no doubt, this section should have represented a cross-section of what is going on in Sociology throughout the world, but this was not achieved. On the one hand, separate sections of the congress were devoted to 'Social Stratification and Social Mobility', 'Intergroup Conflicts and their

Mediation', and 'The Training, Professional Activities and Responsibilities of Sociologists'. Research in the first two of these sections is today at its height throughout the world so that between them they occupy a great deal of the present content of sociological study. The last of these sections is one which must by its very nature always be of profound interest to those engaged in this discipline, and conceals within itself problems which are not only ethical, but which are profoundly bound up with matters of practical research. If only for this reason, then, the section on recent developments could not be representative.

But there were additional reasons. Inevitably these papers, collected at random, could not be representative of the total sociological situation: only a carefully designed and commissioned selection of papers could achieve this. One might feel that the omissions were mainly of two kinds: in this section, American, English and French sociology tended to be under-represented; and, secondly, certain topics of great importance were conspicuously absent. For instance, questions of sociological theory—a topic inadequately represented in the congress as a whole—and also the comparative neglect of the border area between sociology, social policy, and social philosophy. As will emerge later in this paper, the actual congress at discussion did something to remedy all these deficiencies. Nevertheless, in one day devoted to many topics, only a little could be said, and much that one would wish to have elaborated was passed quickly over.

This was perhaps particularly marked in the aspects dealt with by Drs. Busia and Eisenstadt, from the Gold Coast and Israel, Mrs. Bryce from Agra, and by Professor Maiti from Patna. The problems of societies, whether ancient or modern, which are undergoing rapid technological change, violent urban expansion, the impact of alien cultures, and in addition have to deal with massive population shifts, are of a kind to which, it was alleged, the techniques and ideology of social anthropology are unsuited, while the techniques of sociology are too little applied. Such areas are growing in number and importance in the contemporary world, and raise problems of practical urgency and great interest for sociological theory—especially for the analysis of social change—and issues that inevitably bring the sociologist to the urgent consideration of questions of value. These questions of value are of three main kinds: problems of dealing with divergent values as social data; problems of discriminating between values; and problems of what values should be involved in policy.

This enormous and fascinating subject inevitably aroused great interest and was left with reluctance. In its importance, interest and brevity of appearance at the conference, it may stand as typical of the diverse themes discussed. It is desirable that, as the chairman, Professor den Hollander, said in his opening remarks, 'this section should become one of the permanent sections of subsequent congresses of the associations'—if only to allow some glimpse of those topics which, however important, might not publicly be raised in the sterner, more restricted, sessions of the other highly specific sections. In this way, too, gaps of subject or of national representation may be filled by those engaged in the responsibilities of planning the programmes of future ISA meetings.

The course of the discussion may now be briefly outlined before the content of the papers is examined.

Professor den Hollander welcomed his colleagues. He announced that he

would not generalize from the impressive but heterogeneous material before him. Nevertheless, he felt, it was striking how the subject was becoming more and more one in which research was corporate rather than individual. He went on to consider topics raised in the papers and to make a number of observations already incoporated in this text. He was followed by the *rapporteur* who examined the papers in more detail and made an attempt to group them in terms of their subject matter and interest.

The first speaker was Professor Dodd of Seattle who argued that, if sociology were to advance, then the researches carried on in the different countries of the world must be comparable. In 1954, as an aid to this, he hoped to see the publication of a world manual of 'polling' techniques, operationally defined. Such a work will require annual revision and volunteers from many nations—volunteer helpers should establish contact with either Mrs. Myrdal or with Professor Dodd at the University of Washington.

Professor R. König, of the Sociological Seminar of the University of Cologne, decided not to read his paper, but to comment on certain points raised earlier at the congress and by the *rapporteur* of this section. He was deeply concerned with a problem perhaps more properly belonging to another section—the problem of how to teach a discipline at once theoretical and practical. Should we treat sociology as one discipline or as many? The relations of disciplines separated by university faculty frontiers raise a problem perhaps insoluble. As will be seen, the session was to return repeatedly to these matters, and Dr. Busia who spoke next felt that his experience in Africa suggested a return to the problems of the pioneers of sociology and a deliberate re-encountering of questions of philosophy and *weltanschauungen*. We should not teach sociological method separately from other studies, for method is an integral part of all sociological work.

Dr. Eisenstadt, on behalf of his Isreali colleagues, deplored the limitations of staff and resources for research, with which the rich Israeli scene is confronted. Out of such richness selection of appropriate topics must be a matter of governmental and public need: even so the best research is 'fundamental research'. Professor Dodd then discussed the paper he had contributed to the session on the study of values (see below) and the next speaker, Dr. Pipping of Abo, turned to a question which involved basic questions for sociology, social anthropology, and social psychology: the problem of the socialization of children and their adult personality structure—a problem more complex than is usually thought, if only because the attitudes of any two parents are not themselves necessarily consistent (see below).

Mrs. Bryce returned to the subjects raised earlier by Dr. Busia and Dr. Eisenstadt with special reference to the problems to be faced by Indian sociology.

Dr. Wurzbacher of the Unesco Social Science Institute at Cologne agreed with Dr. Eisenstadt about 'fundamental research' and illustrated his argument by reference to his paper, showing how some of the basic theses of Tönnies were today being validated. Dr. Karsten of Helsingfors spoke on the sociology of old age, and suggested that 'old age' itself was a social concept which correlated with differences in social structure. Mr. Dampierre followed on behalf of Mr. Chombart de Lauwe (both of the Centre for Sociological Studies, Paris) and commented on the latter's paper (see below).

Mr. H. Friis of the Danish Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs gave an account of the recent development of sociology in Denmark and the way in

which this ministry had moved from the employment of economists and statisticians to the utilization of sociologists, especially in the study of youth. He illustrated the importance of case-work methods and follow-up inquiries in the field of delinquency studies.

Professor Maiti brought the session back to questions which had arisen earlier; he gave information on the Indian contribution to the Unesco Tensions Project, and explained how the attainment of dominion status by India in 1947 had resulted in greater government aid for the social sciences. Simultaneously the new freedom of India had encouraged a new scientific interest among young Indians in social science. He illustrated all this with references to refugee problems, marriage, birth control and population questions, tribal problems, the attitudes of industrial workers and so on. In all this work of education and research a constant problem had been the absence of adequate textbooks: perhaps time would remedy this. One point of particular interest made by Professor Maiti was that the middle castes are enjoying a steadily rising prestige as their economic importance grows. This alteration of prestige is recognized even among Brahmins.

Dr. N. Anderson of the Unesco Institute at Cologne gave an account of the Darmstadt survey (see below), and was followed by Professor F. Pollock of the revived (1950) Institute for Social Research at Frankfort, who stressed the need for socially minded administrators and suggested that the objects of the educational programme at the institute were to produce men who read Hegel, understood Heidegger, and who could use American empirical technique. He also described the attempt to construct an index of 'social morale' in Germany in empirical terms.[1]

Mr. Pages of the Centre of Sociological Studies, Paris, discussed his paper on *ton affectif* (see below), and was followed by Mr. Celestin on the work undertaken by the French Centre 'Economy and Humanism'—an account of which formed the eighteenth paper of the session. This speaker was particularly concerned with the problems of the standard of life.

Professor M. Ginsberg of the London School of Economics and Political Science began by referring to the problems of 'pioneer countries' raised by Doctors Busia and Eisenstadt, and suggested that sociological education in such countries might well begin with the consideration of the particular society in which the teacher worked. 'That of course involves', Professor Ginsberg went on, 'that, in a place like the Gold Coast, for example, there would have to be a number of studies, which I think have not yet been made, of the social structure on the particular area. And there is also, I think, a very remarkable and extraordinary fact: that we are not in possession at present of books dealing with the structure of such units even in regard to the more developed countries. For instance I know no book that will inform you fully about the social structure say of contemporary England or of contemporary France or contemporary Germany. These books do not exist. I am sure that they could exist, that in these cases there is in existence sufficient material— demographic and every other kind of institutional material—which needs only to be brought together through some sort of consultative scheme. I don't mean that these books in question should be identical, for each country must have its own of course. . . .' Out of such resources we might hope to see the rebirth of comparative sociology. Dr. Busia had raised the question of social philosophy:

---

[1] From this point onwards the recording proved almost completely valueless.

'Well, I have always thought you cannot teach sociology or indeed any social science effectively, without a parallel course in social philosophy. It's necessary to keep these two distinct, not to mix one with the other, but it is necessary to have them both. The problem really is what this social philosophy should contain. This is a really difficult question because while in European countries, students in some countries may be presumed to have some general knowledge of philosophy, especially in those universities where the study of philosophy is compulsory for everybody, it is I think becoming more common for students to have no philosophy at all. It is, for example, perfectly possible for a student to have a degree in economics or international law or any other subject without studying philosophy.' Methodology, the epistomology of the social sciences, can best be taught incidentally, as an integral part of concrete studies.

More important is the problem of values. Undergraduates in sociology are unavoidably naïve and, once they have received instruction in some general theory of value, they should have demonstrated to them the problems of value which are raised by different institutions such as class, property, the family, etc. A constant, and difficult, objective is to teach students how to distinguish questions of fact from questions of value.

Dr. Brodersen of the New School for Social Research, New York, expressed agreement with Professor Ginsberg's comments on social philosophy, and deplored our lack of knowledge of world society. Not only do we know too little of 'pioneer societies'; we are ignorant of important matters affecting the most advanced countries. Despite such works as Carr-Saunders' statistical account, we lack proper sociological analyses of any major society. The difficulties of such an analysis must prove great, but they can and should be overcome, if only because such information is becoming more and more vital for the shaping of world policy.

Professor Maiti returned to the problem of textbooks. Not merely analysis and description are needed: we must 'try to show in our textbooks how certain primary value attitudes and derivative value attitudes' are involved in social interaction. From the primary values of one's own country one can proceed to international comparison and understanding.

Dr. O. Friedman, London, spoke on the need for students being instructed in psychology, particularly 'the relationship between individual motives and the general development of society'.

The *rapporteur* referred to the importance of descriptive sociology, and said: 'It seems to me regrettable that in the growth of modern sociology we have become so afraid and ashamed of mere description. To describe is regarded as a very unimportant and essentially unscientific activity. I suggest that the making of such descriptions is as truly research, is as truly valuable, as are any other activities in which sociologists may be engaged. We need not merely descriptions of the frontier nations, as Dr. Busia called them, but, in all our respective societies, really first-class descriptive works. Certain attempts, I know, have been made very recently. I should be very interested to know what has become of the series of works sponsored two, or possibly three, years ago by Unesco, some of which I read in manuscript. These were volumes which consisted very largely of descriptive accounts by one author or by a team of authors on the social structure and the social life of some 20 nations. Among these volumes I remember with particular pleasure the work—unpublished, as far as I know—of Professor Gabriel Le Bras on France, which

seemed to me to make a very real advance on any descriptive writing I've seen hitherto by sociologists.'

Dr. Busia illustrated the problem of conflicting values for people in 'frontier nations' by an illuminating anecdote of his own youth and a conflict between the European valuation of time and the African valuation of ritual courtesy.[1]

He was followed by Dr. Bergsma of Amsterdam, who explained the long tradition in the Netherlands of human geography. Professor Max Sorre had said, in Liège in 1952, that it was time that geography discovered sociology. In Holland something of the sort had been achieved. It is necessary that the scope of sociology be restricted if works of the kind desired by Professor Ginsberg are to be written: one way of doing this is by concentrating on sociography. He had learned that in Frankfurt there are two distinct bodies: the Institute for Social Research and the sociographical institute. From his own standpoint in Amsterdam he found this division difficult to understand. Dr. Pollock replied that the two bodies in Frankfurt *did* work together, but that sociography was there interpreted in a rather statistical way. The Institute of Sociography asked 'What?', while the Institute for Social Research asked 'Why?'

Mr. Posioen argued for a reconsideration of both sociological theory and research methods so that nothing, not even the most subtle values, be lost sight of. Mr. Pagès closed the discussion,[2] and Professor den Hollander expressed his thanks to those who had taken part.

We now turn to the consideration of the papers submitted, none of which was read, and not all of which were discussed. It is striking that in this section, despite the scale of American sociology only one paper, that of Dr. Dodd, came from the United States. On the other hand, from the 'pioneer countries' —perhaps the most exciting societies, sociologically speaking—came the paper of Dr. Busia, the four papers of Doctors Eisenstadt, Foa, and Ben-David from Israel, the paper of Mr. Heeren from Indonesia, and that of the East African Institute of Social Research. From the defeated countries of the late war came the papers of Dr. Anderson, Dr. Pipping and Dr. Wurzbacher (Germany), and those of the Japan Sociological Society and of Messrs. Ariga, Nakano, Morioka and Morton. There were two papers (Professor Nadel and Dr. A. Silbermann) from Australia, one (Professor M. y. Nunez) from Mexico, one (Professor König) from Switzerland (and Germany), one from Denmark, and two from Holland. From France, Belgium and Geneva there were no fewer than six contributions. The diversity of subject matter in these papers from the French-speaking areas was also remarkable. There was no British paper at this session.

The largest number of papers consisted of factual reports on developments in teaching and research. These were either, like the first seven papers, reports on national developments, or reports on the work of specific bodies. The French Centre, Économie et Humanisme, for example, submitted a complete list of its publications which can be found in the mimeographed second volume of papers in this section.[3]

Dr. Paredes of Quito raised the question of the relation of philosophy and

---

[1] No more can be said here of Dr. Busia's contribution—one of the most interesting of the session—owing to the faulty recording.
[2] Here the record is entirely missing.
[3] Obtainable from the International Sociological Association, Skepper House, 13 Endsleigh Street, London, W.C.1., U.K.

sociology in modern culture. Sociology has now taken up the traditional role of philosophy, in relation to the institutions, cultural media, and psychological content of society. Professor Dupréel of Brussels attempted a generalization of the object of sociological studies. We classify the objects of knowledge in terms of their likeness and difference. It is among the category of living beings that the laws of similarity are most important and most obscure. Here we dwell in a world of probabilities subject to pragmatic generalization.

Mr. Pagès suggested that sociologists should include among their objects of study *le ton affectif*, which plays an important part in the mechanisms which govern individual and group behaviour. From this study may be derived hypotheses suited to concrete field research, both in macro and micro-sociology. He illustrated this theory with reference to a number of psychologists —notably Lewin.

A number of the papers were concerned with community surveys and allied matters. Mr. Chombart de Lauwe said, 'The selection of residential units (villages and urban districts) has appeared to us to be essential for comparative study and the making of experimental studies in the field.' He illustrated this with material from the important work which has recently appeared, *Paris et l'agglomération parisienne: l'espace social dans une grande cité* (Presses universitaires de France, two volumes). The survey of Darmstadt described by Dr. Anderson has also been published—though not quite completely—in eight volumes. (A ninth is expected, and Dr. Anderson has promised us an American volume on the survey.) The project, 1949-52, was conducted under mixed German and American auspices and was used both to obtain data and train young sociologists. 'The Darmstadt survey is probably the first attempt to survey a city together with its hinterland. At the time the survey started about half of the 115,000 pre-war population still resided outside the city, blown out by the bombing that destroyed most of the urban centre. The situation afforded an opportunity to observe how a badly-bombed community recovers itself. The situation also afforded an opportunity to study postwar problems in the overcrowded rural communities. In these efforts the survey received the full co-operation of groups and officials in both city and hinterland.'

German youth was studied by the Unesco Institute at Cologne and reported on by Dr. Wurzbacher, a start being made in a rural community. To see the place of the young people in society as a whole the following social groups were studied: families; neighbours; friends; organized leisure groups; churches; political groups; work groups—the total population having been subjected to intensive interview through a random sample. An historical study of local leaders since 1885 has been undertaken the better to investigate local social forces. 'Alongside this pilot study a survey extending over the whole of the West German Republic with the same subject, integration and stratification, based on the experiences gained from the pilot study, is at present under way. It should serve to set the proper limits to the representativeness of the first study and to prepare the way for a further series of monographic studies to be conducted in small, middle and large-size towns.'

In his paper Dr. Pipping described how in a sample of 422 German youths 'The father was generally seen as being more authoritarian than the mother. He and his acts are less criticized. The girls, who are brought up more strictly than the boys, are more likely to stress restrictions, but also to approve of them. The theory that a stern father makes authoritarian children was not found to be generally valid.' Something has been said on this interesting paper

4

(and the doubt it casts on certain simple culture-personality theories) above, in the account of the discussion at the session.

Mr. Ben-David described how in Israel a sample of 600 youth movement members were investigated in both cities and small towns. 'A preliminary analysis of the results seems to substantiate and refine the broad structural hypothesis, which served [as] the starting point of this piece of research, i.e., that formalized age groups of the youth movement type are found in societies where the discontinuity between the particularistically oriented family and universalistic, large-scale society goes together with important collectivistic elements in the central value system. It was found that children from families which have a strong individualistic identification with their social status, if they join a youth movement at all, tend to join the comparatively liberal and individualistic scouts.'

Dr. Eisenstadt's study of 'Leadership, Mobility and Communication' sprang from Israeli research into the problems of a massive and diverse immigration. Immigrant groups were studied locally and 'ethnically' in terms of group cohesion, values, participation in associations and national life, leadership, etc. The main associations—cultural and political—were studied in terms of their values, membership, and leadership. The composition of élites and their selection was investigated, and failures in communication and the emergence of deviant behaviour were studied. Dr. Foa in his paper concentrated on the nature of leadership as manifested in Israel. He distinguished leaders who think of their job in terms of the individuals who are led, and those who think first of the goals which the group is trying to achieve. All this he studied in terms of scales and a complex socio-psychological analysis.

The paper on the family in Japan involved co-operative effort like that of the Darmstadt survey (q.v.). The family is conceived in terms of the lineage, family worship, familial property, and a weakening patriarchal dominance. The paper set this analysis in a historical frame, but no account is given of the techniques of investigation of this fascinating institution. A few references to published work provide the only clues.

Apart from this family study, direct institutional analysis can only be found in Dr. Banning's paper. He was not concerned to give an account of the Dutch Reformed Church, but he in fact gives considerable information about it—and in addition tells us something about the growth and content of sociology in Holland and about some of its ambitions for the future. The Sociological Institute of the Church has investigated the impact of the war on the life and mind of youth, has encouraged 'pastoral sociography'—the study of material from the localities useful for pastoral work—studied the economic situation of the clergy, and found that they are mainly recruited from lower middle-class groups. The institute, short of funds though it is, has extensive plans for future researches.

An unusual subject was the subject of Dr. A. Silbermann's contribution. Although Dr. Silbermann wrote from Australia, the study of radio-music was made in Paris on behalf of the Centre d'Études Radiophoniques. The purpose of the research was practical: the attraction of listeners and the 'prevention of taste control' along with, rather surprisingly, the 'creation of desirable cultural homogeneity'. A massive apparatus of interview and functional analysis was used to establish a 'culture chart' which 'would indicate at first glance any deviation of the socio-cultural tendency of the [broadcasting] institution from the general socio-cultural tendency of the society. . . .'

An unusual source of data is suggested in Mr. Poisson's paper. Sociology and economics, using a statistical analysis, could glean much from public notaries' documents (*Actes notariés*) which provide information extending over the centuries, especially on questions of marriage and the family, property, and documents.

The question of values in a very large sense was raised by Professor Dodd. His own summary may be quoted: 'Our dimensional system which combines symbolic logic, statistics and matrix algebra, augments social science as a means of expressing, predicting and controlling inter-human behaviour in respect to whatever values men hold. Our system is based on six classes of dimensions: Time, Space, People, Desiderata, Desiring, Attendant social conditions.

'We develop our values project into a system of human tensions by: (1) Defining values: we use operational definitions whose reliability is measured and shown to be high. (2) Observing values: demoscopes with six sub-technics of designing, questioning, sampling, interviewing, tabulating and reporting, measure the values expressed in verbal statements. (3) Classifying values: we study values which are greatest when distributed along each of our six dimensions. (4) Measuring values: we measure the intensity of desiring a value and use eight standards of desiring. (5) Scaling values: technics dealing with the wording of questions are used as in our National Security Poll. (6) Correlating values: the technic is the *n*-matrix handled by our dimensional matrix formulas. (7) Predicting values: methods for predicting public behaviour from a poll are used. (8) Validating values: the technic is the multiple correlation. (9) Experimenting on values: in Project Revere experiments upon increasing a social value are done. (10) Deducing new aspects of values: one evidence is the derivation of some 24 aspects or dimensions of any value. (11) Combining values in tension system: tension is a function of two observed factors: desiring and desideratum. Sets of tensions may be integrated into a single decision for a course of conduct. Our system of human tensions applies to interracial, industrial, marital and intra-personal tensions and provides a unifying formula and technics for crucially testing the effects of international tensions.'

The papers on national and local developments in teaching and research represent all the continents. Dr. Busia in his paper explains how the war brought new skills, new experience, and rapid social change (especially in the increase of urbanism) to the Gold Coast. A need was inevitably felt for social research into land use, into urbanism, etc. From the Institute of Arts, Industries and Social Science, founded in 1943, came a number of anthropologically oriented studies of Ashanti under the direction of Professor Fortes. Other bodies, with other aid, made studies in the fields of economics and of anthropological interest. Development here was accelerated under the impact of the Colonial Social Science Research Council, but remained essentially anthropological. The work of the West African Institute of Social and Economic Research (headquarters in Nigeria) has been primarily economic. The Sociology Department of the University College at Achimota has undertaken work on urban surveys, the aspirations of schoolchildren, traditional music, etc. All this raises for Dr. Busia (cf. above) 'the question of the integration or distinction of the two fields of social or cultural anthropology . . . and sociology'. Dr. Busia is for integration.

Dr. Audrey Richards' account of the East African Institute of Social

Research, Kampala, Uganda, established in 1950, proposes to us a long list of investigations, some of which would traditionally be ascribed to anthropology, others to sociology, others again to history or linguistics. Here, again, the old divisions seem inappropriate in a 'pioneer country'.

At Achimota and Kampala the European tradition is English; in Indonesia it is Dutch, and some sociology can be found as long ago as 1924, when Schrieke worked on social tension in south-west Sumatra. Today there is social science teaching at both Jakarta and Jokjakarta. In Jakarta the orientation of sociology seems practical: social stratification, sexual tensions, Eurasian status and family structure, and documentary research are all being studied. At Jokjakarta urban sociology (with help from Yale), and a study of women's organizations is going forward.

The report for Japan consists essentially of a list of researches which sound—especially in the field of rural sociology—of great interest. This list is too long for reproduction here. There is in addition a tabular classification of no fewer than 325 research projects in all the fields of sociology.

The paper from Israel is concerned either with matters considered earlier in this report or with marginal studies—sociologically speaking—in economics, history, etc.

Dr. Mendieta y Nuñez reported on the work done at the National Autonomous University of Mexico, where an Institute of Social Investigation was founded in 1930 and re-organized in 1939. From this paper the close integration of theory and field research emerges as a major objective of the institute. An ethnographic map of Mexico was followed by a series of 48 related monographs on the indigenous races, which, it is hoped, will provide material for a ten-volume ethnology of Mexico. Surveys of housing, communal lands, etc., have emerged from this work. In addition the well-known *Revista Mexicana de Sociologia* and a series of 17 booklets on sociology are published.

Dr. Nadel, like the Israeli report, aims widely. In his account of Australia he lists 22 bodies in six universities which are concerned with social studies, and gives a summary of 39 research projects. These include studies of communications, stratification and mobility, urban youth and age, industrial relations, tensions of immigration, social prejudice, etc. Elsewhere he is concerned with more marginal matters—though these include a social survey of north Sydney and much interesting work in social psychology at Melbourne and elsewhere.

What is to be found in the paper on Holland is summarized by its authors, Professor den Hollander and J. P. Kruyt: 'The historical connexion between sociology, sociography and social geography in the Netherlands is unique and is largely explained by the influence of Steinmetz, till 1933 professor of social geography in Amsterdam. Sociology found general recognition in Dutch universities after World War II. There was only one chair in sociology before 1940 (Bonger, 1940, Amsterdam). Now every university in the Netherlands has one or more professors of sociology and/or sociography. Their names, the general academic framework of their teaching and the national organization of Dutch sociologists are given, the institutes engaged in research, either connected with universities or non-academic, are enumerated, together with some of the chief research projects now being undertaken. A bibliography attempts to classify the most important publications of Dutch sociologists in various fields of social research.'

In Denmark, according to the Danish Sociological Society, it was not

until the arrival of the late Professor T. Geiger in 1937 that the discipline was recognized in the universities. Just after Geiger's death Professor Ranulf of the philosophy chair at Aarhus also died, and Denmark lost another distinguished sociologist. There is now also a chair in sociology at Copenhagen, with an institute; the work of Dr. Friis and the Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs has been mentioned above. This paper summarizes Danish research in stratification and mobility, into social conditions and welfare, and suggests a situation unusually rich in useful work and governmental-academic co-operation.

In Geneva is the Centre de Recherches Sociologiques on which Professor Girod reported. Founded in January 1952 the centre is interested in industrial sociology, electoral sociology, communication, urbanism, and methodology. The institute studies for Unesco the documents of the United Nations and the specialized institutions which concern sociology.

Finally Dr. König reported on his experience of research techniques in Switzerland and Germany. German-speaking Europe was little interested in field research before 1945. The populations of these areas are not prepared to be interviewed, or for survey work, and only experience can break down this resistance. Interviewing requires new attitudes in these lands. In addition there are problems of language as the techniques of field investigation were largely developed in English-speaking countries and are not readily suited to translation into German. It seems probable that such difficulties are not unique to Switzerland and Germany.

In the foregoing no attempt has been made to establish a unity out of diverse materials where no natural connexions existed. I hope that I have summarized fairly what took place and what was presented. If I have done injustice it was done unwittingly.

PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF SOCIOLOGISTS [1]

J.-R. TRÉANTON

The reports submitted on 'the professional activities and responsibilities of sociologists' faithfully reflect the position of sociology in the world today. As a young science and a new profession, it is approached in different ways in different countries. In the United States of America it has long since found acceptance beyond the university campus, and sociologists are now playing their part in all branches of national life. But this over-rapid growth is forcing them to pause for a critical stock-taking—which they are undertaking with considerable courage. The papers in Section IV deal with deontology and with

---

[1] It is regretted that owing to technical failures in the recording, this paper cannot fairly report the points raised in the discussions by Mr. Busia (Gold Coast) and Messrs. Friedmann and Morin (France).

the 'status' that should be given to the many-sided activities of their profession.

Their European, Indian and Mexican colleagues are concerned with other problems. To begin with, they want to increase the still too limited number of professional openings; they are also anxious to clarify the general ethics of their science. They wonder in what direction it should be guided in this contradictory and distracted world in which we live, and what contribution sociological research and teaching can make towards the advent of a new humanism.

WHAT IS A SOCIOLOGIST?

A whole congress could have been taken up in describing the 'sociological species'. The various reports contained in Section IV hardly provide us with a complete portrait of the contemporary sociologist that is authentic for all countries, but at least they give an idea of some of his characteristics.

What is the distinguishing mark of the sociologist? His university degree? A rather unsatisfactory criterion, for neither France nor Italy—to mention only two of the countries represented at Liège—offer their students an opportunity to pursue a full course of higher studies in sociology.[1] Other countries provide very different courses leading to the M.A., Ph.D., the pass degree or the doctorate in sociology. Mr. Mendieta y Nuñez speaks of 'the great and apparently irreconcilable divergence of opinion among European sociologists as to what constitutes the subject matter of sociology and the way in which this subject matter should be organized'. From the data he supplies[2] it would seem that American sociology is equally varied. As taught in universities, it is treated less and less as an integral science, as 'a coherent body of knowledge and techniques which are distinguishable from those of other sciences'. Dr. Sibley, who makes this remark, adds that 'sociologists of an earlier generation, unconfused by today's plethora of discrete findings of empirical research, could . . . agree that there was a recognizable corpus of sociology, while differing as violently as they would over the merits of competing treatises on the subject. Today, American textbooks of sociology seldom contain the word "principles" in their titles, and their contents are typically highly eclectic, encompassing selections of both data and inferences from other disciplines'.

Even if 'sociology' is no longer—or not yet—in existence, there is no denying that in some countries sociologists are thriving. Take a look at the figures for America: in 10 years the membership of the American Sociological Society has increased from 1,500 to 4,000. Universities are now conferring each year as many as 140 doctorates in sociology, as against 75 before the war. Professional openings are increasing in like proportion. It is true that three-quarters of American sociologists are still pursuing their career in universities.[3] But a growing number are placing their talents at the service of public or private 'practical' research organizations. Army morale, racial relations,

[1] Cf. the reports by Messrs. Pellizi and Morin and the general report by Mr. de Bie on the teaching of sociology throughout the world.
[2] According to the inquiry conducted by Raymond and Ruby J. Reeves Kennedy: 'Sociology in American Colleges', *American Sociological Review*, October 1942.
[3] Dr. Sibley.

consumer habits . . . one could go on listing indefinitely the domains in which recourse is now had to 'applied' sociology.

Outside the United States of America, the situation is less satisfactory. The conclusions reached by Mr. Pellizi in a report dealing with Italy are true for France and many other countries: 'The lack of university chairs and institutes', he writes, 'prevents the training of specialized students, the lack of specialized students provides a good argument against the establishment of chairs and institutes.' The introduction of sociology in the secondary school curriculum, advocated by some authorities, is still a remote possibility. As Professor Hughes rightly points out, the sociologist cannot be absorbed by the European *gymnasium* or *lycée* as easily as by the American college.

Has the student more chance of earning a decent livelihood outside the university? Public or private subsidies sometimes enable him to devote his time to demography, industrial relations or colonial problems.[1] But this is a trifle by comparison with the potential opportunities in all these fields. Is the situation likely to change in the years ahead?

In the absence of a complete picture of present and future openings for sociologists in the different countries, it is impossible to tell. Sociologists would need, as Mr. de Bie, *rapporteur* for Section IV, suggests, to carry out a detailed inquiry into the present position and prospects as regards actual and possible openings in their particular science. Nothing could give them a better idea of the direction in which that science should be developed.

The diversity of tasks for which sociologists are fitted and their progressive emancipation from the university open up new prospects for the future. Sociologists are wondering about the future status of their profession. Are they on the way to forming an established, recognized body of specialists having the freedom of the city and letters patent?[2] The reports by Professor Hughes and Dr. Sibley define the problem of this semi-corporative structure which would amount to setting up 'strong and clear boundaries between their occupation and all others; and to [developing] career opportunities for those within. . . . [Sociologists] will complement this clear bounding with an attempt to make the profession more universal, so that the professional may carry on his work in a greater variety of situations, so that his skill may meet the needs of any client whatsoever or so that this method of investigation may be applied at any time with equal validity'.[2]

The medical profession itself, as Professor Hughes pointed out, has not succeeded in matching this 'maximum of specific bounding' by a 'maximum of universality'. Sociology is in hardly better case. Its constant aim will no doubt be 'to select, train, initiate and discipline its own members and to define the nature of the services which they will perform and the terms on which they will perform them'.[3] But does that mean that sociologists will form a 'profession' quite apart from economists, anthropologists, and statisticians, in short, the many specialists concerned with human affairs? Dr. Sibley does not think so: 'I am inclined to believe', he states, 'that whatever name may be attached to a future profession dealing with social relations, the skills and knowledge which it will require will include much that is now labelled

---

[1] Some data on the situation in France and Italy are supplied in the papers submitted by Mr. Pellizi and by Messrs. Friedmann and Tréanton.
[2] These are the terms used by Mr. de Bie to convey the various shades of meaning contained in the word 'profession'.
[3] Everett Hughes.

sociology, but also much derived from other social science disciplines, including especially psychology and anthropology'.

Increasingly artificial boundaries are being set up between these various branches of science and it is hardly a suitable time to aggravate the situation by professional sectarianism. Sociologists should open their ranks to scientists in related fields and extend their contacts with other branches of knowledge. The future would show the folly of trying to shut themselves up in a water-tight compartment of their own.

We are reassured on this point by the reports from Europe. In Italy, France and the United Kingdom, sociologists have widely varying backgrounds— history, law and philosophy. In the United States of America, on the other hand, Professor Hughes discerns an alarming tendency to extend the length of studies and to advance the crucial moment when the student has to concentrate solely on the official university curriculum for sociology. Surely an unwise course, for these curricula are not infallible; no one can say for certain what is the ideal initiation for the trainee in sociology. It is all very well, he says, to require more extensive training as methods develop; these methods reflect the temptation 'to raise the status of our subject by proving that it takes as long to become a sociologist as to become a physicist or physician'.

Premature specialization would stultify sociology and tend to draw in 'people of some one bent with a tendency toward selecting for study only those problems and toward using only those methods which fit the concept of sociology crystallized in the conventional prerequisites'. Unduly rigid qualifications for the study of sociology would discourage people from taking up this career late in life, as some of our most illustrious sociologists have done—a point brought out by Professor Hughes.

Sociology should be an open profession forgoing any corporate guarantees. As a 'young and groping' science, it has not yet worked out precise enough standards of competence to enable it to keep its own house in order. It is seldom possible, notes Mrs. Glass, 'to check the processes of empirical investigations [in sociology] so thoroughly that their methodological integrity is established beyond doubt'. How can sociology bar from its ranks charlatans and humbugs? But unless it does, it will lose prestige and public support.

This is considered a particularly serious danger by Dr. Glaister A. Elmer, who describes his experiences in Korea as head of the Air University Far East Research Group. Considerable damage can be done, under pretext of conducting surveys, by pseudo-sociologists, whose complacency is equalled only by their ignorance. The other American papers deal chiefly with the means of avoiding such damage. The best method of safeguarding the profession against infiltration by unreliable elements would appear to be the establishment of a system of deontology—a charter of the rights and duties of sociologists.

DEONTOLOGY OF THE PROFESSION

Professor McClung Lee reminds his colleagues that psychologists have long been familiar with these difficulties: their concern with ethical problems 'reflects in part their longer involvement in commercial research and thus their longer exposure to powerful public criticism'.

The difference, pointed out by Professor Hughes—who described this transition from theoretical knowledge to therapeutics, which psychology accomplished before sociology—is that the clients of the psychologist are private individuals, whilst those of the sociologist are groups or institutions—collective clients who are more difficult to handle.

The individual asks the psychologist or doctor to help him solve a vital problem. The group—a government, private association or commercial company—is not always animated by such laudable intentions when it has recourse to sociology. It has already taken its decision, and is merely trying to give it a scientific gloss. The sociologist is not asked to tell the truth, or to suggest a remedy for the situation. The man of action knows, or thinks he knows, both remedy and truth, and is only seeking to give them the spectacular blessing of science. The funds placed at the disposal of the sociologist are proportionate to the interests at stake. And the sociologist may be sorely tempted to produce 'scientific results' in line with the aims of his sponsor's publicity campaign!

The Problems of 'Practical' Sociology

The 'commercialization' introduced even into university circles by journalistic bodies, publicity campaigns, public opinion polls and market research, is today threatening the traditional ethics of sociology on three different points:

The Choice of Research Projects. This is the theme of Mr. Miller's paper. The sociologist is in danger of forfeiting his freedom to select his own subjects of investigation—a form of freedom which is traditional in 'pure' science, but is being increasingly restricted in 'applied' science. Will the universities offer this freedom a last refuge? The tendency of these institutions to 'direct [their] activities into community service functions, practical surveys, and *ad hoc* studies' which are of undoubted value but, as experience goes to prove, are 'made at the expense of *bona fide* research,[1] makes us doubt whether this will be the case. Mr. Miller warns students against the danger to their scientific training of accepting utilitarian tasks designed less for their instruction than for bolstering up the funds of their universities.

'Commercial' research is still less rewarding. It burdens the sociologist with uninteresting work and is full of snares. Is it his duty to refuse certain subjects of investigation? To turn away certain would-be employers? Yes, if he feels that a particular assignment is incompatible with professional integrity[2] or if his employers insist on his using false weights and measures.

Methods of Investigation. The 'sociology merchants' sell the goods they are asked for. To please their 'customers' they use fake methods and 'cook' their experiments. Unfortunately, it is difficult to unmask them. But as Professor McClung Lee points out, their 'customers' are at least under no illusion as to their value: 'They buy or subsidize the work of willing hirelings for certain purposes, 'largely propagandistic, and have contempt for it, and they go to

---

[1] Professor Clark.
[2] Mrs. Glass laid special stress on this point.

ethical professionals when they have a problem upon which they need enlightenment.'

Announcement of Results. The general public, unfortunately, does not discriminate; it has no means of differentiating between the sound and the spurious goods offered under the label of 'sociology'. This is to some extent the fault of sociologists, who do not pay sufficient heed to the use made of their public statements: 'Where findings are of considerable popular interest, . . . [when they] are news, the research sociologist should lend his hand to those publicizing the information to the end that skilful and accurate popularization rather than distorted of sensational reports go forth.'[1]

Will these few rules, drawn up by joint agreement, suffice to protect sociology against 'commercial erosion'? A good definition of the problem is given by Professor McClung Lee, who points out that what is needed is to 'give the rapidly multiplying practical sociologists a due regard for the value of the academic traditions which have made our colleges and universities relatively so free from restraint and thus so fertile in the stimulation of productive research'.

All sociologists should return, from time to time, to refresh themselves at these unsullied springs. They are scientists and educationists before they are businessmen. Even if they were inclined to forget this, public opinion would recall them to a more just appreciation of their role: in the United States of America, their reputation 'derives especially from the identification of the field with scientists and professors of academic communities and with the non-pecuniarily oriented ethics of science and education'.[2]

From Professional Deontology to the Ethics of Knowledge

Professor Morris Ginsberg, chairman of Section IV, gave at one meeting a very apt definition of this ideal, which is applicable to all branches of knowledge and education. 'Truth', he stressed, 'is an intrinsic value, that is to say, an intrinsic quantitative value—something that is desirable for its own sake.' But science also has an instrumental value; 'it is valuable not only for its own sake but because it makes other values possible'. The conclusion Professor Ginsberg draws from these two basic principles is that they imply a certain discipline of the mind, steadfastness and devotion, detachment and impartiality, the power of distinguishing whether an object is one of belief or of fact; the willingness to abide by the evidence, however unpalatable it may be: in short, scientific integrity.

Science is a social phenomenon. Professor Ginsberg denies that truth is 'a private affair'. He reminds us that it 'depends for its cultivation and growth upon mutual stimulus and friendly and open interchange of views and discoveries'.

Professor McClung Lee reaches conclusions similar to those of Professor Ginsberg, giving due prominence, in his proposed elementary 'catechism', to the sociologist's duty towards his students and colleagues. When, as so often happens, he is engaged both in teaching and in research, he must not neglect his task as educator. Despite the fact that his students provide him with 'a

---

[1] Professor Clark.
[2] Professor McClung Lee cites various American investigations into the relative prestige of different professions.

cheap source of research assistance', his first concern must be to develop their talents. He should be chary of maintaining 'a cult-like or sectarian atmosphere' which is fatal for the free discussion of ideas. 'Credit should be assigned to all those who have contributed to a publication in proportion to their contribution.' This same frankness and honesty should, as Professor McClung Lee points out, characterize his relations with his younger or older colleagues.

OBLIGATIONS OF THE SOCIOLOGIST TOWARDS OTHERS

But the sociologist's world is not bounded by the walls of his study or the confines of his university campus. The merit of Mrs. Glass's paper is that it gives a vigorous reminder of the sociologist's obligations towards the outside world. Professor Hughes' remark that 'although many sociologists would like to consider their work politically neutral, it is not considered so by those who make revolutions of right or left, or by those who have special interests in the things we study' is balanced by Mrs. Glass's statement that 'a true sociologist is essentially a political animal, though not a politician. His responsibility to society is synonymous with his responsibility to his profession. In other words, a sociologist who does not believe in the possibility of social progress and who takes no part in promoting it (or, conversely, in checking retrogression) is a contradiction in terms'.

Sociologists should therefore regard social changes, the present and the future of society as 'the main theme of their thoughts and studies'. They are not entitled to plead an illusory neutrality in the establishment of values, on the score that these are merely relative. They have to make a choice, to search their conscience regarding each individual case. But on what factors can they rely for guidance?

Mrs. Glass admits that it is difficult to induce all members of the profession to agree as to standards of social progress—or even as to the possibility of discovering standards which are not of an 'extra-scientific nature'. Therefore, she points out, 'so long as there are social and national conflicts, and so long as sociologists recognize their responsibility to take sides, there will be disunity among them, and sociology will be a segmented, rather chaotic discipline'.

There is nothing final about this. Conflicts and misunderstandings can be solved: 'Do people really differ as much as they are told about fundamental values?', Professor Ginsberg asked during the discussions. His personal opinion is that there is more general agreement than is supposed about fundamental questions. Disagreement is often caused by failure to draw a distinction between questions of fact and questions of value. Sociologists are hardly in a position to verify all social facts that would enable them to solve the problems confronting their own consciences or those of other scientists. Professor Ginsberg advises them to be extremely humble. 'Just consider what you could reply, what the best sociologists could reply, supposing they were confronted by the physicists, and the physicists asked them to say: "What will be the effects upon the probability of war of secrecy concerning atomic weapons? What will be the effect of certain limitations of armaments on the future war?" You can't answer such questions: we are just not in a position to answer any such questions scientifically, and I think it would be absurd for us to pretend that we can.' No pretentious terminology 'cloaking emptiness of thought and lack

of ideas' can conceal the fact that we are helpless in certain fields. Members of the congress were unanimous in denouncing the effect of the esoteric pedantry that makes science promise more than it can fulfil.

But humility does not mean timidity. There are many fields in which sociology can already—or soon will—provide objective data for the solution of general problems relating to the ethics of knowledge. It must, however, maintain active interest in the men and ideas of the day. 'Indeed', Mrs. Glass observes, 'it sometimes seems that we know less about our surroundings than the pioneers of sociology knew about theirs a hundred or fifty years ago.' And she reproaches present-day sociology with its 'preoccupation with oddities and peripheral matters, with primary groups, microscopic methods of investigation and with a crude empiricism that justifies shortsightedness'.

She would no doubt readily admit that it is sometimes very difficult to distinguish between the essential and the subsidiary, the 'significant' and the insignificant. A subject which we regard as devoid of interest may provide a valuable field of investigation for sociologists of the next generation, whereas a theme we consider essential today may amount in the end to no more than a little word-spinning.

The discussions at Liège successfully disposed of certain disagreements more apparent than real, between Mrs. Glass and other members—Mr. Miller in particular. The latter lays stress on the impartiality and detachment of the sociologist, and denies the 'significance' of purely 'mechanical' techniques already in existence. But this is because he is alive to the dangers of undue publicity and commercialization which beset sociology in his country. Mrs. Glass is in favour of sociologists taking an active part in contemporary life, because she knows what useful work they can do in that sphere. However, she is the first to admit that the affective preferences of the research worker, which are essential to his choice of a field of inquiry, must give way, once that choice has been made, to scientific detachment, which is necessary for carrying out research, for evaluating and presenting the findings. And Mr. Miller, for his part, admitted during his speech that certain 'white-coat' sociologists were wrong to assume not only the working costume of the chemist and the physicist, but also their impassivity and their attitude of icy detachment with regard to their subject of study.

Professor Pellizi gave, perhaps, the clearest summing up of this important discussion 'The sociologist', he says, 'should give up all extensive study of any particular structure of human behaviour which finds no clearly "sympathetic" response in him. . . . It is unpleasant to see men of science engage in public discussion about important and even tragic affairs, without giving evidence that they *feel* with their own hearts the specific experiences and passions which have motivated such affairs.' But he hastens to add: 'The observation and analysis of emotive-representative structure in which the scholar "participates" also entails a discipline of autocritique of the scholar himself.' Accordingly, sociology, like all other branches of science, may be defined as a system of deontological self-criticism or, in more simple terms, as a scientifically organized 'know thyself'.

Mr. Jagannadham's paper provided Section IV with the necessary concrete picture of the tasks awaiting the sociologist in a country where development is in full swing. The social and economic structure of India is gradually adapting itself to the demands of modern civilization. The caste system and the division of the community into large family units are becoming less rigid.

Social classes are being formed, and very serious problems are resulting from the emergence of an industrial proletariat. Sociology has an active contribution to make to economic and social reconstruction.

Education is evolving: how are we to preserve what was valuable in the old kind of teaching? How can we reconcile the wisdom of the ancient system of education, which was an all-round preparation for life, with the Western system of intensive, specialized training? How is education to be extended rapidly to the public as a whole? How are the people to be helped to see beyond their religious beliefs and prejudices? 'One of the problems for the social planners in this land of ancient spiritual values is to give to these people an outlook and system of religion in which are reconciled faith and reason, traditional and scientific outlook.' New laws are rapidly changing the status of women. Here again, 'sociological research would be of considerable help in studying the relationship between law and public opinion and in enacting integrated legislation in proper form and time'.

What is the exact contribution that sociologists can make to so tremendous an undertaking? 'The universities should conduct objective investigations and serve a twofold purpose, viz. to offer constructive criticism on government policies, anf to convey the message of right values and policies to the people at large.'

These words might be adopted as a guiding principle by twentieth-century sociology. Sociologists can act as guides and advisers to members of their governments. This opens up prospects for a division of tasks and of administrative organization. [1] There would be, on the one hand, bodies devoted to 'practical' research, specializing in some particular field, such as population, racial minorities, town planning, etc., and providing those responsible for policy and administration with the necessary sociological data; and, on the other hand, university institutions devoted to 'pure' research or to long-term undertakings of no immediate value to the national life.

Most ministries are already equipped with research and information offices; all that is needed is to get them into the habit of resorting to social science. If professional sociologists always worked side by side with men of action, the result would no doubt help to break the vicious circle described by Mrs. Glass: 'So long as the sociologist's approach is incomprehensible to administrators and to the public, he is not given the opportunity of being comprehensible: he is not able to demonstrate the need for, and the use of, sociological thought and study.' A period of postgraduate apprenticeship for young sociologists in central and local government might also, as she suggests, help to 'break the ice' between men of action and men of science, and to dispel their stereotyped views of one another.

The future role of sociology depends on such contacts with the 'enlightened' public—and with the general public as well. There is a close connexion between the position occupied by scientists in the various countries—their status, prestige and degree of independence—and the general scale of national values. 'It would be extremely ingenuous, particularly for a sociologist, to regard sociology as a pure science, cut off from social pressures and interests, to picture it as somehow unconnected with sociological reality. Prejudices, fears, taboos, conventionalism and even hatred come to the fore even in studies that purport to be highly objective. Sociology is steeped in ideology. The

---

[1] Report by Messrs. Friedmann and Tréanton.

sociologist must be aware of this fact, whether he poses as a therapeutist, a mediator, a reformer or as a modest, impartial scientist.[1] It is for the sociologist to influence the civilization of his country and his epoch. He can do so by research, by his activity as a citizen and an intellectual and, if he belongs to a university, by his teaching.

The teaching of sociology was not discussed at any great length during the Liège congress. The general report on this subject, prepared by Mr. de Bie, will soon enable an accurate and complete picture to be drawn of all the problems involved. Several of the papers in Section IV dealt, however, with some of the most interesting points.[2] Sociology, Mr. Mendieta y Nuñez points out, should be taught on three different levels: '(i) As general information to complement and to conclude a liberal education; (ii) As profound and specialized information in certain aspects of the subject; (iii) As the systematic, profound and specialized training of professors of sociology, of researchers and of sociologists.'

We may touch here on the first of these aspects, with which the discussions at Liège were directly or indirectly concerned: What part should be played by sociology in the training of young minds and in the general education of twentieth-century man? Mr. de Bie put the matter excellently when he said that it provides the citizen with a basis of fact and theory with regard to human groups and social processes, that give him a better understanding of his own and other societies. It should therefore be taught in such a way as to link up theory with national history and realities, but at the same time to oppose ethnocentrism, 'the sworn enemy of the sociologist',[3] furnishing mankind not only with data and values, but also with the determination to translate them into fact. As Mr. Ginsberg reminded us, it is not so much knowledge which is lacking, as the will to apply knowledge. By bridging the tragic gulf between knowledge and action, sociology can help mankind to solve its disagreeements by peaceful means.

LIST OF PAPERS SUBMITTED

SECTION I. SOCIAL STRATIFICATION AND SOCIAL MOBILITY

ISA/SMM/CONF.2/ . . .

1. Professor David Glass, 'Proposal for the Empirical Study, on a Cross-national Basis, of Social Mobility, and Social Stratification'.
2. Alain Touraine, 'Rapport sur la Préparation en France de l'Enquête Internationale sur la Stratification et la Mobilité Sociales'.
3. Dr. Gunnar Boalt, 'Social Mobility in Stockholm'.

---

[1] Edgard Morin.
[2] Particularly the papers read by Mr. Mendieta y Nuñez and Mr. Morin, and the conclusion of Mr. de Bie's general report, which was distributed to members.
[3] Mr. Mendieta y Nuñez.

4. Keith R. Kelsall, 'Recruitment of Higher Civil Servants in Britain'.
5. Research Committee, Japan Sociological Society, 'Sample Survey of Social Stratification and Social Mobility in six large cities of Japan'.
6. Dr. Andreas Miller, 'Das Problem der Klassengrenze und seine Bedeutung bei der Untersuchung der Klassenstruktur'.
7. Professor A. Graffar-Fuss, 'Mobilité Sociale et Rupture du Milieu Familial'.
8. Professor Shu-Ching Lee, 'Administration and Bureaucracy: The Power Structure in Chinese Society'.
9. Dr. K. V. Müller, 'Selektive Wanderung zwischen sowjetischen und westlichen Besatzungsgebiet in Deutschland'.
10. Dr. S. N. Eisenstadt, 'Social Mobility and the Evolution of Intergroup Leadership'.
11. Sakari Sariola, 'Defining Social Class in Two Finnish Localities'.
12. Asher Tropp, 'Factors affecting the Status of the School Teacher in England and Wales'.
13. Dr. A. W. Luijckx, 'Inquiry into the Mobility of Employment in the Dutch Middle Class'.
14. Professor Stuart C. Dodd and Dr. H. Winthrop. 'A Dimensional Theory of Social Diffusion'.
15. T. Brennan, 'Class Behaviour in Local Politics and Social Affairs'.
16. Professor G. Mackenroth, 'Bericht über das Forschungsvorhaben "Wandlungen der deutschen Sozialstruktur (am Beispiel des Landes Schleswig-Holstein".'
17. Professor A. A. Congalton, 'The Status of Research in New Zealand in the Field of Social Stratification'.
18. Prof. Radhakamal Mukerjee, 'Social Structure and Stratification of the Indian Nation'.
19. Prof. E. W. Hofstee, 'Changes in Rural Social Stratification in the Netherlands'.
20. Prof. F. van Heek, 'The Method of Extreme Types as a Tool for the Study of the Causes of Vertical Mobility'.
21. Prof. Helmut Schelsky, 'Die Bedeutung des Schichtungsbegriffes für die Analyse der gegenwärtigen deutschen Gesellschaft'.
22. Prof. Sylvain de Coster, 'Des Obstacles à l'Ascension Sociale par les Études'.
23. Thomas B. Bottomore, 'Higher Civil Servants in France'.
24. Prof. Erwin O. Smigel, 'Trends in Occupational Sociology in the United States'.
25. Prof. F. van Heek, 'Cross-National Enquiries and Group Studies about Social Stratification and Vertical Mobility in the Netherlands'.
26. Dr. Ida van Hulten, 'Summary of a Study of Social Mobility at the Philips Works, Eindhoven'.
27. Serge Utechin, 'Social Stratification and Social Mobility in the U.R.S.S.'
28. Prof. Kurt B. Mayer, 'The Theory of Social Classes'.
29. Dr. Paul C. Glick, 'Educational Attainment and Occupational Advancement'.
30. Prof. Reinhard Bendix, 'The Legitimation of an Entrepreneurial Class: The Case of England'.
31. L. J. Lebret, 'Note sur les Difficultés Rencontrées dans la Stratification Sociale'.

32. Johannes Nordal, 'The Recruitment of the Professions in Iceland'.
33. P. Chombart de Lauwe, 'Perception et Représentation dans les Études de Stratification et de Mobilité Sociales'.
34. Prof. Kaare Svalastoga, 'Measurement of Occupational Prestige. Methodology and Preliminary Findings Based on Danish Data'.
35. Prof. Isaac Ganon, 'Social Stratification in Uruguay'.
36. Henri Mendras, 'Structure de la Société Paysanne d'une Région du Sud de la France'.
37. F.-A. Isambert, 'Pratique Religieuse et Classes Sociales en France'.
38. Alain Touraine, 'Le Statut Social comme Champ d'Action'.
39. Louis Couvreur, 'Mobilité Sociale et Milieu Résidentiel'.
40. N. Xydias, 'Conscience de Classe et Mobilité Sociale à Vienne-en-France'.
41. Prof. Harold Pfautz, 'Social Stratification and Sociology'.
42. Dr. Sven-Erik-Astrøm, 'Literature on Social Mobility and Social Stratification in Finland'.
44. Norman Birnbaum, 'Social Class and Religion in the German Reformation'.
45. Prof. Seymour M. Lipset and Prof. Reinhard Bendix, 'Ideological Equalitarianism and Social Mobility in the United States'.
46. Lucien Brams, 'La Famille Ouvrière en France; Situation Matérielle; Vie Familiale (1900-1953)'.
47. Dr. Sverre Lysgaard, 'Social Stratification and the Deferred Gratification Pattern'.
48. Dr. Alessandro Lehner, 'Premiers Résultats d'une Enquête par Sondage Effectuée sur la Population de Rome'.
49. Mrs. J. E. Floud, Mr. F. M. Martin, Mr. A. H. Halsey, 'Equality of Educational Opportunity and Social Selection in Britain'.
50. Professor T. T. Segerstedt, 'An Investigation of Class-consciousness among Office Employees and Workers in Swedish Factories'.
51. Paul Minon, 'Choix d'une Profession et Mobilité Sociale'.
52. Nelson N. Foote, Walter R. Goldschmidt, Richard T. Morris, Melvin Seeman and Joseph Shister, 'Alternative Assumptions in Stratification Research'.

SECTION II. INTERGROUP CONFLICTS AND THEIR MEDIATION

ISA/L/IC/G/ . . .

1. Prof. Arnold Rose, 'Group Conflict and its Mediation—Hypotheses for Research'.
2. Prof. Heinrich Herrfahrdt, 'Die Bedeutung des Ausgleichs von Gruppengegensätzen für das Staatsleben der Gegenwart'.
3. Willard Johnson, 'Social Science Research and Intergroup Relations Agencies'.
4. Prof. Albin R. Gilbert, 'Inter-Ethnic Tensions and Mediation'.
5. Prof. Alberto Baldrich, 'Los Conflictos entre Grupos'.
6. Dr. H. Garcia Ortiz, 'Problemas Generales acerca de los Conflictos entre Grupos y su Solucion'.

ISA/L/IC/INT/...

1. Prof. Robert C. Angell, 'Sociological Research into the Problem of World Order'.
2. Prof. Helmut G. Callis, 'The Significance of Cultural Heritage in the Etiology and Adjustment of International Conflicts'.
3. Dr. Barrington Moore, 'Notes Toward a Theory of International Relations'.
4. Prof. Rudolf Blühdorn, 'Remarks on the Scientific Approach to some Sociological Problems involved in International Relations'.
5. Prof. Henri Janne, 'Le Rôle de la Méfiance Mutuelle dans l'Intégration Institutionnelle des États sous l'Empire de la Nécessité'.
6. Prof. Werner Levi, 'The Peaceful Solution of International Conflicts'.
7. Prof. Kurt H. Wolff, 'Preliminary Study of the German Ideology concerning the U.S.A.'.
8. Dr. F. Tenhaeff, 'Scandinavian Co-operation: An Example of Regionalistic Integration'.
9. Dr. Charles Boasson, 'Focalization and Fusion of Fear in International Tensions.'
10. Prof. W. J. H. Sprott, 'The Policy Makers'.

ISA/L/IC/IND/...

1. Dr. Dirk Horringa, 'Industrial Conflict in the Netherlands'.
2. Prof. Kunio Odaka, 'Identification with Union and Management in Japan'.
3. Prof. O. Kahn-Freund, 'Intergroup Conflicts and their Settlement'.
4. Dr. Franca Magistretti, 'Facteurs Sociologiques dans la Structuration Interne d'Équipes d'Ouvriers Industriels'.
5. Dr. J. Haveman, 'Social Tensions in the Relationship of the Farmer and Farm Labourer in an Agricultural District of Northern Holland'.
6. Prof. E. Wight Bakke, 'Organization and the Individual: The Fusion Process'.
7. Prof. Paul Horion, 'La Solution des Conflits Industriels en Belgique'.
8. Prof. Robert Dubin, 'Industrial Conflict and its Institutionalization'.
9. E. de Dampierre, 'Une Usine Rurale'.
10. Dr. R. M. Saksena, 'An Analysis of Labour Tensions in India'.
11. Mrs. Guilbert and Mrs. Isambert, 'Quelques Aspects Actuels de la Concurrence entre Travailleurs Masculins et Féminins dans l'Industrie en France'.
12. Dr. M. Crozier, 'Le Mouvement des "Relations Humaines" et l'Étude Objective des Rapports entre Patrons et Ouvriers'.
13. Dr. Theo Pirker, 'Problems of Industrial Conflicts and their Mediation'.
14. Prof. Harold L. Sheppard, 'Approaches to Conflict in American Industrial Sociology'.
15. Dr. Frans van Mechelen, 'Quelques Aspects de la Hiérarchie dans l'Entreprise Industrielle'.
16. Dr. K. G. J. C. Knowles, ' "Strike-Proneness" and its Determinants'.
17. Dr. Clark Kerr, 'Industrial Conflict and its Tactical and Strategical Mediation'.
18. Prof. Alfred Bonne, 'Institutional Resistances to Economic Progress'.

ISA/L/IC/RAC/...

1. Prof. Tadashi Fukutake, 'Influences of Emigrants in their Home Village'.
2. Prof. Stuart C. Dodd and Keith S. Griffiths, 'The Logarithmic Relation of Social Distance and Intensity'.
3. Prof. Radhakamal Mukerjee, 'Intergroup Conflicts in India'.
4. Prof. René Clémens, 'L'Assimilation des Italiens et des Polonais dans la Région Liégeoise'.
5. Dr. Sydney Collins, 'The Social Implications of Mixed Marriages in British Society'.
6. Pierre Fouilhe, 'Le Rôle de la Presse Enfantine dans l'Apprentissage aux Situations Conflictuelles'.
7. Dr. Edmund Dahlström, 'Esthonian Refugees in a Swedish Community'.
8. Alain Girard, 'L'Adaptation des Immigrés en France'.
9. Dr. Pierre Clement, 'Attitudes de la Population de Vienne-en-France vis-à-vis de Groupes Raciaux et Culturels Différents'.
10. Prof. H. Z. Ulken, 'De l'Hétérogénéité Ethnique et Religieuse vers l'Homogénéité Culturelle'.

SECTION III. RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN SOCIOLOGICAL RESEARCH

ISA/L/RD/...

1. Prof. A. N. J. den Hollander, 'A Survey of the Development of Sociology in the Netherlands, especially after World War II'.
2. Dr. S. F. Nadel, 'Sociological Research in Australia'.
3. Dr. H. J. Heeren, 'Report on the Development of the Social Sciences in Indonesia'.
4. Japan Sociological Society, 'Some Recent Trends in Japanese Sociology'.
5. Dr. K. A. Busia, 'Recent Developments in Sociological Research in West Africa'.
6. Dr. S. N. Eisenstadt, 'Sociology in Israel: 1948-1953'.
7. Dr. R. Girod, 'Rapport sur le Centre de Recherches Sociologiques sur les Relations Humaines—Genève'.
8. Dr. Nels Anderson, 'A Community Survey of Darmstadt, Germany'.
9. Kizaemon Ariga, Takashi Nakano, Kiyomi Morioka and John S. Morton, 'The Japanese Family'.
10. Dr. S. N. Eisenstadt, 'The Research Project on Leadership, Mobility and Communication'.
11. J. Ben-David, 'Report on the Research Project on Youth Movements in Israel'.
12. Prof. Stuart C. Dodd and Chahin Turabian, 'A Dimensional System of Human Values'.
13. Prof. L. Mendieta y Nuñez, 'Social Investigation in the National Autonomous University of Mexico'.
14. East African Institute of Social Research, 'Report on the East African Institute of Social Research'.
15. Jean Paul Poisson, 'Une Nouvelle Méthode en Sciences Humaines: l'Étude des Actes Notariés'.
16. Dr. Alphonse Silberman, 'Sociological Aspects of Radio-Music'.

17. Prof. G. Wurzbacher, 'Report on Aims, Methods and Present State of a Community Study of the Unesco Institute for Social Sciences, Cologne'.
18. Centre 'Économie et Humanisme', 'Travaux de Sociologie Entrepris par le Centre "Économie et Humanisme"'.
19. P. Chombart de Lauwe, 'Études Comparatives en Ethnologie Sociales et Applications'.
20. Dr. Knut Pipping, 'Report on the Unesco Study "Attitudes of the German Youth Toward Authority"'.
21. Prof. W. Banning, 'The Sociological Institute of the Dutch Reformed Church'.
22. Robert Pagès, 'Le Ton Affectif et les Mécanismes Sociaux'.
23. Danish Sociological Society, 'Recent Sociological Research in Denmark'.
24. Prof. René König, 'Report on Some Experiences in Social Research Work in Switzerland and Germany'.
25. Dr. Uriel G. Foa, 'Types of Formal Leaders: Their Role Perception and In-Group Contacts'.

ISA/L/RD/MISC./...

1. Prof. E. Dupréel, 'Sur une Généralisation de l'Objet de la Sociologie'.
2. I. Baltacioglu, 'Esquisse d'une Division Rationnelle de la Sociologie'.
3. Dr. A. M. Paredes, 'El Porvenir de la Filosofia y los Methodos Sociologicos'.
4. A. Povina, 'La Sociologia Argentina Contemporanea'.
5. C. A. Echenove Trujillo, 'Sociology and Social Thought in the Argentine Republic'.
6. B. H. Grand Ruiz, 'Aportes Sociologices del Existencialismo de Jean Paul Sartre'.
7. Ismaël Quiles, 'Aporte Social del Cristianismo'.

SECTION IV. THE TRAINING, PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF SOCIOLOGISTS

ISA/L/PAR/...

1. Prof. A. McClung Lee, 'Standards and Ethics in Sociological Research'.
2. Prof. C. Pellizi, 'Notes on the Professional Activities of Sociologists in Italy and on the Deontology of the Sociological Profession'.
3. V. Jagannadham, 'Problems of Social Policy and Social Planning with special reference to India'.
4. Prof. Everett C. Hughes, 'Professional and Career Problems of Sociology'.
5. Edgar Morin, 'A propos de la Formation des Sociologues en France'.
6. Prof. Georges Friedmann and Jean Tréanton, 'Remarques sur les Activités et Responsabilités Professionnelles des Sociologues en France'.
7. Prof. L. Mendieta y Nuñez, 'The Teaching of Sociology'.
8. Prof. Carroll D. Clark, 'The Relations of Public Institutions with Sources of Research Funds'.
9. Prof. S. M. Miller, 'The Choice of Research Projects'.
10. Dr. Glaister A. Elmer, 'Integrity: The First of the Field Research Requirements'.

11. Dr. Elbridge Sibley, 'Professional Activities and Responsibilities of Sociologists in the United States'.
12. Mrs. Ruth Glass, 'Detachment and Attachment'.
15. Prof. Pierre de Bie, 'Conclusions du Rapport Général sur l'Enseignement de la Sociologie, de la Psychologie et de l'Anthropologie Sociales'.