

TRANSACTIONS OF THE FOURTH  
WORLD CONGRESS OF SOCIOLOGY

ACTES DU QUATRIÈME  
CONGRÈS MONDIAL DE SOCIOLOGIE

VOLUME I

TRANSACTIONS OF THE FOURTH  
WORLD CONGRESS OF SOCIOLOGY

ACTES DU QUATRIÈME  
CONGRÈS MONDIAL DE SOCIOLOGIE

Milan and Stresa, 8-15 September, 1959

*General Theme*

SOCIETY AND SOCIOLOGICAL KNOWLEDGE  
LA SOCIÉTÉ ET LA CONNAISSANCE SOCIOLOGIQUE

*VOLUME I*

Sociology in its Social Context  
La Sociologie dans son Contexte Social

INTERNATIONAL SOCIOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION  
ASSOCIATION INTERNATIONALE DE SOCIOLOGIE

1959

THE JOURNAL OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SOCIOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION  
VOLUME 17, PART 1, 1959  
PUBLISHED BY THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION  
13 ENDSLEIGH STREET, LONDON, W.C.1.

© International Sociological Association 1959

Published by the International Sociological Association, Skepper House,  
13 Endsleigh Street, London, W.C.1, and printed in Great Britain by  
Hanbury, Tomsett & Co. Ltd., London, N.W.10

## Editorial Note

The papers collected in this volume are contributions towards a systematic and critical account of the development of modern sociology, examining in diverse contexts the social and intellectual influences which have affected its form and content. The papers will be discussed in a plenary session of the Congress on September 8, 1959.

It is regretted that two papers, Professor R. K. Merton's introductory essay and Professor D. V. Glass' study of sociology in Britain, were not available in time for inclusion in this volume. These papers will, however, be available for discussion at the Congress and will be published later in Volume III of the *Transactions*.

## Introductory Essay

## Contents

	PAGE
EDITORIAL NOTE - - - - -	v
INTRODUCTORY ESSAY	
Raymond Aron, <i>Société Moderne et Sociologie</i> - -	1
NATIONAL AND REGIONAL STUDIES	
FRANCE	
F. Bourricaud, <i>La Sociologie Française</i> - - -	23
GERMAN FEDERAL REPUBLIC	
T. W. Adorno, <i>Contemporary German Sociology</i> - -	33
INDIA	
R. N. Saksena, <i>Sociology in India</i> - - - -	57
ITALY	
R. Treves, <i>Sociological Study and Research in Italy</i> -	73
JAPAN	
M. Shimmei, <i>Japanese Sociology in its Social Context</i> -	95
LATIN AMERICA	
G. Germani, <i>The Development and Present State of Sociology in Latin America</i> - - - - -	117
POLAND	
J. Chalasiniski, <i>Sociology and Social Mythology in Post-War Poland</i> - - - - -	139
SPAIN	
E. Gómez Arboleya, <i>The Origins of Sociology in Spain</i> -	147
U.S.A.	
B. Barber, <i>American Sociology in its Social Context</i> -	161
U.S.S.R.	
P. N. Fedoseev, <i>Sociology in the U.S.S.R.</i> - - -	177
YUGOSLAVIA	
R. Lukic, <i>Les Conditions Sociales du Développement de la Sociologie en Yougoslavie</i> - - - - -	187

## Société Moderne et Sociologie

RAYMOND ARON

(Professeur de Sociologie à l'Université de Paris)

La sociologie a tenté de rendre compte de sa propre existence depuis qu'elle existe. Tous les grands sociologues du siècle dernier et du début de celui-ci, Auguste Comte, Karl Marx, Max Weber, ont esquissé une explication de leur propre science par l'état de la société. Il ne sera pas inutile, au seuil de cet essai, de rappeler les grandes lignes des trois auto-interprétations : théorie positiviste de la sociologie comtienne, théorie marxiste de la sociologie dite prolétarienne, théorie weberienne de la sociologie compréhensive. Ces trois auto-interprétations suggéreront les données actuelles du problème de la sociologie de la sociologie.

### I

Selon Auguste Comte, la sociologie ou physique sociale naît au moment où la méthode scientifique s'étant définitivement imposée dans l'études de tous les ordres de réalité, matérielle et vivante, est reconnue comme valable, et seule valable, pour l'étude de la réalité humaine, sociale et historique. La sociologie naît à un moment déterminé de l'histoire des sciences. Mais ce moment de l'histoire des sciences est aussi un moment de l'histoire générale de l'humanité. En effet, l'intelligence exerce à toutes les époques une fonction régulatrice. Les idées directrices qui commandent l'accord des esprits et fondent l'unité collective expriment l'avancement de notre savoir. Il était impossible de saisir clairement la loi des trois états et la classification des sciences avant que l'accession à l'âge positif des sciences de la nature et de la vie ne permit tout à la fois de créer une physique sociale et de tirer de la physique sociale les propositions démontrées qui s'imposent à tous comme jadis s'imposaient à tous les dogmes de la religion inspirée ou révélée.

L'auto-interprétation du marxisme est du même type. Dans la mesure où la sociologie montre le passage nécessaire d'un régime à un autre—de l'esclavage au servage, puis au salariat, puis au socialisme—elle n'aurait pu naître avant que le capitalisme ne révélât tout à la fois ses contradictions et la possibilité de les résoudre par-delà la révolution prolétarienne. Le marxisme comme le positivisme se veut vérité universellement valable et pourtant datée. Il est vrai que, sur ce point, les marxistes ne donnent pas tous le même sens à la vérité du

marxisme. Le marxisme, selon certains marxistes, serait essentiellement lié au prolétariat. Seul celui-ci pourrait penser l'histoire selon la vérité totale, parce qu'il est le sujet de la phase prochaine, l'acteur principal dans le dénouement de la préhistoire. Mais il me paraît conforme à l'inspiration de Marx que la vérité du marxisme soit universelle quand bien même le prolétariat serait seul capable de ou disposé à l'accueillir.

L'auto-interprétation de la sociologie weberienne est plus complexe. Max Weber souhaitait faire une place à la subjectivité du sociologue, subjectivité qui reflétait ou exprimait certains traits du milieu social. Il admettait abstraitement le caractère historique des questions, quitte à maintenir la validité universelle des réponses. Les questions de la sociologie weberienne portent sur la spécificité de la civilisation occidentale, avant tout sur la rationalisation économique, administrative, juridique, et sur les origines de cette spécificité. D'où la confrontation de l'homme d'aujourd'hui, qui doit être homme de métier, avec le puritain qui voulait l'être. D'où l'étude comparative des grandes religions et, finalement, de toutes les organisations économiques, sociales, juridiques et politiques pour mettre à sa place notre temps et notre société. La question exprime un homme ou une époque, la réponse formulerait une vérité universellement valable.

Parmi les différentes écoles de sociologie, certaines se situent dans la lignée du positivisme à condition de donner à ce terme un sens vague, celui de l'application aux phénomènes sociaux d'une méthode inspirée de celle des sciences naturelles. Cette sociologie positive, scientifique, accepterait l'auto-interprétation que suggérerait le positivisme d'Auguste Comte: la méthode des sciences de la nature ayant remporté, dans tous les domaines, d'éclatants triomphes, les bons esprits ne doutent pas que seule l'application de la même méthode permettra d'analyser et d'expliquer les phénomènes sociaux.

Mais si l'on peut appeler positivistes les sociologues qui croient à l'unité fondamentale de la méthode scientifique, les positivistes aujourd'hui prennent le contre-pied d'Auguste Comte sur un point décisif: celui-ci affirmait qu'au niveau de la biologie un renversement intervenait, la saisie de l'ensemble, organisme ou société, devant précéder aussi bien qu'éclairer l'étude des parties ou des détails. Le primat de l'ensemble s'exprimait, dans la sociologie d'Auguste Comte, par la connaissance des grandes lois de la statique et de la dynamique avant que l'inventaire des diversités historiques soit achevé, par la détermination de l'ordre fondamental de la société humaine (statique) à partir du tableau cérébral (équivalent d'une conception de la nature humaine), en bref, par la thèse selon laquelle l'histoire de l'humanité est *une* et ne constitue qu'un développement et non une création. Les sociologues que l'on appellerait aujourd'hui *positivistes*, ont, depuis longtemps, abandonné les prétentions synthétiques de Comte, ils sont



résolument analytiques. Bien plutôt seraient-ils enclins à nier radicalement tout ce qui pour Auguste Comte constituait l'apport de la sociologie: les lois fondamentales de la dynamique sociale (loi des trois états, classification des sciences, société militaire et société industrielle, religion spontanée, puis inspirée, puis révélée, puis démontrée, etc.).

La sociologie d'Auguste Comte appartient au passé. Celle de Marx appartient, qu'on le veuille ou non, au présent. Elle a été la doctrine du parti qui, en 1917, a réalisé la première révolution qui se disait et se voulait socialiste, elle est restée la doctrine officielle de l'Union soviétique, elle est devenue celle de la Chine et des démocraties populaires. Que l'on soit marxiste ou antimarxiste, on ne peut nier le fait que des millions d'hommes se réclament de la pensée de Marx. Avec le marxisme, l'ambition d'Auguste Comte s'est accomplie: une vérité prétendument scientifique est devenue le dogme d'une collectivité, c'est-à-dire l'ensemble des propositions que les individus ne discutent plus parce qu'ils les tiennent pour démontrées. En ce sens, la sociologie est peut-être la seule science (ou pseudo science) à constituer un dogme au sens où l'entendait Auguste Comte.

Entre la postérité d'Auguste Comte, satisfaite d'études spéciales, objectives, mais sans prétention à embrasser l'ensemble, et la postérité de Marx, qui, comme le montre le rapport du Professeur Fedoseev, est toujours convaincue de connaître les lois fondamentales du développement historique, économique et social, la postérité de Max Weber permet-elle de réaliser une synthèse ou d'établir un dialogue? Il serait facile d'expliquer le marxisme de la sociologie soviétique par le contexte social (le régime dit socialiste, planificateur avec parti unique), le non ou l'antimarxisme de la sociologie américaine et, dans l'ensemble, de la sociologie occidentale, par le contexte social (le régime capitaliste-démocratique). Ce serait là moins une explication qu'une constatation: des deux côtés du rideau de fer, la sociologie est liée au contexte social, d'un côté par son ambition de connaître les lois générales du développement, de l'autre par son affirmation, implicite ou explicite, qu'elle ne connaît pas de telles lois ou qu'éventuellement celles-ci n'existent pas. Mais conclure sur une affirmation relativiste, dans le style de Karl Marx lui-même, équivaudrait à renoncer pour la sociologie à l'objectif d'une vérité universelle. La sociologie de la connaissance peut et doit s'appliquer aux différentes écoles de la sociologie, mais non les renvoyer dos à dos, comme également légitimes et également arbitraires.

## II

A travers tous les rapports nationaux, on retrouve, plus ou moins clairement exprimée mais incontestable, une affirmation qu'il me paraît utile de souligner: l'étude empirique, scientifique, des phénomènes sociaux accompagne normalement la formation de la société

moderne. La sociologie (au sens large où elle tend à se confondre avec la sociographie) peut être interprétée, en première approche, comme une prise de conscience de la modernisation de la société. Ainsi formulée la proposition paraît banale, presque évidente.

La modernisation de la société est aussi industrialisation. Elle implique donc un brassage incessant des individus, la création de métiers nouveaux, la modification de la répartition des individus **entre** les campagnes et les villes, entre les occupations. A l'image d'une société stable se substitue celle d'une société en perpétuel mouvement. La représentation des groupes sociaux qui se perpétuent à travers la relève des générations s'efface au profit d'une image contrastée, la mobilité des individus paraissant trop grande par rapport à l'idéal traditionnel, insuffisante par rapport à l'idéal nouveau de liberté et d'égalité. La sociologie, telle qu'elle se crée dans la première moitié du XIX<sup>ème</sup> siècle, se veut étude empirique, conforme aux rigueurs de la science, des phénomènes sociaux, l'accent étant mis sur l'adjectif *social* puisque l'essentiel n'est plus ni le régime politique, ni l'organisation économique mais un domaine plus profond, qui s'entend à la fois les relations d'autorité et les relations d'échange (les grandes théories sociologiques diffèrent d'après la définition qu'elles donnent du social en tant que tel).

De cette origine même dérivent les deux tendances entre lesquelles diverge la sociologie moderne. Une première définition retient dans la sociologie toutes les études empiriques de n'importe quel aspect de la réalité sociale, ce dernier adjectif désignant, en ce cas, le genre dont l'économique, le juridique, le politique, le criminologique sont des espèces. Selon une autre définition, le concept social est spécifique, en deux sens possibles d'ailleurs: ou bien le social désigne l'englobant, c'est-à-dire l'ensemble qui embrasse l'économique, le juridique, le politique, l'idéologique; ou il désigne un aspect, lui aussi partiel ou, du moins, formel, qui peut, à la rigueur, servir de fondement à toutes les disciplines attachées à l'analyse des sociétés mais non dégager les lois du développement global.

Dans quelle mesure la sociologie s'est-elle constituée en discipline autonome en un pays donné, dans quelle mesure, au contraire, les études empiriques ou statistiques des familles, des classes, des villes, des criminels, se sont-elles multipliées sans être baptisées sociologiques, sans que des chaires de sociologie soient créées et qu'une association de sociologues professionnels s'organise? Les rapports nationaux que l'on lira plus loin suggèrent non une explication totale mais, du moins, une liste des variables.

L'organisation des universités constitue un facteur important. Là où domine l'influence des juristes d'un côté, des économistes de l'autre et où se prolonge la tradition de la théorie politique, la sociologie a peine à se tailler un secteur propre, économistes et juristes poursuivant les

études empiriques de tels ou tels phénomènes sociaux, philosophes ou spécialistes de la politique se réservant l'examen des conceptions théoriques ou philosophiques. Tel semble le cas de l'Italie où Pareto n'occupa jamais de chaire de sociologie et où Mosca lui-même n'était pas officiellement appelé sociologue.

Le cas de la France est quelque peu différent mais il illustre aussi l'action de la structure universitaire moins sur le contenu des recherches que sur la formation et la répartition des disciplines. Au début du siècle, Durkheim réussit à imposer dans les universités françaises la discipline dite sociologie. Etant lui-même agrégé de philosophie, il occupa la chaire de sociologie à Bordeaux d'abord, à Paris ensuite. En fait, jusqu'à une date récente, il n'y eut que cinq chaires occupées par des sociologues dans l'université française (deux à Paris, une à Bordeaux, une à Toulouse, une à Strasbourg), sans même que ces chaires portent officiellement le nom de sociologie. La sociologie se trouve ainsi rattachée à la philosophie pour l'enseignement et pour la recherche, séparée des facultés de droit où est enseignée l'économie politique. Des deux sociologues ayant une formation économique dans l'école durkheimienne, Simiand et Halbwachs, l'un occupa longtemps une chaire au Conservatoire des Arts et Métiers, l'autre à la Sorbonne. Cette organisation universitaire freina, pendant l'entre-deux guerres, le recrutement des sociologues et, du même coup, le développement des recherches sociologiques. Les économistes recevaient une formation juridique, non sociologique. Les philosophes avaient une culture littéraire, non juridique ou économique. Les perspectives de carrière étaient médiocres pour ceux qui songeaient à se spécialiser dans la sociologie. L'organisation universitaire a-t-elle été la cause unique ou même principale de la stagnation de la sociologie entre les deux guerres en France? Certainement pas. Une cause "événementielle" est intervenue: l'école de Durkheim a été décimée pendant la première guerre mondiale. Les amis ou disciples de Durkheim, les plus capables de recruter des élèves par leur rayonnement personnel (Mauss, Simiand) n'enseignaient ni l'un ni l'autre à l'École Normale Supérieure ou à la Sorbonne. Mais, en dehors de cette raison accidentelle, on aperçoit une autre raison, plus profonde: les Français manquaient, pendant tout cette période, de curiosité à l'égard de leur propre société, ils étaient prisonniers d'un réflexe conservateur, habitués aux pratiques de la III<sup>ème</sup> République, qu'ils n'aimaient pas assez pour la transfigurer, qu'ils ne détestaient pas assez pour la mettre en pièces analytiquement ou se révolter contre elle. La discussion politique, de caractère idéologique, fut passionnée au cours des années 30, elle fut menée surtout par les hommes de lettres. Elle eut un curieux caractère "d'aliénation," les idéologies d'importation, communiste et fasciste, ne recoupant pas exactement les réalités nationales.

Après la deuxième guerre mondiale, au cours des douze dernières années, une explosion de vitalité et de passion fit craquer les cadres:

sur le plan idéologique, la discussion fut incessante entre hommes de lettres et philosophes sur les mérites ou démérites des diverses doctrines (communisme, socialisme démocratique, gaullisme, etc.); sur le plan scientifique, de nombreux jeunes gens furent attirés par la recherche sociologique, sublimant leurs passions politiques en curiosité scientifique; enfin, sur le plan de la réalité sociale, les progrès de l'industrialisation, la recherche de la productivité, le souci des relations sociales transformèrent le visage social du pays et répandirent la conscience des nécessités de l'enquête empirique, de la connaissance scientifique, de l'amélioration des rapports sociaux par l'application du savoir.

Ces analyses sommaires suggèrent une liste de trois variables: modernisation sociale (ou industrialisation), organisation universitaire, curiosité scientifico-politique de la réalité sociale, la première variable ayant, à la longue, une efficacité supérieure et finissant par rendre inévitable la prolifération de la sociographie, les deux autres variables exerçant une influence régulatrice, accélérant ou retardant l'allure du développement scientifique. Ajoutons que l'effort d'imitation doit s'exercer sur les pays mêmes où la modernisation en est à sa phase première: la création de la sociologie ou, du moins, de la sociographie fait partie du processus d'industrialisation que l'on appelle, d'un côté du rideau de fer, occidentalisation et, de l'autre, édification du socialisme. (Il va de soi que ce processus ne s'accomplit pas de la même façon des deux côtés).

### III

Les deux dernières variables que nous avons notées—organisation de l'université, curiosité politico-scientifique du réel—se rattachent l'une comme l'autre aux données nationales. Il est donc tentant, surtout dans ce recueil de monographies consacrés à l'état de la sociologie dans les divers pays, de s'arrêter un instant sur le rôle du facteur national. Le fait est que l'on parle de sociologie allemande, américaine, anglaise, française, etc., et que l'adjectif ne vise pas seulement à rappeler le passeport que détiennent les sociologues ou la langue dans laquelle ils s'expriment, mais aussi certaines caractéristiques que revêt la discipline ici et là.

Pour une part, l'explication s'offre d'elle-même. Les sociologues d'un même pays se connaissent mieux les uns les autres qu'ils ne connaissent leurs collègues du dehors. Nos collègues soviétiques ne font pas partie de l'univers de coopération et de dialogue dans lequel se déroule notre existence scientifique. Même à l'intérieur du monde occidental, nous sommes presque obligés de donner une importance supérieure à nos compatriotes, parce qu'ils traitent le plus souvent de problèmes qui nous intéressent directement, parce que la controverse se déploie plus librement entre ceux qui parlent la même langue et se réfèrent aux mêmes présupposés.

Le cadre de la sociologie est encore, en une large mesure, national. Quelle est la portée de ce caractère national de la sociologie?

L'organisation universitaire fait partie de cette variable nationale, mais elle n'en est que l'expression institutionnelle et souvent la plus superficielle. Si nous laissons de côté la pure sociographie, l'étude empirique, plus descriptive qu'analytique, des phénomènes sociaux, toute sociologie comporte une *interrogation*, une *conceptualisation*, une *délimitation de son objet*, un *mode d'explication*. L'interprétation de la sociologie à partir du cadre national est d'autant plus instructive que questions, concepts, objet et explications sont davantage déterminés par des influences proprement nationales. Jusqu'à quel point en va-t-il ainsi? C'est là un problème de fait sur lequel nous ne pouvons ici donner que des indications sommaires.

Si nous évoquons les principaux pays d'Europe, nous ne pouvons méconnaître l'existence d'une tradition propre à chacun d'eux. Ce n'est point par hasard que la Grande-Bretagne, aujourd'hui encore, est presque rebelle au terme sociologie tout en menant des études sociographiques de haute qualité (*Social Surveys*) et en appelant anthropologie la sociologie appliquée aux sociétés prémodernes ou aux aspects sociaux des sociétés modernes. En Italie, le *Traité de Sociologie générale* de Pareto ou les *Eléments de Science politique* de G. Mosca prolongent le courant machiavélien mais ils se font difficilement une place entre les vieilles disciplines, la philosophie idéaliste excluant la conception, qui se veut scientifique et passe pour cynique, du pouvoir fondé sur la force et la ruse et aucune des facultés anciennes n'offrant d'asile à ce type de recherche ou de doctrine. En France, la première grande école sociologique du siècle, celle de Durkheim, joint à la prétention scientifique la prétention synthétique, comme Auguste Comte l'avait fait et comme la plupart des philosophes sociaux français l'ont fait depuis le XVIII<sup>ème</sup> siècle, rationalisme et idéologie constituant la combinaison apparemment conforme à la double aspiration des Français à user de la seule raison et à transformer (ou transfigurer) la réalité selon leurs rêves. Enfin, la grande période de la sociologie allemande du début du siècle jusqu'en 1933 est dominée par la conjonction, la fécondation réciproque de la problématique hegeliano-marxiste, du souci de connaissances et de réformes sociales, enfin de l'élaboration d'une théorie générale susceptible de servir de fondement à une sociologie comparée des institutions à travers l'espace et le temps.

Il n'est pas question d'attribuer à l'interprétation nationale une valeur inconditionnelle ou même une priorité. Quand une nation passe de la démocratie "occidentale" (ou capitaliste) au socialisme de style "totalitaire" (ou prolétarien-soviétique), elle change de sociologie. Entre la sociologie marxiste et non marxiste, provisoirement, l'issue de la guerre, chaude ou froide, décide, non l'aboutissement de la controverse scientifique, en d'autres termes, la force pure et non la force du

raisonnement. Même quand l'évolution de la sociologie n'était pas à ce point subordonnée à celle de la politique, la nation ne constituait pas une cause unique et toute-puissante. En France comme en Allemagne, en Angleterre comme en Italie, il y avait des écoles rivales, d'inspiration philosophique ou de préférences politiques tout autres. Le dialogue entre marxistes et anti-marxistes en Allemagne, entre rationalistes et catholiques en France a été un élément essentiel du développement de la pensée sociologique. Il n'en est pas moins possible de déceler l'action du milieu national sur les quatre termes que nous avons énumérés plus haut (question, concept, objet, explication).

Prenons l'exemple de deux pays, tout proches l'un de l'autre et, implicitement ou explicitement, en perpétuel dialogue, la France et l'Allemagne. La question originelle de la sociologie d'Auguste Comte est celle de l'unité sociale ou du *consensus*, la contradiction entre la pensée théologique et la pensée scientifique étant considérée comme l'origine ultime du désordre occidental. La tentative de Lévy-Bruhl (morale et science des mœurs) et de Durkheim (moral sociologique) se situe dans le prolongement de cette interrogation initiale. Le thème de l'intégration, dans la pensée durkheimienne, sort, lui aussi, du besoin ressenti du *consensus*.

La question originelle de la sociologie allemande (celle d'avant 1933) a une origine hégéliano-marxiste. La contradiction fondamentale est moins celle de la pensée positiviste et de la pensée religieuse que celle de la continuité historique et du conflit de classes. La guerre sociale entre entrepreneurs et ouvriers n'est, dans la vision d'Auguste Comte, qu'un aspect et non un aspect décisif, de la société industrielle. De ces points de départ différents suivent de multiples conséquences: l'usage de l'opposition civilisation-culture, la sociologie de la connaissance dans le style de Scheler, l'enquête sur les origines du capitalisme dans le style de Max Weber (les puritains *voulaient* être hommes de métier, nous devons l'être), toute cette conceptualisation historique suppose, au rebours du postulat scientifique, qu'une méthode unique de pensée ne s'impose pas à chaque époque, que des modes essentiellement autres de connaissance ou de croyance sont, à une même époque, légitimes. La sociologie durkheimienne veut surmonter l'anarchie sociale et intégrer les individus aux communautés. La sociologie allemande d'avant l'hitlérisme voulait comprendre la rationalisation (économique, juridique, technique, administrative) dont le capitalisme est une expression et sauvegarder les valeurs de culture que menace cette rationalisation.

Ces deux interrogations et conceptualisations, telles que je viens de les rappeler sommairement, ne sont pas contradictoires. Le rapprochement de ces deux problématiques suggère plutôt des problèmes nouveaux: quelle est la place des conflits de classes dans une société rationalisée? Quelles possibilités demeurent offertes aux modes non

scientifiques de pensée? Il n'en reste pas moins que, selon l'interrogation initiale, la recherche s'engage dans d'autres directions, qu'elle met en lumière d'autres secteurs du réel, qu'elle utilise d'autres concepts. La sociologie de la culture d'Alfred Weber et la sociologie des religions de Max Weber dérivent d'une problématique qui n'est pas séparable de la société moderne mais d'une certaine prise de conscience de la société moderne, qui n'est peut-être pas essentiellement allemande mais qui a été, en fait, dominante dans les milieux allemands à une certaine période.

Les deux démarches ultérieures—objet, explication—sont-elles, et en quelle mesure, dominées par l'interrogation initiale? On sait que Max Weber, convaincu du caractère historique de l'interrogation, mettait l'accent sur la validité universelle des réponses scientifiques à des questions changeantes avec les personnes (classes, nations, époques). En fait, cette distinction, valable au niveau élémentaire, sociographique, l'est moins au niveau global que nous avons envisagé dans les pages précédentes. L'objet de la sociologie de Max Weber est l'étude comparée des relations entre économie et croyances religieuses, entre formes juridiques et relations économiques, entre types de pouvoir et organisation sociale, c'est-à-dire la reprise, sur le plan de la diversité historique des sociétés, des interrogations que lui avait suggérées son expérience personnelle de la société moderne (capitaliste rationnelle). Et le mode d'explication—qu'il s'agisse de la référence aux relations interindividuelles, des schémas d'action ou de la mise en lumière de la singularité de la civilisation occidentale—porte la marque de l'interrogation existentielle.

Qu'on nous entende bien. Nous ne voulons évidemment pas dire que les résultats de la recherche weberienne, les conclusions auxquelles elle arrive seraient sans valeur pour qui partirait d'une interrogation différente. Tout au contraire, dans une étude logique plus poussée, nous nous efforcerions de montrer que la sociologie compréhensive et comparative de Weber, sans être la seule possible, est (dans la mesure où elle est en accord avec les faits) d'une vérité universelle, bien qu'elle ne soit pas la seule interprétation possible. Tout ce que nous souhaitons suggérer, c'est que le caractère historique et la validité des propositions sociologiques ne sont pas exclusifs l'un de l'autre.

Nous avons décelé le caractère national de la sociologie dans les théories de la plus vaste portée. Il aurait été autrement facile de dégager le caractère national de la sociologie si nous avions fixé notre attention sur le chapitre de la sociologie qui prend la nation elle-même pour objet. La sociologie politique, en France, a été polarisée vers les enquêtes de sociologie électorale et le livre d'André Siegfried relatif à la France de l'Ouest a servi de modèle parce qu'on retrouvait, dans cette partie du pays, les oppositions dites classiques, droite-gauche, résistance-mouvement, ancien régime-révolution. Les Fran-

çais ont pensé leur histoire coupée en deux par la Révolution, comme les Russes, au siècle dernier, étaient obsédés par la relation entre leur pays et l'Occident.

Sans doute s'agit-il, dans les deux cas, d'une vision philosophique ou d'une controverse politique plutôt que d'une analyse sociologique. Mais, si nous traversons l'Atlantique et si nous observons la scène américaine, ces notions ne tendent-elles pas à se rapprocher au point de se confondre et la sociologie ne devient-elle pas, dans son objectivité même, dans l'impersonnalité apparente de ses interrogations, dans la limitation ou la quasi limitation au présent, l'expression de la société américaine, un peu comme la recherche de Taine ou de Renan (*Les Origines de la France contemporaine, La Réforme intellectuelle et morale de la France*) développait les questions que l'élite française formulait à l'égard de l'histoire de France? La sociologie essentiellement actuelle des Etats-Unis n'est-elle pas, en d'autres termes, l'image d'une société qui se veut tournée vers l'avenir plutôt que vers le passé, qui s'efforce d'éliminer la dimension historique et qui se pense composée d'individus quelconques américanisés par le milieu?

On a souvent remarqué le fait incontestable que les sociologues américaines ont étudié de préférence, comme les sociologues de tous les pays, les problèmes que le milieu leur posait. Comment n'être pas soucieux de l'acculturation, alors que la société américaine était faite de blancs et de noirs, et de blancs venus de tous les pays d'Europe, à des dates différentes, chaque groupe chargé d'un héritage spécifique qui lui avait été légué par ses ancêtres européens? L'intériorisation des normes sociales qui, pour ainsi dire, demeure invisible dans une communauté dont la continuité historique n'a pas été rompue, est un processus offert à l'observation quand il tend à l'intégration d'immigrants et que l'on peut en comparer le déroulement aux différents âges. La nature de la société américaine imposait, dans une large mesure, la problématique qui a été celle de la sociologie américaine, l'individu, le groupe culturel ou religieux, le milieu naturel, la collectivité américaine. Les véritables origines de la société américaine, jusqu'à une date récente, se situaient dans les pays d'où les Américains étaient partis pour entreprendre une aventure sans précédent.

La méthode structurelle-fonctionnelle, une théorie du style de celle du Professeur Parsons s'appliquent d'autant plus aisément à la réalité que celle-ci comporte une plus grande pluralité de groupements intermédiaires entre l'individu ou la famille d'une part, la collectivité globale de l'autre—ce qui est le cas de la société américaine. Non qu'il n'y ait des groupements d'unité forte et des groupements d'unité faible, comme dans toutes les sociétés, non que l'on ne puisse distinguer à une extrémité des strates tout proches d'une catégorie statistique et, à l'autre, des communautés faites d'individus animés de la même volonté ou de consciences presque confondues. Mais un sociologue



observant sans préjugé la société américaine est frappé d'abord par le nombre des groupements nationaux, religieux, sociaux, culturels, politiques etc. auxquels appartient spontanément chaque citoyen des États-Unis, par suite de la manière dont le pays a été peuplé, par suite également de l'organisation sociale. Le souci prédominant de la lutte de classes semble artificiel dans un pays de pionniers où les chances de promotion sont ou semblent très grandes, où la hiérarchie de prestige des groupes nationaux est aussi évidente que la hiérarchie des groupes économiques, où se combinent une exigence d'américanisme (conformisme) et une hétérogénéité naturelle. L'étude empirique, la sociographie répond au besoin d'une société qui apparemment n'a rien à cacher et qui a tant à découvrir, qui est ou se croit en perpétuelle évolution et où tous les phénomènes sociaux sont ou semblent simultanément individuels *et* collectifs (individuels puisque l'immigrant a la responsabilité de son sort, collectif puisque l'américanisme est un ensemble de pratiques et de normes qui s'impose de l'extérieur au nouvel arrivant et qui sera absorbé de l'intérieur par la seconde génération).

Les traits spécifiques de la sociologie américaine se rattachent ainsi à quelques traits de la société américaine, les uns et les autres exprimant la modernité. *Souci d'études empiriques* (observation et description de la manière dont vivent les hommes), *souci d'études statistiques* des couches, catégories ou classes, le nombre des individus qui atteignent à un revenu donné ou qui appartiennent à un groupe déterminé étant l'objet de la recherche, *souci d'études psychologiques*, afin de connaître l'opinion des hommes telle qu'elle s'exprime dans les réponses données aux questions des enquêteurs aussi bien que dans l'attitude adoptée à l'égard du travail, de la politique ou du loisir, *souci d'explication objective*, l'explication étant, tour à tour, de type structurel ou fonctionnel mais supposant l'ensemble social donné ou le reconstituant à partir des phénomènes partiels, *souci, enfin, de réformes fondées sur le savoir*, ces cinq soucis sont typiques de la sociologie américaine. Sont-ils aussi normaux dans une société industrielle? En effet, celle-ci veut se connaître elle-même parce qu'elle est en perpétuelle évolution, connaître en termes quantitatifs, parce que la mathématisation résulte des besoins de l'administration et de la productivité, connaître les réactions des individus parce que le fonctionnement de la production ou du régime politique dépend pour une part de ce que pensent et ressentent les individus, connaître les raisons pour lesquelles ils prennent telle ou telle attitude (et les raisons se trouvent dans le milieu, atelier pour les travailleurs, quartier pour l'électeur). Enfin, toutes ces connaissances sont, par essence, utilisables, l'explication du mécontentement du travailleur, contremaître, ingénieur, entrepreneur, suggérant le changement à apporter pour dissiper ce mécontentement.

Cette analyse est inévitablement schématique (la place nous manque ici pour la développer), mais elle est, me semble-t-il, en accord avec

l'interprétation que l'on trouvera dans le rapport national du Professeur Bernard Barber, elle permet de rendre compte sinon des caractères positifs de la sociologie américaine, du moins de certaines absences. La sociologie américaine est actuelle plutôt qu'historique, elle suppose le plus souvent ce que les marxistes appellent " structure sociale " plutôt qu'elle ne cherche à dégager explicitement cette structure, elle était relativement peu portée aux comparaisons de société à société. Ces traits négatifs vont en s'atténuant, la sociologie américaine tendant, au fur et à mesure de ses progrès, à acquérir le sens de l'histoire, de la totalité, de la comparaison. Ils n'en restent pas moins visibles et ils s'opposent aux traits spécifiques de la sociologie soviétique, tels qu'ils ressortent de l'exposé du Professeur Fedoseev.

Les différences entre les sociologies des divers pays d'Occident se ramènent aux modalités diverses selon lesquelles chaque nation a découvert la modernité, en a pris conscience, en a formulé la nature. Le contraste entre sociologie soviétique et sociologie américaine, qui sur le plan mondial, domine notre description, reproduit finalement l'opposition de deux écoles sociologiques, toutes deux nées en Occident, mais l'opposition est durcie, cristallisée par la consécration étatique d'une des écoles par l'Etat russe, chinois, etc.

#### IV

La confrontation entre sociologie américaine et sociologie soviétique s'impose au sociologue. Non que ces deux écoles soient les deux seules que l'on puisse observer à l'heure présente, ni que les sociologues, dans tous les pays, doivent prendre modèle sur l'une ou sur l'autre, mais, en dehors même de la place qu'occupent Union soviétique et Etats-Unis sur la scène mondiale, les sociologies soviétique et américaine remplissent, chacune dans leur patrie, une fonction importante, elles sont aussi éloignées que possible l'une de l'autre, elles sont presque incapables de dialoguer l'une avec l'autre, chacune donnant de l'autre une interprétation qui la valorise elle-même et dévalorise sa rivale. Pour les marxistes d'U.R.S.S. la sociologie américaine (quels que soient ses mérites dans la mise au point des méthodes d'enquête et l'observation des faits) est la superstructure d'une société capitaliste. Pour les sociologues des Etats-Unis, la théorie marxiste dont se réclament les sociologies soviétiques n'est qu'une idéologie justificatrice d'un certain Etat (totalitaire) et d'une certaine économie (planifiée).

Il serait facile à l'observateur de transfigurer la rivalité des deux écoles en la stylisant, en présentant chacune d'elle sous sa forme parfaite. La sociologie américaine exprime la société américaine, la sociologie soviétique exprime l'Etat soviétique; celle-là justifie la structure de la société américaine, implicitement, par l'absence d'une théorie comparative des structures sociales, celle-ci justifie ou prétend justifier la société soviétique, explicitement, en y voyant une phase de la dialectique historique dont l'aboutissement sera le communisme et la

société sans classes. Les sociologues américains ne se réclament pas ouvertement d'une philosophie ou d'un système de valeurs, mais ils sont en majorité "libéraux," ce qui se traduit par la tendance "gauche" en français, peut-être faudrait-il dire "progressistes" en langage international. En fait, ils sont réformistes par référence aux valeurs qui sont officiellement celles de la société américaine et que celle-ci ne réalise pas entièrement (par exemple, dans les questions raciales, ils sont, en majorité, favorables à l'égalité et à l'intégration, ils admettent que la mobilité sociale, l'égalité entre les individus au point de départ est souhaitable, etc.). Les sociologues soviétiques professent une théorie qui donne à la fois un sens au devenir historique et un fondement aux valeurs. Mais le conformisme spontané que tels reprochent aux sociologues américains n'a rien de commun avec le marxisme obligatoire de "droit prolétarien" de nos collègues soviétiques (est-il vraiment impossible *humainement* qu'un sociologue, né et formé en Union soviétique, devienne incroyant ou hérétique en ce qui concerne la vérité du matérialisme historique?) A partir du moment où certaines propositions du marxisme sont devenues vérités d'Etat et où l'interprétation même de ces propositions fait objet de décrets, parfois changeants mais, à chaque instant, soustraits à la discussion, comment la controverse scientifique peut-elle se développer librement entre sociologues des deux côtes du rideau de fer?

Inévitablement, la controverse se dégrade en "sociologie de la connaissance," réciproque et agressive. Les sociologues soviétiques nous voient prisonniers de la société capitaliste, aveugles avec bonne foi dans le meilleur cas, serviteurs d'intérêts sordides avec cynisme dans le pire. Nous les voyons, volontairement ou non soumis aux ukases du Comité central ou du Praesidium, convaincus peut-être avec sincérité de certaines vérités mais ayant largement recours, selon l'expérience historique de toutes les religions dogmatiques, à l'interprétation symbolique. Ils nous démasquent et nous les démasquons, ils nous dévalorisent en nous expliquant, nous leur rendons la pareille.

Ce dialogue, scientifiquement agressif, n'est évidemment pas le dernier mot de la "sociologie de la sociologie." Au-delà de l'agression réciproque, s'étend tout le vaste champ de la recherche empirique. Nos collègues soviétiques sont provisoirement fidèles à la tradition d'Auguste Comte selon laquelle, en sociologie, on connaît l'ensemble mieux que le détail. Ils sont "détenteurs des lois générales du développement social." Ils ont, comme nous tous, beaucoup à observer, à analyser, à expliquer en ce qui concerne les groupes sociaux, les réactions des travailleurs à la machine, la mobilité sociale, le niveau des revenus etc. Ce champ d'études empiriques, celui sur lequel se déploie la sociologie américaine, est offert à tous les sociologues de tous les pays. En chaque pays, les sociologues trouvent un champ, à certains égards autre: le développement de la société industrielle ne s'est pas accompli dans deux pays de manière exactement identique

(milieu géographique, ressources matérielles, traditions culturelles, n'étaient pas les mêmes), ce développement ici et là n'en est pas arrivé au même stade, les réactions à l'industrie et au machinisme demeurent à beaucoup d'égards "nationales." Mais ces différences des champs nationaux d'investigation n'excluent pas une certaine communauté: partout, à notre époque, il y a beaucoup à découvrir parce que toutes les sociétés, à un degré ou à un autre, sont affectées par les bouleversements qu'apporte la modernité industrielle et que ces bouleversements imposent l'étude descriptive et statistique (urbanisation, difficultés de logement, alcoolisme et prostitution, progrès de la scolarisation, tous ces phénomènes accompagnent la société moderne, d'un côté ou de l'autre du rideau de fer). Il y a donc place, dans l'ordre de ce qui constitue l'apport essentiel de la sociologie dite américaine, c'est-à-dire l'étude descriptive, statistique, psychologique, non pas tant pour la compétition pacifique que pour la coopération scientifique.

Il est entendu, par exemple, que, théoriquement, il n'y a pas de chômage dans une économie planifiée (il n'y en a pas non plus dans une économie parfaitement libérale où le salaire serait égal à la productivité marginale du dernier travailleur disponible) mais, en fait, nos collègues polonais ont découvert, après 1956, que, en cas d'afflux trop rapide de la main d'oeuvre dans les villes, les emplois peuvent manquer pour cette surpopulation urbaine. Parfois les emplois offerts peuvent être de rendement faible et équivaloir à un demi chômage, ou bien, au contraire, la main d'oeuvre peut faire défaut dans le cas d'investissements considérables et de disparité entre le besoin de travailleurs qualifiés et les ouvriers qui s'offrent à l'embauche. Les problèmes des relations entre la main d'oeuvre en quête d'emploi et les emplois offerts par les entrepreneurs privés ou publics ne se posent pas de la même façon dans les différents systèmes économique-sociaux, mais ils se posent dans tous les régimes et ils sont plus ou moins imparfaitement résolus non pas tant par les différents régimes économiques et sociaux que par les pays appliquant des méthodes différentes selon les régimes.

L'exemple du chômage n'est pas le meilleur que nous aurions pu prendre en faveur de notre thèse, parce que le phénomène pose déjà un problème "théorique" (au sens où nos collègues soviétiques emploient le terme théorie). En régime socialiste planifié, la théorie indique qu'il n'y a pas de chômage; s'il y a, malgré tout, des travailleurs qui ne trouvent pas d'emploi, ce qui d'après nos collègues polonais, se produit parfois dans leur pays, il subsiste deux solutions: ou bien les faits ont tort et, par conséquent, ils sont niés brutalement et officiellement éliminés—ce qui se passait entre 1949 et 1955; ou bien les faits sont reconnus et alors on concède qu'à l'est et à l'ouest, des faits qui seraient exclus si le régime fonctionnait parfaitement peuvent se produire. Mais le problème du logement en période d'industrialisation rapide se pose dans tous les régimes et nos collègues soviétiques nous disent qu'il est, à certains égards, plus aigu chez eux que dans la plu-

part des sociétés occidentales. Le problème des loisirs, des moyens de communication, de la hiérarchie des salaires, de la mobilité sociale de génération à génération, se posent partout, encore qu'ils ne se posent pas dans les mêmes termes. Le sociologue français ne détesterait pas une étude comparative de la *Pravda* et des *Izvestia* d'un côté, du *Figaro*, du *Monde*, de *l'Aurore*, du *Parisien libéré*, de *France-Soir*, de l'autre côté. Cette étude serait du type coopératif, elle n'engagerait pas le sociologue dans la compétition pacifique en faveur de la *Pravda* et contre *France-Soir* (ou inversement).

La sociologie empirique, sur le mode *coopératif*, deviendra inévitablement, à un moment ou à un autre, une sociologie du type *compétitif*. Autrement dit, le sociologue s'interrogera sur la manière (ou les manières) dont un régime d'un certain type résout un certain problème. La faiblesse de la sociologie américaine est de ne pas suffisamment chercher une interprétation synthétique du fonctionnement effectif des divers régimes, la faiblesse de la sociologie soviétique est de connaître ce fonctionnement en théorie avant de l'avoir étudié en fait. Qu'il y ait ou non des lois du développement économique et social, nous ne démontrerons pas leur réalité ou leur irréalité si nous ne les cherchons pas. Mais des lois formulées avant les révolutions scientifiques et techniques du XXe siècle ont peu de chances d'être vraies si elles sont instructives, peu de chances d'être instructives si elles demeurent vraies après ces révolutions et si elles s'accordent avec le maintien du capitalisme dans les pays industrialisés et les plus avancés et le surgissement de régimes soi-disant socialistes dans les pays peu industrialisés. La loi de la succession des régimes économiques et sociaux doit être singulièrement vague pour n'être pas réfutée par des événements qu'elle n'aurait pu permettre de prévoir et qui la contredisent apparemment.

La tâche de la sociologie, en cette période que nos collègues soviétiques appellent celle de la compétition pacifique, est de mener à bien cette comparaison des régimes dans un esprit d'objectivité, c'est-à-dire sans supposer à l'avance que le régime de nos préférences a tous les mérites et qu'il est le maître de l'histoire et de l'avenir. Nos collègues économistes ont entrepris une tâche comparable, l'étude comparée des méthodes, des taux, des coûts de la croissance, ils sont en train d'établir une théorie générale de la croissance qui permettrait de reconnaître les phénomènes communs à la croissance dans tous les régimes (urbanisation, industrialisation, automatisme, etc.), les phénomènes caractéristiques de certaines phases de croissance (stabilité ou baisse du niveau de vie dans les premières phases de croissance), et, enfin, les fonctions sociales remplies différemment dans l'un et l'autre régime (la répartition des ressources entre les divers emplois est décidée par le pouvoir politique en régime soviétique; il est, en grande partie, le résultat de décisions individuelles innombrables en régime occidental; de même, le rôle du crédit, du taux d'intérêt, des banques est autre ici

et là, les oscillations de la conjoncture que connaît l'Occident ne se retrouvent pas telles quelles en régime soviétique, etc.).

L'équivalent, en sociologie, de cette théorie générale de la croissance serait une théorie des régimes sociaux, qui montrerait les données communes à toutes les sociétés modernes ou industrielles et les caractères spécifiques de chaque régime. Les métiers sont pour la plupart les mêmes dans toutes les sociétés industrielles à une même étape de leur développement. La comparaison viserait à montrer dans quelle mesure le pourcentage de ceux qui exercent un certain métier est plus ou moins élevé dans un régime d'un type donné (la distribution des marchandises emploie-t-elle plus de main d'oeuvre en Occident que dans le monde soviétique?), de quelles manières la répartition des revenus varie avec le régime (quel est le degré de l'inégalité *réelle*, ici et là? La hiérarchie des revenus traduit une autre appréciation de la valeur relative des occupations? etc.); enfin, comment les individus se distribuent en groupes et comment les groupes coopèrent ou entrent en conflit ici et là. Aucune des sociétés industrielles de notre temps n'est homogène, toutes comportent une hétérogénéité de professions, de revenus, de modes de vie (en dehors même des distinctions de nationalités et de religions à l'intérieur des Etats): dire que les classes, en régime soviétique, ne sont pas antinomiques et qu'elles le sont en Occident est peut-être vrai mais il ne suffit pas d'affirmer ces propositions pour qu'elles deviennent évidentes, ni de citer Marx pour les démontrer. Une théorie de la structure sociale respective des régimes soviétique et capitaliste est possible mais elle ne peut se fonder sur les textes de Marx, elle devrait reposer sur une étude empirique des deux réalités.

Ce qui paralyse le dialogue, ce n'est pas que nos collègues soviétiques soient favorables à leur régime et hostiles aux nôtres (nous leur rendons la pareille), ce n'est même pas qu'ils sachent à l'avance les mérites de leur régime et les turpitudes du nôtre, c'est la pauvreté de leur information sur le monde occidental et la répétition, sous prétexte de théorie, de formules stéréotypées sur le capitalisme et le socialisme. En vérité, nous sommes souvent tentés de leur souffler des arguments contre les sociétés capitalistes, tant ceux qu'ils emploient nous paraissent anachroniques. S'ils veulent dénoncer le capitalisme américain, nos collègues soviétiques pourraient trouver des chefs d'accusation plus convaincants que la toute-puissance ou le bellicisme des monopolistes.

Résumons-nous. L'opposition entre sociologie américaine et sociologie soviétique s'explique évidemment par le contexte social des deux pays. Quand l'Etat se réclame d'une théorie sociologique, les sociologues ne peuvent avoir une entière liberté de réflexion. Même si la sociologie américaine est, d'une certaine manière, l'expression de la société américaine, elle a par rapport à la société américaine une autonomie que la sociologie soviétique ne peut avoir par rapport à l'Etat

prolétarien. Mais cette situation de fait, qu'il n'est pas au pouvoir des sociologues de modifier, n'implique pas plus la guerre des sociologies qu'elle n'implique le choc des armées. La compétition pacifique est possible pour les uns et pour les autres à la seule condition que l'importance des structures sociales étant admise, le sociologue demande à l'observation des sociétés actuelles et non à la lecture des auteurs du siècle dernier la réponse à la question: quelles conséquences sociales comportent les traits spécifiques de chaque régime économique-social?

Nous étions partis de trois traditions: celles d'Auguste Comte, de Karl Marx et de Max Weber et de l'interprétation que chacun de ces grands doctrinaires a donnée de sa propre doctrine. Tous trois voyaient dans la sociologie une science qui part du présent, applique une méthode scientifique. Tous trois ont d'une certaine manière cherché les fondements d'un nouveau consensus, Auguste Comte par-delà l'opposition de la théologie et de la science; Karl Marx par-delà la lutte de classes, Max Weber par-delà la rationalisation. La recherche du consensus demeure peut-être l'inspiration de la sociologie d'aujourd'hui, mais elle se subdivise spontanément en plusieurs sortes d'enquêtes.

La sociologie analytique, descriptive, statistique, psychologique, dont la sociologie américaine, dans la diversité de ses tendances, offre le modèle, est partie intégrante, indispensable de toute sociologie, pour deux raisons: la rigueur méthodologique est une exigence de l'esprit moderne, la réalité de la société industrielle suggère des enquêtes de cet ordre, indispensables pour savoir ce qui est et pour améliorer organisation et fonctionnement. En ce sens, toutes les sociologies, à travers le monde, tendent à s'américaniser.

Mais ces enquêtes parcellaires comportent un danger: elles tendent à négliger certaines données qui n'apparaissent pas parce qu'elles constituent le milieu ou le conditionnement des faits étudiés. L'étude de l'atelier risque d'omettre les caractères de l'usine dans son ensemble, l'étude de l'usine le caractère de l'entreprise capitaliste, l'étude de l'entreprise le caractère du régime du marché, l'étude du marché les caractères psycho-sociaux de la culture américaine. Les sociologues américains ne sont nullement inconscients de ce danger et leurs efforts théoriques tendent à y parer par une reconstitution de l'ensemble social, grâce à un système complet de variables.

Ces efforts théoriques ramènent la sociologie aux débats traditionnels sur le concept du *social*, sur le sens, formel ou matériel, de ce concept, sur la conception particulariste (sociologie, science d'un aspect de la réalité) ou universaliste (sociologie, science de la totalité). Ces débats, à leur tour, sont, en fait, liés aux controverses philosophiques, à la diversité de systèmes conceptuels. Inévitablement, à ce niveau, l'organisation universitaire, la formation initiale des sociologues (juristes, anthropologues, économistes, etc.), les préférences philosophiques

(vision individualiste ou "globaliste" des ensembles sociaux) influent sur le développement des théories sociologiques. Le relativisme n'est pourtant pas le dernier mot de cette "sociologie de la sociologie." Etant admis que chaque société nationale, chaque moment historique a reçu des traditions et découvre des problèmes, la sociologie n'en a pas moins un thème central, le développement de la société industrielle, thème qui s'articule en plusieurs thèmes subsidiaires, phases du développement, rapports de cette société aux sociétés du passé, rapports de cette société à la culture propre de chaque unité nationale ou de chaque unité supranationale, etc. Ce thème lui-même nous aide à comprendre la multiplicité des grandes écoles sociologiques selon les phases de développement (Marx et l'industrie textile du XIX<sup>ème</sup> siècle), selon le sens donné à la société industrielle (rationalisation, machinisme, etc.), selon l'aspect de cette société qui passe pour décisif (lutte de classes ou rationalisation du travail), selon le principe de synthèse retenu (classes, formes de production, rationalisation, etc.). La sociologie de la sociologie montre le sens de la multiplicité des écoles, de leur rivalité et de leur co-opération. L'étude comparée des régimes économico-sociaux dérive spontanément de cette confrontation des sociologies en même temps que des sociétés.

Cette étude comparée permet-elle de connaître l'avenir grâce à la détermination des lois du développement historique? Nous voudrions sur deux exemples indiquer quel genre de prévisions est possible, quelle équivoque recèlent les propositions courantes.

La propriété individuelle des moyens de production est-elle exclue par les lois du développement historique? Pour répondre à une telle question, encore faudrait-il préciser la signification que l'on donne au concept de "propriété privée." Les grandes corporations sont-elles ou non propriété privée? Si l'on tient ces corporations pour propriété collective, il n'est pas illégitime de prévoir que, pour les principales industries, la propriété individuelle doit disparaître. Si, en revanche, seule la propriété étatique de type soviétique est considérée comme propriété collective, annoncer la diffusion universelle de cette dernière forme de propriété, c'est annoncer que le régime soviétique actuel servira de modèle à tous les régimes de l'avenir. Une telle prévision n'est certainement pas démontrée scientifiquement, surtout pas si l'on se réfère au marxisme, puisque celui-ci suggérait une dépendance des rapports de production par rapport aux forces de production et que ces forces de production, dans le Russie de 1917, étaient moins développées que dans les pays d'Occident. Dans cette perspective, le régime de type soviétique accompagnerait plutôt une phase de développement que l'Occident a déjà traversée. Une argumentation du même genre s'appliquerait aux problèmes de la planification: la prévision formelle d'une certaine planification est possible et peu intéressante, la prévision d'une planification soviétique serait instructive mais elle est arbitraire. A propos des institutions politiques—parti unique ou



partis multiples, élections unanimes ou contestées—il serait plus difficile encore de donner la formule soviétique pour l'avenir inévitable ou prévisible.

Personnellement, je ne donnerai pas le régime de type occidental pour le vainqueur, à l'avance désigné, de la compétition pacifique. La sociologie, me semble-t-il, ne peut ni désigner le vainqueur ni affirmer qu'il est déjà désigné (par qui?) ni même affirmer qu'il y aura *un* vainqueur. Non que la sociologue soit sceptique, mais seuls les enfants veulent connaître dès le début la fin de l'histoire ou du moins être assurés que l'histoire aura une fin. Ne serait-il pas temps que la sociologie arrivât à l'âge mur et cessât de baptiser scientifique la prévision du *happy ending*?

National and Regional  
Studies

## La Sociologie Française

FRANCOIS BOURRICAUD

(Professeur de Sociologie à l'Université de Bordeaux)

L'état présent de la sociologie française ne s'explique pas seulement par quelques caractères distinctifs de notre société: sans doute le regain d'intérêt pour les sciences sociales qui s'y manifeste depuis la fin de la seconde guerre mondiale est lié aux transformations, au rajeunissement de notre pays. Mais les formes qu'a prises la curiosité sociologique en France doivent beaucoup au passé et à des traditions déjà anciennes.

C'est un lieu commun de voir dans Auguste Comte le fondateur de la sociologie française. Mais cette filiation ne doit pas nous faire oublier l'intérêt de la " philosophie des lumières " pour les problèmes sociaux, et les tentatives de quelques mathématiciens illustres comme Condorcet, Lagrange, Poisson, qui ont essayé, avec des fortunes diverses, de combiner le calcul des probabilités à une psychologie sommaire, pour résoudre certains problèmes pratiques comme l'organisation et le vote des assemblées. A bien des égards, l'effort, comtiste se présente comme une réaction, peut-être comme une régression: Comte a développé avec prolixité quelques thèmes que la théorie sociologique ultérieure devait enrichir: la distinction du pouvoir temporel et du pouvoir spirituel, la notion de consensus, la notion de division du travail. On peut même trouver chez lui l'ébauche de la méthode fonctionnaliste: les diverses activités humaines sont présentées comme liées, la société décrite comme un " système." Mais sa contribution proprement " positive " reste plus discutable: elle se réduit à une philosophie de l'histoire qui attribue aux Etats membres de la " République occidentale " une prépondérance exclusive. Ses vues sur l'organisation familiale sont dénuées de tout relativisme anthropologique. La sociologie comtiste qui est une tentative de restauration ou de reconstruction de l' " ordre " spirituel et temporel, étouffe entre les limites étroites que le génie impérieux de son fondateur lui avait assignées.

L'authentique père de la sociologie française, et jusqu'à ce jour son représentant le plus illustre, c'est Emile Durkheim. Ce très grand esprit possédait une combinaison d'aptitudes exceptionnelles. A une capacité architectonique qui lui permettait de saisir les liaisons et les ensembles, il joignait un goût très sûr pour l'observation et l'analyse. Les prétentions encyclopédiques de Durkheim peuvent nous paraître aujourd'hui un peu naïves. Durkheim semble parfois avoir cédé à la tentation de " systématiser " l'ensemble de l'évolution humaine—

spécialement au début de sa carrière quand il distingue les deux types de "conscience collective" et qu'il oppose l'intégration sociale par "assimilation" à l'intégration sociale par "différenciation." Mais ses analyses, même les plus ambitieuses, restent toujours liées à l'interprétation de faits et de matériel ethnologiques (comme dans *Les formes élémentaires de la vie religieuse*), ou sociologiques (comme dans son livre célèbre sur le *Suicide*). A cet égard, la réussite de Durkheim dans notre tradition sociologique toujours tourmentée par les démons de la philosophie, est bien près d'être exemplaire: une sorte d'équilibre est réalisé entre l'ampleur du dessein et la rigueur scrupuleuse des moyens mis en oeuvre. Ne dissimulons pas les faiblesses de ce grand homme: son dogmatisme, sa manie de régenter, son goût de la polémique, la vendetta impitoyablement poursuivie contre Tarde et contre l'école de Le Play, une certaine étroitesse (qui d'ailleurs a été exagérée par des vulgarisateurs un peu plats). La grande infortune de la sociologie durkheimienne est d'être devenue entre les deux guerres une sorte de substitut honteux et clandestin de l'idéologie officielle. Auguste Comte ambitionnait pour le sociologue un rôle décisif dans la régulation du pouvoir spirituel. La sociologie durkheimienne a été près de réaliser cette ambition: elle y a plus perdu que gagné.

Durkheim n'était pas seulement un chercheur et un penseur de la plus haute distinction; il forma des disciples qui dans les 20 premières années du siècle assurèrent à son école une audience et un crédit mérités. Il faut citer ici, outre M. Georges Davy très lié à Durkheim, Marcel Mauss dont l'oeuvre a exercé une influence bien au-delà du cercle de ceux qui ont bénéficié de son enseignement, et deux sociologues tournés l'un et l'autre vers les problèmes économiques: François Simiand et Maurice Halbwachs. L'oeuvre de Simiand a eu un retentissement considérable chez les historiens, et n'est pas sans avoir fait impression sur quelques économistes; celle d'Halbwachs riche en observations très fines est encore aujourd'hui d'un grand secours pour qui se préoccupe d'une interprétation concrète et réaliste des comportements du consommateur. Vers 1930, le rayonnement de l'école durkheimienne commence à baisser. Raymond Aron publie son premier livre *La sociologie allemande* en 1934, qui attire l'intérêt sur l'oeuvre de Max Weber dont la tonalité surprend et choque des esprits formés au positivisme durkheimien. Cette mise en cause du positivisme est poursuivi dans un tout autre esprit par M. Georges Gurvitch dont les premières oeuvres sont consacrées à l'idée du "droit social." L'intérêt pour la philosophie marxiste déjà si sensible dans les années 30, (*le Matérialisme dialectique* de Henri Lefèbvre paraît quelques années avant la guerre), contribue aussi à détourner quelque peu de la sociologie durkheimienne, ou du moins invite à l'interpréter dans une perspective assez critique.

Lorsque la guerre finit en 1945, la sociologie française doit se réconstituer sur frais nouveaux. Un mouvement de réaction détournera pour un temps les "jeunes" de l'enseignement durkheimien. Ils s'ouvrent aux disciplines et aux méthodes qui fleurissent alors aux

Etats-Unis, et la "recherche" deviendra le maître mot pour cette génération. Ces "recherches" seront conduites dans les secteurs les plus variés. La sociologie industrielle se constitue autour de M. Friedmann; elle se développe autour de quelques préoccupations dont les uns sont spécifiquement françaises, et les autres sont communes à tous les sociologues industriels. L'attention aux "problèmes humains," l'interrogation sur le "destin de la classe ouvrière," s'alimentent largement aux préoccupations idéologiques des chercheurs; le goût pour l'observation directe et immédiate, exprime leur scrupule, leur souci de justification et de vérification. Dans le même temps, d'autres groupes s'organisent qui étudieront la vie sociale et domestique des ouvriers; il faut citer ici les travaux de M. Chombart de Lauwe et de son "équipe." Le monde rural n'est pas oublié; alors que jusqu'ici, il avait été étudié presque exclusivement par les historiens et les géographes. Les changements rapides qu'il subit depuis 1945, intéressent quelques sociologues comme Henri Mendras. Autre nouveauté: l'étude des problèmes religieux relevait traditionnellement des historiens et des ethnologues. M. Le Bras entreprend d'observer la "pratique religieuse" comme un fait de comportement susceptible d'être enregistré et quantifié. Mais si les travaux de M. Le Bras ne commencent à retenir l'attention du grand public qu'après la guerre, ils ont été entrepris et conduits dès le début des années 30. Dans une perspective assez comparable d'observation, d'enregistrement et de comptage, il faut signaler les travaux de géographie électorale qui nous préparent une interprétation nouvelle du régime politique français. M. André Siegfried avait donné de ces études un modèle inoubliable dans son *Tableau politique de la France de l'ouest au début du XIXe siècle*. M. François Goguel et des chercheurs travaillant avec lui à la "Fondation Nationale des Sciences Politiques" poursuit la ligne de travaux amorcés par M. Siegfried et contribue à enrichir la connaissance du comportement électoral. Ce renouveau de curiosité des français pour leur société nous le voyons à l'oeuvre dans les études de sociologie électorale, rurale, industrielle, urbaine, religieuse; mais nous en trouvons un autre signe dans les travaux de quelques ethnologues et spécialement de M. Georges Balandier qui s'intéresse à la transformation des peuples africains colonisés, à leur industrialisation et à leur accession à l'indépendance. L'optique traditionnelle est ainsi renouvelée; au lieu de concentrer son attention sur le fonctionnement instantané d'une société isolée l'observateur s'attache aux contacts, déformations et transformations que ces contacts engendrent pour les sociétés en présence.

Ce qui frappe d'abord dans la sociologie française actuelle, c'est sa vitalité. Après le relatif engourdissement des années 30, notre sociologie a retrouvé un niveau d'activité qui, compte tenu des faibles moyens mis à la disposition des chercheurs, apparaît assez honorable. Mais elle a sûrement perdu par rapport à la grande époque durkheimienne en rigueur et en organisation ce qu'elle a peut-être gagné en variété et en diversité. Les sociologues se trouvent de plus en plus associés à des spécialistes des disciplines voisines. Dans certains domaines, la

collaboration a été fructueuse; par exemple pour l'interprétation des systèmes agraires ou encore pour la représentation spatiale de quelques phénomènes sociaux comme les conduites électorales. La collaboration avec les historiens si elle n'est pas toujours facile, n'a jamais été interrompue. Sans doute les problèmes qui intéressent les sociologues sont-ils bien loin d'être tous résolus par la méthode historique. Mais l'existence d'une revue comme les *Annales*, fondée par Marc Bloch et Lucien Febvre, permet un dialogue continu, et quelques grands ouvrages historiques offrent aux sociologues des thèmes de réflexion autant que des matériaux d'information. En outre, marquons—pour notre part avec la plus grande satisfaction—qu'un des tabous durkheimien, la condamnation de la "psychologie," est en voie de rapide liquidation. Le développement de la psychologie sociale a offert aux sociologues l'occasion d'interpréter un certain nombre de phénomènes sociaux avec plus de finesse et de précision. En revanche nous nous sentons personnellement assez inquiet de la dissociation progressive entre les recherches ethnologiques et les travaux sociologiques. Pour les durkheimiens, ethnologie et sociologie apparaissaient comme inséparables; mais la spécialisation croissante de ces disciplines les a amenées à s'éloigner l'une de l'autre. Il ne nous appartient pas de dire ce que l'ethnologue a perdu; il nous semble qu'en se privant du contact avec des sociétés et des cultures radicalement étrangères, le sociologue s'expose à rester captif des idéologies qui dominent dans sa propre société. M. Levi-Strauss, qui mieux que tout autre français d'aujourd'hui réunit au plus haut point les qualifications de l'ethnologue et du sociologue, a écrit un jour que l'ethnologie est un "dépaysement systématique." Ce "dépaysement" n'est-il pas d'autant plus nécessaire qu'on a plus d'occasion de rester entre soi, et de vivre avec des gens dont les conduites et les habitudes sont plus voisines des nôtres?

Mais si la sociologie française actuelle manifeste des curiosités et des intérêts très divers, parvient-elle à lier d'une manière organique ce faisceau d'intentions, cette multiplicité de directions? La réponse n'est pas aisée. Réfléchissons aux conditions qui ont assuré la croissance harmonieuse de la sociologie durkheimienne. Durkheim maîtrisait les diverses "sciences auxiliaires" de la sociologie

Son information ethnologique était vaste, et précise; ses connaissances statistiques, sans être très profondes, lui mettaient en mains un outil d'analyse à la fois rigoureux et nuancé. Ses travaux sur le suicide, pour sommaires et insuffisants qu'ils paraissent aux statisticiens modernes, constituaient pour l'époque une contribution tout à fait originale et sérieuse. Même si la théorie de la religion que Durkheim a élaborée à partir des travaux de Spencer et Gillin nous apparaît aujourd'hui vétuste et desuète, l'analyse des populations de l'Australie centrale qui lui sert de point de départ et de caution nous frappe encore par sa pertinence et sa fermeté. En outre Durkheim était parvenu à

Quand nous parlons de sciences auxiliaires, nous n'entendons point du tout un asservissement fondé en nature ou en dignité: la sociologie peut en soi être traitée comme une discipline auxiliaire par d'autres sciences sociales.

placer ses recherches dans une perspective bien liée, à les rattacher à ses préoccupations philosophiques fondamentales. Non seulement la sociologie durkheimienne avait réussi à établir un contrôle efficace sur les diverses disciplines et méthodes aux informations et aux sources desquelles elle recourait, mais elle avait su aménager des rapports viables avec la philosophie et l'idéologie dominante de son époque. Qu'il entrât pour une large part dans cette harmonie beaucoup de dogmatisme et un peu de naïveté, nous ne le nierons pas. D'ailleurs les périodes assez heureuses pour associer la croissance et la stabilité sont exceptionnelles. En tout cas, il faut convenir que la situation a beaucoup changé depuis Durkheim. D'abord les " sciences auxiliaires " ont connu elles-mêmes des développements très rapides. Durkheim réussissait à se tenir au courant des recherches les plus significatives en ethnologie et en sociologie: qui pourrait aujourd'hui prétendre à une information très sérieuse dans l'un et l'autre domaine? En outre, la " mathématisation " progressive des sciences sociales—qu'elle soit imputable aux progrès et aux raffinements de la statistique, ou aux recherches logico-mathématiques qui ont fleuri autour de la théorie des jeux—rend de plus en plus difficile à la plupart des sociologues une connaissance de première main des problèmes posés par les progrès de disciplines connexes et voisines de leur science. Ils n'ont que trop tendance à se rassurer en se persuadant que de telles recherches sont vaines. N'empêche que cette carence pèse lourdement sur le contrôle que notre discipline peut exercer sur ses " auxiliaires." En outre l'espèce d'ingénuité idéologique dans laquelle Durkheim menait ses recherches, ne nous est plus permise. La conjoncture très particulière qui a vu après 1945 le renouveau de la curiosité sociologique en France, a été saturée de querelles, de " débats " et d'arrière-pensées idéologiques. La fascination qu'a exercée le marxisme à la fois sur ses partisans et sur ses adversaires, a obligé les uns et les autres à prendre conscience des objectifs, des limites, de la " relativité " de la recherche sociologique. Aussi la sociologie française s'est-elle trouvée dans le temps même où s'affirmait sa vitalité, soumise à des tensions et des déchirements très douloureux. Comme nous avons du mal à suivre et à coordonner les diverses tentatives lancées d'un peu partout sur tous les points du champ de bataille des sciences sociales, nous avons, (du moins pour certains d'entre nous) le sentiment désagréable d'être inférieurs à notre tâche et de ne pouvoir correctement faire notre métier. En outre, si peu que nous nous interrogeons sur le sens de notre activité nous étions amenés à la mettre en cause, et, (pour beaucoup d'entre nous), nous nous sentions incapables d'en trouver une justification, sinon dans nos goûts et nos préférences personnelles. S'agit-il d'une " crise " spécifiquement française? Ces difficultés sont-elles inséparables de la condition du sociologue? Moins la conscience du relativisme idéologique est forte, moins cette crise est ressentie; plus le contrôle que la discipline exerce sur ses méthodes et sur ses outils est efficace, moins le sentiment d'inadéquation et d'impuissance est douloureux. L'actuelle sociologie française se caractérise-t-elle par une conscience déchirée des limites imposées aux recherches sociologiques, combinée à une appréciation

très réaliste ou même pessimiste des insuffisances et des défaillances de son propre outil? Peut-être faudrait-il chercher du côté de la structure particulière du pouvoir spirituel dans notre société. Comte voyait dans la sociologie la "systématisation" la plus compréhensive et, dans notre discipline le régulateur de la conscience collective; Durkheim sur ce point semble avoir suivi l'enseignement positiviste. Dans quelle mesure cette conviction que le sociologue promu à la qualité peu enviable de "spécialiste des généralités," a-t-elle été partagée en dehors de nos cercles? Elle a alimenté au début du siècle les interminables querelles entre philosophes rationalistes et sociologues durkheimiens sur la distinction entre le "fait" et le "droit," entre l'"éthique" et "la science des moeurs." Elle n'est pas étrangère aux difficultés qui se sont instaurées entre certains durkheimiens et les marxistes. En tout cas, elle apparaît bien comme caractéristique de la sociologie française. Est-il raisonnable d'assigner à une discipline, riche surtout de promesses, de telles ambitions? Peut-on tenir pour légitimes les fins et les valeurs du sens commun? Même si une prudente réserve eut été plus avisée, l'acuité des débats idéologiques dans notre société nous ramenait sans cesse à de telles questions; mais peut-être du même coup avons-nous tendance à nous écarter des recherches minutieuses, dont l'intérêt semble résider non pas dans les conséquences que le lecteur peut en dégager, mais dans les résultats vérifiés qu'elles nous apportent. Les travaux strictement empiriques n'ont jamais eu chez nous trop bonne réputation; on leur reproche leur étroitesse: "tant de peine de temps et d'argent dépensé pour si peu de chose." Sans doute pourrions-nous citer quelques études empiriques récentes et remarquables; mais elles se présentent toujours comme des "essais;" de rapides "sondages" dont on laisse à d'autres le soin de jauger les promesses, ou bien des constructions ambitieuses, des "mises en forme" qui ordonnent, classent, plus qu'elles approfondissent ou enrichissent. Sans doute les crédits manquent-ils pour entreprendre de longues recherches; en outre, nous ne possédons pas assez de chercheurs qualifiés. Peut-être peut-on invoquer aussi le manque de co-opération et d'"esprit d'équipe." Pourtant des groupes permanents se sont constitués, par exemple autour de M. Georges Friedmann pour la sociologie industrielle, de M. Chombart de Lauwe pour la sociologie urbaine. Mais ces équipes se heurtent à des difficultés administratives très sérieuses. La "recherche" constitue à beaucoup d'égards une sorte de cul-de-sac; sans doute est-il possible d'y faire carrière, mais il est assez difficile de passer de la "Recherche" à l'Université. Les "chercheurs" se trouvent bloqués sur une piste qui ne les ramène que très irrégulièrement vers la "voie royale" de l'enseignement; quant aux "enseignants" ils ne disposent pas en général de beaucoup de moyens pour conduire efficacement des recherches empiriques de quelque ampleur. Beaucoup de nos "chercheurs" sont au regard des professeurs d'université des "franc-tireurs." (Des jugements non moins sévères venus de l'autre bord font contre poids à cette sévérité). Mais si les "chercheurs" sont en général dépourvus des vénérables parchemins, c'est que pour la plupart ils les ont dédaignés. Aussi le recrutement des "chercheurs" reste assez largement



distinct du recrutement des "enseignants." Nos grands concours universitaires recrutent des professeurs et le critère de sélection reste très largement rhétorique, et dans une moindre mesure pédagogique. Une bonne partie des jeunes gens que la recherche sociologique attire se sentent plus désireux de participer activement à l'examen et à la solution de problèmes en cours et de travailler à des recherches originales. En général nos jeunes sociologues sont des esprits "inquiets,"\* que leur première formation a déçus, et irrités, que le moule de notre enseignement universitaire a laissés insatisfait. La vocation sociologique fait souvent suite à une première déception : chez des économistes sensibles à l'étroitesse de leur discipline, des historiens ou des géographes à la recherche de principes . . . Cette variété d'origine atteste une richesse de curiosité, qui les rend très exigeants pour la nouvelle discipline qu'ils viennent d'embrasser, insatisfaits qu'ils étaient en général par leurs études antérieures. Si les premiers pas du sociologue sont difficiles, la suite de sa carrière ne l'est pas moins : l'université française ne nous offre pas beaucoup plus d'une demi douzaine de chaires, en comptant toutes celles de Paris et de la province, car la sociologie n'est enseignée que dans les universités. Jusqu'à ces toutes dernières années, elle n'apparaissait que comme un certificat pour la licence de philosophie. Depuis un an, une licence de sociologie a été instituée,—mais elle ne confère pas le droit d'enseigner dans les établissements secondaires. L'enseignement de la sociologie se faufile dans les "instituts d'études politiques" ou dans les "centres de préparation aux affaires;" mais cette introduction récente reste précaire et limitée. Aussi le chercheur ne doit pas songer à une carrière facile dans l'université, (dont l'accès, plénier lui est en outre barré par la longue épreuve rituelle du doctorat). Il ne peut pas beaucoup plus compter sur l'administration ou le secteur privé pour élargir les maigres débouchés que lui offre l'université : il est vrai que l'industrie demande quelques sociologues, de même que quelques administrations s'intéressent à l'aménagement du territoire. Mais ces diverses perspectives restent assez limitées. Ajoutons que les rapports entre le sociologue et ses "utilisateurs" sont souvent difficiles. Nos sociologues ne sont que très partiellement "professionalisés;" même s'ils médisent de la tour d'ivoire, ils n'ont pas renoncé à l'idéal de connaissance désintéressée, de recherche "pure" auquel leurs clients de l'industrie ou de l'administration restent souvent fermés. Peut-être jugera-t-on que cette peinture est poussée au noir, mais il nous semble que l'on qualifierait assez bien le sociologue français par sa "marginalité." Nous avons vu qu'il lui est difficile de se faire une place dans l'université; et cependant il répugne à s'en séparer tout à fait. C'est qu'il ne lui plaît guère d'être un pur "professionnel," et en général il énonce des jugements peu favorables sur ses collègues qui consacrent tout leur temps à des recherches "payées" par l'administration ou par les "affaires." Même le titre de "chercheur" dont quelques uns se parent avec une prédilection frappante, masque quelque gêne et beaucoup d'ambiguïté. D'abord, la "recherche" doit être "désintéressée," elle doit contribuer à la solution de quelques "grands prob-

\* au sens hispanique du terme.

lèmes:" toute description purement empirique quand elle atteint un certain degré de minutie, court toujours en France le risque d'être tenue pour dérisoire ou arbitraire. La subtilité des interprétations nous fait dire que l'auteur va chercher "midi à quatorze heure;" et l'abondance du détail nous le fait accuser de myopie.

Dans la variété des oeuvres et des tentatives, quelles tendances semblent aujourd'hui dominantes dans notre sociologie? Distingons quelques tendances essentielles dans notre actuelle production sociologique. Plaçons dans un premier groupe les oeuvres qui s'intéressent à l'interprétation globale des sociétés industrielles modernes. Ainsi, M. Raymond Aron dans ses livres postérieurs à la guerre, et dans les cours qu'il donne à la Sorbonne depuis 1955, a repris à la lumière des hypothèses et des faits récents les schémas par lesquels les grandes sociologies historisantes du siècle dernier s'efforçaient de saisir la spécificité, d'expliquer le développement et de prévoir les avatars des sociétés occidentales. Ce champ d'étude associe étroitement à la sociologie proprement dite des disciplines voisines, surtout l'économie et la science politique. De leur côté les spécialistes de ces disciplines lorsqu'ils s'intéressent aux phénomènes de la "croissance" ou de l'"industrialisation," sont amenés à déborder le champ de leurs spécialités et à y introduire des faits et des hypothèses empruntés à la réflexion sociologique: les "données institutionnelles," "culturelles," sont fréquemment invoquées par les économistes pour rendre compte du fonctionnement des systèmes et des mécanismes qu'une théorie strictement économique se reconnaît de moins en moins capable d'expliquer intégralement.

Cet intérêt pour l'interprétation globale des sociétés industrielles n'épuise pas, et de loin, les possibilités de l'actuelle sociologie française. Bien qu'il préfère se qualifier lui-même d'ethnologue, et qu'il n'accepte qu'avec beaucoup de réserve et de méfiance le titre de sociologue, M. Lévi-Strauss exerce sur une fraction des sociologues français, (même ceux qui ne sont pas professionnellement des ethnologues) une profonde influence. L'effort pour retrouver dans les faits sociaux des relations intelligibles, pour réduire leur complexités à des systèmes de rapport qui en expliquent à la fois la forme actuelle, la genèse, et le développement, apparaît à bon nombre comme la tentative la plus hardie et la plus adéquate, pour faire des "sciences sociales" des sciences sans guillemets. De nombreuses discussions se sont déroulées autour de l'oeuvre de M. Lévi-Strauss; son "formalisme" les rapprochements qu'il s'est efforcé d'établir entre l'analyse sociologique et l'analyse linguistique, ses réflexions sur l'application des mathématiques aux sciences sociales, ont donné lieu à des appréciations diverses mais sont apparues à tous comme un des efforts les plus vigoureux et les plus originaux.

M. Gurvitch dont l'oeuvre d'avant-guerre concernait sociologie du droit, maintenant un esprit critique toujours en éveil s'est efforcé de juger les contributions de ses compatriotes et des sociologues étrangers à la lumière d'un idéal très haut et très ambitieux de l'analyse

sociologique. L'effet salubre de l'enseignement et des publications de M. Gurvitch a été de sans cesse rappeler deux exigences difficilement conciliables: l'analyse sociologique ne doit pas perdre de vue les relations ou formes de sociabilité qui sont le plus aisément saisissables dans les "groupes particuliers" et dans les "groupes restreints," mais elle ne doit pas non plus négliger l'aspect "total" ou "global" des phénomènes sociaux. L'avertissement de M. Gurvitch était opportun pour tous ceux qui avaient tendance à accorder un privilège indu à des aspects particuliers, (c'est à dire abstraits) de la réalité sociale, et à oublier que cette réalité n'est pleinement compréhensible que dans son expression "totale" et "globale."

Examinons pour conclure l'image que la sociologie française donne de notre société. D'abord cette image reste assez fragmentaire et superficielle: rien de comparable chez nous à la contribution massive que les sociologues américains ont apportée à la connaissance de leur propre société. En outre, ce que nous savons de la France d'aujourd'hui, nous ne le devons pas seulement aux sociologues; des monographies régionales écrites par des géographes, des études économiques nous ont appris beaucoup. Disons pourtant que dans la contribution des sociologues deux traits se dégagent qui caractériseraient la présente société française. Nous avons été extrêmement sensibles à ce que M. Alfred Sauvy (démographe dont l'oeuvre très riche et très diverse intéresse à la fois l'économie et la sociologie), appelle le "malthusianisme français." La rigidité des habitudes et des opinions politiques par exemple, avait été depuis longtemps soulignée par les travaux de M. Siegfried et apparaît comme une des hypothèses les plus intéressantes suggérées par les recherches de sociologie électorale. Le conservatisme de nos chefs d'entreprise que l'on a tendance à opposer au "dynamisme" de l'entrepreneur selon Schumpeter a longtemps constitué un des lieux communs de l'analyse sociologique autant qu'économique. Il a fallu la très rapide expansion d'après 1952, pour que la tendance à cet égard commence à se renverser. Mais la société française n'apparaît pas seulement aux yeux de ceux qui l'étudient comme une société conservatrice, mais aussi comme une société divisée par les conflits idéologiques. L'opposition entre la "droite" et la "gauche," l'intensité des luttes de classes, la rivalité entre les groupes d'âge si sensible par l'insistance des partis français même les plus vétustes à se donner pour "jeunes" et pour défenseurs des "jeunes," le caractère inexpiable de certaines rivalités et de certains conflits, l'âpreté des querelles idéologiques ne suggère pas seulement que la France est divisée, mais qu'elle prend goût à ses divisions, qu'elle aime leur donner une expression radicale et extrême, et surtout à les revêtir de tous les ornements de la "rationalisation" idéologique. La France, nation "statique," "conservatrice" ou "regressive" et idéologiquement divisée, tels sont les deux stéréotypes les plus communs chez les français qui professionnellement s'intéressent à leur propre société. Il serait curieux d'examiner si l'image que spécialistes étrangers se font de la France, se superpose à celle que les spécialistes français en donnent et s'en font. Le thème du "malthusianisme" semble avoir trouvé le plus grand crédit: il est

présent aussi bien dans les travaux d'un universitaire américain comme M. Sawyer que<sup>1</sup> dans les observations d'un journaliste suisse comme M. Herbert Luthy<sup>2</sup>. En revanche, touchant le second thème, les étrangers ont une position assez différente de celle des observateurs français. Dans un ouvrage ingénieux, consacré au "malaise politique en France," un sociologue américain M. Nathan Leites souligne l'absence de toute base idéologique dans les conflits qui déchirent notre monde politique et parlementaire. Au niveau de l'observation anthropologique, divers auteurs sont amenés à des conclusions voisines: la violence et l'intensité des conflits recouvriraient des zones de consensus plus larges et plus solides qu'il est généralement supposé. Ce désaccord—ou du moins cette divergence—entre les observateurs français et leurs collègues étrangers nous amène à nous demander dans quelle mesure les français ne sont pas victimes des limitations propres à leur qualité d'observateurs participant à la société qu'ils décrivent. La position de l'intellectuel dans la société française n'amène-t-elle pas celui-ci à exagérer les aspects de tension et de conflit, à négliger les bases d'accord explicite et surtout implicite? Cette question très difficile nous conduirait à entreprendre la sociologie de l'intellectuel. Celui-ci est-il par la logique même de son rôle, critique de sa propre société? L'exemple de nos collègues américains et soviétiques nous dissuade de répondre affirmativement à cette question. Mais d'autre part, l'attitude critique de l'intellectuel vis-à-vis de sa société doit-elle être toujours interprétée comme un signe morbide pour la société, ou comme l'indice d'un "malaise" chez l'intellectuel? Pour aucune catégorie d'intellectuels, plus que pour le sociologue, il n'y a de question plus importante. Disons que nous ne prétendons être ni les avocats ni les accusateurs de notre société, mais n'oublions pas que même lorsque nous prenons du recul vis-à-vis d'elle, notre attitude et notre jugement sont pour une large part préparés par la "culture" qu'elle nous a transmises. C'est en comprenant sa société que le sociologue peut comprendre son propre rôle, et sa propre destination; la conscience de soi et la connaissance d'autrui constituent une seule entreprise, même si les modalités et les directions en semblent à première vue distinctes et irréductibles. Il ne nous appartient pas, ou du moins il n'appartient pas à nous seuls, de décider dans quelle mesure les sociologues français sont conscients d'eux-mêmes et "connaissent" leur propre société. Les quelques notes qui précèdent auront peut-être contribué à éclairer le problème en rendant sensible le contraste entre l'ampleur de nos ambitions et l'exiguité des moyens dont nous disposons, la fragilité de nos résultats. Mais c'est seulement une étude systématique du sociologue dans le "milieu intellectuel" français qui pourrait nous permettre de répondre à cette question.

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup> In William Miller, *Men in Business*, pp. 7-23.

<sup>2</sup> H. Luthy, *La France à l'heure de son clocher*.

## Contemporary German Sociology\*<sup>1</sup>

T. W. ADORNO

(Professor of Philosophy and Sociology, University of Frankfurt)

No simple survey can accomplish the task of depicting the present condition of German sociology; in order to understand the situation, we have to formulate, upon reflection, some general notions of it. We must begin, of course, with the situation after the war. We have to recall not alone the general vacuum which then prevailed in German academic life, the isolation of German development from the international one as a whole, but a specific fact: the hostility of Hitler and his intellectual bailiffs to sociology as a science. We interpret this hostility in terms themselves far too ideological, should we attribute it (as the National Socialists themselves might do) to their emphasis on factors which have been termed natural and constant, and connected with a supposed "human nature" as opposed to factors historical and social. These ostensibly natural factors (not to mention the phoney mythologies of the twentieth century) were nothing of the kind. They were arbitrary postulates, protected by brute force from scientific criticism, and imposed as a *Weltanschauung* for political purposes. The National Socialists' hatred of sociology expressed nothing more than a simple fear of that knowledge which might disturb the real determining forces of society: differences of interest and relationships of power. The more stubbornly the Nazis ruled, the more obdurately were these denied.

Precisely the propagandistic theses asserted by the regime, but which it took seriously only as an instrument of power, could have been uncovered—as ideology—by sociology; thus the discipline appeared dangerous. In short, sociology struck those in power, to use their term, as a disintegrating force. A cheap exploitation of a verbal similarity associated it with socialism—despite the fact that the specific conception of sociology stemming from Comte was hardly designed to increase the dynamics of the forces released by the emancipation of the Fourth Estate, but rather served the defence against them. It did not trouble the National Socialists that their bogey-man, sociology, repeating Plato's claims, asserted that it could direct society from the social position it occupied by virtue of its scientific objectivity, beyond the play of social forces. Finally, National Socialism, simultaneously pseudo-revolutionary and pseudo-conservative, came to hold

\* Translated from the German by Norman Birnbaum

against sociology less its partisanship than its objectivity, just as today in the dictatorships of the East "objectivism" is a term of abuse and a deadly threat.

Immediately after the war, therefore, the doors were thrown open, and as much as possible was admitted of what, for twelve years, had been missed—above all, from America, where just since the early 1930's, one particular branch of sociology, empirical social research had (under the demands of communication, market and opinion research) developed the most refined methods. And these were developed on a front so broad as to be hardly conceivable in Germany.

The most obvious tendency in post-war German sociology is the recourse to these methods and the retreat of theory. Before the catastrophe sociological theory was characteristic of Germany: it deeply permeated the work even of a sociologist like Max Weber, in so many respects already empirically and positivistically inclined. While he conceived of himself as the advocate of a value-free sociology in opposition to the remaining philosophical-metaphysical components in sociology (his Ideal Type was entirely conceived in nominalistic terms and he denied to it any substantiality), Weber devoted a large part of his work to methodology, in the form of philosophical reflection on the nature and procedures of sociology. One of his central ideas, that of understanding (*Verstehen*), which he held in common with the contemporary philosopher Wilhelm Dilthey, was itself still a piece of philosophical speculation. He sought to penetrate society in the hope that it was essentially determined by spiritual forces—and similar to the understanding mind. Post-war German social inquiry, however, seeks to assimilate its methods as much as possible to the quantitative and classificatory procedures of the natural sciences, from which Weber (a follower of South-west German idealism in his view of science) wanted to separate social inquiry as an area *sui generis*.

We may characterize the present situation of German sociology, rather drastically, as one of schism from philosophy. It is not accidental that in the post-war years representatives of the older generation alone, like Rüstow and Freyer, attempted total depictions of contemporary society's essential problems; a view of totality is necessarily philosophical.<sup>2</sup> The absence of any clear-cut limitations of sociology, the possibility of including everything conceivable in it, is an insufficient explanation of why the younger sociologists have so completely renounced the aims which dominated their discipline from Comte and Spencer through Pareto. What has changed is the cultural and intellectual attitude: the younger generation of sociologists themselves belong to that supposedly sceptical generation, which otherwise provides one of their favourite objects of inquiry. They prefer to stick to specific and intermediate ranges of phenomena, which they regard as ascertainable and certain; they prefer to abandon pretensions

which they consider (more or less) as the legacy of a period when sociology's specific tasks, and therewith its methods, were not clearly formulated—pretensions which, in their view, ought to be liquidated. In their thought, they incline to identify themselves expressly with the tendency to specialization rather than treating it critically; frequently, however, this tendency triumphs objectively, even against the will and wishes of the scholar.

This development was not merely stimulated from outside, for instance, by American influence—although the German tendency to go from one extreme to the other is evident in a certain desire to out-Americanise the Americans, just when the latter are moving towards critical and philosophical reflection in sociology. American and German sociology has been drawn appreciably closer to one another from antithetical poles; German sociology has been drawn into that international process of integration which seems to correspond to the division of the world into large units with large-scale social planning.

But it has reached this point because of its own intrinsic tension—between the philosophical idea, without which sociology is unable to apprehend its object, society, and the empirical determination of fact, without whose resistance to wild ideas and mythology thought is condemned to impotence in society: the more impotent, the more grandiose its aims. Precisely that *motive* of the opaque and the hidden, which (in opposition to the philosophical tradition) empirical research so emphatically brings out, is a constituent of society itself: it expresses the fact that society, like history, moves forward over the minds of men. Emile Durkheim defined the social fact, with entire consistency, through the compulsion encountered by the single subject; he equated blind, collective regularity with the actual object of sociology—an object which, in contradiction to the doctrine of his contemporary Max Weber, was not “understandable.”

The divergence between Weber and Durkheim reflected an antinomy basic to the subject matter. Non-philosophical sociology aims at mere, descriptions and systematizations of whatever is the case. But this, unrelated to the concepts that are themselves expressions of the social structure, is not really true: it is an appearance, a façade. On the other hand, sociology has been compelled to emancipate itself from philosophy in order to match that conception of science to which, since its inception, it has been attached: positivism. This process in the history of ideas is a late and partial aspect of that inclusive one in which philosophy, in the course of an all-embracing process of Enlightenment, had to surrender more and more realms of fact to the individual sciences. Nature and History as subjects of rational enquiry have now been followed by those social questions which, since the Platonic Republic, philosophy had sought to solve. The shadow of regression has accompanied that progressive differentiation of method, accomplished

by a progressive division of labour, which cost that view of totality by metaphysics. (And the rationality of yesterday is invariably the metaphysical prejudice of today). The case of sociology, developed late and synchronized with society's regressive movement, makes that clear. Insistently, sociology has sought to distinguish itself from the neighbouring sciences, above all from psychology and political economy, and this with a zeal itself hardly rational—derived from the predominance of methodological interests over those in content.

Sociology's concerns have grown thin—a consequence of its loss of concern with essential economic questions, which inquired into those underlying processes by which society produces and reproduces itself, and which infuse life into the so-called forms of sociability (*vergesellschaftung*). A science which hopes to extract and crystallize "the social" by abstraction from the problems entailed in the relationship of social forces to the process of society's own self-preservation, is compelled to fetichize what remains as "inter-personal relations." The functions, and essential contradictions, of these relations in the human metabolic exchange with nature and with the whole of society, are ignored. Thus sociology becomes social psychology, something which it finds no less embarrassing by the standards of "scientific" tidiness.

In contemporary German "Realistic Sociology" in fact, inter-personal relations within economic units are often isolated from the actual situations of economic interest and assigned to motives ostensibly specific to the organization of each enterprise. But the results of investigations conceived in other terms show that these motives are in fact the character masks assumed by the society's total system of economic conditions. These conditions are present in every single enterprise, but they cannot be attributed to the forms of inter-personal relations prevailing in it.<sup>3</sup>

It may be remarked, incidentally, that this development in sociology corresponds to what has happened on the other side: economics isolated from sociology on the map of the sciences, for its part, has renounced the claim to depict the central life processes of society. Economics leaves this to sociology, which itself has withdrawn from the problem. Contemporary economics has devised, with a highly developed mathematical apparatus, schemata for dealing with possible relationships within already developed economies of exchange—without tolerating within its own boundaries the analysis of the exchange relationship itself, its social nature and dynamics. The concern which lends to both sociology and economics their *raison d'être* has disappeared in the cleft between them: the one expects from the other, what each does not accomplish; and precisely to ignore this problem constitutes the "scientific" pride of each.



The divorce of sociology from psychology is no less precarious. If we concentrate upon subjective and irrational "inter-personal relations", we cannot evade psychology. Freud, in *Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego*, has remarked that it was crudely dogmatic to contrast a specifically sociological, collective psychology with the psychology of individuals. But a bias has been introduced into sociology through the shift of emphasis to society's subjective elements: it deals, allegedly, directly with human beings and not with those institutions which constitute their objective conditions of existence. It is not accidental that the phrase "the only important thing is the human personality" has long since been degraded to an ideological slogan. All of this is useful to vested interests which expect from sociology, basically, reliable information on the smooth organization of human groups—and advice on "steering" them, to use a current term.

But all of these things are not simply faulty developments and distorted conceptions, which can be corrected from the outside by recalling the great sociological traditions (in fact, half forgotten). Nor can it be corrected by the infusion of philosophical ideas, or even of what are referred to as "models". The logic of the process, the effort to construct a specifically sociological *corpus* immune to attack and criticism entails, inevitably, the fullest development of those limitations on sociology which produce quietism: the relevant questions are eliminated, and the result is a regression of the social consciousness expressed in this form of scientific reflection.

The impetus of post-war German sociology responded to a genuine need. To meet the tasks of planning which arose after total defeat, the physical destruction of the cities, after events like the advent of millions of refugees, reliable and informative data were required. The methods of "administrative research" were indispensable to government agencies: problems like the potential for adjustment of the refugees and returned prisoners could not be dealt with simply by social statistical reports.

Extensive investigations, in many respects contradicting each other, sought to determine whether and to what degree the family resisted the uprooting of entire population strata in the immediate post-war period. Inevitably and understandably, the approach entailed a certain pro-familial tendency which communicated itself in the results—despite all the methods and techniques of research employed. In this context, it was easy to underestimate the long range tendency towards a weakening of the family. This came very close, theoretically, to the affirmation of social ties for their own sake—or for their integrative effect in certain situations. The substantial worth and legitimacy of these ties, however, were hardly questioned any more: to have done so would have contravened the anti-philosophical taboo in sociology.

The extraordinary interest in industrial sociology and the sociology of the work unit also had its bases in today's reality. After the more or less authoritarian inner organization of German heavy industry, which developed in the Wilhelmenian Empire, persisted through the Weimar Republic and was reinforced under the Hitler regime, new forms were developed which were adapted to democratic procedures in organization, in the kinds of psychological requirements they posed, and in an infinite number of separate questions like the Law on Co-determination. For this reason, information was needed about the workers' subjective consciousness: this was only to be obtained by sociological survey techniques.

These research interests were also fused with an anti-theoretical tendency, even where post-war sociology was supported by workers' organizations. A vacuum was created by the quiet rejection of Marxist theory—a result, on the one hand, of the history of German Social Democracy and, on the other hand, of the confiscation and demagogic falsification of dialectical materialism by the Russian dictatorship. The single substitute which seemed to fit into the tradition of scientific activity in the working class movement—without being either Marxist or very obviously anti-Marxist—was value-free empirical sociology. The pathos of disenchantment, the realism, on which sociology insisted in its most recent phase, were well suited to the disillusioned consciousness of a working class which envisaged no real power able to alter everything fundamentally—as expected in socialist theory. Our insight into this relationship, however, does not permit us to overestimate the actual neutrality of neutrally inclined social research. The latter, by renouncing that comprehensive thinking, which surpasses the restrictions of single facts, and is therefore of necessity critical, subserves only too well that constricted condition of consciousness which it registers: the function of social research, however, should be the analysis and sociological derivation of that consciousness.

That social consciousness, meanwhile, deceives itself by concentrating on the problem of the more effective functioning of the social machinery: it idealizes its own situation. It is not accidental that the dichotomy of functional and dysfunctional is the highest to which the work of Talcott Parsons rises—and this work is increasingly influential in many places in Germany. Instead of all this, the consequences should have been drawn from the contradiction between the diminished chances of individual development (diminished by the standards of possibility in this time and place) and the continual necessity for social adjustment. But in any case this contradiction cannot be substantiated solely by empirical reference to the materials before us.

Contemporary sociology, in terms of its mere structure of categories, elevates the simple reproduction of what exists to an ideal. As often in the history of science, an equivocation says more about the problem

than semantic criticism would concede. Positivism is an attitude which not only clings to what is given, but takes a positive view of it. To a certain degree, it explicitly makes it own—through reflection—what seems inevitable anyway.

\* \* \*

This introduction enables us to set in context the detailed account of the position of German sociology that follows; these details have been chosen, rather arbitrarily, to serve as examples. Numerous Introductions, Surveys, Summaries, and Textbooks testify to the growing interest in sociology in Germany. These stem primarily from the necessity of making good past deficiencies—and to meet those legitimate demands for material, which arise from the crass discrepancy between the number of students of sociology and the number of academic teachers of the subject. Perhaps these books are also intended to substitute for those theoretical essays which are not attempted any more—or perhaps, they are substitutes for concrete investigations. A tendency towards popularization is unmistakable: the larger publishing houses have recently demonstrated their preference for sociological lexica and pocket books. Unquestionably, this literature remedies a deficiency—but it is equally unquestionable that it is already under the pressure to make scholarship “teachable”, to prepare it for the consumer market.

By contrast with other countries, especially the English-speaking ones, the number of serious empirical studies published in Germany is still small—and we also lack the facilities to obtain an adequate view of what has been done. Nonetheless, the situation has improved noticeably since the first post-war years, when we were impoverished for information about the specific problems and phenomena of West German society. Thus we have publications (the first in Germany for thirty years) about aspects of the consciousness of the workers (Popitz *et al*), about the black-coated workers (white collar workers) (Bahrdt, Müller, Neundörfer), the family, the rural community, the metropolis, the medium-sized city, youth, political parties and other groups. These publications outweigh, quantitatively, recent work in historical sociology or social history: the history of social ideas, once so lively in Germany, has also receded. By contrast with the period before 1933, there has been a pronounced shift in the themes of sociological work.

Ahistorical, limited empirical analyses are also dominant in political sociology, although precisely this discipline in Germany developed out of a tradition of historical and theoretical inquiry—the science of government under the direction of Otto Hammer. (Staatswissenschaft). The Berlin Institute of Political Science is the chief centre of political sociological studies. There (and incidentally in other University institutes) two themes are dominant: the sociology of political parties and the study of extra-parliamentary interest groups. The preoccupation with parties is due to very real pressures: the Constitution

of the Federal Republic (Basic Law) delegates to the parties, indeed guarantees to them, the right to participate in the shaping of the political will of the people (Article 21, Basic Law). This is a contrast with the Weimar Constitution. An infinite number of sociological questions have been thrown up concerning the relationship of the resultant constitutional situation to two other principles anchored in the Basic Law, the principles of popular sovereignty and of parliamentary representation. It may be mentioned that many of the investigations in question (like those of Otto Büsch and Peter Furth on the SRP—Sozialistische Reichspartei, neo-Nazi) have utilized certain of the social psychological insights reported, in America, in *The Authoritarian Personality*, for the sociology of parties.

Those working on the sociology of parties are concerned with problems which direct their attention more to the discussion of structural changes in political organizations and institutions than to the pursuit of theoretical questions. Insofar as the division of labour between sociologists, historians and political scientists assigns to the sociologists empirical studies, they rely mainly on the findings and ideas of the political scientists. The latter, however, now pay much more intensive attention to sociological investigations and questions than was ever before the case in Germany. We owe the most important book in this field to the Berlin Institute of Political Science: Sigmund Neumann, (ed.) *Parteien in der Bundesrepublik. Studien zur Entwicklung der deutschen Parteien bis zur Bundestagswahl 1953*. (Stuttgart/Düsseldorf, 1956). Seven monographs constituting this volume were devoted to the parties offering themselves to the electorate in September 1953. Their development since 1945, their organizational structure, their programmes, their co-operation with interest groups, and the social origins of their members were analysed, on the basis of the material already at hand and not attained primarily through survey work. By comparison, there was less emphasis on the "organizational realities" of the parties: their actual internal structures, the relationships between the leaderships, memberships and local groupings; the processes of decision at the top; the reciprocal relations of parties and interest groups. The authors made no effort to hide this defect, which limits the value of the work to that of a preliminary study. We cannot reproach the authors on this account: as before, the interest groups and the parties oppose the most energetic resistance to the scientific study of their essential and actual structures, which of course are not identical with their formal legal constitutions—and this applies to parties of all political complexions.

Political sociology and political science have been forced away from the questions which are most relevant and which dominated the discussion in the 1920's: for instance, the functions of bureaucracy in modern democracy, the political consciousness of the higher civil service, the relationship of the economy to the state, the financing of the

parties—in short, the problem of how real social power realizes itself in institutions. Not the least of the reasons for this situation is that the authoritarian structure of Wilhelmenian Germany has managed to survive into the era of pressure groups. And, as one of its consequences, the idea of power is only seldom considered: in this respect even political sociology seems to be becoming a de-politicized science.

Theodor Eschenburg's *Herrschaft der Verbände?* (Stuttgart, 1955) has done most to further the discussion of the extra-parliamentary interest groups. The book has not only led to a discussion of the issue in principle, but has also stimulated a body of literature which reports on the organization, composition, membership, and programmes of the most important interest groups and on the membership of their officials in the first and second Parliament (Bundestag) and in the public administration.<sup>5</sup> Eschenburg documents the influence of the important interest groups on political decisions. But we still lack empirical analyses of the internal working of the interest groups, of their tendencies towards oligarchy and self-perpetuation, the extent and modes of their influence on the parties, government and the bureaucracy—in short, of their real social power. The grounds for this deficiency are obvious: sociology encounters difficulties in obtaining primary data, in Germany as in the rest of the world, when it touches society's neuralgic points. But this is to assert no less than that science, and therewith the public, is almost ignorant of essential aspects of the decision making process in the Federal Government, the several states, and the local governments, and that we can learn only extremely little of an authenticated kind about the functioning of democracy in contemporary Germany. In spite of all the emphasis on the realism of post-war German sociology, it has hardly approached the most important real issue which it was obliged to confront.

The number of historical studies of parties is relatively large, for example: L. Bergsträsser, *Geschichte der politischen Parteien in Deutschland* (8. u. 9. völlig neu bearbeitete Auflage, München, 1955) W. Mommsen, *Deutsche Parteiprogramme. Eine Auswahl vom Vormärz bis zur Gegenwart* (München, 1952), W. Treue *Deutsche Parteiprogramme 1861-1954* (Göttingen, Frankfurt, Berlin, 1954), O. K. Flechtheim, *Die Deutschen Parteien seit 1945. Quellen und Auszüge*, Berlin, Köln, 1955). There have been new editions of earlier works on this theme, for instance of Robert Michels' implicitly antidemocratic sociology of parties, and those of Max Weber—just as there have been new editions of many older sociological works. Not much has been done in West Germany on the sociology of the eastern power system, chiefly because the dictatorships make factual studies most difficult. The Berlin Institute has also published several studies of the German Democratic Republic, for instance: M. B. Lange, *Wissenschaft im totalitären Staat. Die Wissenschaft der sowjetischen Besatzungszone auf dem Weg zum 'Stalinismus'*. (Stuttgart, Düsseldorf, 1956).

Where sociology most closely approaches the centre of society's vital processes, the sphere of industrial production, we may see most clearly the connection between its empirical-positivistic change of course, its practical utilization for administrative purposes, and its resigned obedience to the supremacy of existing relationships. Most of what is done in this area may be categorized as the sociology of the group. Although the most varied descriptions and definitions of the group are given in the available handbooks and lexica, attempts to understand society as a whole, which might have devoted attention to the category "group", have been practically unknown since 1945. (Bernsdorf and Bülow, 1955; Ziegenfuss, 1956; König 1958). Fundamental analyses of the meaning and function of groups in the social process are with few exceptions hardly to be found.

In a surprising contrast to the relative lack of group studies with a larger theoretical purpose is the repeated tendency (favoured by König, as by Durkheim and Bogardus) to elevate the study of groups to the central object of sociology. At any rate, it is possible to interpret in this sense König's introductory remarks under the heading, "Group", in the Fischer Lexicon, *Soziologie*, (Frankfurt, 1958).

"In order to make clear the primary importance of the idea of the group, we begin with the observation by Florian Znaniecki, that in contemporary sociology the idea of the group has replaced the idea of society. This observation is unquestionably correct, and is important in two respects. (1) It points to a methodologically important tendency, to end the pre-occupation with the larger structures of the total society and to bring under observation those partial structures which, at least are nearer to us and perhaps easier to visualize than the former. (2) It emphasizes the decision (although one which has yet to find general acceptance) to treat the group as the central object of sociology in general. Naturally, there arises on this basis the further question of how these groups are related to the larger structures of the total society."

Intentions of this kind are dominant in the sociology of the enterprise.\* This discipline "is far on the way towards becoming, along with the scientific study of work technique, the physiology of work, the theory of business enterprise, and industrial sociology, one of the foundations of modern scientific economic management." It would be difficult for critics to formulate their objection to the present situation of this branch of knowledge in Germany in more precise fashion. But the citation is from an approving observation by Otto Neuloh.<sup>6</sup> The scientific treatment of industrialization and its consequences, of the relationship between productive forces and the social relations of production under capitalism, were once inspired by the critical impulse.

\* German *Betriebssoziologie*, best translated in English as "industrial sociology" but often distinguished from the latter in Germany, where industrial sociology sometimes refers to the larger sociological study of industry, *Betriebssoziologie* to studies of specific economic units.—Translator.

In the twentieth century there developed, on this basis, the (necessarily futile) effort to reform society by means of reform of the separate economic unit. (Rosenstock, Michel).

This has all been forgotten, or eliminated, or kept alive only in the manner of historical learnedness. The "social question" in society has become the problem of "human relations" in the factory. Industrial sociology and the sociology of the enterprise rose in Germany after the war; it is a hyphenated sociology which is oriented not to its own traditions but to the results and methods of American social research.

Of course, it is possible to object that the grand theories of the nineteenth century and the social-political efforts of the first decades of the twentieth century were inadequately grounded in empirical data. The desire to make good this deficiency, and the shift of emphasis from reflection about the object to the unprejudiced ascertainment of facts (following Max Weber's postulate) does not, however, express a neutral attitude toward the object. The facts are presented as ultimate realities, as the actual legitimate source of scientific knowledge; but the facts, once ascertained, can only be understood as the expression of a social totality.<sup>7</sup> Instead of completing the examination of facts in this way, they are assumed to be effective in the complex of relationships under examination—and thus to a large extent they are isolated from that complex. Empirical social research is now exploiting, in this sense, a possibility only opened by its recent development: the exact depiction, and also the prediction by scientific rules, of the behaviour and consciousness of large human groups. This possibility is an answer to administrative and manipulative needs. It corresponds to a subjectively directed purpose, the ascertainment of the functioning (or lack of functioning) of men under specific technological or group conditions—in economic organizations, particularly in large ones. The noted Hawthorne Investigation has had the greatest influence on these studies. While its methods and results have long since been subject to discussion in America,<sup>8</sup> the literature of the German sociology of the enterprise treats the notion of the critical character of the informal group as practically sacrosanct.

The idea that sociology, in order to demonstrate its right to exist, must be able to define objects which distinguish it from all other scientific disciplines is not irrelevant to the "subjectivist" conception of the sociology of economic organization. Once their depth psychological aspects have been eliminated, the so-called inter-personal relations within the industrial organization seem to constitute such an object. Neuloh, indeed, seeks to separate "life processes" from "work processes" in the economic organization—as if the objective structure of work, and its character as a commodity, had nothing to do with the life of the worker. Neuloh states, categorically: "Those who interact

are important for the sociologist, and for the theory of relationships in general, as persons. Only secondarily do they appear as specialists, as incumbents of functional positions, as directors (members of the board), graduate engineers, master artisans, workers—and this through the way in which they shape their relationships in the plant.”<sup>9</sup> An extreme effort is being made to distinguish the sociology of economic organization from the theory of business enterprise—instead of conceding that the lines of demarcation between the branches of science encompass no ontological order in the objects themselves. The theory of economic enterprise cannot disregard the person who works in the plant; the sociology of the enterprise can just as little ignore the end of the enterprise, which determines the objective functions of the workers. To term the enterprise, with Neuloh, a “Konvivium”; to reduce the object of the sociology of the enterprise to those components of the worker’s behaviour not immediately determined by the end of the enterprise (König) means to eliminate from the objects of sociology the compulsion to which individuals must submit in order to preserve their lives and the life of the society.

These views, of course, are not characteristic of all of contemporary German industrial sociology, but they do represent a strong tendency. This approach is also basic to the plant surveys conducted by the private commercial opinion polling institutes, which are intended to improve the enterprise. Occasionally, the single enterprise’s dependence upon society is recognized—but only in general terms; the actual researches treat the enterprise in isolation. Helmut Schelsky has indeed emphatically insisted that industrial sociology and the sociology of the enterprise ought not to separate the enterprise from its context, but to “think through the problems of the enterprise precisely in relation to the prevailing structures and problems of the total society”. But he also describes as the “fundamental tension and dynamic of our modern industrial civilization” the relation between the enterprise, as a unit (from an economic-technical point of view concerned with production) and the effort to integrate it socially through measures of a kind internal and external to it. But this formulation causes us to lose sight of the fact that this “fundamental tension” is due to impulses specific to the enterprise—like increases in productivity for the sake of higher profits—and not to relationships which can be separated from economic goals. Further, it leads to an over-estimation of the sociological relevance of efforts in social policy and social psychology. According to Schelsky, if the sociology of the enterprise were to pursue the double goal of increasing the social and psychological satisfaction of the workers, and improving the productivity and profitability of the enterprise, it can create a “bridge over the abyss between entrepreneur and worker”.<sup>10</sup> But this abyss is intrinsic, not to the separation of social and psychological satisfaction, on the one side, and productive achievement and economy, on the other, but to the social form assumed by that economy.



A series of investigations do begin with the objective conditions and functions of the industrial enterprise and its members, and from this point of view, do proceed to the analysis of conflict, contradictions of interest, and power relations—by contrast with the efforts of many contemporary economic sociologists who are oriented subjectively, and to the problem of what is called integration. In this respect, works which otherwise diverge from one another agree: Pirker and Lutz; Popitz and Bahrtdt; Dahrendorf; and those from the Frankfurt Institute of Social Research. In his *Industrie-und Betriebssoziologie*, Dahrendorf says:

“The sociologist concerned with men working in the industrial enterprise views them, not primarily as personalities in their entire fullness and individuality, but as the bearers of social roles—as turners, or secretaries, or section chiefs, or assembly line workers or works foremen or directors. The sociologist of the economic enterprise sees in the foreground the relationships among the personnel of the enterprise in virtue of their positions and tasks, not in virtue of their personalities.” Dahrendorf’s book, *Soziale Klassen und Klassenkonflikt in der industriellen Gesellschaft* (1957) shows his pre-occupation with structural conflicts. We cannot here discuss the question of what place the category of the personality in its entire fullness and individuality can find in that objective structure. Meanwhile, Pirker, Lutz, and Braun studied the objective pre-conditions for a democratization of personal relationships in the enterprise, in their large volume, *Arbeiter, Management, Mitbestimmung* (1955). Popitz, Bahrtdt, Jüres and Kesting concentrated on the objective conditions of work in foundry, and the forms of co-operation between workers and their reactions, which resulted from these conditions (*Technik und Industriearbeit*, 1957). Closely related to this study is: *Das Gesellschaftsbild des Arbeiters* (1957). The Institute for Social Research, investigating cyclical movements in hard coal mining, concentrated on a specific problem (viewed as part of the social situation of the mining industry); the change of work teams in specific pits.

The preference for subjective investigations is also confirmed by a survey of the voluminous literature on post-war German youth. Very little significance is attributed to the objective life conditions of this generation: most of the works deal with the attitudes and behaviour of the young, and only rarely are these interpreted by reference to the social structure. The favourite theses of the sociology of youth were already formulated in 1947, in two descriptive works; since then they have become widely disseminated.<sup>11</sup> Both works emphasized the sober and factual, realistic and practical, cool and illusionless attitudes of youth—although the authors diverged in other points, for instance on the “reticence” or “openness” of youth, possibly because they were dealing with different socio-psychological strata of the personality.

Felix Schenke<sup>12</sup> confirmed the hypothesis on the sobriety and objectivity of those who are today between fifteen and twenty-five years old. But it is at this point that we see the other side of this realism: the large number of the young who are difficult to educate, asocial, and in need of care and protection. The second special number of the *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie*, edited by Peter Heintz and René König (Köln, 1957) was devoted to this group—*Soziologie der Jugendkriminalität*. König also contributed the main article on *Einige Bemerkungen zur Stellung der Jugend-kriminalität in der allgemeinen Soziologie*. We may mention Gerd Biermann's contribution, "Wege zur Jugendkriminalität," which proposed that research should pay attention to early childhood indications of need for special care and protection, pointers to disturbed relationships between a child with a weak ego and its family, itself often neurotic—and to failures in the mother-child relationship. All the possible aspects of asocial and socially harmful behaviour and attitudes have been screened: active regression (over-compensation), passive regression (discouragement and demoralization), the "trauma of urbanization" and the problem of the decline of intelligence.<sup>13</sup> But we have very little valid data on the sexual behaviour of the young, although it is generally asserted that, unlike youth in 1900 or 1918, this generation finds its sexual life "no problem."

Two monographs in the larger Darmstadt community survey to some degree run counter to the general tide in the sociology of contemporary youth: G. Baumert, *Jugend der Nachkriegszeit*, and I. Kuhr, *Schule und Jugend in einer ausgebombten Stadt*. Baumert was unable to observe the much-cited process of post-war social levelling; according to him, youth's status consciousness remains unchanged. He does confirm that the young, especially ten-year olds, do react in an extremely practical fashion: their attention is concentrated on the immediately given. But uncertainty is hidden beneath the thin cover of this "concretism:" the young are seeking a substitute for paternal authority. Irma Kuhr also emphasizes the ambivalent relationship of devotion to authority and opportunism (incidentally, both can be connected to one another in a manner easier than appears). Authoritarian behaviour patterns seem to dominate precisely with school children. The school is uncritically accepted, particularly by children without fathers, refugee children, and workers' children. They are under such pressure from their situation that they can hardly put up any resistance to it. Youth's "realistic standard of judgment" suggests its defencelessness, and eventually the liquidation of the special fantasy land of childhood, once so characteristic of high *bourgeois* culture. The retreat into conformity, if through non-conformist systems of reaction, points to the same thing.<sup>14</sup>

Karl Bednarik's book, *Der junge Arbeiter von heute* (Stuttgart, 1953) has made an impression outside the world of science. On the basis

of his experience with working-class youth in Vienna, the author describes their emancipation from the conventional restrictions of *bourgeois* society—but also the decay of proletarian class consciousness. He alleges that a “liberation for anarchy”—a most questionable formulation—has occurred; in this framework he depicts aspects of existence as “disorientation,” “synthetic individuality,” “socialized father hatred,” “lost solidarity,” and so on; but these categories simply describe forms of reaction, and their psychodynamic implications remain unexplored. Youth relates itself in a concrete manner to work and to occupation: this is matched by indifference to the public sphere. Towards the state they behave in part as beneficiaries, in part as complainants. At times, the author’s latent sympathy for the type he describes becomes explicit approval.

Today’s empirical concern with the subjective aspects of the younger workers is perhaps so popular because it seems to promise documentation of a factual and irrefutable kind for the hypothesis of a general social levelling. The effort has been made to prove that on account of the so-called *embourgeoisement* of the young workers’ mind, their want of class consciousness, the proletariat exists no more. (Incidentally the socialist theory of society never imputed class consciousness to the workers as a fixed characteristic, but the theory, rather, sought itself to produce it). The theoretical identification of the proletariat by using the separation between producer and means of production has been repressed by the criterion of whether workers feel themselves to be such—especially the younger workers, who have not grown up within the tradition of the working class movement.

Helmut Schelsky’s two volumes, *Arbeitslosigkeit und Berufsnot der Jugend*, (Köln, 1952) are not entirely free of this tendency. This work tends to draw general conclusions about the youth problem from extreme situations, rather than following up the specific conditions and effects of unemployment as such. 2,278 young people between the ages of fourteen and twenty-five were subjected to extensive interviews from 1950 to 1951. Craftsmen were represented amongst the total number of employed—when we make a comparison with industry—in a lower ratio (inversely proportional) than the one prevailing amongst the total group of apprentices. The so-called old middle classes (older sectors of the petty *bourgeoisie*) practise what we might term “apprentice breeding.”\* After the completion of their training, the young often have to change occupations and enter industry as unskilled workers. Prestige demands led these apprentices into training in the first place, and their shift of occupations induces in them a far more pronounced feeling of demoralization and declassment than is evinced by those youths who enter the factory immediately after leaving school. In general, the study holds that the respondents viewed occupation as

\* They train too many apprentices for the current market.—Translator.

a means of social ascent and evaluated work in these terms. Along with choice of the wrong occupation and unsuccessful apprenticeships, this was the ground for frequent changes of job. In general, "unemployed youths do not come from the families of unskilled workers but from skilled workers' families and in part from *petty bourgeois* and even higher families". Sixty per cent came from broken homes; often, the relationship of parents to children was "over-organized" and the choice of occupation over-charged with emotion: this easily led to neurotic symptoms. By contrast with studies of unemployment in the period before Hitler, like the noted study in Marienthal, effects of unemployment on family life were not observed. Precisely considerations of familial prestige often led those affected to hold out through periods of unemployment in order to avoid slipping into a less qualified position.

Kluth emphasizes in his contribution (to the Schelsky studies), on attitudes to politics and the state, that "youth's contacts (with these spheres) become less, and also become less certain, to the degree that the forms of contact become more abstract and impersonal—that is to say, the less personal ties are involved." The de-politicization of the young, often their generalized hostility towards politics, reflects this tendency. But we ought not to over-rate it: often they simply imitate the attitudes of adults. But distrust of the parties and indifference to political ideologies are, indeed, general. Certain symptoms of authoritarian allegiance appear in this connection: for instance, the view that the state "ought to install more order," concern itself with "the community of the folk," and "guarantee to each his own,"—but the individual's private sphere is to remain undisturbed. Kluth refuses to speak of "belief in authority," and prefers the rather more positively toned expression, "belief in symbols." He interprets authoritarian character traits and indeed sympathy for Nazi ideas as reactions to the "abstract rationality" of democratic political processes. He does not take these signs of regression too seriously, despite the disturbing jargon spoken by the panel.

Schelsky interprets the results of the investigation in terms of his conception of the levelled middle class society. The cause of unemployment amongst the young is "the difficulty of integrating contemporary German youth in the adults' world and society." Apprenticeships are so favoured by the young workers that they prefer unemployment to abandoning their training; Schelsky sees in this "a transformed expression of the bourgeois world's striving for property." Often the young have to make a change at the conclusion of their apprenticeship; if this proves disappointing, we find "a view of work as a job, as merely a way to earn money, instead of the achievement drive and demand for prestige which leads to a craft apprenticeship." We may remind ourselves, in contra-distinction to this view, that the undoubted advance of the conception of the job is a result primarily of changes in the work

process itself. This has rendered ever more superfluous not alone apprenticeships but also experience in the traditional sense; it has effected a general disqualification, which then of necessity allows no occupational standard other than the quantitative one of the job's equivalent in money wages.

Conforming to his total approach, Schelsky attributes to the family a decisive influence on occupational attitudes; he insists that the abstract rationality of modern industrial society drives human beings to cling to intimate spheres like the familial one. These observations of psychological reactions to the process of alienation in no case prove that traditional basic forms like the family can fulfill this function indefinitely. It is not accidental that the totalitarian regimes have to a large extent replaced the family from above with their own giant collective forms—without, incidentally, renouncing their very effective propaganda about the family as the germ cell of society.

Schelsky has also edited a further volume, *Arbeiterjugend gestern und heute*, (Heidelberg, 1955). In the essay, "Arbeiterjugend: Begriff und Wirklichkeit," Heinz Kluth attempts to distinguish, in behaviour and self-consciousness, that which is specific to this generation of German working-class youth by contrast with its predecessors in the nineteenth century and after the first world war. But his theses are the familiar ones: primarily the idea of the absence of class-consciousness. The wish to rise socially as an individual, not as a member of a class or a group, has fundamentally changed youth's relationship to the society as a whole, to its occupations, and to its leisure time. The "sobriety" and "nearness to reality" of contemporary youth are also products of this desire—as is their revulsion against political ideologies. (In all of these investigations, the idea of ideology has been applied with no further ado to precisely that theory which, for its part, conceived the idea of ideology and the critique of it). The young people felt tied to their current jobs. In this way, they divided into a large number of groups, each strange to the other, which could see nothing they had in common apart, perhaps, from the difference between themselves and the black-coated workers. "Society today can offer the young perhaps a single generally accepted pattern through which they may realize their need for social esteem: the occupational hierarchy." But it would be a mistake to confuse this attitude with "the mentality of a professional estate;" the rejection of movement from one job to another is not a consequence of what we might term loyalty to the firm but of opportunistic calculation. The values effective in this context are essentially taken from the *petty bourgeoisie*.

Ulrich Lohmar's investigation, printed in the same volume, ("Die arbeitende Jugend in Spannungsfeld der Organisation in Gesellschaft

und Staat") to some extent diverges from Schelsky's point of view. According to Lohmar the young person seeks from his group not "the experience of community" but wants "to be addressed as an individual." The phenomenon of alienation is described by Lohmar in terms of the "Labyrinth" of modern society, which makes very difficult an "inner relationship" to the state. This thesis pervades nearly the entire literature. It could be asked if modern society is in fact as opaque as the sociologists depict it, above all as opaque as the sociologists themselves seem to find it? In the era of large-scale organizations the tendency to eliminate complicated intermediate mechanisms has perhaps made many things simpler than when liberalism flourished; perhaps there are veiling mechanisms of a particular kind, which make society appear impossible to understand; and perhaps we ought now to study these mechanisms? The alleged labyrinthine character of society may well be interpreted as a projective image of the impotent, who are now unable to do that which was once termed "making one's own way."

Finally, in his contribution "Die soziale Gestalt der heutigen Jugend und das Generationsverhältnis der Gegenwart," Rudolf Tartler identifies the conflict between generations, quite correctly, as the expression of a specific social situation. Today's youth has no "generational consciousness," a finding which coincides precisely with that observation made generally in Germany—and also in the framework of empirical social research—of a break in the consciousness of historical continuity. In this, as in many other respects, the younger German generation is perhaps drawing closer to American structural patterns.

Further, we have at our disposal in Germany a range of public opinion surveys of youth problems. But the theoretical interpretation of these was obviously begun after the completion of the field work; they are, therefore, hardly differentiated enough—but this does not diminish the worth of the voluminous statistical material they contain.

The Northwest German Radio System, in Spring 1953, conducted a survey in its broadcasting area; this was published in Munich in 1955 under the title, *Jugendliche heute*. Gerhard Schröter studied the "Interesse an den publizistischen Mitteln" and came to the interesting conclusion that youth's taste hardly differed from that of the adults. Their interest in books is greater than one usually assumes; however it is concentrated on a level of taste characterized by names like Ganghofer and Knittel.\* The mass media of communication seem to work to each other's benefit rather than to compete amongst themselves; in any case none of the young respondents were not reached by one of the media. Further, Georg Gramse in his report on the "Einstellung der

\* American-English equivalents: Margaret Mitchell and A. J. Cronin.—Translator.

Jugendlichen zur Politik" confirms the results of other investigations: youth, distrustful, keeps its distance from the political parties—something which does not basically distinguish them from the adults. Gramse thinks that this comes from no conscious oppositional position in politics, but from a certain general indifference to higher things. Finally, Helga Ruscheweyk treats "Die Einstellung der Jugendlichen zu Glaubensfragen" and believes that she has found "an inner religious tie" among half the respondents—a tendency which, along with interest in politics, is particularly strong in the smaller and medium sized cities.

The private Market and Opinion Research Institute EMNID has published three surveys, carried out in 1953, 1954 and 1955: *Jugend zwischen 15 und 24* (Bielefeld, 1954-56). In the last one, (entitled *Wie stark sind die Halbstarken?*) by Rolf Fröhner and his associates, the results of the previous two are incorporated. Above all the study seeks to demonstrate the so-called "normalcy" of contemporary youth, but this category obviously was basic to the construction of the questionnaire. The respondents were questioned rather intensively about their role models. Most of the sample named persons from their own life circle. As models from the German past we encounter above all statesmen and war heroes: we infer again that contemporary German youth has a strong tendency towards authoritarian loyalty, which is only apparently contradicted by the collective excesses which are so often discussed. Three quarters of the young people questioned approved of their parents' educational methods; fifty-five per cent approved of the phrase, "Young people should obey and not criticize rules." Here also, we do not find symptoms of a conflict between generations. The strong drive for social mobility is again evident in occupational aspiration and occupational choice. (Forty-seven per cent). But this is conceived as "a process in stages over generations; for oneself a more proximate goal is stuck to." Jobs in smaller and medium sized firms were preferred, on account of the better "human relations" expected there; those already employed in small enterprises, however, expected to find this precisely in large ones. The thesis about the sobriety and matter-of-factness of youth is again documented: material desires predominate amongst forty-one per cent—but political interests are stronger than had been previously suspected. However, fifty-seven to sixty-two per cent are politically disinterested. Forty-nine per cent support the present democratic state; nineteen per cent reject it; forty-two per cent remain undecided. Only fifty per cent feel that they have personal political responsibilities—again an index of an increase in authoritarian attitudes. A third of the sample evaded questions about Hitler and National Socialism. A general tendency to ideological consolidation seems to have paralleled the economic development of post-war Germany. Eighty-two per

cent listen to the radio, seventy-two per cent read newspapers, seventy per cent read the illustrated weeklies and similar publications, sixty-two per cent attend the cinema. Fifty-two per cent claimed to have read at least one book in the four weeks period before the interview.

DIVO has published a stimulating report of its study *Zur ideologischen und politischen Orientierung der deutschen Jugend und ihrer Führer*. (Bad Godesberg, 1957). 1,579 young people in the Federal Republic, the same number of youth leaders, and a representative sample of adults were interviewed. Those who belong to youth organizations seem to live, mainly, in small towns, belong to the Churches, are still mostly at school or in training, have low incomes but skilled occupations or advanced educational backgrounds. Twenty-five per cent of the sample were members of organizations. (Other investigations, like Reigrotzki's *Soziale Verflechtungen in der Bundesrepublik*, produced far higher figures). Democratic impulses and what may be termed personality variables are less important in determining political behaviour than the respondents' view of the economic situation. Anti-democratic attitudes are correlated with fascist sympathies, but the former are more pronounced than the latter. The phrase, "We ought to have a single strong party again, which would really represent the interests of all strata of our people," was approved by forty-one per cent, disapproved by forty-two per cent and evoked seventeen per cent undecided responses. The corresponding figures for the total population are: yes, twenty-five per cent; no, forty-seven per cent; undecided, twenty-eight per cent. The phrase, "we need a leader with a strong hand," was approved by twenty-one per cent, disapproved by sixty-two per cent, and found seventeen per cent undecided. (In the rest of the population the figures are: sixteen per cent, twenty-five per cent, twenty-nine per cent). Sympathy for National Socialism is a matter of melancholy for its social policies, not for its militarism and imperialism: Communism which is otherwise extremely unpopular (primarily because it is conceived as spiritually oppressive) is also praised on this account. The DIVO investigation, like most youth studies, emphasizes the connection between loyalty to authority and the striving for social security, the need to be "taken care of." The responses to a scale measuring tolerance towards minorities showed that the Communists, followed in order by Nazis, Jews, and large industrialists, evoked the most affect. But the number of "don't knows" in this context is relatively high; questions about attitudes towards the Nazis and the Jews were distressing.

The contention of the sobriety of youth appears again in Schelsky's interpretation of empirical data in *Die skeptische Generation. Eine Soziologie der deutschen Jugend* (Düsseldorf/Köln, 1957). Scepticism is taken to mean the renunciation of romantic conceptions of freedom, vague idealism and sentimentality about nature—the characteristics



of the old Youth Movement. These have been replaced, in Schelsky's view, by a turn to matters practical and immediate, thought and behaviour adapted to the demand for order and planning, in the interest of self-advancement and social security. What is peculiar to Schelsky's work, however, is that these findings (common to all contemporary work on the sociology of youth) are not criticized but rather what might be termed "rescued." "Behind the sceptical worldly cleverness which appears cold-faced there hides a thoroughly lively need to identify—and to conform to—the substantial and moral aspects of men and affairs. But at the same time the young are deeply suspicious of being deceived by phrases, indeed by any kind of words." (p.60). It is unnecessary to deny that this observation is in part accurate but we may hesitate to interpret this shyness as the key to the understanding of concretism. Schelsky does not conceal the negative aspects of the scepticism he describes but he consoles himself with the thought that political apathy is also a protection against susceptibility to illusions. "The question is whether modern mass democracy's large-scale organizational structure . . . does not directly produce this type of behaviour on the part of those who, non-political, accept the system. The question is, further, whether modern democracy in the long run may not have to accept—positively—this stratum as the pillar of the system."

Schelsky terms youth's tendency to shrug off political responsibility "unpolitical-democratic" behaviour, which sharpens its view of the demands of daily life. Contemporary youth's search for "behavioural security" is its "basic need, grounded socially and in human nature." The extreme adaptation of youth to the adult world reflects its wish to "cement its private life"—derived from the necessity of building up an economic existence. (But this in no way distinguishes the present from other periods). Thus Schelsky explains the empirical data which show no specifically youthful mentality. An "independent and therefore positively identifiable role for youth in society" is "no longer evident" but we are "compelled to conceive of the contemporary social role of youth only as a transitional phase between the role of child, which has remained distinctive, and what is today generally viewed as the final role of adult." If we refuse to accept as characteristically youthful a higher degree of adaptation to objectively social conditions, there are no sociological distinguishing characteristics of youthful as opposed to adult behaviour.

The ideas of "mature youth," "adapted youth," "sceptical youth," are equivalent. In fact this adaptation often remains superficial; it is exhausted by defensive and adjustive reactions which conceal but do not overcome a basic uncertainty of behaviour. Schelsky does admit that this pseudo-maturity contains those traces of deformation implied by the expression, concretism. But he stops short of the diagnosis of

the concretistic attachment to nearby things as pathological, as an ego weakness conditioned by childhood injuries. His hesitation allows him to pass to affirmation. He defends contemporary youth against reproaches on the score of its authoritarian loyalties and anti-democratic potential; rather, he holds, it is privatized and thoroughly tolerant. But these theses are exemplified with young manual and white collar workers, not with grammar school and university students. The latter constitute "the element of structural leadership and serve as behavioural models" in the younger generation, although university students also tend to behaviour which is "directed towards examinations and careers." The young adopt towards the state "a consumer's attitude." But Schelsky welcomes all of these developments as adequate to the changed social situation.

Gerhard Wurzbacher and his colleagues differ, on many counts, with Schelsky in their book: *Die junge Arbeiterin. Beiträge zur Sozialkunde und Jugendarbeit*. (München, 1958). Pre-industrial and early industrial residues were observed in the reactions of young unskilled female workers—and also in the norms and institutions affecting them: this applied to their work, leisure and family relations. But, simultaneously, they conformed to the behavioural patterns of industrial society. The resultant conflict produced infantilism and tense, emotional excesses.

Further, there are two studies, independent of the total range of empirical studies interpreted by Schelsky, whose results contradict the views which predominate in German sociology. Ernst Lichtenstein has presented in the *Handbuch für Sozialkunde, Abteilung A II*, pp. 1-111, (Berlin and München, 1955) an outline for a sociological study of youth. He is acutely aware of the fact that puberty is not simply a natural phenomenon but essentially a historical one, implicated in society's dynamic processes. The contemporary tendency is to shorten the period of maturation at the expense of childhood—but at the same time the transition to maturity has been delayed, the adolescent transitory condition extended. A change in the social status of youth has corresponded to this process. Lichtenstein also encounters compulsive adaptation, heteronomous behaviour, but he thinks it due not to an appreciation of reality but often to a "schizophrenia in the conduct of life." Work and leisure clash with one another. The human being who is disciplined by his work performance remains, outside this sphere, fixated at an infantile developmental stage. The concentration on business-like behaviour in the workplace constricted youth's horizon of experience, its capacity for abstraction and differentiation, its language. In this way youth became susceptible to the "magic of images," the social psychological fashions propagated by the media. The conformity induced by the premature assumption of functions in the social system renders youth liable to mass suggestions and spiritual and psychological simplifications of the most varied kind.

Alexander Mitscherlich, in his study "Pubertät und Tradition," in *Verhandlungen des 13. Deutschen Soziologentages*, (Köln, 1957) develops the view that the traditional forms of behaviour transmitted by society have lost their binding force because they no longer suffice to master social reality. A "perpetuated infantilism" is the result of the conflicts originating in this way, and of the often remarked acceleration of the processes of puberty. According to Mitscherlich, the price of youthful adaptation is not only far higher than Schelsky's and König's estimate, but apparently healthy behaviour discloses itself as neurotic—a tensely exaggerated normality. This theory attempts to unite, dynamically, the observations made on the reality-oriented character of the new young generation with the analysis of the symptoms attributable to their damaged existence. What characterizes the world of youth is a flood of sensations—and the tendency to counter-balance, with substitute satisfactions, the unpleasant conditions and the loss of natural gratifications imposed on youth by a social order which is too powerful for it. The lack of a protective tradition interferes with the psychological process of ego development. Mitscherlich has taken seriously the depth psychological interpretation of phenomena which appear harmless only as long as we confine ourselves to their description.

The problem of authority is the focal point of works like that of Lichtenstein and Mitscherlich. This theme was also the centre of a 1954 UNESCO project, which has resulted in one of the most productive of all works on post-war German youth: Knut Pipping and associates, *Gespräch mit der deutschen Jugend. Ein Beitrag zum Autoritätsproblem* (Helsinki 1954). Pipping's results show that the father image still occupies a leading position in the psyche of German youth—although it initially appears less obvious than to the mother image; boys and girls are both tied more to the father than the mother; the latter is usually felt to be more loving. The inner psychological dynamic of youth is not as "progressive" as the dominant view asserts: German youth regards punishment and education as synonymous. Only twelve per cent of the 444 members of the youth sample rejected the assertion in the questionnaire: "In adulthood one is thankful for the blows one received as a child." According to this study as well as to others, public affairs play only a very small role in the lives of these youths—devoted entirely to the private sphere. "We often find a real identification with power where the father is described as a liberal and warm-hearted comrade but the mother as relatively cold and dominating." (p. 421).

The German sociology of youth eventuates in a controversy. Should it depict, positively, (in the two senses of the word) the overwhelmingly strong adaptive tendency of contemporary youth? Or should it debit

the regressive elements (of whose existence there is hardly a doubt)—not only as pathological symptoms of individuals, but as the expression of a pathological general condition in society, which reproduces itself in the individual's scars?

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup> The contribution to this report of the associates of the Institute for Social Research at Frankfurt University is so essential that its authorship may be considered a collective one. Special thanks are due to Dr. Helge Pross, Dr. Egon Becker, Dr. Ludwig von Friedeburg, and Karl Markus Michel.

<sup>2</sup> Alexander Rüstow, *Ortsbestimmung der Gegenwart/Eine universalgeschichtliche Kulturkritik*, 3 Bde. (Erlenbach-Zürich und Stuttgart, 1950-57); Hans Freyer, *Theorie des gegenwärtigen Zeitalters* (Stuttgart, 1955).

<sup>3</sup> Theo. Pirker, Siegfried Braun, Burkart Lutz, Fro. Hammelrath, *Arbeiter, Management, Mitbestimmung/Eine industriesoziologische Untersuchung der Struktur der Organisation und des Verhaltens der Arbeiterbelegschaften in Werken der deutschen Eisen- und Stahlindustrie, für die das Mitbestimmungsgesetz gilt* (Stuttgart und Düsseldorf, 1955).

<sup>4</sup> P. F. Lazarsfeld, *Remarks on Administrative and Critical Communication Research*, in: *Studies in Philosophy and Social Science*, IX, 1941, p. 2 ff.

<sup>5</sup> See, apart from Eschenburg, especially R. Breitling, *Die Verbände in der Bundesrepublik/Ihre Arten und ihre politische Wirkungsweise* (Meisenheim am Glan, 1955); J. H. Kaiser, *Die Repräsentation organisierter Interessen* (Berlin, 1956).

<sup>6</sup> *Deutsche Betriebssoziologie/Eine Bestandsaufnahme*, in: *Schriftenreihe der Rationalisierungsgemeinschaft Mensch und Arbeit*, 4, 1956.

<sup>7</sup> See T. W. Adorno, *Soziologie und empirische Forschung*, in: *Wesen und Wirklichkeit des Menschen/Festschrift für Helmuth Plessner*, ed. by Klaus Ziegler (Göttingen, 1957), p. 245 ff.

<sup>8</sup> See G. Friedmann, *Problèmes humains du machinisme industriel* (Paris, 1946), p. 301 ff.; D. C. Miller, W. H. Form, *Industrial Sociology* (New York, 1951), p. 35 ff.; C. M. Arers'berg, *Behaviour and Organization: Industrial Studies*, in: *Social Psychology at the Cross-roads*, ed. by J. H. Rohrer and M. Sherif (New York, 1951), p. 324 ff.

<sup>9</sup> *Die deutsche Betriebsverfassung*, 1956.

<sup>10</sup> *Aufgaben und Grenzen der Betriebssoziologie*, 1954.

<sup>11</sup> E. Lippert, *Epochalpsychologische Jugendforschung*: L. Zeise, *Bild der deutschen Jugend*, both in: *Kongressbericht* (Bonn, 1947), Bd. III.

<sup>12</sup> *Zur Psychologie der Jugendlichen heute*, in: 2. *Nurnberger nationalwissenschaftliche Woche*, 1952 (Berlin, 1953).

<sup>13</sup> See W. Roessler, *Jugend im Erziehungsfeld* (Düsseldorf, 1957).

<sup>14</sup> See especially G. Koepnick, *Mädchen einer Oberprima* (Darmstadt, 1952).

## Sociology in India

R. N. SAKSENA

(Professor of Sociology and Director, Institute of Social Sciences,  
Agra University)

Sociology is a new science to be introduced in India. It is a much younger science than in the West, where it had its birth at the turn of the century. In the West during the last 40 or 50 years, in fact since Sociology gained recognition as a science of society, it has taken long strides in emerging as a body of more systematic social theory "in which theory that had formerly been largely speculative in character was drawn into closer relationship with empirical studies . . . This was accompanied by the re-statement of propositions, often deduced from sound theory and expressed as hypotheses and then tested by observations". Thus, Western sociologists are keeping more to "hard facts".

### INDIAN SOCIAL THOUGHT

The same impact can be felt in India. But the developments have not been so spectacular. For Indian sociologists have inherited a different social philosophy, which is not only ancient but even goes far beyond the known history of many civilisations. It is also unique in considering the relations of man not simply as relations to other human beings but to all life. In the Hindu social system, the whole Cosmos is believed to be dominated by one Supreme Being, which is identifiable with Self. But a distinction is drawn between the Cosmic Self and the Psychic Self. The Cosmic Self is the Supreme Reality, the Unity which lies behind all multiplicity, known as *Brahma*. But the Psychic Self, the manifestation of one's own self, is *Atman*. It is the "subject which persists throughout the changes . . . It is the simple truth that nothing can destroy. Death does not touch it nor vice dissolve it. Permanence, continuity, unity, eternal activity are its characteristics".

Again, it is the doctrine of *Karma*, that sums up individual action and behaviour. *Karma* literally means deed, action. At every moment of our life we are performing some *Karma* (action). Each action produces its own reaction or result and the nature of this result depends upon the moral or immoral nature of the action performed. Driven on by his *Karma* the individual moves from existence to existence, since

individual life is only a span out of a series. This series is called the round of Transmigration. And this round ends only with the attainment of salvation (*moksha*), the realization of the Supreme Unity and experiencing it subjectively.

The doctrine of *Karma* provides a continuum of social existence, in terms of *ashrama*. It literally means a stage, a period or a condition. The past being determined and the future only conditioned, "life" in Hinduism cannot be regarded as fatalistic resignation but as an opportunity for intense striving as a preparation for self-realization.

In this sense human life must be lived for the realization of the four ideals of life, namely, *dharma*, *artha*, *kama* and *moksha*. The law of *dharma* imposes upon the individual a set of rules to be followed in his relationships, filial, economic, religious and social. The second ideal of *artha* may be interpreted as action or conduct leading to the economic or temporal good of the individual as living in a social group of which he forms an organic but unique part. *Kama* indicates the cultural aspect, in the sense that it means the enjoyment of life and thus proves to be a strong corrective to the streak of pessimism and renunciation. It regulates the relationships between the sexes on the assumption that the life of the flesh, far from being something sinful or harmful in itself, has a necessary and moral function to perform. Last, there is the ideal of *moksha* or salvation which demands that all actions must be performed by the individual with this ultimate end in view. To facilitate the fulfilment of these ideals an individual's life is divided into four stages of *brahmacharya*, *grihastha*, *vanasprastha* and *sanyasa*. These may be translated as periods of life devoted to study, household duties, contemplation and renunciation.

It is, therefore, obvious that spiritual values to us are not so much a form of mystic religion as a mode of life. It also explains the complete absence of an organized church in India, quite unlike the West. In this connection it may also be mentioned that while other civilizations have perished, the Indian civilization, which is contemporary with those of Egypt and Babylon, is still functioning. How has India managed to remain more or less the same in the midst of social migrations, upheavals and political changes that have elsewhere changed the face of society? Why is it that her conquerors have not been able to impose on her their language, their thoughts and customs, except in superficial ways? It is because the vitality of Indian culture lay in its power to reaffirm the old values and to unmask the decaying ones only to rediscover them. This is what Buddha, Mahavir and Shankaracharya achieved, who gave a new lease of life to Indian civilization. There have been many reformist movements in the country, but none so revolutionary as to upset her fundamental values. As Hans Kohn points out; "A truer basis of unity than modern national sentiment was to be found in a common intellectual heritage, persisting through an unbroken tradition and moulding and permeating

India's whole social life to the minutest detail, and in the peculiar contemplative piety which lies at the root of all the various forms of Hinduism<sup>27</sup>.

Religion has played a very important role in the life of our country. It is the centre round which the whole of Indian social life rotates. A wave of blind imitation of everything that was Western had begun to spread in the country at the beginning of the 19th century. This was also the period when the British had succeeded in consolidating their power in India. The free thinkers and the "young Bengal" group under the leadership of Derozio acted like Nihilists, paying no respect to traditions or ancient beliefs. But they failed miserably in their attempts. But at the same time reformers like Raja Ram Mohan Roy, Keshub Chander Sen, Swami Dayanand Saraswati, infused a new life into Hindu society, because their great achievement was that they succeeded in preserving the fundamental unity of Hindu social organization and its value systems.

Whenever Indian society was faced with forces of disintegration the society threw up new culture from within itself. But the contact of Indian society with the West, unlike that of Modern with Mediaeval society in Europe, introduced a foreign element into Indian culture. It is in this context that the modern sociological thought of India has to be understood. This impact led some thinkers, who wanted to return to the traditional principles, to reject Western civilization altogether. Among the prominent modern thinkers who subscribe to this view may be mentioned Coomarswamy and Bhagwandas. Coomarswamy is very uncompromising in his criticism of Western civilization, while Bhagwandas, although adhering to the traditional sociological thought of India, believes in a rationalistic synthesis. But it is rationalism on a religious basis. However, a healthier development has been in the direction in which attempts have been made to interpret traditional concepts and values from a modern rationalistic-positivistic point of view. Contemporary sociology in India poses the problem. If no solution has been found, it forms the worst dilemma of Indian sociologists. This predicament is perhaps the key to the understanding of the fundamental trends in contemporary social thought in India.

Even the current sociological view cannot be said to be divorced from metaphysical thinking. Radhakamal Mukerjee has observed that "social interests and experiences must express our conceptions of the nature and functions of divinity". Mukerjee's main concern from the beginning of his intellectual career has been the reorientation of the social sciences as expounded by Western thinkers. His approach may be said to be interdisciplinary. He regards universal law as affecting human beings "in something which is moulded by the interaction of classes and interests within the state". Furthermore, it is in "groups and associations which conflict or co-operate with one another" that human values are moulded. He has tried to show

how economic principles are founded on physical and psychological principles and how intimately they are connected in their functioning with the institutional set-up. Mukerjee is not an orientalist. In his *Institutional Theory of Economics*, he not only joins the American School led by Veblen, Common and Mitchell, but gives it a new orientation by emphasizing the new role of traditions and values. "Personality develops out of a process of interweaving of group interests and values with clearly marked out and even stereotyped values". This organization of impulses will be furthered and completed by religion. He further elaborates his view-point in his *Dynamics of Morals*. He gives a fourfold typology of groups arranged in a hierarchical series: The Crowd, the Interest Group, the Community and the Commonalty. These groups have different norms of organization, criteria of evaluation, sanctions and means of control, and different ends and values.

¶ Professor Mukerjee's thinking is clearly indicative of the rise of Sociology in India. His thought covers a vast field, from ecological studies and observations to religion and mysticism. He even goes further and endeavours to integrate such extremes as ecology and mysticism in one grand whole. In the final analysis, as Saran points out, the bases of Dr. Mukerjee's synthesis of traditional and modern thought are the concepts of level, hierarchy, and the theory of symbolism; also the methods of re-interpretation and adaptation. The concepts and methods are all traditional<sup>9</sup>. In both economics and sociology he has made a big effort to meet the challenge of the West.

Another prominent exponent of the synthesis theory of Indian culture is D. P. Mukerjee. He looks upon the impact of the West on Indian society as a phase in the social process of cultural assimilation and synthesis that has been going on in Indian history almost from the very beginning. In his view Indian culture has grown by a series of responses to the successive challenges of many races and cultures, which has resulted in a synthesis. Western impact is the latest phase in this process and the problem is not one of acceptance or rejection but of understanding the laws of cultural synthesis in the context of Indian history. Mukerjee gives indications of being under the influence of Marxist thought, though it cannot be said to be orthodox Marxism, in his analysis of Indian culture. For, in his view, the process of synthesis of culture, which Muhamadan rule in India initiated, was interrupted by the English Conquest, since it also meant a change in the economy of the country which put a new emphasis on economic factors in the processes of culture formation and culture change. The British, while introducing a new economy, tried to foster it by unrealistic policies of land settlement and education. And in this process the old middle class was replaced by a new middle-class. Indian society ceased to be of the "closed" type without becoming "open". And here lay the danger. This mechanical unity of Indian



society could be disrupted at the slightest clash of middle-class interest. But he does not believe in any such contingency ever arising, since he is convinced that the new economic forces which are working in Indian society will lead to the emergence of a new, stable culture in India<sup>4</sup>.

But in his later thought he shifts more towards the role of tradition in Indian culture. He is not prepared to be dubbed as "traditionalist", but he passionately advocates the study of traditions with a view to re-interpreting the Hindu theory of man and society. Thus, he gives a clear indication of his departure from his earlier attempt to analyse social change in terms of Marxist thought. "Thus it is that I give top priority to the understanding (in Dilthey's sense) of traditions, even for the study of their changes. In other words, the study of Indian traditions, which, in my view, is the first and immediate duty of the Indian Sociologist, should precede the socialist interpretations of changes in the Indian traditions in terms of economic forces<sup>5</sup>". Professor Mukerjee's lament is: "It pains me to observe how our Indian scholars succumb to the lure of modern 'scientific' techniques imported from outside as a part of technical aid and 'know how' without resistance or dignity. In the intellectual transactions which are taking place, it seems that we have no terms to offer, no ground to stand upon".

It may, therefore, be said that in our sociological thinking there is a preponderance of belief in nature and divinity. An individual's actions are believed to be justified not only in his own lifetime but even beyond. Thus, Darwinism, which had such a great influence on Western thought, could possibly not have found a place in Indian thought. Even now in our society an individual's behaviour and values are interrelated as part and whole. Hence, Sociology in India cannot be entirely "objective" in its content and approach. It has to contain a little bit of abstract philosophy, which provides a continuum between the past and the present, which constitutes the dynamics of Indian society.

A great product of such a synthesis in thinking was Mahatma Gandhi, who led the struggle for the freedom of the nation to its successful end. He cannot be said to be a revivalist or believer in sociological archaism by any means. On the other hand he was a great social innovator. He did not belong to the *elite* but to the masses and succeeded only because he could appeal to their spiritual sentiments and make himself understood. He believed in the dignity of man, not under class-structure, but as a being than whom nothing is higher. The ultimate ideal of man is to realize God and anything that lowers man in this world, lowers His dignity. Closely connected with this belief was his conception of man in relation to his environment. Since the world is a creation of God, one must enjoy the world with a sense of sacrifice. He did not pin his faith to the material welfare of man, and thus he substituted "standard of life" which had moral

values for "standard of living". But the basic idea underlying Gandhian thought was non-violence. There were others, for instance Buddha, who preached non-violence, *ahimsa*. But they meant by it negation of enjoyment. To Gandhi non-violence was not a negative approach. It meant to him that in order to promote the dignity of man and for developing personality there must not be any compulsion or coercion. Non-violence was an approach to a problem through persuasion and compromise and hence it was the only suitable weapon for use in the struggle for freedom. It is the greatest tribute to Mahatma Gandhi that through non-violent means India regained her freedom, because hardly a parallel can be found in the history of the world where a nation has established her freedom only through non-violent means. It was a dynamic force created by Gandhi by harnessing the spiritual values of the people and making full use of them. As Bogardus observes, "Gandhi's social strength illustrates the surprising effectiveness that can be achieved under theories of life and world negation<sup>8</sup>".

#### TEACHING OF SOCIOLOGY IN INDIA:

In India Sociology was introduced as a subject for teaching at post-graduate level for the first time in the University of Bombay in 1920, when Sir Patrick Geddes was appointed as the first Professor of Sociology. If we analyse the status of Sociology in the Indian Universities, we find that Sociology is taught in 20 out of 34 Universities. But Sociology has been given an independent status in only nine Universities, where it is taught both at post-graduate and undergraduate levels. These Universities are: Agra, Bombay, Gujrat, Karnatak, Lucknow, Baroda, Osmania, Patna and Mysore. In Osmania University Sociology is taught as a separate subject in B.A., but at post-graduate level it is included under Anthropology. In the remaining Universities it forms a part of teaching in other Social Sciences, specially Economics, Political Science, Philosophy and Psychology.

At undergraduate level students are required to have an elementary knowledge of the fundamentals of Sociology, as understood in the West, combined with a study of Indian social institutions and also problems of social reconstruction and welfare. At the post-graduate level there is no difference in the scope of Sociology as taught in our Universities and the West.

Here it is necessary to mention that since 1947, when India regained her Independence, there has been a widespread awakening among the people and realization of the social and economic problems which confront the people. And, thus, greater demands are being made on the Universities to encourage the study of social problems. Greater emphasis on community projects and other welfare activities initiated by the State has also accelerated this process. An interesting outcome has been the introduction of Social Work in University courses of

study, which has received increasing patronage from the Government and provides employment to trained graduate social workers. The University of Lucknow, which formerly included Sociology under Economics, led away by this impulse, has created a new department of Sociology and Social Work, which imparts instruction in both, as separate subjects, at undergraduate and post-graduate levels. The Agra University has established an Institute of Social Sciences, which provides for teaching in Sociology and Social Work only at a post-graduate level. The Baroda University has a separate Faculty of Social Work, while there are five other Institutes or Schools of Social Work, at Bombay, Calcutta, Madras, Banaras and Delhi. The syllabus of Social Work includes both academic acquaintance with the fundamentals of Sociology and Social Psychology and a professional knowledge of Social Work, with a regular course in Practical Work. Unlike the United States of America, where policy-makers and bureaucracy and industrialists turn more and more to Sociological researchers for guidance, with the result that Sociology has acquired a professional status also, in India the new emphasis is on the expectation that Sociology will enable trained social workers to be better equipped to render a professional service "based upon scientific knowledge and skill in human relations".

Sociology, which has been given an independent status by some Universities, is also included as a subject in the teaching of other special Social Sciences. Thus, Principles of Sociology forms one of the optional papers in the M.A. Examination in Political Science in the Universities of Lucknow and Agra and in Philosophy and Psychology in the Universities of Lucknow and Banaras. In the University of Calcutta Sociology is taught as a part of Anthropology.

It may be interesting to observe here that invariably the syllabi of the Universities teaching Sociology as an independent subject include Cultural Anthropology and Social Psychology as compulsory papers. This gives an indication of indefiniteness of the academic status acquired by Sociology, especially in its relationship to Cultural Anthropology and Social Psychology. Of these two, Anthropology had an earlier start in the country, possibly because the foreign government at that time needed the help of anthropologists in administering tribal areas and hence many civil servants of the Indian Civil Service, such as Hutton, Grierson, Mill and many others, became known as anthropologists. But even in Universities (an older University like that of Calcutta and a new University like Behar), where there is a separate Department of Anthropology, Sociology (including studies in advanced Principles of Sociology) is invariably included in the syllabus.

#### SOCIAL RESEARCH IN INDIA:

However, we find a more modernistic trend in current social research in the country. In the wake of Independence, the country was faced with many social problems which needed a new technique to handle

them. India is predominantly an agricultural country. For a very long period the village social system continued to remain integrated, because external factors could not enter deeply into it. The result has been that for centuries the rural social organization, power structure and leadership retained their traditional hierarchical character, with higher castes and landlords maintaining the power equilibrium. But since the advent of the National Movement, which had its culmination on 15th August, 1947, Indian village life has been faced with a new challenge involved in the process of democratization and innovation. With many legislative and tenurial reforms and finally with the inception of development schemes of rural reconstruction, the village social system is confronted with new forces and factors of change. Therefore today, the village, its social organization, its culture, its value pattern, its leadership, its economic structure, in fact, the entire village community, is standing at the threshold of a new era. The old power structure, which was based solidly on traditional caste structure and feudalistic traditions, is meeting a challenge from the new forces of democratization in the shape of constitutional rural Panchayats at the village level and the entire Parliamentary democracy at the national level. Therefore, changes of far-reaching socio-economic importance are being ushered in by the villagers themselves, greatly facilitated by innovating leadership on the one hand, and the conscious attempts by the State on the other, so that the people may be motivated to pursue their own goals and build an economically sound and productive system. It is for this reason that village studies and monographs represent a new trend in Social Research. We have now quite a few interesting studies of rural life as lived in different parts of the country. Recently illuminating village studies have been published by Srinivas, Dube, Majumdar, Oscar Lewis, Gough, Beals, McKim Marriot, Steed, Mandelbaum and others. All these authors have adopted a different approach by not studying rural life as a traditional rural sociologist would do, because these social scientists had different orientations and backgrounds. If Oscar Lewis was interested to compare his Ranikhera village with its counterpart Tepoztlan in Mexico and thus compare the two cultures on the basis of the findings of these two villages, others want to explain how the norms and values are being carried on in a traditional way. In other words, the studies done so far reflect the microcosmic approach and try to generalize from one village the nature of the social structure of the rest of rural India. How far these generalizations may be said to be a scientific analysis of Indian rural community is open to grave doubt.

It is in this field that American influence has been most powerful. In fact, it is mostly American scholars who have made these studies and those that have been done by Indians are, with few exceptions, in collaboration with American Research Projects. The techniques used have been mostly interviews and questionnaires by paid investigators. I have nothing to say against the interest being taken by foreign social

scientists in studying processes of rural change in India. It is something for which we may even feel grateful since we have had the advantage of empirical research techniques. But the difficulty arises in the use of interpreters, whose real assignment is that of collection of field material. Again, it is open to objection that the data so collected should have been processed in another country and the book on the Indian village written according to a preconceived plan there. These doubts were raised by Professor D. N. Majumdar in his Presidential Address (Anthropology Section) to the First Indian Sociological Conference (1955). He went so far as to say: "This is . . . mechanization with a vengeance and a challenge to methodology in the social sciences".

It has been the belief of Sociologists in this field that intensive studies of a few select villages would yield, in course of time, certain generalizations, first, in the field of Indian rural sociology and, secondly, in general social theory. With the latter objective comparative studies have also been made. All that they have succeeded in achieving is describing the habits and customs, rituals and ceremonies and economic structure of the villages. The social structure of villages has been studied in terms of caste ranking and socio-economic relations of caste. It could be expected that in this process the determinants of these inter-caste rankings were discovered, but it is difficult to establish any consistent set of criteria even for a single village. The chances of discovering general principles applicable to Indian rural society are very remote. It ignores the fundamental fact that the Indian village is a community. So far it had been a self-contained socio-economic unit. It had not been concerned with the great political upheavals that had taken place in the history of India. What is the vital force that kept the India village community alive and self-sufficient throughout her history? The present studies fail to give an answer, since their approach is mainly ethnographic. However, this approach to rural Sociology may have some appeal to cultural anthropologists, since it affords them an opportunity to interpret a traditional society in terms of the assumptions of modern thought. But such an attitude implies the refusal to understand tradition in its correct perspective. There is another danger in such ethnographic-monographic studies. It has led to a number of implicit or explicit generalizations, which are unwarranted not only because they have been inferred from insufficient data but also because evidence to the contrary is available. Most of these studies have been made in short periods, ranging from six to 18 months, which is a very short period for proper appraisal, particularly so in the case of foreign social scientists, who do not understand the language of the people. Under these circumstances, exaggerations and important omissions can hardly be avoided.

Similarly, the Joint Family, joint in home, kitchen and worship is giving way to a more individualistic family under great economic pressure, created by competition, unemployment and disparity in in-

come. Even then, if economic co-operation is lacking between members of a family, worship remains a family function. The ancestors receive family ministrations on the anniversary of their deaths, their names are memorized and cited at social ceremonies and their goodwill and blessings are secured by appropriate rituals. But the fact remains that new trends are to be clearly observed in the old Joint Family, which is gradually breaking up. In this direction, Dr. Ghurye and Dr. Kapadia, both of Bombay University, have done pioneer work. Dr. Ghurye has made a comparative study of family institutions in the West and in India (*Family and Kin in Indo-European Culture*, Oxford, 1955), while Dr. Kapadia has written on both *Hindu Kinship* (Bombay Popular Book Depot, 1956), and *Marriage and Family in India* (Bombay, Oxford University Press, 1956). Dr. Kapadia describes the growth of kinship, marriage and family on the basis of ancient sources and generally tries to interpret them in terms of modern thought. An attempt has also been made to study changes in the structure and functioning of the modern family, as well as the effects of recent legislation on marriage, divorce and Hindu women's right to property. However, the methodology of both is historical-sociological.

In the field of social research the caste system of India has attracted the attention of almost all sociologists and anthropologists. The earlier tendency in this field was to seek the origins of the caste system and to propose a rational, or at any rate historical, basis for it. Notable among such studies are those of Ibbetson, Nesfield and Risley. The recent tendency is to study caste in its functional aspects, particularly from the aspect of cultural structure. In this connection particular mention may be made of Hutton, Majumdar and Ghurye, who have made notable contributions towards focussing attention on the functioning of caste in contemporary society. Recent researches have also been occupied with analysing caste occupation and economic status, inter-caste relation (tensions and distance), caste attitudes, degrees of inter-caste connubium, social tensions and caste structures. Caste has also figured very prominently in some of the recent village studies.

The acceptance of planning as an avowed policy by the Government of India has given a new turn to sociological research. The Planning Commission felt the necessity of setting up machinery for gauging the effects of changes introduced in the course of implementing the Plans. For this purpose the Commission set up a Research Programme Committee, consisting of eminent social scientists of the country. It finances various research projects, generally through the Universities. The main concern of the State is to harness research competence to problems of rehabilitation and social reconstruction.

Naturally, the role of the Government in sponsoring research was bound to assume greater significance; next in importance are the Universities. In this connection the following analysis will be of interest:—

*SPONSORSHIP*

<i>Sponsor</i>	<i>Projects</i>
1. Research Programme Committee (Planning Commission)	22
2. Universities	17
3. University Grants Commission	5
4. UNESCO	2
5. Ministry of Education	8
6. Central Board of Film Censorship	1
7. Institutions	3
8. Departmental	2
9. Foreign Universities	2
10. U.P. Government	2
11. Private	5
12. Joint	1
	—
Total	70
	—

It may, however, be mentioned here that there is a danger of bureaucratic control over social research in the case of Government-sponsored projects, and the Universities have begun to complain that the Research Programme Committee, instead of controlling, supervising and financing research projects, should confine themselves only to the last function of financing and leave social research in the hands of academic bodies alone. For, after all, only the results are needed by the sponsors and not control over research.

## SOCIOLOGY AND SOCIAL POLICY:

“ Social Policy may be said to be directly connected with what ought to be done, or at any rate with the choice of what is in some sense the *best* among the alternative ways of collective action ”. In the selection and guidance of such action Sociology can lend a very helping hand. Perhaps at no other period in Indian history has the need for such action been felt to be so paramount as now. After attaining Independence, the country found itself faced with many vital problems of social and economic reconstruction. It was under great socio-economic handicaps that India launched her career as a welfare state. And in order to achieve the objective of the welfare state, planning came to be recognised as an accepted policy of the Government.

The constitution of the Republic of India (Part IV) gives in detail the principles which should guide the State in promoting the welfare of the people. They are not justiciable rights given to the citizens, but are included in the Constitution as directive principles. The State is required to secure for the citizens adequate means of livelihood, equal pay for equal work, protection against abuse and exploitation of workers' economic necessity, the protection of their health, as also

of children of tender age and youth against exploitation and moral and material abandonment. Within the limits of its economic capacity and development, the State is required to make effective provision for securing the right to work, to education and to public assistance in case of unemployment, old age, sickness or disablement and in other cases of undeserved want. These directives in the Constitution are not mere expressions of pious hopes, but constitute the essential ingredients of social policy in India and the basis of planning.

Real India consists of villages; nearly 82 per cent of the country's population are village dwellers. But it is tragic to find that, in general, the village presents a picture of poverty, malnutrition, poor standards of public health and illiteracy. It is, therefore, obvious that if the nation is to progress, the development of rural communities should be given first priority. The planners have been quite conscious of this fact. The First Five Year Plan defined the immediate and ultimate objectives of rural community development programme as following:—

1. To provide for a substantial increase in the country's agricultural production, and for improvements in the system of communications, in rural health and hygiene, and in village education.
2. To initiate and direct a process of integrated culture change aimed at transforming the social and economic life of the villages.

As has been mentioned elsewhere, the Indian village is a very complex system. The habits and tastes, social practices and traditions, area of belief, social structure, attitudes and values of rural community are not only different but also form an integrated whole. Therefore, if the State intends to take the initiative in order to bring about radical changes in the village community, it would be easier by adopting a sociological approach. This can only be done with the help of trained social scientists. As Dube points out: "While planners and administrators must share the primary responsibility for the formulation and implementation of rural development projects, the social scientist can give them invaluable help in the areas of social organization, human relations, culture, and values touched by the plans".

It is true to a great extent that at present in the case of Government-sponsored village welfare work the relations between the common village people and Government officials are characterized by considerable distance, reserve and distrust. It is not because villagers are not appreciative of what is being done for them by the State, but their reaction to any innovation is very sharp. Either they reject it in its totality or accept it. There is little scope for experimentation, since in this process of rejection or acceptance traditional values play a very important role. Again, a peculiar type of vacuum exists in the life of the villagers. Some recent Governmental measures, such as radical tenurial reforms, creation of statutory village Panchayats, introduction of community development programmes and the constitu-



tional ban on the public practice of untouchability have raised their levels of expectation and aspiration. This has also affected interpersonal and inter-group relations in the village. While the expectations have been aroused, "in concrete terms people have not had enough evidence of it so far to warrant a shift in their attitude". In a community which has been reared on tradition for centuries, a new programme or scheme can only be accepted after their resistance has been overcome, not through exercising authority but by creating understanding. This explains to a great extent the lack of people's participation in community development programmes. Therefore, a full appraisal of their attitudes, values, sentiments and beliefs ought to be obtained first before launching any scheme. In this field, sociologists can be of immense help. It is encouraging to find that the Government are fully aware of this need. The Government of India has set up a Central Institute of Study and Research in Community Development at Mussoorie and the Uttar Pradesh Government is maintaining another Action and Planning Research Institute at Lucknow with the same object. In both Institutes sociologists and anthropologists are engaged in research in the field of community development under Government service. There are some foreign social scientists also who are associated in some of these projects. But it would be more fruitful if the University Departments of Sociology were also associated with such studies and evaluation programmes. For, after all, what is needed is a balanced and critical evaluation of the motivations and mechanism of change in rural communities, together with an analysis of the cultural determinants of acceptance and rejection. The findings will prove of immense help towards better planning and execution of development programmes. This also emphasizes the need for the development of Rural Sociology as an important branch of Sociology in India.

Another interesting field in which Sociology has influenced State action in India is penology. The concept of the purpose of punishment has in recent years changed from the safe custody of the offender to protection of society and rehabilitation of the offender. The emphasis now is on social defence and rehabilitation of the criminal. In the history of penal reforms a very great advance was made in Uttar Pradesh in 1952 when an open camp for 2,000 prisoners, known as Sampurnamand Camp, was organised in District Banaras on the banks of Chandra-Prabha river. The main purpose of the camp was to reform the prisoners by employing them on some productive work of national utility under conditions of freedom approaching normal life. The Camp enabled the prisoners to live more or less as free men without being subjected to the irritating presence of warders, *chowkidars* and policemen. It provided for complete freedom of movement and association. There were no barracks, cells or enclosures. The prisoners were housed in tents or hutments in the open, untrammelled by guards. The inmates were provided with the amenities of electricity,

radio, gramophone and records relayed by loud speakers, musical instruments and facilities for games and sports.

In addition to wages, prisoners got a special remission of 30 days for a month at the camp subject to the maximum of half the sentence. Out of the wages earned, twelve annas per head were recovered towards their maintenance. The balance was credited to the account of each inmate and he could utilize this amount for purchasing articles of his daily needs from the canteen or send a part of his savings to his family or keep the amount to take with him on release. The total earnings in this camp amounted to Rs.7,70,000 in wages, out of which Rs.5,50,000 were claimed by the State on account of the maintenance of the prisoners in the Camp leaving Rs.2,20,000 as their savings.

This Camp has now become a regular feature of the correctional work that has been introduced as a measure of penal reform in the State. Even "lifers" who had served only three years or so in jails were sent to the Camp. They displayed a marvellous sense of discipline. This is the most novel experiment tried anywhere in the country, and has proved to be immensely successful in changing the outlook of the prisoners and restoring in them a sense of self-respect and a desire to earn their own living.

A similar trend is to be noticed in penal institutions. In prisons marked improvements have been made in meeting the basic human needs of food, clothing and shelter. In recent years efforts have been made to make living conditions as pleasant and comfortable as possible. It has proved to have a wholesome effect on the general behaviour of the prisoners. In Central and First-class District prisons, the inmates are required to set up an elected committee (Panchayat) of their own to look after the management of the cook-house, arrange recreational programmes and decide cases of breaches of discipline referred to them. The Panchayats provide the prisoners with an opportunity to regain their faith in themselves, a sense of participation and responsibility. These are some of the broad features of the Correctional Programme, which has been introduced in the prisons and constitutes a new chapter in penal administration in the country.

It is, therefore, evident that in view of the great social developments that are taking place in the country, Sociology can be legitimately expected to gain in importance and contribute to the practical side of living. For, as Gunnar Myrdal, points out, "the social sciences have all received their impetus much more from the urge to improve society than from simple curiosity about its working". But as Sociology gains greater recognition in the country, it may be expected that the Universities will have some very important functions, not only of training the increasing number of sociologists needed for practical tasks, but also of taking the main responsibility for carrying on research, both in general and methodological questions relating to Social advancement.

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup> Chapin: "Reflections on changes in Sociology During the Past Forty Years", *Sociology and Social Research*, 40:387.

<sup>2</sup> Hans Kohn: *A History of Nationalism in the East*, p.349.

<sup>3</sup> A. K. Saran: *Recent Trends in Sociology* (ed Rouex).

<sup>4</sup> D. P. Mukerjee: *Modern Indian Culture*.

<sup>5</sup> Mukerjee, Presidential Address to the First Indian Sociological Conference.

<sup>6</sup> E. Bogardus, *The Development of Social Thought*, p.47.

<sup>7</sup> Compiled from the Bulletin issued by the UNESCO Research Centre for South East Asia, Calcutta.

<sup>8</sup> Dube, *India's Changing Villages*, p.152.

<sup>9</sup> Gunnar Myrdal, *Value in Social Theory*, p.9.

## Sociological Study and Research in Italy

RENATO TREVES

(Professor of the Philosophy of Law, State University of Milan)

### I

I do not propose in the present paper to study sociological doctrines and research in Italy, but rather the social, political, and cultural factors that sometimes favoured and at other times hindered or in various ways affected the development of these doctrines and researches.<sup>1</sup>

With this purpose in view I shall follow the subject in historical order with a separate consideration of four consecutive periods: (1) the era of Positivism which extended approximately from the unification of Italy to 1903, the year in which Benedetto Croce's *La Critica* first appeared; (2) the period where Idealism was the prevalent doctrine, extending from 1903 to 1922 when Facism came into power; (3) the Fascist dictatorship from 1922 to 1945; and finally (4) the period covering the years during which Italy reverted to its free democratic institutions.

I consider that chronological order is the most appropriate, not only because it best indicates the succession of facts and trends which influenced the development of sociological studies in various ways during the periods quoted, but also because it makes it easier to explain the present situation more clearly. In my view this is due not only to the fact that today is yesterday's child and a knowledge of the past is essential to a full understanding of the present, but also particularly because in sociology, which is a very young science, the past is still more or less the present, inasmuch as the activities of many representatives of the earlier periods including even the first of them, the Positivist period, continue to develop and constitute a valuable contribution to the present era. As recently as the end of 1957 we had the pleasure of seeing one of the most famous writers of the Positivist period, Alfredo Niceforo, draw up with almost youthful enthusiasm a very clear outline of general Sociology.<sup>2</sup>

Having regard to the many and remarkable transformations that the concept of sociology has undergone during this time and also to the fact that in Italy sociology is not based on any University tradition which might serve to clarify its concept to some extent, I will use the term sociology in its widest sense, including not only sociological

theories, but also social research as well as some studies of social and political philosophy.

## II

Taking the first of the periods referred to, we can say that on the whole it favoured both the development of sociological research and the theoretical study of sociology and sociological sciences. In fact, Italy in this period gave rise to some remarkable social phenomena which even the supporters of widely-opposing political tendencies could not fail to consider and discuss. These social phenomena are, for instance: the industrialization of the North and the consequent rise of an industrial working class which steadily increased both in number and awareness; the serious misery and backwardness of the South, which became all the more evident when contrasted with conditions in the North; the increase of emigration, which began at about the time of Italian unification especially from the Northern Provinces, and which in the following years assumed alarming proportions with a definite preponderance of emigrants from the South. In this same period new trends of thought in Italy were favouring the development of theoretical studies of sociology and social sciences, these trends having superseded the empty doctrine of Spiritualism that until then had dominated the specific field of philosophy and the wider field of culture. These new trends of thought were in fact Positivism, a Positivism closely linked with the evolutionary doctrine of the time, which was by no means free from inconsistencies and errors, but which at least had the merit of striving to adhere closely to science and experience, and of realising fully the seriousness of social problems, stressing the importance both of research and of doctrines addressed to the study and analysis of them.

For a better appreciation of how and to what extent conditions were favouring and encouraging social research and the study of theoretical sociology, it might be advisable to start by showing how the principal political movements contributed to this work in endeavouring, by different methods and for various purposes, to solve the urgent economic and social problems of the day.

Among these political movements, we may first of all consider Socialism. When one recalls the socialist claims that constituted a common objective for the various trends of socialism, one can easily imagine the sincere interest of its supporters in investigating and studying contemporary social evils and seeking to provide remedies for them. To realize all this we need only recall how earnestly at the end of the last century many Italian socialists, such as Napoleone Colajanni, who later turned republican, or Saverio Merlino, self-styled "Devotee of Sociology" and "Revolutionary Socialist", studied social conditions in Italy and we need only look through the early issues of *Critica*

*Sociale*, the fortnightly review of "Scientific Socialism" in which numerous collaborators dealt with various sociological problems, such as the agrarian question, hygiene in workmen's homes, maternity, the large landed estates in Sicily, rice-culture on the Paduan plain, etc., etc. The Socialist movement apart from its contribution to investigations and researches on the Italian Society of the day, which were in no way superior to those made by other parties, distinguished itself by succeeding in arousing a particular enthusiasm for sociological studies. In fact, Enrico Ferri, Achille Loria, Adolfo Asturaro, Alessandro Gropali, Antonino de Bella and others argued that sociology, based on evolutionistic Positivism, was bound to lead to Socialism and that the latter, and in particular the Marxist doctrine of historical materialism, was simply one form, albeit the best, of positivistic sociology.<sup>3</sup>

These sociological and positivistic interpretations which led to positivistic sociology being seriously studied not only with the interest and care of the scientist but also with the enthusiasm and faith of the reformer, were opposed by Antonio Labriola who during the closing years of last century laid the foundations of theoretical Marxism in Italy by a number of writings in which he re-established a close link between Socialism and Hegelianism and rejected any interpretation of Socialism as simple positivistic sociology.<sup>4</sup> In spite of this, Labriola and his Socialist successors never showed themselves averse to sociology as did Croce and the Idealists shortly afterwards. Labriola himself even frequently admitted the legitimacy and importance of sociology and referred to it repeatedly in his university lectures.

When one considers the theories which attempted to identify sociology and Socialism and the fact that many Italian sociologists during the final decades of the last century were socialists or near-socialists, it would probably become clear why men of other parties, though greatly interested in social problems and contributing highly important studies and research to them, yet showed some hesitation in using the term "sociology" and preferred to call it social science. Ignoring terminology and considering the actual facts, we cannot help acknowledging that during the period in question many supporters of the various political ideologies opposed to Socialism contributed practical researches and theoretical studies to sociology that were in no way inferior to what was done by socialists.

We must not forget that among the supporters of what we might call Conservative Liberalism, several should be given credit for having undertaken extensive and accurate research into actual conditions in Italy and having described and studied them in works of undoubted value. It is impossible here to list all these studies and works, evidently written in quite a different spirit from that of the socialists, inasmuch as the authors were attempting to understand social evils and indicate remedies for them, impelled not only by sincere humani-

tarian sentiments but also by a desire to oppose the flood of revolutionary movements and to prevent any possible danger to the ruling class. After Stefano Jacini's *La Proprieta fondiaria e la popolazione agricola in Lombardia* (Landed property and the agricultural population of Lombardy) a study which dates back to 1856, mention might be made however of Sidney Sonnino's work on land tenure by metayage in Tuscany, Leopoldo Franchetti's research on conditions in the Neapolitan Provinces, and Pasquale Villari's on Southern Italy and on the social question throughout Italy. Particular mention should be made of the extensive official investigations of the period, e.g. the Parliamentary inquiry instigated in 1877, into the conditions of agricultural workers throughout Italy, presided over, organized, and directed by Jacini, and the investigation into Sicilian conditions undertaken in 1875 by Franchetti and Sonnino at their own expense.\* Apart from these contributions to research and knowledge of conditions in the various regions of Italy, the Conservatives interested in social problems added their share by theoretical studies of sociology, and in this connection it suffices to mention critics of the parliamentary system like Scipio Sighele and particularly Gaetano Mosca. It is well known that Mosca who had conservative tendencies and shared with the conservatives already referred to an interest in the social problems of the south, during this period published his principal works *Sulla teoria dei Governi* (Theory of Governments) in 1884, *Le Costituzioni Moderne* (Modern Constitutions) in 1887 and the first edition of *Elementi di Scienza Politica* (Elements of Political Science) in 1896, in all of which he developed his theory of "political classes" and his conception of "political formula" and "legal defence" which still continue to arouse great interest, and not only among Italian thinkers.

Lastly, entirely different and opposed both to Socialism and Conservative Liberalism is the Catholic Social Movement, which must be mentioned because of its contributions to sociological studies inspired by principles obviously somewhat far from modern thought. Amongst its supporters might be mentioned Father Curci, Bishop Bonomelli and especially Giuseppe Toniolo who, from a political point of view, helped to vitalize the movement by trying to "unify the Catholic forces which at that time were split between the Conservatives and Reformers . . . and in view of the threat of Socialism urge them to consider social reforms";<sup>6</sup> Toniolo, from the scientific point of view, was perhaps the most representative figure of the whole movement. It is not possible, here, to discuss all Toniolo's practical researches and theoretical studies in the field of sociology, but it is worth mentioning briefly some of his programme articles which help to explain the nature of the contribution of Social Catholicism to sociological studies. For instance, in a lecture in 1891<sup>7</sup> he criticized the positivistic and materialistic tendencies seeking to put social order outside the historical institutions of the Catholic Church and energetically defended the funda-

mental principle of subordination of science to faith. In particular I might mention the "Programme" of the *Rivista Internazionale di Scienze Sociali* which from its foundation in 1893 to the present day has continuously contributed so much to the study of social sciences. In this programme, which is signed by Toniolo and Monsignor Talamo, editor-in-chief of the Review, it is evident how the ideas and principles put forward at the 1891 Conference are reaffirmed and the hope expressed that the various social sciences and auxiliary disciplines united "in one vast sociological synthesis" would co-operate, each in its own field and by its own means, in the attainment of the common goal, which is essentially that of "demonstrating the value of the Christian Social Order".

Having seen how during this period the principal political movements aware of the social question favoured, each in a different way, the development of practical research and theoretical study of sociology, it will now be interesting to observe how this development was also favoured by the cultural atmosphere of the period dominated by positivistic thought.

All thinkers agree that the most eminent figure in Italian Positivism during the period in question was Robert Ardigo and it must be admitted that he contributed considerably to the progress of sociological studies in Italy, stressing their importance and developing his own view of Sociology in close connection with his entire philosophical system in which all reality is a natural fact and in its formation follows the law of continuous development from the indistinct to the distinct. Society, itself conceived as a natural fact, is inexorably subjected to this same law.<sup>8</sup> Moreover, this concept of Ardigo's provided, so to speak, the orientation and character of the Italian sociological conceptions of the time which although founded on a scientific and anti-metaphysical basis yet eventually, like Ardigo himself, ended in metaphysical conceptions as a result of the keen desire to discover the general laws of the development and ultimate aims of society. Thus we find that, while adhering to Ardigo's or other similar doctrines, many Italian sociologists, such as Enrico De Marinis, Angelo Vaccaro, Pietro Siciliani, Fausto Squillace and others, although starting from mechanistic or more often evolutionistic ideas, eventually published sociological treatises that today might be more exactly considered as treatises on social philosophy if not downright metaphysics. At any rate, apart from attempts to arrive at general syntheses and solutions of fundamental problems, it cannot be denied that by the end of the 18th century Italian Positivism had produced some works on general sociology, like those of Enrico Morselli<sup>9</sup> or Icilio Vanni which were outstanding for their time and also encouraged the development of equally commendable sociological researches on particular and concrete subjects. An example of such research, was the work at the Laboratory of Political Economy, of Turin University, directed by



Salvatore Cognetti De Martis, where various problems of what might today be called industrial sociology, rural sociology, the sociology of emigration etc., etc., were studied.<sup>10</sup>

Among the various schools fostered by the positivistic atmosphere by far the most prominent, both on account of its importance and its originality, was the positivist school of criminology which no longer looked upon crime as a legal abstraction but as a concrete human act and by considering the right to punish as a social function opened up fresh approaches and new aims to sociology in the legal field. In this connection it should be particularly remembered that this school, through Cesare Lombroso, laid the foundations of criminal anthropology and, through Ferri, the basis of criminological sociology,<sup>11</sup> a doctrine which gave rise to new and interesting studies of criminological factors, considered not only as physical and anthropological but also social, such as density of population, financial and political aspects, customs, religion, public opinion, family, education, etc., etc. Apart from laying the foundations of criminological sociology, many of those who were more or less closely connected with the positive criminological school attacked other problems of specific sociological interest, e.g. as previously mentioned, the backwardness of the Southern regions compared with those of the North. In this connection we must remember in particular the work of Niceforo who supported Sergi's doctrine of the decadence of the Mediterranean race. Using statistical data together with exact, patient anthropological research, he tackled the problem of distinguishing between two Italian races, one more or less Nordic in character and the other of Mediterranean type degenerated by the influx of Moorish and Spanish blood.<sup>12</sup> Niceforo's thesis was supported by some adherents of the positive school, such as Sighele and Lombroso himself, but it was also strongly criticised by other writers, like Gaetano Salvemini and Colajanni; the latter also became involved in controversies with the Lombroso School and especially with Ferri on other questions, e.g. those relating to criminological sociology.

### III

Turning to the second period quoted, we find that the dawn of the new century brought a profound alteration in the cultural atmosphere of Italy. The dominating trend of thought, namely evolutionistic positivism, which had hitherto inspired the leading sociologists, weakened by defections and internal crises, finally succumbed to the combined attack of the new trends of idealism, irrationalism and pragmatism, which gradually prevailed and acquired a leading position in Italian thought. Among these various tendencies we are particularly interested in the first mentioned, the idealistic, on account of its severe and precise criticism directed not only against positivism in general, but also in particular against sociology considered as a discipline indissolubly linked with positivism and even as a typical expression of it.

The idealistic trend in question is that represented mainly by Benedetto Croce and Giovanni Gentile which possessed in *La Critica*, a review founded by Croce in 1903 and directed by him, a most effective instrument for the diffusion of its ideas and for permeating and influencing the most diverse strata of Italian culture.

It has become a commonplace to claim that the idealistic trend is largely responsible for the fact that during the first decades of this century sociology was ostracized by official Italian culture and, subject to some reservations, I think that this is substantially true. The sociology ostracized by idealism was the positivistic sociology of the previous century, i.e. the sociology which strove to establish a species of metaphysics brought up to date by the latest findings of science, which even if it had not been condemned by idealism would have brought ostracism on itself because of its inherent contradictions. Moreover, this condemnation by idealism, pronounced against a sociology already condemning itself, served not so much to ostracize this particular sociology as to prevent sociology in general from improving and transforming itself and to prevent Italian thinkers from striving to attain this improvement and transformation by collaborating with scientists from other countries. The condemnation of this sociology by idealists has not always been of the same character or intensity and even among idealists one must distinguish between the radical adversaries who deny any value or justification to sociology and others, less radical, who admit its potentiality and justification but within extremely narrow limits, having regard less to the name than to the subject matter and aims.

If one considers these criticisms by idealists, it can be said that among the less radical, apart from those of Iginio Petrone<sup>13</sup> which led to much arguing over sociology, those of Croce merit special notice. Croce, after explaining that on account of its philosophical claims sociology is falling into the error of empiricism, by which "the empirical and natural sciences are endowed with philosophical authority and value"<sup>14</sup> contends that to exclude the possibility of a social philosophy within the scope of spiritual philosophy, does not exclude the possibility of an empirical social science. He even admits this empirical social science but points out that like any other science it fails to give us true, i.e. conceptual knowledge, giving us knowledge useful only in practice, a pseudo-conceptual knowledge which, by its nature, in the specific case of sociology, corresponds substantially with that complex of pseudo-conceptual knowledge which we derive from the "science and theory of Law" or also, as he put it later "from the empirical science of politics".<sup>15</sup> While Croce, denying the possibility of a sociology with philosophical claims, admits the possibility of an empirical social science, within certain limits, Gentile denies even this possibility and as already mentioned, adopts an attitude towards sociology which appears to be more radically negative when compared with that of

Croce. In fact, Gentile does not limit himself merely to criticizing positivistic sociology for its philosophical claims, he also denies that its empirical research has any practical value or function and claims that, like any other science, it persists in error and that this error, inherent in abstract thought, must be overcome by concrete thought, philosophical thought, the only one whereby we can grasp at true knowledge, i.e. as a self-conscious act.<sup>14</sup>

We have seen that, in the opinion of many, these criticisms by Croce and Gentile helped to ostracize sociology from official Italian culture and something has already been said on this point. Having indicated briefly the nature of these criticisms, an explanation should now be given of what this much talked of "ostracism" of sociology really was. It was brought about by a certain coldness, distrust, and often decided hostility on the part of official Italian culture towards sociology, and its consequences were twofold. In the first place, it slowed down and finally paralysed all the work done during the closing decades of the last century towards including sociology as an official subject in Universities. The only result of all these efforts was the appointment of some "free" lecturers and some "regular" lecturers, and in 1903 the fruitless attempt to establish a Chair of Sociology at Rome University which was to have been offered to Loria. In the second place, this ostracism caused a considerable decrease in the number of publications devoted to sociology and particularly in the number of specialists to promote the subject, i.e. sociologists, who all but disappeared from the Italian cultural scene where they found no encouragement and no useful work for them to do.

All this should not be taken to mean that at that time in Italy sociology was no longer talked about and that Italian thinkers lost all interest in sociological research and theories. It must not be forgotten that the idealistic trend, while coming to the fore in what we might call the humanistic field of culture, made very little impact in the strictly scientific field and during the first decades of this century specialists in the various social sciences continued on their way without being appreciably disturbed or disorientated by criticism from the idealists. While owing to these criticisms sociology was generally abandoned by thinkers interested mainly in history or philosophy, it still remained the subject of much study and research on the part of specialists of the various social sciences.

To satisfy ourselves on this point we need only glance through the annual volumes of the *Rivista Italiana di Sociologia*, founded in 1897 and which continued to appear regularly throughout the whole of the period in question, i.e. until 1921. These volumes, to which many authoritative writers contributed, show clearly that a certain group of thinkers on various subjects continued to show some interest in keeping sociology alive and this interest manifested itself also in other significant

ways. For instance, the *Societa Italiana di Sociologia* was formed in 1910 under the chairmanship of Raffaele Garofalo, one of the principal representatives of the positivist criminological school and in 1911 the Congress of the Institut International de Sociologie was held in Rome to discuss the subject of the "sociological conception of progress", a subject on which the review published a special issue.<sup>17</sup> All that has been said above will be confirmed by an examination of this special issue which contained contributions from such authorities as the historian Salvioli, the demographer Gini, the philosopher Del Vecchio, but not from one genuine sociologist, and the same applies to all the other issues of the review, particularly those of the later volumes. In other words, it will be seen that at the general cultural level of that period it was less a matter of dealing specifically with sociology than with the "development of the sociological aspect of the various social sciences". This was also stated explicitly in 1897 by the editors of the review in their initial programme.

This fact is clearly confirmed not only by inspection of the volumes of *Rivista Italiana di Sociologia*, but also by the numerous contributions on sociology from specialists on various subjects. Except for Niceforo who, although he was a professor of statistics, I would not hesitate to describe as a sociologist, and who at the time in question had already published his well-known research on the poorer classes and on social stratification, it can, in fact, be claimed that during this period the main contributions to the study of sociology came from specialists in other fields. I have in mind legal philosophers like Groppali, Gino Dallari, Alfredo Bartolomei, Alessandro Levi, Vincenzo Miceli, who studied problems of general sociology and various sociological aspects of law; anthropologists like Sergi, already referred to, and who continued his remarkable studies mainly in connection with evolutionism; ethnologists like Giuseppe Mazzarella who published his *Studi di Etnologia Guiridica* in several volumes and, especially, statisticians and demographers like Rodolfo Benini, Filippo Carli, and Corrado Gini. We must not forget that in this and also in the subsequent period Carli published his well-known work of a specifically sociological nature and Gini developed his doctrine on demographic metabolism, explaining his concept of sociological neo-organicism, and published numerous papers on sociological problems of war and demographic factors of national evolution.<sup>18</sup>

Apart from these sociological works by specialists from other fields, research on social problems in Italy was continued during the first two decades of this century by supporters of the most varied political creeds who showed very great interest in the work. This is evidenced by the reviews published at the time, e.g. the Socialist *Critica Sociale* the Liberal *Riforma Sociale*, the Catholic *Rivista Internazionale di Scienze Sociali*, in all of which widely differing sociological problems are treated most thoroughly, such as, for instance, the class problem,

agricultural labour, emigration, workers' housing, industry, etc., etc. At that time the problem of the South continued to attract great attention and much work and research was devoted to its study by thinkers and politicians of all creeds and parties. In this connection we might mention the work of the Parliamentary Commission, as described in the report of 1911, on the position of peasants in the South and in Sicily, presented by its Chairman, Senator Eugenio Faina, and especially also the work of Francesco Saverio Nitti, who studied the Southern problem particularly from an economic and financial point of view, the work of Giustino Fortunato, who studied the same problem from different and wider perspective, and that of Gaetano Salvemini who in the review *L'Unita*, which he founded in 1912, defended with other thinkers his definitely liberal views on the problem and described his attitude as a Liberal defence of the peasants.<sup>19</sup>

The foregoing consideration of contributions by non-sociologists to sociological study and research and of criticisms of sociology by idealists, which practically stopped further publications on this subject from the point of view of evolutionistic positivism, should not be taken to mean that no genuine work on sociology was published in Italy during the period in question. It was, in fact, actually during that period that the most important works on the subject appeared, works that definitely established Italian sociological thought even in the international field. Among these works, which have nothing in common with those based on evolutionistic positivism, which they resolutely oppose, should be mentioned, apart from the second edition of *Elementi di Scienza Politica* by Mosca, the writings of Roberto Michels on the sociology of political parties,<sup>20</sup> which despite some definite methodological defects, have something fundamental to say on the subject, and above all, after *Sistemi Socialisti* of 1902, the *Trattato di Sociologia Generale* by Vilfredo Pareto of 1916. Space precludes any discussion of the considerable importance of the works of the last-mentioned author or of their influence on thinkers of the different social sciences. Having already referred to the criticism of sociology by idealists, it may not be amiss to conclude this paragraph by pointing out that while this criticism was not directed against Mosca because he claimed to have adopted the historical method, it was levelled against Pareto. Although bound to Pareto by ties of close friendship and sincere admiration for his ability as an economist, Croce criticized the treatise as a "case of scientific teratology", while Guido de Ruggiero, following in Croce's footsteps, judged Pareto's work with equal severity.<sup>21</sup>

#### IV

During the following period, i.e. between 1922 and 1945, the situation of sociological studies and research worsened because of the advent of Facism which predominated in Italy during this entire period and severely restricted freedom of practical research and theoretical studies

in any field more or less directly concerned with political or social life, and hence also that of sociology.

Facism is an extremely complex phenomenon and it is certainly impossible to try to explain it here. For our purpose it is enough to remember that Facism came into power by force and maintained itself by despotism, without any precise ideal to strive for nor any definite doctrine to apply, simply making use of a great variety of ideals and doctrines to justify the changes of orientation of its realistic and contingent politics. This nature of Facism is clearly evident not only from its history and the explicit utterances of its leader, but also from the fact that its so-called doctrine was inspired, depending on the time and circumstances, by the most varied and contradictory concepts: first by irrationalism and mysticism largely derived from Nationalist tradition, then by the idealism of Gentile, who might be called the official interpreter of the doctrine, then again, after 1929, i.e. after reconciliation with the Church, by the anti-idealistic trends of what is known as "Italic Realism" more or less consistently associated with those of Catholic spiritualism, and lastly, after association with Germany, by the National Socialist and racial doctrines combined with a resurgence of irrationalism and mysticism.

In spite of the difficulties and disturbances which a dictatorial regime like that of the Fascists was bound to create in the sociological field, it cannot be said that Fascism completely prevented such studies and in fact a brief review of their vicissitudes is called for, to indicate the various phases of Fascist politics and their different ideological and doctrinal orientations.

Fascism, born in 1919, came to power in October 1922, but only by the end of 1925 had it established an absolute dictatorship by suppressing all freedom of criticism and opposition. It is interesting to note that during 1925 and the preceding years, in spite of ever-increasing danger and violence, so long as there remained any chance of expressing an opinion, sociological and political studies were remarkably intensive and fruitful.

On the Southern question which, as we have seen, has always been the subject of important sociological investigations, various contributions of considerable importance appeared between 1922 and 1925, although they were largely dominated by political interest which in any case had always been prevalent in this field. In this connection might be mentioned, apart from some papers by Salvemini and other authors already referred to, the contributions of Luigi Sturzo, Antonio Gramsci, and in particular *La Rivoluzione Meridionale* by Guido Dorso and the research and investigations of Umberto Zanotti Bianco on schools and the conditions affecting childhood in Calabria. The Southern question, although of "national scope" as Sturzo put it, was not, however, the main problem which attracted the attention of Italian public opinion

during those years. The main problem was, of course, that of Fascism which produced some studies of considerable sociological interest although inevitably dominated more than ever by political passion, e.g. Luigi Salvatorelli's book on *Nazionalfascismo* and some others published in the collection *Biblioteca di Studi Sociali* edited by Rodolfo Mondolfo, including those by Mondolfo himself, by Luigi Fabbri and particularly Piero Gobetti.<sup>22</sup> Although not strictly a sociological work, but rather political and historical, Gobetti's *La Rivoluzione Liberale* calls for particular mention here on account of its insistence on the value of experience and the need for concrete knowledge of "Italian reality", its interpretation of Mosca's and Pareto's political class and ruling class doctrine and its concept of class struggle as an "infallible tool for the formation of new ruling classes". The doctrine of Mosca and Pareto, during these and subsequent years attracted the attention of Dorso who added new and interesting features, and used this doctrine for revolutionary instead of the conservative purposes, intended by the originators. Like Dorso and Gobetti, Gramsci also dealt fully with the problems implied in this doctrine and with others connected with them, although he did not associate himself with the writings of Mosca and Pareto, but was connected with the Marxist theory of classes.<sup>23</sup>

All these theoretical and practical studies with a direct bearing on conditions in Italy were undoubtedly of sociological interest, but came to a sudden end in 1925 owing to the repressive measures taken in that year by Fascism. Salvemini and Sturzo had to leave Italy and to take refuge abroad, Dorso and Zanotti Bianco were persecuted and reduced to silence, Gramsci and Gobetti died, the former after several years in prison, the latter in Paris from wounds and ill treatment inflicted by the Fascists.

Owing to these conditions and the impossibility of contradicting any arguments in favour of the established regime after 1925, we obviously have no reason to comment on any works published on this subject, because in spite of their apparently sociological character they must, I think, be considered more as apologetics and propaganda than works of science and philosophy. I accordingly pass over any works of racial sociology published after Fascism adopted the German racial policy, mostly by second-rate writers, even though there were a few exceptions which are certainly no credit to Italian science. Neither will I mention any of the publications written to justify, support, and promote the demographic policy adopted by Fascism even though, compared with the foregoing, these publications were more numerous and by thinkers of a higher scientific reputation. Even if I run the risk of being accused of not being comprehensive,<sup>24</sup> neither will I deal with the no less numerous writings on the Fascist Corporate State even though these are of a sociological nature, considering the conditions brought about by Fascism and the fact that social peace was enforced by the police while

the working classes were deprived of any possible means of autonomous organisation.<sup>24</sup> I do not think that any scientific importance can be attached to works discussing doctrines which, from a theoretical point of view, might undeniably have had some value, but had none at all when their theories were referred to facts from which they were completely divorced. It was claimed, for instance, that under the Fascist regime capital and labour were on the same level and were united in the Corporate State, and that the Fascist corporative principle was a recognition of democratic principles, i.e. free and active participation of every individual in the life of the collective group to which he belonged.

Leaving aside all this literature of a mainly propagandist and apologetic nature as well as the writings on social and political philosophy published abroad by anti-fascists, which, like the *Socialisme Liberal* by Carlo Rosselli<sup>25</sup> were only known, studied, and discussed in Italy after the fall of Fascism, there is not very much to be said of the sociological studies published after 1925. At best, a few indications may be given by a separate consideration of the trends of thought which subsequently proved most productive under Fascism.

The idealistic trends which occupied a leading position in Italian culture up to 1929 produced few and rather superficial contributions to sociology. In this field Gentile's tendencies must be distinguished from those of Croce. Disregarding what Gentile wrote in support of Fascism and considering only his scientific writings, I believe that he has not contributed greatly to sociology and that his last book *Genesi e Struttura della Societa* is of purely philosophical interest, in spite of its title. As regards Croce, I believe, as already mentioned, that a less negative attitude is indicated, not only on account of his different attitudes to science in general and to sociology in particular, but also because of his defence of the freedom of science and the sincerity of the scientist and his condemnation of men of culture who in the service of politics, distort facts and hide the truth. Closer than Gentile to the concrete facts of life and history, Croce made better and more interesting contributions to sociology even though as a historian and philosopher rather than a sociologist. I have in mind, for example, what Croce wrote about the middle classes or about political parties or about Fascism considered as activism or about some contemporary sociologists, such as Spengler and Mannheim.<sup>26</sup> With regard to contemporary sociology, especially that of the Germans, apart from Croce, I might mention the writings of other philosophers who did or did not share Croce's views. One thinks, among the former, of Carlo Antoni who, in his book *Dallo Storicismo alla Sociologia*, discusses fully the best known representatives of German formal sociology, criticizing them severely, and, among the latter, Norberto Bobbio, who deals much more leniently in the same period with the doctrines of Scheler, von Wiese, Freyer, and other German sociologists.<sup>27</sup>



If, on the whole, idealistic philosophy always proved essentially averse to sociology, Catholic spiritualism, which after 1929 attempted to supplant idealism and to take a leading position in the field of culture, was never hostile to sociology, but in fact on occasion it showed itself definitely in sympathy. Space forbids examining in detail the contributions made by Catholic thinkers to sociological study during the period in question, but a good idea can be gained by glancing through the principal reviews, such as *Civiltà Cattolica* which contains many articles by A. Brucculeri on the subject, or the *Rivista Internazionale di Scienze Sociali* already referred to. The works published in this review and elsewhere by Marcello Boldrini, Amintore Fanfani, Agostino Gemelli, Francesco Vito, and others show clearly that these thinkers, although specialists in other fields, contributed effectively within their sphere to the elucidation of questions of undoubted sociological interest, such as labour, emigration, the poor classes, the ruling classes, origin of the family, history of capitalism, etc. In all this work, however, the Review on the whole always remained true to the aims established in its programme, which were not only scientific but also political and religious, and during this period its attitude towards Fascism, on many if not on all questions, for example, towards the Fascist Corporate State, was an attitude of full approval.

Apart from the idealistic and Catholic trends, during the Fascist period the tendencies of thought related to the Nationalist tradition always retained a certain validity and importance and tended in various ways towards irrationalism and mysticism.<sup>28</sup> Obviously no outstanding contributions to sociology were to be expected from sources so different in character from the rational and objective nature of sociological studies. On the other hand, the supporters of irrationalism and mysticism, allied to Nationalist traditions, could not help feeling interest and sympathy for critics of parliamentarianism and for certain doctrines, such as that of political class, political formula, or ruling class, developed within Italian sociology by Mosca and Pareto obviously with conservative and anti-democratic aims. During the period in question these factors induced a certain fervour in the study of sociological doctrines and some thinkers even attempted to link them with Fascism and thereby provoked reactions and discussions similar to those provoked early in this century by other thinkers who tried linking the same doctrines to rising Nationalism.<sup>29</sup>

Mention should also be made of investigations carried out during this period by many social scientists, demographers, anthropologists, political scientists, etc. I prefer not to do this because it would involve distinguishing between strictly scientific and political and propagandist work, which is not possible here.

Before concluding this section I must mention that in 1936 the Fascist Government officially instituted faculties of political science whose

curriculum included sociology as an optional subject although since 1923 it had been compulsory for a degree in social science at Padua University, in the Institute Cesare Alfieri of Florence and in the School of Statistical and Actuarial Science at the University of Rome. Owing to conditions in the country, the institution of some faculties of political sciences and new courses of sociology did not contribute appreciably to the development and progress of studies in this field.

## V

During the periods just considered, from the close of the last century onwards, hostility towards sociology was increasing and the development of practical research and theoretical studies in this field became ever more difficult, but during the period we are about to consider, viz: the years after the second world war, the situation has been completely reversed in this respect. Although in this long-neglected field of our culture there are still no proper schools and we are still far from having any adequate organization for research, yet there are clear indications of a re-awakening of interest and a resumption of work which justify a hope of fruitful developments at a steadily increasing rate.

The reasons for this renaissance of sociological studies are easy to see, in my opinion, and some of them can be briefly stated here.

In the first place, with the collapse of Fascism and the return to democratic institutions, Italy recovered the freedom of choice and the privilege of criticism and discussion which are necessary to scientific work in any field, and especially so in sociology. The restored freedom re-awakened not only great interest in the social problems of the country, as is evidenced by the programmes of the political parties and even by the National Constitution, which is particularly aware of such problems, but also created a general and strong desire to learn the true facts about Italian society and especially about the backward regions, concerning which little or nothing could be said during the dictatorship. And this thirst for knowledge and understanding and even sometimes for action is evidenced by several significant facts, to mention only the success of Carlo Levi's books and to a lesser extent of those by Rocco Scotellaro, which throw a new light upon the social scene in the Southern regions, or the interest awakened in all levels of society by the work done in those regions by Danilo Dolci and by his books which abound in data collected by interviews, investigations, and observations on the spot, and although lacking the technical perfection of professional sociologists, are extremely stimulating because of the warm human feeling that inspired them.<sup>30</sup>

Apart from the return to constitutional freedom and the revival of interest in knowledge of concrete social problems and conditions, a renaissance of sociological studies in Italy was also favoured by the decline of Idealism which, although redoubling its attacks on sociology

through the medium of numerous articles by Croce, by Antoni,<sup>31</sup> and others, no longer succeeded in making the impression it formerly did, nor did it hit the mark, inasmuch as it continued to attack the sociology of 19th-century Positivism, now abandoned by all, and disregarded the new sociology which, in turn and in equally harsh terms, criticized the general syntheses and ambitious claims of Positivism. With the decline of Idealism other trends arose, which were no longer averse, but rather favourable to sociological studies. I have in mind numerous trends of Catholic thought, some of Marxist thought, and also, in particular, conventionalism, logical positivism, and analytical philosophy, all of which are resuming and developing the motives which were already present and active in Italian culture at the beginning of the century through the work of some representatives of pragmatism, like Giovanni Vailati and Mario Calderoni, who insisted on the instrumental value of knowledge and directed their investigations towards concrete research in logic, methodology of the sciences, linguistic analysis, etc., etc.

One last fact to point out among the factors responsible for the recent re-awakening of sociological studies in Italy, is the intensification and strengthening of the ties between Italy and the United States of America, ties that are not only scientific and cultural, but also economic and political, and the consequent general interest aroused in the theories and techniques of American sociology, not only amongst men of culture, but also business men, politicians, manufacturers, government officials, etc. etc. Among these last, interest in American sociology is naturally centred especially on that part of it which, by means of improved research methods, is devoted essentially to practical purposes, e.g. improvement of human relations between employers and employees, between senior and junior staff, public relations with government offices, and generally between members of a social group.

We cannot go into all the reasons for the re-awakening of sociological studies in Italy, but will deal instead with the various ways in which this re-awakening manifests itself both inside and outside the Universities. We shall have to be very brief, dealing only with the facts as a whole without particularizing thinkers and their works, since there are a large number of both and a proper time perspective is lacking for any syntheses and evaluations.<sup>32</sup>

As regards the University atmosphere, we must first mention the recent formation of a group of young sociologists and social research workers, which, if limited in number, at least exists where there had never been one before. Although, in the Universities, State competitions for full professorships in Sociology have not yet taken place and only one professorship in Sociology has been taken by a professor coming from a different subject, several "free lecturers" have been appointed, who are holding courses and doing research work in some

Faculties of Law and in the Faculties of Political Sciences. Some of these lecturers studied, or completed their studies, in the U.S.A. and with few exceptions, they are interested mainly in American sociology and they tend to use its technique and follow its precepts. This is evident from their subjects, criteria, and methods, such as studies and criticisms of the principal writers and trends in American sociology, articles on general problems like those of the methodology of social sciences, relationships between theory and research, or lastly works on specific problems such as human relations, mass communications political parties, social groups, leisure and the many problems of urban and rural sociology, industrial sociology, religious sociology, etc., etc.

This group of sociological specialists is allied in the faculties of literature and science with a group of perhaps still fewer but certainly no less active and alert thinkers. This is the group of cultural anthropologists who lecture and conduct research on various subjects of sociological interest and who are related to the sociologists not only by the nature of their scientific research but also by the fact that they encounter similar difficulties in getting their subject-matter fitted into the curriculum of Italian Universities. In this connection, as compared with sociologists and cultural anthropologists, a certain advantage is enjoyed by social psychologists who, with the first two mentioned, form one of the three typical social sciences. Social psychologists can, in fact, carry on their work in connection with professorships and institutes of psychology, which are now numerous and well organized at the Universities. But institutes of psychology and social psychology are obviously not the only University institutions where social research workers find opportunities for sociological research. Owing to the increasing interest in sociological problems and especially the increasing tendency of modern sociology towards research requiring team work and close collaboration between specialists in different fields, many other institutes connected with University professorships are carrying on research work which in a wider sense might be called sociological, and thus in some cases actually develop into real sociological research centres. Some idea of the number and importance of these institutes can be gained when we consider the many subjects which by their nature are closely connected with sociology as understood today: economics and agrarian economics, statistics and demography, town planning, ethnology, linguistics, pedagogics, hygiene, occupational medicine, political and legal sciences, etc., etc.

The re-awakening of interest in social study and research in Italy is not only evident within the Universities, but also outside them, as already mentioned, because not only scientists, but business men, manufacturers, managers of firms of all kinds, political leaders, and trade-union organizers are all gradually, if slowly, beginning to realize the advisability, not to say the necessity of studying and knowing the social background in which they work. It would be impossible to

enumerate here the many private and public establishments that are engaged in research and the collection of data of sociological interest or to give details of this research and those engaged in it, many of whom are working quite independently of each other. As an instance we might mention one manufacturer, Adriano Olivetti who, starting from general principles of his own conception of community, organized in his own factory and offices, centres for the study of problems such as human relations, and the sociology of co-operation, and encourages much research work and investigations of considerable sociological interest. With the support of various industrial and financial groups, the Associazione per lo Sviluppo Industriale del Mezzogiorno (Association for the Industrial Development of the South) was established in 1947 and has carried out interesting sociological investigations in various regions, particularly in the depressed South of Italy. In the field of city government, the Municipality of Genoa organized an Office of Social and Labour Studies which investigated problems of urban sociology, e.g. slums and workmen's housing. But these are only very limited instances compared with the large number of private and public undertakings that have their own offices and centres for studying the most varied sociological problems for their own particular and essentially practical purposes. We must not forget the many scientists who independently of all these offices and centres and also of the Universities are working earnestly and zealously on such problems as electoral sociology, and industrial and religious sociology.

We cannot conclude this brief review of the recent re-awakening of sociological studies in Italy without mentioning a few more facts, in particular the resumption of parliamentary inquiries, some of which are of special sociological interest, e.g. that on unemployment, under the Chairmanship of Roberto Tremelloni, or that on Poverty, presided over by Ezio Vigorelli, which included a remarkable investigation of the agricultural district of Grassano. Also the numerous Congresses, some on kindred subjects and others concerned more directly with sociology, e.g. the 14th Congress of the International Sociological Institute, held in Rome in 1950, the International Congress on Backward Areas organized by the National Centre of Prevention and Social Defence, held at Milan in 1954, the First National Congress of Social Sciences organized by the Italian Association of Social Sciences<sup>3a</sup> jointly with the Centre referred to above and held at Milan in 1958. Then there are the periodicals dealing with sociological problems, too numerous to list. Some of them specialise, e.g. *Quaderni di Sociologia*, edited by Nicola Abbagnano and Franco Ferrarotti, while others, without specialising on the subject, have published notable contributions to sociological studies, e.g. *Il Mulino* which has become a centre of initiative and research and inter alia organized a meeting in 1953 at Bologna on the subject of philosophy and sociology. The "Luigi Sturzo Institute" was founded in 1951, and in 1953 published *Scritti*

*di Sociologia e Politica in Onore di Luigi Sturzo* (Writings on Sociology and Politics in Honour of Luigi Sturzo) and since 1956 has been publishing a *Bollettino di Sociologia*. In various papers published since his return from exile, Sturzo has developed a metaphysical conception of sociology, on the basis of his own historicism, in which he reaffirms the fundamental motives of social personalism affected by spiritualistic tendencies. In spite of the author's prestige, this conception of his cannot be said to have gained general acceptance among Italian students of sociology. A wider recognition has been given to Abbagnano's conception based on the best known trends of American thought, as expounded by him in various articles in the review which he publishes, and in other works, in which he considers sociology as an empirical science devoted to the study of attitudes and institutions and which shares with the natural sciences the basic feature of its own object, viz: reproducibility which makes it possible to foresee the future.

If, after this short summary of the re-awakening of sociological studies in Italy I were to mention the trends of thought prevailing today, I would say that the most prevalent are those of American sociology, both in the field of theory and practical research and in fact most activity is concentrated on the latter. However, if much is being done, much still remains to be done to ensure that practical research, especially research in situ is adequate, i.e. in line with the actual possibilities existing in the country and the scientific and cultural level already attained in other fields. To conduct sociological research in this way presupposes adequate organization and at present there are still many and serious difficulties to be overcome. It must be admitted that even though the ruling class, political and financial, is no longer indifferent, as it was in the past, it is still not fully conscious of the importance and usefulness of sociological studies and research and does not provide all the necessary facilities for the effective carrying out of these studies and investigations. Moreover, social scientists and research workers at the universities and outside are still too small in number and the experience of many of them is still too limited for any really important work. Among the many offices, centres, and institutes engaged in sociological studies and research there is no proper collaboration and each works independently, unaware of what the others are doing, often using special terms and points of reference that differ from any of the others. This great disparity of the institutions and groups collecting data and engaged in research for so many different purposes: scientific, economic, political, charitable, religious, etc., gives rise to serious confusion and to prejudices and hostility between individual units and groups, sometimes more than justified. We need only imagine how perplexed some scientists may be by the research into human relationships as carried on by many institutions for essentially practical purposes. In a recent book, Livio Livi, not without reason, qualified this research as para-scientific rather than scientific and re-

ferring to the workers engaged in it he said "that these practical interests make the so-called sociologists appear more like a professional man looking after the interests of his clients rather than a real scientist".<sup>34</sup>

To overcome these difficulties and initiate sociological studies and research adequately organized and capable of dealing with the different and particular aspects of modern Italian society will mean a long road to travel. Having regard to Italy's recent history and its present position, I do not believe that it would be sufficient merely to establish proper contacts and to create an organization. An empirical sociology, a sociography as Toennies would have called it, collecting data, describing phenomena and conducting research by constantly improving and more accurate methods and techniques was unknown in Italy during the Fascist regime and does not exist today, but if it had existed at the time, it would not have been persecuted, on the contrary, it would have been used and developed. The sociology persecuted by Fascism was a discipline of a totally different nature, a discipline of "pure sociology" and of "applied sociology", as Toennies would have called it,<sup>35</sup> which possibly owing to the nature of its aims and failure to use specific techniques, may not even belong to true sociology and would be more correctly described as social philosophy. Between empirical sociology and social philosophy there are, I think, profound differences of aims and methods and the two disciplines can hardly be confused with each other. I think, though, that it would be most desirable to establish closer and better contacts between them. The social philosopher, accustomed almost exclusively to using historical methods in developing his theories and verifying his hypotheses may, in fact, derive great benefit from the data and facts of empirical sociology. The empirical sociologist in contact with social philosophy and identifying himself with its problems and methods would derive no less benefit in evaluating the aims of his own research. A mutual relationship between social philosophers and empirical sociologists might then help to prevent them developing that dogmatic spirit which sometimes takes facts and sometimes values as absolute truths, and to keep alive the critical spirit which admits of no absolute truths and considers any values as conditioned by facts and facts as conditioned by values.<sup>36</sup>

In the specific field of sociological study collaboration between social philosophy and empirical sociology and fostering of the critical spirit could, I think, be best ensured by studying the sociology of knowledge which, as we know, deals particularly with the relationship between facts and values and vice-versa, provided that its true and profound significance is appreciated. I will therefore conclude these remarks on the recent re-awakening of sociological studies in Italy by pointing out another aspect of it, which seems to justify hopes of further development, namely, the revival of interest in the sociology of knowledge, both on the part of humanistic thinkers who look upon

it as a link between the great historical trends of German sociology and those of American sociology, and on the part of cultural anthropologists who feel uneasy about the prevalent naturalism of Anglo-Saxon thought and tend more towards the dialectic and historical concepts of traditional European culture. It is desirable that interest in the sociology of knowledge and the need for the critical spirit which animates its best representatives should spread increasingly among Italian scientists devoted to sociology who are daily growing in number. This might help to ward off the danger of seeing the subject transformed into a formidable instrument for almost any purpose and thus also to avoid the still greater danger recently pointed out by Bobbio in the conclusion of his address to the First National Congress of Social Sciences, by his supposition of a "tyrant whom an immense laboratory of prominent research workers is keeping informed day by day of the innermost secret motives of the human spirit".<sup>27</sup>

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup> Italian sociological doctrines have been examined in many papers. I mention a few and reference to these will provide further and more detailed bibliographies since, considering the nature of the subject and limitations of space, I can only give the essential references. Richard, *Le mouvement sociologique en Italie*, *Revue de synthèse historique*, 1909, pp. 257 ss; Michels, *Elemente zur Sociologie in Italien*, *Köln Vierteljahrshäfte für Soziologie*, 1924, pp. 219 ss; Becker, *Sociology in Italy*, in, Barnes-Becker, *Social Thought from Lore to Science*, Boston, 1938, vol. II, pp. 1002 ss; Treves, *Sociologia y filosofia social*, Buenos Aires, 1941, Appendice "El pensamiento italiano contemporáneo" pp. 122 ss; Castrilli, *L'insegnamento della sociologia in Italia*, *Rivista int. di Filosofia del Diritto*, 1941 pp. 265 ss; Govi, *L'insegnamento e l'avvenire della sociologia in Italia*, *Rivista int. di Filosofia del Diritto*, 1942, pp. 448 ss; Panunzio, *La sociologie italienne*, in Gurvitch, *La sociologie au XX siècle* Paris, 1947 vol. II, pp. 643 ss; Ayala, *Tratado de sociologia*, Buenos Aires, 1947, vol. I cap. VI "La sociologia italiana", pp. 209 ss; Spirito, *La sociologia in Italia*, *Revue int. de philosophie*, 1950, n.13; Santucci, *Cultura italiana e problemi sociologici*, Introduzione a Rumney-Maier, *Sociologia, la scienza della società*, Bologna, 1955; Ferrarotti, *La situazione degli studi sociologici in Italia*, *Quaderni di sociologia*, 1955, pp. 55 ss; 1956, pp. 24 ss; Pellizzi, *Gli studi sociologici in Italia nel nostro secolo*, *Quaderni di sociologia*, 1956, pp. 67 ss, 123 ss; Battaglia, *Oggetto e prospettive dell'odierna sociologia*, *Bollettino di sociologia dell'Istituto Sturzo*, 1956, n.3; Di Carlo, *La sociologia in Italia nella seconda metà del secolo scorso*, *Sociologia. Bollettino dell'Istituto Sturzo*, 1957 n.4; Ferrarotti, *Orientamenti e caratteristiche della sociologia in Italia*, in the collective vol. *La filosofia contemporanea in Italia*, Roma, 1958, pp. 367 ss.

<sup>2</sup> Niceforo, *Schematico profilo di una sociologia generale in cinquanta paragrafi*, *Rivista italiana di economia, demografia e statistica*, July—December, 1957.

<sup>3</sup> See spec. Ferri, *Socialismo e scienza positiva*, Roma 1894. For wider information on this subject, Bulferetti, *Le ideologie socialistiche in Italia nell'eta del positivismo evolutivistico*, Firenze, 1951.

<sup>4</sup> Labriola, *La concezione materialistica della storia*, 4a ed., Bari, 1953; la ed. 1897, *Discorrendo di socialismo e filosofia*, 6a ed., Bari, 1953, la ed. 1897.

<sup>5</sup> On these studies and research for the period we are dealing with and for the following ones, see: Tagliacozzo, *Voci di realismo politico dopo il 1870*, Bari, 1939; Romano, *Storia della questione meridionale*, Palermo, 1945; Caizzi, *Antologia della questione meridionale*, Milano, 1950. Caracciolo, *L'inchiesta agraria Jacini*, Torino, 1958.

<sup>6</sup> De Gasperi, Foreword to Toniolo *Opera omnia*, serie III, vol. II, Citta del Vaticano, 1949, p. VIII.

<sup>7</sup> Toniolo, *Il compito odierno delle scienze sociali ad opera dei cattolici*, *Opera cit.* vol. cit. pp. 275 e ss.



<sup>8</sup> Ardigo, *La morale dei positivisti; Sociologia*, in *Opere filosofiche* volumi III, IV, Padova, 1885, 1886.

<sup>9</sup> Morselli, *Elementi di sociologia generale*, Milano, 1898; Vanni, *Prime linee di un programma critico di sociologia*, Perugia, 1888. For further references on these authors and on the previously quoted ones, see note 1.

<sup>10</sup> *Rivista italiana di sociologia*, 1897, p. 131, 1898, p. 557.

<sup>11</sup> Ferri, *Sociologia criminale*, 5a ed., Torino, 1929, ed. with the title *I nuovi orizzonti del diritto e della procedura penale*, Bologna, 1881.

<sup>12</sup> Niceforo, *Italiani del nord e Italiani del sud*, Torino, 1901.

<sup>13</sup> Petrone, *Della sociologia come scienza autonoma; La sociologia e la sua elisione logica nella filosofia dello spirito*, Atti della Accademia di scienze morali e politiche di Napoli, vol. XXXVI, 1906, republished in, Petrone, *Filosofia del diritto con l'aggiunta di vari saggi su etica, diritto e sociologia*, Milano, 1950.

<sup>14</sup> Croce, *Logica come scienza del concetto puro*, 5a ed., Bari, 1928, p. 262.

<sup>15</sup> Croce, *Estetica come scienza dell'espressione e linguistica generale*, 5a, ed. Bari, 1922, p. 70, *Etica e Politica*, Bari, 1931, p. 244.

<sup>16</sup> Gentile, *Sistema di logica come teoria del conoscere*, 2a ed. Bari, 1923.

<sup>17</sup> *Rivista italiana di sociologia*, settembre-ottobre 1911.

<sup>18</sup> For these authors and relevant bibliography see note No. 1.

<sup>19</sup> For this subject refer to note No. 5.

<sup>20</sup> Among Michels' several studies on this subject, see *La sociologia del partito politico nella democrazia moderna*, Torino, 1912.

<sup>21</sup> Croce, *Conversazioni critiche*, serie IV, Bari, 1932, p. 167; De Ruggiero, *La filosofia contemporanea*, 3a ed., Bari, 1929, vol. II pp. 230 ss.

<sup>22</sup> Salvatorelli, *Nazional fascismo*, Torino, 1923; Mondolfo, *Per la comprensione storica del fascismo*, Bologna, 1922; Fabbri, *La contro-rivoluzione preventiva*, Bologna, 1922; Gobetti, *La rivoluzione liberale*, Bologna, 1924 2a ed. Torino, 1949.

<sup>23</sup> Dorso's and Gramsci's complete work has been published by Einandi. For brief information on these authors refer to Bobbio, *Teorie politiche e ideologie nell'Italia contemporanea*, in, *La filosofia contemporanea* cit.

<sup>24</sup> I could be accused for instance by Pellizzi, see: *Gli studi sociologici* . . . cit. p. 141. Actually this article ends with reference to the importance of Fascist Corporatism.

<sup>25</sup> Rosselli, *Socialisme liberal*, Paris, 1930.

<sup>26</sup> Treves, *Benedetto Croce filosofo de la libertad*, Buenos Aires, 1943, *Sociologia e historia*, Revista de la facultad de derecho, Tucuman, 1943, pp. 494 e ss.

<sup>27</sup> Antoni, *Dallo storicismo alla sociologia*, Firenze, 1940; Bobbio, *L'indirizzo fenomenologico nella filosofia sociale e giuridica*, Torino, 1934; *La persona nella sociologia contemporanea*, Torino, 1938.

<sup>28</sup> On the mystique of Fascism, see the issues of the review " *Dottrina fascista* ", Milan from 1937 onwards. On the mystique of Nationalism, see Arcari, *Le elaborazioni della dottrina politica nazionale fra l'unita e l'intervento*, Firenze, 1934-1939.

<sup>29</sup> On this subject and its bibliography, see Delle Piane, *Gaetano Mosca, classe politica e liberalismo*, Napoli, 1952, pp. 360 e ss.

<sup>30</sup> Levi, *Cristo si e fermato a Eboli*, Torino, 1945; *Le parole sono pietre*, Torino, 1955; Scotellaro, *Contadini del sud*, Bari, 1954; Dolci, *Banditi a Partinico*, Bari, 1956, *Inchiesta a Palermo*, Torino, 1956.

<sup>31</sup> *Il Mondo*, 28 dicembre 1950, 17 novembre 1951.

<sup>32</sup> For bibliographical references and more details about the revival of sociological studies in Italy refer to Barbano, *La sociologia in Italia oggi, Saggio bibliografico*, *Il Politico*, 1954, pp. 494 ss. Rapport, Cappanari, Moss, *Sociology in Italy*, *American Sociological Review*, August, 1957; Rose, *La sociologie en Italie vue par un americain*, *Bull. int. des sciences sociales*, 1958, n.I.

<sup>33</sup> This Association was created in 1957 and was recognized as the Italian Section of the International Sociological Association.

<sup>34</sup> Livi, *La vecchia e la nuova sociologia generale positiva*, Milano, 1957, p. 235.

<sup>35</sup> Toennies, *Einführung in die Soziologie*, Stuttgart, 1931, p. 313 ss.

<sup>36</sup> Treves, *Spirito Critico e Spirito dogmatico*, Milano, 1954.

<sup>37</sup> Bobbio, *Atti del I Congresso Nazionale di Scienze Sociali*, vol. II Bologna, 1959.

# Japanese Sociology in its Social Context

M. SHIMMEI

(Professor of Sociology, Tohoku University)

## INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

As the study of sociology was begun in the 1870's in Japan, Japanese sociology may well be credited with having a history at least as long as that of American sociology. And its development itself can compare quite favourably with that of European sociology, though not of course with that of American sociology, so far as the number of institutions where sociology is taught and persons who teach sociology therein are concerned. We have now about 150 universities and colleges that have either a separate department, or one or more courses, of sociology. The number of persons who teach sociology in these institutions is estimated at about 350. The Japanese Sociological Society, a national association of sociologists and others who are interested in sociology has a membership of about 800. These figures are by no means large in comparison with those in the United States. However we may safely say on the basis of these facts that, next to the United States, Japan has been favoured by the development of sociology at any rate so far as it is observed from the quantitative standpoint.

It is true that the development of sociology in Japan has been especially remarkable since the end of World War II owing to the fact that the study of sociology was greatly enhanced by the establishment of new institutions and by greater freedom of investigation, including sociological investigation, under the new circumstances after the defeat. However, it is undeniable that this development itself could not have been realized, if sociology had not been afforded beforehand favourable opportunities to strike its roots deeply into the soil in its past history. Just as an adequate cultural basis is necessary for the appearance of a new invention, scientific achievement also needs for its development a favourable pre-existing condition. In this sense the rapid development of Japanese sociology since the end of World War II itself bespeaks clearly enough that the development of sociology in Japan has been rather happy throughout its whole history, even if it has been unable to escape sometimes being faced with difficulties which threatened its very existence.

Of course this does not mean that Japanese sociology has been so blessed as to produce excellent scientific achievements deserving to be

noticed not only quantitatively, but also qualitatively. Frankly speaking, until at the earliest about the early 1920's most of the Japanese sociologists had been rather eager to transplant or popularize multifarious sociological theories of the West without any intention to bring out new perspectives. In this respect Japanese sociology forms a striking contrast to British or German sociology which succeeded in giving birth to some world-famous sociological theories in spite of the fact that sociology as an independent science is not very firmly established even now. As for the reason thereof we may perhaps point out that the study of sociology in Japan has not always been pursued with proper scientific consciousness, on account of the circumstance that the sociology introduced into Japan from the West was too easily accepted without necessary reflection on its nature as a new science, although the very cause which facilitated the development of sociology in Japan may in one sense be attributed to this state of mind.

Perhaps such a fate might have been one which was inescapable for an oriental nation which was forced to adapt itself to the impact of modern Western civilization with no scientific tradition of its own. However, it is all too clear, that, so long as this deplorable dual character cannot be wiped out, we are unable to say complacently that the development of Japanese sociology has been very happy. Whereas the development of Japanese sociology can compare favourably with that of Western sociology in the quantitative sense, it is doubtful that this could be asserted also in the qualitative sense. In this sense Japanese sociology must be said to be still confronted with the problem how to overcome this unparalleled qualitative defect even at present.

#### THE IMPORTATION OF WESTERN SOCIOLOGY

The reason why the development of sociology has been apparently so favourable in Japan may be attributed to the very fact that the study of sociology was blessed with an adequate spiritual climate when it was for the first time imported from the West. As is well known, Japan entered into a new stage of her history with the Restoration of 1868 which gave birth to a new Meiji era after the collapse of the Tokugawa Shogunate (feudal government). At that time Japan was filled with the spirit of progress and innovation and the people as well as the new government were so to speak wholeheartedly devoted to seeking and acquiring all sorts of Western thought and knowledge in order to catch up with the progress of Western civilization.

Of course the Restoration of 1868 was not a revolution in the modern democratic sense, as the term Restoration itself suggests. It was in reality a queer mixture of monarchical absolutism and democratic liberalism engineered by an upper *samurai* class rather than something which grew up from among the masses. Consequently it is quite natural that the new government dominated by the upper *samurai* class strove to consolidate the foundation of its power by all means

without due regard to the democratic principle after its victory had been settled. However, the government knew also very well even at this juncture that it was indispensable for it to utilize all available Western sciences and ideas, however democratic and liberal they might have been, in order to establish a new state rich and strong enough to compete with the Western countries in the future. From that standpoint the government was not only tolerant of, but was willing to encourage, the transplantation of Western sciences and ideas in accordance with the general spirit of the age.

It is not surprising that, under those favourable circumstances, great progress was made in the importation of the Western sciences, and by the strenuous efforts of scholars soon after the Restoration all important Western sciences, natural and social, including sociology came to be transplanted into Japan one by one.

It was Comte's sociology which was chronologically first made known to the Japanese. His name and sociological theory were introduced, though briefly, to Japanese readers by A. Nishi, one of the leading liberal thinkers, in an article published in 1873. However his sociology failed to appeal to the Japanese, who were at that time anxious to learn more liberal and democratic thought from the West, as its conservative implications was all too clear.

In contrast with this, the most widely read and highly welcome was the work of no other person than the English sociologist Spencer, who was also noted as a radical defender of individual rights and laissez-faire policy. His *Social Statics* was translated into Japanese in 1877 and henceforth there appeared almost incessantly about thirty translations of his works until the early 1890's. One reason why his works were so welcome is that they offered appropriate arguments to support the *Jiyu-minken-undo* (Liberal Human Rights Movement) which was launched at the end of the 1820's as a protest movement against the absolutistic policy of the new government by a group of bourgeois politicians and thinkers. They were ready to utilize all kinds of Western liberal and democratic thought introduced to Japan in order to popularize and disseminate liberal and democratic thought among the people. For this purpose they referred to not only Spencer's works, but also J. S. Mill's, Buckle's and Rousseau's. However it was Spencer after all who exerted the greatest influence, unsurpassed by other thinkers for a long time, and his popularity as a thinker also served not a little to let the Japanese scholars acknowledge him as a leading sociologist, with the indirect consequence that sociology itself almost came to be recognized as a new science.

In the case of Spencer's sociology, its supporters were not only limited to the liberal and democratic minded circle. The new government who were standing against them were also ready to accept it, so far as his general theory of society was concerned. It was especially

his theory of social evolution, founded on the broader theory of cosmic evolution, which was accepted almost unanimously on all sides as a fundamental principle to explain the history of human society. And those who adhered to this standpoint were led consequently to conceive sociology as a fundamental science to other social sciences. What should be noticed is that this view was supported not only by those who became sociologists, but also by other scholars who had been studying economics and political science. When we take that state of things into account, it is no wonder that the study of sociology was not only not beset with difficulties, but was heartily welcome and made the focus of investigations, with the result that it came to be established as a regular course as soon as university education was begun in Japan.

#### THE BEGINNING OF JAPANESE SOCIOLOGY

The honour of having lectured on sociology for the first time in Japan must be given to Ernest Fenollosa, an American teacher who was called to Japan in 1878 and lectured on philosophy, political science and finance at Tokyo University which had been established in the previous year. He was not a sociologist in the proper sense, but he proposed and delivered lectures on sociology on the ground that sociological knowledge was indispensable for those who wish to study politics. In 1881, when sociology was officially sanctioned as a distinct course of study in the curriculum, he was invited to lecture on the subject and continued until 1886 when he left the post and returned to his native country. He seems to have lectured on sociology chiefly on the basis of Spencerian evolutionism, using as textbooks Spencer's *Principles of Sociology* and Morgan's *Ancient Society*. The first Japanese who gave lectures on sociology was Shoichi Toyama, Dean of the Faculty of Letters of Tokyo University. He supported Fenollosa's idea that lectures on sociology should be given as a general introduction to social and political science, and he himself ventured to lecture on sociology as the foundation of history before he gave lectures on the history of philosophy, though properly he was not a sociologist. He continued to lecture on sociology until he became President of the University in 1897, becoming the first professor in charge of the chair of sociology when it was established in 1893. He had no connection with the *Jiyu-minken-undo* which sprung up in 1876 and continued until 1884 when it was extinguished by the government. Nevertheless he belonged to the liberal wing among the scholars who stood by the cause of liberalism and dared to vindicate human right in a pamphlet *Against the Fallacy of Anti-human-rights-theory* published in 1880 against Hiroyuki Kato who tried to refute the theory of human rights from the standpoint of social Darwinism. His sociological conception was modelled on Spencerian evolutionism combined with the theory of human rights which was in some degree mixed with the conceptions of Buckle, Bagehot, Maine and Guizot. He left no sociological work except some sociological articles in which he tried to investigate prehistoric Japanese

society in the positivistic spirit, utilizing chiefly materials taken from Spencer's works. In this sense his contribution to Japanese sociology was not great so far as the theoretical contents are concerned. However, it is quite certain that he was the first person to introduce sociology as a regular course of study into university education, thereby clearing the way for the future development of Japanese sociology. As mentioned above, sociology found in Japan a suitable spiritual climate for its development when it was first imported. It was welcome and moreover recognized at once as the master science presiding over all other social and historical sciences. Nevertheless, it will be not fair to Toyama, if we underestimate his achievement on that account, because it is solely owing to his foresight that the study of sociology was firmly established as part of the academic tradition not long after it had been introduced into Japan and thus its prospects of development were assured. Toyama's position in the history of Japanese sociology may well be compared in this sense with that of Sumner in the United States. Though he was not equal to Sumner as a sociologist, he can be credited with the same pioneer work of paving the way for the study of sociology in university education by promoting the establishment of a chair of sociology and giving lectures on sociology himself.

Soon after Toyama began to lecture on sociology at Tokyo University, Nagao Aruga who had studied philosophy, history and sociology under Fenollosa, planned and started to publish a system of sociology. It should have been composed of six volumes of which he managed to publish only the first three: Vol. I, *Treatise on Social Evolution*, (1883), Vol. II, *Treatise on Religion*, (1883), and Vol. III, *Treatise on Tribal Systems*, (1884). His system of sociology was, just as in Toyama's case, based on a Spencerian conception of sociology, including the theory of social evolution and that of the social organism. It cannot be denied that he designed his system of sociology in imitation of the Spencerian system. However, it was also true that he was not content to follow what Spencer had done and went further, at least in Vol. III, in presenting some original observations, utilizing the materials concerning China, Korea and Saghalien which he himself had collected by reading through manuscripts. He gave up his plan to build up a system of sociology when he was appointed secretary to the House of Elder Statesmen in 1884, and even when he came back to the academic world later after some years of study in Europe, he never reverted to sociology, as his scientific interest had turned from sociology to the legal sciences. Be that as it may, it is noteworthy that the first and second volumes of his work were published in the same year as Ward published his *Dynamic Sociology* in the United States. Aruga's sociology of course compares very unfavourably with Ward's. However, his position may be, though only in a figurative sense, compared with that of Ward in contrast with Toyama whose position reminds us of that of Sumner.

## THE IMPACT OF POLITICAL CONSERVATISM

Japanese sociology, which was in the process of being established since 1881, was, owing to the strong influence of Spencer on it for some time, characterized by the spirit of liberalism and democracy as it was exemplified by Toyama and, though in a lesser degree, also by Aruga. However, this salient feature of Japanese sociology was unhappily destined to be lost. The *Jiyu-minken-undo* which arose as an anti-governmental liberal and democratic movement demanding the immediate establishment of a National Diet declined owing to the repressive measures of the government after about 1880, although at first it succeeded in arousing enthusiasm and sympathy throughout Japan and led to the formation of two political parties: the Liberal and the Progressive Party. As soon as the government was convinced of its victory over the *Jiyu-minken-undo*, it took steps to proclaim to the people that the government intended to establish a National Diet in 1890, but solely in order to pacify national sentiment, and it proceeded at the same time to prepare a draft of the Constitution. The intention of the government was to draw up a draft of the Constitution which would empower it, in defiance of democracy, to secure the consolidation of the state on the basis of absolutism. In that case what the conservative politicians looked upon as the model of the future Japanese state was nothing else than the Prussian state. According to that policy they endeavoured to draw up a draft of the Constitution in which it was to be provided that the supreme power to control the military and naval forces, and to appoint the premier, would be conferred on the emperor, so that the parliament might not interfere with the formation of the cabinet. With that objective in mind Hirobumi Ito and his followers visited Germany in 1882 and heard there the lectures of Lorenz von Stein and Gneist, and on their return they encouraged the study of the science of law, especially of German origin, instead of English and French origin whose theories used to be liberal. What is to be noticed here is that with that turn of the governmental policy a change was brought about in the political climate saturated with democratic and liberal thought and all the liberal thoughts introduced from the West began to lose their influence.

It is all too clear that, under such circumstances, sociology also found itself in a situation in which it could no more enjoy its former privileged status. Of course Toyama could continue lecturing in the University, and furthermore a chair of sociology was established there during this period. The academic status of sociology in university education may well be said to have been stabilized for ever. However, it cannot be denied that the study of sociology was obliged to lose its original progressive character and to become by and by a mere handmaid science patronized by the government. And this changed situation is most eloquently symbolized by the case of Kato. He was once famed as one of the most valiant advocates of constitutionalism. But he changed his opinions after 1879 and turned out to be the militant

defender of bureaucratic absolutism. As mentioned above, he was led into a controversy with Toyama when he repudiated the theory of human rights as fallacious in his book *A New Theory of Human Rights* published in 1882. The reason why he was induced to be conservative may be traced to the influence of German scholars, especially Bluntschli and Biedermann whose books he translated between 1872 and 1875. Later he came to be attracted by Schaeffle and Lilienfeld on the one hand, and by Haeckel and Darwin on the other, consequently adopting the standpoint of social Darwinism which laid stress on the theory of the struggle for existence and that of the survival of the fittest. He was also influenced by Spencer's works which he read. But in his case Spencer's theory of evolution was only so far appreciated as it coincided with social Darwinism so that there remained no room to defend human rights. He had been very sympathetic to sociology and, though his conception was different from Toyama's, he was always ready to promote the study of sociology, being President of Tokyo University between 1877-1886 and 1890-1893. But nevertheless, it cannot be denied that his sociological standpoint was manifestly conservative. And Kato was the very person who had a major influence upon Japanese sociology after political conservatism became active.

In 1889 the promised Constitution was at last promulgated and in the following year the Imperial Diet was opened. However, the government which did its best to eradicate any democratic element from the Constitution was still afraid of the supposed undesirable consequence of constitutionalism and tried to strengthen the measures to be taken against possible changes in popular thought. In the same year as the Diet was opened, the Imperial Rescript on Education was promulgated for the purpose of reinforcing the old Confucian morality against the attacks of radical democratic thought. It is unnecessary to say that, with this ever accelerating tempo of conservatism, the tide turned out to be unfavourable to the study of sociology in the proper sense. After about 1890 sociological publications became fewer. In this climate of opinion it was only Kato who published his works. He published *Outlines of Sociology* in 1891, *The Struggle for the Right of the Strong* in 1893, *The Progress of Morals and Law* in 1894 and *The Law of Moral and Legal Evolution* in 1900. This is the reason why he can be regarded as the symbol of this period.

#### THE PERIOD OF STAGNATION

The period from the end of the nineteenth century to the early part of the twentieth century was for Japan one of amazing development and miraculous expansion. When Japan succeeded in formally establishing a modern state with the promulgation of the Constitution, she was also coming of age in her development as an industrial society. Japanese capitalism which was still in its infantile age without any factories at the beginning made some progress thanks to the protective policy of the government, which was anxious to foster a modern factory



industry in Japan by means of importing necessary equipment from the West and putting the management of factories at first under its own control. The textile industry was the first to develop and in 1888 there were 1,694 factories employing 123,327 workers. After the victory of the Sino-Japanese War this tendency became more distinct and now Japan entered upon the stage of Industrial Revolution. How far Japan succeeded in building up a strong state with adequate modern industrial equipment was proved later by the victory of the Russo-Japanese War. And after this War, Japanese capitalism was given the opportunity to take a further stride in the development of industry, shifting its centre of gravity from light industry to heavy industry, the number of factories amounting to 10,598 employing 584,318 workers in 1907. Japan, which had started as an agricultural country with the Meiji Restoration changed itself now into a commercial and industrial one. In those years of enormous development Japan expanded her territory twice by military victories and came to be regarded as one of the strongest nations in the world characterized by an unprecedented progressive spirit.

However, this wonderful progress of Japan was in reality not one which was promoted by a genuine progressive spirit. It should be understood as a progress engineered by the ruling class at the expense of the people. They were against the principle of democracy in both internal and external politics. The fact that, until about 1912, they were loath to admit party politics, ever clinging to their narrow clique politics, will explain clearly how stubbornly they opposed democracy. At best they had been progressive only so far as they hoped to transplant Western institutions without letting in the spiritual ingredients mixed with them. Such being the case, while Japan was making progress outwardly as a modern state, there were no manifestations of the substantial progressive spirit which had once characterized Japan. With the ascendancy of Japan as a strong state, nationalism separated from democracy became the leading spirit of the time, and various kinds of reactionary thought sprang up in connection with the rising tide of militant nationalism. And in face of this turn of the current, the study of sociology itself succumbed to the trend of the time.

Of course the study of sociology itself may be said, from the mere formal point of view, to have made some progress. The chair in Tokyo University occupied hitherto by Toyama was occupied in 1901 by Tongo Takebe who came to lead Japanese sociology until the middle of Taisho era. He proceeded to build up a system of sociology which might be regarded as the first really systematic one ever produced. Of his system of sociology entitled *Theoretical General Sociology*, Vol. I *Introduction to Sociology* was published in 1905, followed by Vol. II *Social Laws* in 1906, Vol. III *Social Statics* in 1909 and Vol. IV *Social Dynamics* in 1917. In contrast with Toyama, his teacher, who was under Spencer's influence, he sought the basis of his system in Comte's.

But his intention was rather to build up a system of sociology on the basis of Comtism and Confucianism. Laying stress on the pragmatic character of sociology in the same way as Comte, he asserted that his system of sociology aimed at the discovery of the laws by which the Confucian ideal of the well governed state and peaceful world would be realized. His system was composed of two parts. He treated in his social statics the problem of social order, defining society as an organism on the basis of the theory of the social organism. In social dynamics he treated the problem of social development, especially that of the evolutionary stages, in which seven stages: horde, family, clan or tribe, village, city, state and human society were distinguished. He was of opinion that the last stage of human society corresponded to that of the ideal peaceful world which was conceived by Confucius. His sociology was comprehensive and his concept of society as an organism is worthy of notice as an attempt to synthesize biological sociology and psychological sociology. However, his sociology was rather empty in its contents in spite of its grandiose form, and moreover it was too metaphysical to be called scientific. In one sense he may be said to have inaugurated a new departure in Japanese sociology by introducing Comtean sociology. But his system took over not only Comte's sociology as a framework, but also his conservative spirit. In Takebe's case, the conservative tendency was accentuated still by his idiosyncratic adhesion to Confucianism, which was just in the process of being revived by the conservative politicians as counterbalance to liberalism and democracy. It is only too clear that, with Takebe's ascendancy, the main current of Japanese sociology was changed now from liberalism to conservatism.

Of course there were some sidecurrents which demand our attention even in this period, of which perhaps Ryukichi Endo's sociological works were the most meritorious. Endo, who had graduated from Tokyo University some years later than Takebe, worked mostly as professor in the private universities and published many books on sociology. In contrast with Takebe, he was under the influence of American sociology and in 1898 he translated Giddings' *Principles of Sociology* into Japanese. At first he adopted the standpoint of the theory of the social organism. But he had adopted the standpoint of psychological sociology, since he came to know Giddings' sociology and tried, in his *Sociology in the Present Age* (1901), to consolidate sociology on the basis of psychology, by elucidating the meaning of the theory of consciousness of kind and investigating the laws which governed the realization of collective consciousness. His sociological conceptions were most systematically presented in his *Modern Sociology* (1907), in which he defined the core of society as an associational form of human wills, and proceeded to explain all association and institutions on this basis. He pointed out, as kinds of associational wills, constraint, imitation, agreement, love and others, and as kinds of association, the state, functional association, public opinion, traditional

association, fashion association, intercourse association, family association, heritage association and others. His sociological standpoint was mostly borrowed from Giddings and his system itself was also logically not without inexactness. However, in comparison with Takebe his sociology was far in advance at least in its attempt to establish sociology on the basis of psychology. And his political attitude was also not so conservative as the former's.

We may refer, besides Endo, to Hideo Higuchi and to Iku Kobayashi as sociologists who belonged to the school of psychological sociology at this period. In 1911 Higuchi wrote *A Short History of Sociology*, the first book on the history of sociology published in Japan, in which he concluded that the trend of psychological sociology had been becoming influential as the representative type of sociology, he himself supporting this standpoint. Kobayashi also published *Social Psychology* in 1909 and *Studies in Social Psychology* in 1910, based on the same point of view.

These scholars, especially Endo, represented at this time a new trend in Japanese sociology in opposition to Takebe's biological sociology, and their political attitude was also rather moderate. However, it was not they, but Takebe who led the sociological circle at this time and his conservative orientation caused Japanese sociology to fall into a state of stagnation.

From the beginning of this period social problems were also springing up in Japan with the rapid development of industry and, stimulated by this situation, social movements were already being launched in an embryonic form. In 1899 Gennosuke Yokoyama, a popular writer, published the work *Japanese Lower Class Society* in which he depicted the miserable condition of the working class with compassion. But sociologists failed to show much interest in this question of the time. Their attitudes were generally quite indifferent, except Endo, who emphasized the importance of the study of sociology in its relation to social problems on the ground that the solution of social problems had much to do with the happiness and security of society as a whole. The stagnation and retrogression of Japanese sociology came to be more manifest after the Russo-Japanese War which heightened conservative nationalism. Sociology was allowed to survive, even after the oppressive measures of the government were further intensified with the result that all scientific investigations came to be regarded with suspicion and even the word "social" was suspected of a connection with socialism. Sociology might be said to have been fortunate, as it was exempted from this suspicion. But, to speak the truth, it was because sociology at that time was represented by Takebe who was conservative enough to reassure the conservative government.

#### NEW PERSPECTIVES OF SOCIOLOGY

However, despite so many years of stagnation, the chance of revival was given to Japanese sociology when the Meiji era ended and the

Taisho era began. The conservative semi-feudal aristocrats who were firmly resolved to uphold their power position came to be confronted with the opposition of liberal parties soon after the death of Emperor Meiji. The so-called "Constitution in Danger" Movement was started in 1912, the aim of which was to destroy the absolutist regime of the aristocrats and to establish instead a constitutional government based on the party system. At first this movement was fruitless. Nevertheless, it became in due course influential and at length, after the end of World War I, it grew to be a nation-wide movement.

As the background of this movement we may point out the fact that Japanese industry which had been making progress since the end of the Meiji era, was favoured by a rare opportunity to develop more rapidly just at this time. Japan which fought against Germany with the allied nations was not only honoured by the victory but also enabled to expand her world trade, while the belligerent nations in the West had been too much occupied with the war. It was no wonder that Japanese industry, which had already reached the stage of monopolistic capitalism with the concentration of capital and production, could accomplish an epochmaking development. Between 1914 and 1918 the number of factories increased from 31,717 to 43,949. Factories with more than 100 labourers increased in inverse ratio to those with less than 100 labourers, and the number of labourers rose from 948,000 to 1,612,000. Stimulated by this tremendous development, the capitalist class in Japan became more class conscious and, in opposition to the aristocrats, proceeded to support the cause of constitutionalism professed by party politicians. However, it was nothing else than the idea of democracy, which was imported anew from the West as a consequence of the War, that served to reinforce the movement. After a long interval Japan began again to be fascinated by liberalism and democracy, supported by this trend of the time. The "Constitution in Danger" Movement became year by year more powerful and at last succeeded in 1918 in giving birth to the Hara cabinet, the first party government in Japan. From that time, notwithstanding the counter movements from the side of the aristocracy, this movement continued to advance triumphantly and, with the formation of the Kato cabinet in 1924, the parliamentary cabinet system was finally established in Japan. It was in the following year that the long desired universal suffrage was approved in the Diet and Japan was enabled to take rank with the advanced nations of the world.

With this change of spiritual climate a new wind began to blow again in Japanese sociology which encouraged it not only to revive, but to bring forth contributions which deserved to be called really scientific. The pioneer work in this sense was accomplished by Shōtaro Yoneda, lecturer of Kyoto University, who had made efforts to introduce to Japan the new literature by Western sociologists, especially Tarde and Giddings. He was not so anxious to establish his own sys-

tem. But he came to draw up an outline of his system in an article "On Sociology" published in 1913, in which he divided sociology into three parts: systematic sociology, pure sociology and synthetic sociology. The first, or systematic, deals with the concepts and the classification of social phenomena, the nature of social laws, the methods of sociology and so on. The second, or pure, treats the genesis of inter-mental relationships, social-psychological actions which give rise to them, the fundamental processes and forms through which they are developed. The third, or synthetic, concerns concrete processes of social formation, social circles and groups, cultural phenomena and social and cultural evolution. This conception seems to have been suggested by Tarde, Giddings and Simmel on the one hand, and by de Roberty, Vanni, Worms, Grasserie and Squillace on the other. Yoneda's aim was to construct a large comprehensive system of sociology in which all branches of sociology hitherto developed would be synthesized. A noteworthy feature of his sociology is that he was quick to recognize the important meaning of sociology as a special science proposed by Simmel, though he himself intended to integrate this type of sociology with the synthetic sociology hitherto generally accepted.

In contrast, Yasuma Takata, a disciple of Yoneda's justified Simmel's attempt to delimit the object of sociology on the ground that it might dispel the ambitious but impossible dream of an encyclopaedic sociology and open a door to the establishment of sociology as an independent science. From this standpoint he wrote in 1919 *The Principles of Sociology*, a book of 1,385 pages, and strove thereafter consistently to establish a system of sociology as a special science by publishing his *Introduction to Sociology* in 1923, and the *Studies of Social Relationships* in 1926. He was under the influence of Simmel and Giddings, but, not content to be a mere disciple, he endeavoured to consolidate their scientific achievements by means of penetrating analytical logic, and succeeded in building up a coherent system of sociology which deserved to be regarded as a major achievement.

Yoneda co-operated with Takebe until the latter retired and became a member of the Diet in 1922. He assisted Takebe in establishing the *Japanese Institute of Sociology* in 1913. However he differed from Takebe in both political and scientific attitude. He was liberal rather than conservative in outlook, and he preferred to devote himself to academic study than to meddle with politics with a pretentious programme of sociology as in Takebe's case. Takata began the study of sociology with the desire to solve the problem of property, and later, having reached the conclusion that the Marxian social theory with its economic monism was not valid and could not explain the laws of society, undertook to establish the so-called third interpretation of history. In his *Classes and the Third Interpretation of History*, published in 1925, he repudiated the first interpretation which followed exclu-

sively material factors, as well as the second interpretation which proceeded on the basis of spiritual factors, and asserted that among the many factors of history, socialization as the genuine sociological fact was the most effective and decisive. From this standpoint he attempted to criticize Marxian thought which was becoming influential among the intellectuals at that time and hence he was regarded by them as counter-revolutionary. Properly speaking, however, his sociology belonged to the liberal trend, although he was inclined temperamentally to support the cause of nationalism.

At any rate, it is certain that a new page was opened in the history of Japanese sociology with the appearance of Yoneda's and Takata's works. Besides these two scholars, who established the Kyoto school, Teizo Toda who succeeded Takebe in the chair of sociology at Tokyo University was also at this time renewing the sociological tradition there, by introducing from American sociology empirical research methods derived from the experience of several years' study in the United States. He applied these methods to his favourite study of the family and published, as a result of it, *Studies of Family* in 1926 and *Family and Marriage* in 1934, achieving the synthesis of his studies in *The Composition of the Family* published in 1940. Like Takata he accepted the concept of sociology as a special science proposed by Simmel and contributed not a little to the dissemination of this conception, but his chief merit was that he introduced for the first time empirical research methods and encouraged the positive study of society, thereby giving birth to the Tokyo school under his influence. It was also in this period that the *Japanese Sociological Society* was established, replacing the older *Japanese Institute of Sociology*. And this event itself may well symbolize the transition of Japanese sociology from the older, pre-scientific stage to a new, scientific one.

The development of Japanese sociology at this period was to some degree analogous to that of German sociology since the end of the War. As generally acknowledged, German sociology entered into a stage of amazing development between the 1920's and 1930's to the extent that it came to be regarded as one of the leading sociologies in the world. The reason is that after the defeat in the War, the Weimar Republic was established in Germany and under its democratic regime undreamt-of freedom was granted to scientific investigations, including sociological investigation. And it was almost the same case with the development of Japanese sociology at this time.

#### SOCIOLOGY ON TRIAL

Japanese sociology which at last succeeded in establishing itself during the Taisho era continued to develop in the following Showa era which began in 1926, especially in its first two decades. It was of course because a sphere had already been provided for sociological investigations by the works of Yoneda, Takata and Toda who were active in

the preceding era. However, the circumstances that sociology courses were introduced in other universities also contributed to this development.

What characterized Japanese sociology first of all in this period was the fact that it began to establish itself on its own feet, even if it was still not quite free from the imitation of Western sociologies. The implantation of Western sociologies went on as before and in particular the new German post-war sociology was enthusiastically introduced and welcomed. However, after the publication of Takata's sociological works, Japanese sociologists were gradually led to reflect upon their own achievements. Under these conditions it was no wonder that many sociological currents flourished during this period. How multifarious and kaleidoscopic these currents were may be imagined from the fact that they caused some sociologists to speak of the chaos of sociology. Of course it was too much to speak of chaos, because there could be ascertained at least some main currents amidst the ostensible confusion of various kinds of sociological studies.

Of these currents, one which at first became influential was no other than the type of sociology as a special science, proposed by Simmel and supported by Takata and Toda. Kentaro Komatsu was the first person to set out to construct a sociological system on the same lines as Takata. After having drawn up a plan of his system in the *Introduction to Sociology* (1928), Komatsu completed the first half of it in his *The Theory of Social Structure* (1932) and showed its general outlines in his *Sociology* (1934). His sociological system was a faithful extension of Takata's, although he differed from Takata, who defined sociology as the science of association, in that he insisted that dissociation should also have been included in the object of study, as was the case in von Wiese's work. In comparison with Komatsu, most scholars who professed to regard sociology as a special science were less completely faithful to the original idea. Kazuta Kurauchi who published the work *Education and Sociology* in 1933 and *Cultural Sociology* in 1943 defined the nature of society on the basis of Simmel's formal sociology by utilizing Litt's concept of the reciprocity of perspectives. However, he was interested more in the study of culture as the product of society than in that of society as an associational phenomenon, and he tried to build up a system of cultural sociology which had some resemblance to that type of cultural sociology which arose in Germany as a reaction against formal sociology. Uichi Iwasaki, who published the work *The Nature and System of Sociology* in 1927, and Jisho Usui who wrote many articles in this period adopted the same point of view, so far as they adhered to the concept of sociology as a special science. Nevertheless what they actually presented were types of sociology which rose above the narrowly delimited sphere of formal sociology.

The scholar who succeeded in presenting a great system of sociology along these lines was Junichiro Matsumoto. He completed his plan

to construct a system of sociology by publishing three books *Foundations of Sociology*, *Principles of Group Sociology* and *Principles of Cultural Sociology* between 1935 and 1938, after having suggested the outlines in his *Elements of Sociology* in 1934. He was of the opinion that sociology should be "total" in Andreas Walther's sense, emphasizing the necessity to build up a system of sociology which included all possible elements or phases of society in its object, and attributing the failure of sociology to find unity to the circumstance that sociologists had been prone to select only one element or phase of society as the object of study. His group sociology was in truth nothing but a kind of formal sociology. However, he insisted that his group sociology formed only a part, not in itself the totality of sociology and, pointing out the narrowness of formal sociology which assumed sociology merely as group sociology, attributed to this defect the same cause which encouraged the appearance of cultural sociology as its counter current. He was convinced that his system of total sociology composed of group sociology and cultural sociology was the only one which could in a real sense overcome formal sociology, in spite of the fact that his own approach was itself based firmly on the formal sociological concept of the group. This somewhat equivocal character manifested in the above mentioned scholars indicates that the view of sociology as a special science proposed by Takata was not upheld by them (with the exception of Komatsu) in its strict sense. Perhaps one of the reasons why they adopted such views may be suggested by the circumstance that they were compelled to enlarge their spheres of investigation so as to be able to defend their standpoints against the criticism from the side of synthetic sociology or cultural sociology which were already gaining ground at that time.

Among the scholars who opposed the view of sociology as a special science from the standpoint of synthetic sociology, on consistent methodological grounds, may be counted Masamichi Shimmei, Tetsuji Kada and Monkichi Namba. Shimmei who was convinced of the need to build up a system of synthetic sociology set out to construct his system of sociology in the works *Sociology* (1929) and *Elementary Courses of Sociology* (1935), after having criticized the standpoint of formal sociology in his *Criticism of Formal Sociology* (1928), and reached the stage of presenting his own system in the works *Fundamental Problems of Sociology* (1939) and *On the Nature of Society* (1942). He asserted that the proper aim of sociology is to investigate synthetically both structural and functional aspects of society as a unity of groups which are composed of all possible relationships of meaningful conduct, and he attempted to consolidate this standpoint by proposing the concept of actional unison, with the object of redeeming the unity of society improperly divided into form and content by formal sociological analysis. Kada emphasized in his works *The Outlines of Sociology* (1928) and *Preface to Sociology* (1938) that the object of sociology was



to investigate social life in its totality in opposition to the trend of sociology as a special science in vogue since the emergence of formal sociology. A similar view was also expounded by Namba in his *Elementary Courses of Sociology* (1934) where he defined sociology as a synthetic science the object of which was cultural society, characterizing its synthetic view of society as internal in order to distinguish it from that of encyclopaedic sociology which may be designated as external. He was the first person to introduce American cultural sociology to Japan, himself being influenced by it.

There was one more important current, besides these, which deserves to be mentioned: the current of cultural sociology. The cultural sociology which appeared in Japan in opposition to sociology as a special science was not American, but German, in its origin. No sooner had formal sociology been introduced from Germany than German cultural sociology was made known to Japanese scholars as its antagonist. Of the German cultural sociologists, it was Scheler, A. Weber and Mannheim who were the most widely read and welcomed. The pioneer in cultural sociology in this sense was Eikichi Seki who wrote his *Introduction to Cultural Sociology* in 1929, in which he investigated generally the interrelation between culture and social groups. However, after about 1930, the scholars interested in cultural sociology began to specialize their studies in many different fields and this gave rise to many branches of cultural sociology. The most popular among them was the sociology of knowledge. In 1932 Shimmei published his *Aspects of the Sociology of Knowledge* in which he examined critically the theories of A. Weber, Scheler and Mannheim. Toshio Kamba, Ryozo Takeda and others who founded the *Society for Sociological Study* published in the same year two symposia: *The Sociology of Knowledge* and *Cultural Sociology*. The reason why this field attracted the interest of so many sociologists lies in the fact that the Marxian theory of ideology was at that time very popular, and the younger generation of sociologists who were confronted by it found in the sociology of knowledge an alternative approach.

Japanese sociology, which was given the chance to establish itself as a science from the middle of the Taisho era thus succeeded in consolidating its foundations in the first decade of the Showa era. However, the course of its development was not without some difficulties. It is true that during this period Japanese sociology had been for a while safe from the obnoxious pressure from the side of the government. But it was obliged to face the attack from the side of Marxism which was becoming influential just at that time. As mentioned above, from the middle of the Taisho era the democratic idea was revived in Japan and in connection with it socialism also had the opportunity to develop. However, before democracy could strike its roots deeply enough, so that socialism might march hand in hand with democracy, those who were too impatient to wait for the growth of democracy

turned to Marxian Communism. How influential Marxism was at that time may easily be understood by the fact that, at the beginning of this era, two separate editions of the complete works of Marx and Engels were planned, although one of them was destined to fail. In accordance with this tendency, there arose in sociology the trend of so-called "Criticism of Sociology," the representatives of which were Ikutaro Shimizu who published his *Preface to the Criticism of Sociology* in 1932, and Toshio Hayase who published the work *The Criticism of Sociology* in 1933. This criticism brought some confusions into sociology by disheartening those who were eager to build up sociology as a science, but the trial did not last very long.

However, no sooner had Japanese sociology succeeded in its attempts to safeguard itself against this attack than it began to be threatened by the rising tide of militaristic fascism which was signalled by the outbreak of the Manchurian Affair in 1931. The omens of this fatal development were already discernible in 1930, when Japanese industry and finance was panic-stricken by the ban on the exportation of gold under the Hamaguchi cabinet. The militaristic circles which had been hostile to party politics now took advantage of the social unrest caused by the depression and began to go their own way in order to regain their former prestige in defiance of the party government. The Manchurian Affair was nothing but a natural consequence of this impact of militaristic reaction. In the following year the Shanghai Affair broke out in China and the 5.15 Affair occurred in Tokyo in which a group of militarists including army and navy officers stormed several districts and assassinated Premier Inugai in his official residence. This was followed by the 2.26 Affair three years later in which a group of army officers ordered the soldiers under their control to occupy the premier's residence and the Metropolitan Police Board and killed the Finance Minister, Takahashi, and others. It was no wonder that the warfare extended to the whole of China in the following years, and later Japan was pushed to make war against America and England. After the outbreak of the Manchurian Affair, the political situation in Japan began to change and, in accordance with the ascendancy of the militaristic circles, party politics was compelled to retreat until its existence was completely wiped out in 1940, following the example of Nazi Germany with which Japan had been collaborating on good terms since Hitler took possession of the governmental power.

It is only too clear that in this spiritual climate the study of the social sciences was bound to suffer. In 1933 Koshin Takikawa, professor of penology at Kyoto University was compelled to resign his post on account of allegations that he advocated communism in sexual life. In 1935 Tatsukichi Minobe, professor of administrative law at Tokyo University was advised by the government to revise the contents of his books in which he explained the position of the emperor as an organ of the state. In 1938 Eijiro Kawai, professor of social policy

at Tokyo University was accused and the sale of some of his books written in the spirit of liberalism was prohibited. Confronted with this reactionary onslaught, the conditions for the study of sociology also became very unfavourable. Those sociologists who were especially interested in social problems were discouraged and, generally speaking, the development of sociological studies came to a halt. After about 1940 the study of the nation and nationalism attracted the attention of some sociologists and some interesting books were published; for example, Takat's *On the Nation* (1942), Shimmei's *Race and Society* (1940) and Komatsu's *The Theory of the Nation* (1941). However, so far as theoretical work was concerned, there was no remarkable development comparable to that of the former decades, with the exception of Shimmei's *Dictionary of Sociology* published in 1944. What Japanese sociology could boast of at the end of this era was limited to the achievements in the field of family sociology and rural sociology, such as Kizaimon Ariga's *Japanese Family Institutions and Tenancy Institutions* published in 1943, and Eitaro Suzuki's *Principles of the Sociology of Japanese Rural Community* published in 1940. The destiny of sociology even in its worst moments, was perhaps better in Japan than in Germany, insofar as the organizational forms were not destroyed by political measures and the study of sociology itself was not prohibited. Nevertheless it is true that the government, which became suspicious of the study of sociology, proceeded to promote the science of the state instead and urged the use of the word "welfare" or "state" in place of "society" which had some association with "socialism". Thus Japanese sociology was once again forced to struggle through the marsh of political reaction for its existence.

#### THE PRESENT STATE OF JAPANESE SOCIOLOGY

After the end of World War II Japanese sociology, which had been put to the trial of ultra-nationalism, was given again a capital opportunity to change its position. With the defeat the militaristic regime collapsed and Japan entered upon the stage of transformation into a democratic nation. What is noteworthy from the standpoint of sociology is that a hitherto unknown, great freedom was given to scientific investigation, and sociology was encouraged to utilize this freedom to the full. The postwar situation in Japan was especially favourable for the development of sociology, because with the democratic reform of education a new system of higher education was introduced and in consequence a large number of courses of sociology were established in universities and colleges. Moreover the circumstance that courses in social studies were adopted in place of those in morals or civics in the curriculum of primary and high schools served also to enhance the prestige of sociology, although indirectly. Under these conditions it is quite natural that Japanese sociology achieved so rapid a development that it could claim the second place after American sociology, at least from the quantitative point of view.

When one compares the development of Japanese sociology in this period with that of the preceding one, one is immediately aware of important differences. The most evident one is that the influence of German sociology, which had been for years very strong in Japanese sociology, receded and American sociology began to wield an influence instead. This is of course a remarkable change, if we reflect on the fact that American sociology had hitherto been almost completely disregarded by Japanese sociologists at least until the end of the War, though its existence was made known, and even the works of some American sociologists were introduced to Japan towards the end of the nineteenth century. The reason must be first of all sought in the new situation that Japan came to have especially intimate relations with the United States in all matters since the end of the War, as the latter was entrusted with the occupation administration as representative of the Occupation Authorities and attempted to foster democracy in Japan by introducing and disseminating American culture. It is no wonder that under these conditions Japanese sociologists began to have a special interest in American sociology and, after having studied it, came to be fascinated by it.

And with this turn of the current many changes were brought into Japanese sociology. We may point out as one of these the fact that empirical researches on practical problems, based upon American social research methods, became popular among Japanese sociologists and this tendency is now almost about to replace the predominance of theoretical investigations in the German style which characterized the development of Japanese sociology in the preceding period. Added to this, Japanese sociology was also favoured in this period with the prolific development of new branches of study which were originally introduced from American sociology, such as industrial sociology, educational sociology, public opinion research, and mass communication studies. We noticed already in the preceding period some progress made in some special branch as family sociology and rural sociology. But it is really since the introduction of these new branches that the study of special branches has flourished in the true sense and, with the increasing number of sociologists who became interested in these fields, sociology itself may be said to have become almost absorbed by it.

Such being the case, it is unavoidable that the achievements in the theoretical field compare at present rather unfavourably with those in the special branches. Notwithstanding this, we may point out as scholars who are active in this field Kunio Odaka and Tadashi Fukutake, besides those who represented the preceding period. Odaka, who wrote his *Sociology of Professions* in 1941, proceeded to make his sociological standpoint clear in the work *The Nature and Problem of Sociology I* published in 1949. What he intended to establish was a system of sociology which extended its investigation to society in its

totality by following the example of synthetic sociology, while upholding the special viewpoint of sociology itself as suggested by formal sociology. Fukutake also presented in his *Contemporary Problems of Sociology* published in 1948 a view of sociology which was somewhat similar to Odaka's. He took the same position so far as he asserted that a special viewpoint was necessary for sociology as in the case of other special sciences. However, though he defined sociology as a special science, he characterized its position as central on the ground that sociology had the object to investigate social common life synthetically as a totality interwoven with economic, political and other elements, in contrast with others which study it partly by analysing it into special fields. It is clear that these two scholars tried to arbitrate between formal sociology and synthetic sociology. They have been since then more busy in exploring their own favourite branches of study than in elaborating these suggested frameworks. However, their attempts are to be recognized as the most worthy successors to the sociological systems proposed by Takata, Matsumoto and Shimmei in the preceding period.

In comparison with the field of theoretical investigation, the special branches of sociology are favoured with an ever increasing number of products achieved by scholars who are fervent to learn from American sociology. As for the development of sociology in these branches, perhaps the most conspicuous have been the branches of urban sociology and industrial sociology. In the field of industrial sociology Odaka published his *The Science of Human Relations in Industry* in 1953. In the field of urban sociology Eiichi Isomura published his *Urban Sociology* in 1953 and Suzuki published his *Principles of Urban Sociology* in 1958. However, notwithstanding this turn of interest, it is still the sociology of the family and rural sociology, already firmly established, which may be said to be the most productive. As for the work produced in this field, Fukutake's *Social Character of Japanese Villages* published in 1949 may be indicated as one which was the most widely read and became the subject of much discussion.

At the present moment it is still difficult or too early to evaluate the development of Japanese sociology in this period. What we can say of it is perhaps that the development has been happy in the sense that it was given the opportunity for free and full growth. Of course, though the development has been happy, it has not been without some problems. It is true that, under the influence of American sociology, remarkable progress was made in special branches of sociology reinforced by the introduction of new social research methods. But it cannot be denied that, with the increasing tendency of sociological investigation to diversify, the co-ordination of different branches became difficult and in a sense a state of confusion was brought into Japanese sociology. Hand in hand with this tendency, there appeared also the sign that the interest for theoretical investigation was some-

what enfeebled. At any rate, it is certain that Japanese sociology in this period has not yet succeeded in producing theoretical achievements equal to those in the preceding period. Notwithstanding this, the real situation may be assumed to be not so hopeless, because, in our case, those scholars who are leading in the field of theoretical investigation are themselves also interested in social research and, by their conscious attempts to bring social research and general theory into unity, the two are prevented from becoming wholly independent. This is perhaps the reason why a Japanese sociologist referred to the present state of Japanese sociology as a state of prolific confusion. However, though we have some ground to be optimistic about the future prospects, it is still premature to say that Japanese sociology has established itself so firmly that it can boast of its own scientific tradition. It is too clear that the development of Japanese sociology in this period was effected mostly under the influence of American sociology. However, the problem is not whether it was influenced by American sociology or not, but how it succeeded in utilizing this influence. So far as we can conclude from the short retrospect over this period, Japanese sociology cannot be credited with having succeeded in this, because we had to confront a situation in which most sociologists who were overwhelmed by the influence of American sociology came to lose sight of their own tradition, not to speak of the European tradition. This situation compares strangely with that of American sociology itself which is characterized especially in recent times by the consistent effort to learn and transplant European sociological achievements. This observation serves to hint at the weak point still contained in the present development of Japanese sociology. It is all too clear that Japanese sociology, despite a century of development, is not yet mature enough for independent growth—as is also the case with democracy in Japan.

## The Development and Present State of Sociology in Latin America

GINO GERMANI

(Director, Instituto de Sociologia, Universidad de Buenos Aires)

### I HISTORY OF SOCIOLOGY AND PRESENT KNOWLEDGE OF THE SOCIAL CONTEXT

An overall study of the evolution of Sociology in Latin America correlated with the changing traits of its social context requires the previous discussion of a certain number of points.

In the first place we must consider how far the existing state of knowledge on the two terms of our subject—Sociology and social context—enables us to carry out such a study. Indeed, an attempt of this type would have to rest on the firm basis of research concerning the intellectual, political and social development of the region and that of its different countries; in particular one would require analysis of their respective social structures and of the past and recent changes that these structures have been undergoing, as well as their main repercussions on other sectors of social life. Furthermore, the history of the evolution of sociology in the region—from the point of view of the development of scientific ideas—must first have been laid down by special research devoted to different countries, periods or intellectual trends.

What we are trying to say is that no work of interpretation or synthesis is possible unless it be carried out in the light of serious and more analytic studies that serve as a basis. Unfortunately we are far from this ideal situation. There is, to be sure, a wealth of literature on the history of sociology in Latin America, and this includes many valuable books and papers. Also available are works concerning the historical development of thought in the region as a whole and in many of its countries; these works also point out the main influence of foreign theories and intellectual trends. Nevertheless it is no exaggeration to state that this literature does not really prove sufficient as a background for a study of the type proposed.<sup>1</sup>

Far more discouraging is the situation of the scientific knowledge concerning the second term of our subject: the Latin American so-

cities themselves, their structures and their changes. Although there is certainly abundant literature on this wide field, it cannot be said that we have at hand satisfactory and usable contributions. As a result of the state of our sources many of the generalizations advanced later in this paper are based on the insufficient background furnished by the few studies existing on the subject.

The close connection between sociological knowledge and the society within which it arises has been particularly stressed by students of Latin-American Sociology. It has become almost trite not only to relate certain intellectual developments with social changes, but even precisely to impute certain philosophical or scientific trends to one or another social stratum. Thus, the connection between positivism, or some of its branches, and the bourgeoisie, or particular groups within it, in its first moment of expansion, in many Latin-American countries and particularly in Argentine, has been maintained by many writers. It might be said in this regard that such an attitude is in some measure peculiar to Latin-American sociology insofar as it flourished even before the rise of the modern sociology of knowledge. It has been rightly observed however, that these interpretations could not have been based upon specific analyses owing precisely to the aforementioned lack of basic studies on the social reality.<sup>2</sup> Often brilliant, though also contradictory, these interpretations should be regarded as hypotheses of a very general order, fit to serve as an initial guide in determining the most outstanding features in the evolution of Sociology. Meanwhile, all specific analysis, all progress in the investigation of these subjects, must await further development in sociological studies, both in the field of social structure and in that of the history of ideas and the Sociology of knowledge.

## II CONTINENTAL UNIFORMITY AND NATIONAL DIFFERENTIATION IN LATIN AMERICA.

The second question to be discussed is the legitimacy of an overall study referring to a whole region: how far does the latter constitute a unit both from the point of view of the development of sociology and with respect to its "social context"? It would seem that the unity of Latin-America, in both respects, is partly a question of perspective; it is possible to admit, albeit not without reserve, that the countries composing this region possess a series of common factors typifying them as a whole, as a single sociocultural area, as opposed to other regions of the world. Besides, no one can deny the existence of feelings of unity and solidarity springing from these shared characteristics. Nevertheless, as soon as one passes on to a closer examination of their social structures or their history, divergencies appear; each one of them comes to be seen as a society not infrequently endowed with highly differentiated traits, often contrasting among them-



selves. It would also be possible to discover subregions—as is frequently done—characterized by a community of elements; type of population, of structure, of problems. Furthermore, the degree of development as yet achieved by the different countries is very unequal, and these same differences in level are often to be found within one and the same country.

Although it would not be possible to offer a typology and a classification of the nations making up the region, it will be useful to mention at least their outstanding differential characteristics. In the first place, the differences in size—from Brazil, which covers a great part of the continent, to the little Caribbean countries; and in population—from the 51 millions in Brazil again to countries with a total of under a million inhabitants; and the very remarkable divergencies of a geographical and climatic order, particularly the contrast between equatorial and tropical countries and those of the temperate zone. No less marked are the contrasts as regards ethnic, cultural, economic, and social structure. Here it may be helpful to attempt a classification, although owing to the lack of basic research it will amount to no more than a merely suggestive schematization of the variety of situations to be found on the continent. In a classification of this kind one would have to take into account at least four variables (partly interrelated): the composition of the population as regards its ethnic origin; the degree of urbanization; the degree of industrialization; and, lastly, the class-structure.<sup>3</sup>

It is important to remember that the differentiation between the countries became progressively more deeply accentuated according to the development undergone by each country since the moment of its independence. In spite of a certain parallelism in their respective evolutions, there were marked divergencies in the rhythms of change. In the last 15 years, however, the trend has been towards great rapidity of change over most of the region, which may produce more of a levelling in the future, perhaps quite a near future. This difference in rhythm has given rise to differences in each one of the four variables mentioned. From the ethnic point of view, we may point to a group of five countries in which the population is either totally or preponderantly of European extraction. We refer to the three southernmost countries of the continent, namely, Argentine, Chile and Uruguay, and in the extreme north, Costa Rica and Santo Domingo. Especially in Argentine, Chile and Uruguay, the massive European immigration which began in the last quarter of the nineteenth century produced a radical demographic transformation. The other countries possess considerable proportions of Indians or mestizo population (and, in some cases, negro) and, what is more interesting, among these ethnic groups there are often to be found important nuclei whose culture type is more akin to the "indomestizo" way of life than to the European.<sup>4</sup> This non-European population also differs, moreover, from

country to country as regards the type of social structure in each one of them.

Some countries are highly urbanized with sixty per cent or more more of the population residing in centres classified as "urban" (such is the case with Argentine, Chile, Uruguay, Cuba and Venezuela). They sometimes include great cities concentrating as much as one third of the total population. Others—the majority—possess a predominantly rural population. Two observations, however, are pertinent here: the rhythm of urbanization has been increasing extraordinarily all over the continent during the last few years,<sup>5</sup> and, in the second place, several countries that present a high percentage of rural population nevertheless possess numerous great urban centres; this occurs, for example, with Brazil and Mexico. Although in Latin-America, as in other underdeveloped regions, the level of urbanization is often ahead of the degree of industrial development, the two doubtless partly correspond. Thus, Argentine, Uruguay, Chile, Cuba, Venezuela and Ecuador, the most urban (except the last mentioned), are also the ones presenting the highest proportion of persons engaged in industrial activities. But here also, other countries, with a lower proportion, possess important industrial centres; this is the case with Mexico and Brazil.

These changes in the economic and demographic structure have been observed to be accompanied by modifications in the class-structure, at times of substantial importance. The latter changes have naturally followed the same rhythm as the former, so that the most industrialized and most urbanized nations are also those that have most widely departed from the traditional pattern of stratification.<sup>6</sup> This pattern, though by no means uniform, may be described, as is well-known, as a system of two main classes: an aristocracy, based as a rule upon land-ownership, which monopolised the professions and political power, and a lower class, sometimes divided into various strata. This model was often complicated by the presence of different ethnic groups, the Indians and mestizos composing the lower strata; finally, the presence of "plural cultures" in some countries involved local systems of stratification. At the present day the traditional pattern is either destroyed or in the process of transformation. In three countries—Argentine, Uruguay and Chile—the prevailing system is much like that of Western Europe, with the characteristic of an important middle class (in growth) and a high degree of social mobility which, particularly in the urban sectors, introduces great fluidity and indeterminacy in the class division. In Mexico also the "feudal" structure has disappeared and therewith the ethnic dividing line. In the other countries the traditional pattern subsists to a higher degree; it would, however, be difficult to generalize with any exactitude on this point. The remarks made above on degree of urbanization and industrialization should also be applied here. Countries like Brazil present great urban sectors

whose stratification is similar to that in industrial societies, although access to the upper class may still remain rather rigidly barred. And the same may be affirmed as regards internal regional differences in other Latin-American countries.

This brief description may give some idea of the variety of situations summarized under the name "Latin America". The conclusion, however, should not be drawn that it is impossible to formulate any generalization as regards the development of Sociology in the region. Such an analysis is, indeed, possible, although with the limitations and deformations that may be imagined in view of the characteristics and peculiarities of the various national societies. This optimistic conclusion has its grounds and is based on the factors that have influenced the development of Sociology in Latin-America. Besides the points already mentioned, their common origin in the cultural sense, their feeling of belonging to a greater whole with a shared destiny, one must bear in mind the type of social problems that each country has had to face, and the similarity of the foreign trends of thought that were of most influence in their leading representatives, as well as the reciprocal influences of the different countries. It is possible that these similarities in the forces at work may have been greater in the early stages of the formation of the Latin-American nations, yet to this day they have left their mark so that many common features still persist. There are, moreover, other circumstances particularly worthy of note. In the first place the fact of the relative hegemony of some few radiation-centres with the multiple function of filtering, channelling and propagating the indigenous and foreign intellectual currents that affected the development of Latin-American thought; thus, for example, in most recent times, the concentration in two or three countries—Spain, Argentine and Mexico—of the bulk of publishing activity contributed not a little to the standardization of such influences. In the second place, the relatively high uniformity of university traditions and organization. Of influence here was not only the common legacy from the colonial universities but also their later organization along the lines of a European model—France—and, a point of singular importance for Sociology, their way of recruiting professors and remunerating them, the significance and status of university teaching within the Latin-American societies and the community of attitudes that was to result from all this.

Albeit with different intensity, the evolution of Sociology must face analogous problems and even though the different rhythm of development of the various societies implies different situations and different constellations of elements, favourable or otherwise, it yet seems possible to formulate generalizations without deforming unduly the multiple local realities.

It is, therefore, no arbitrary fact that there should be a very real

tradition as regards the existence of a *Latin-American Sociology*, in the sense of certain features common to the majority of sociological studies by Latin-American writers, in their similarity of attitude, outlook and the nature of their subject-matter in the field of Sociology. Whenever foreign students have referred to this question they have taken the unity of frame of reference for granted and this naturally may have resulted from the particular extra-continental standpoint of these observers. But the writers within the region also take for granted a Latin-American Sociology and assume it to be a common problem. There can be no doubt that Latin-American sociologists are aware of their situation as such, and the existence of a regional association<sup>7</sup>—a phenomenon that is not recorded in other continents—is the institutionalization of this community feeling.

### III THREE STAGES IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF SOCIOLOGY IN LATIN-AMERICA

As has often been remarked<sup>8</sup>, one may fairly clearly discern certain stages in the development of sociological study in Latin-America. They coincide with the historico-social changes that occurred in the region and enable one to trace a certain parallelism with the process of the formation of Sociology as an autonomous discipline.

Leaving aside the colonial period—in which, needless to say, there was no lack of “reflections upon social questions”—we may point out a first phase, a phase of pre-sociological thought which starts from the time of the revolutions for national independence and goes on until the institutionalization of Sociology with the creation of the first chairs at the beginning of this century.

This fact marks, without doubt, the commencement of a second stage—in which we find the incorporation of the discipline in the university—whose end might be fixed at the present moment or, rather, the decade 1950-1960, for, as will be seen, there is taking place at the present time a process of change which may well be expected to mark the beginning of a third stage that differs to a certain degree from the period now closing. It is also possible to trace subdivisions within the first two periods, though far less clearly pronounced than the main phases.

### IV THE FIRST STAGE IN DEVELOPMENT: “PRESOCIOLOGICAL THOUGHT”

The historico-social changes displayed by the epoch of independence and the stormy decades that followed it have left a very considerable impress upon the content of what we have termed “pre-sociological thought”. In fact, politico-social preoccupations run throughout the intellectual works of Latin-Americans: the main theme of their writings is precisely the concrete, historical society that they are living in and

feel called upon to transform. In Latin-America, says Crawford, all philosophy is *social philosophy*.<sup>9</sup> We have here a philosophy, in the words of Korn<sup>10</sup>, bound up with everything that is most positive, most real, most practical in life, a philosophy imbued with social, moral and intellectual necessities. The whole history of ideas in this period may—as Zea does<sup>11</sup>—be regarded as revolving around the problems posed by the social history of these countries, by the contemporary reality they had to confront and modify, and by the vision of the wished for future they felt as depending upon this history, this present, and their own capacity to modify it.

There is a leitmotif, as it were, and this leitmotif is the effective emancipation of the different countries of the continent, their transformation into nations endowed with a “reality” or a “being” of their own (to employ a terminology dear to Latin-Americans) and fit to play their part among the other nations of the world.

For this ideal to be attained—the purpose of those who have been called “social realists”<sup>12</sup>—one must start, however, from the social reality, just as it is, without illusions of any sort. Only in this way will it be possible to embark on the great task of building up the new nations.

This feature—to know reality so as to transform it—which reminds one of the Comtean “to know so as to foresee”, is to be found, however, in Latin-America even before the introduction of positivism and constituted, without doubt, an element of great importance for the rapid diffusion of the latter which took place in the second half of the nineteenth century.

There are two other features that characterize what we have termed “pre-sociological thought” in addition to its “social realism”. In the first place, we are not dealing with writings that are easily classifiable as scientific, historical, political or philosophical. The term “thought”, as has been observed, embraces in fact a special signification peculiar to the history of ideas in Latin-America. A sense perhaps closer to that of the *philosophe* of the eighteenth century<sup>13</sup>. Gaos has defined it as a way of thinking that “forms part of life”, whose subject is constituted by problems connected with immediate circumstances in time and place which are therefore pressing for solution, but with one peculiarity; although this is its subject, the manner in which the latter is treated exhibits “the methods and style of philosophy and science”.<sup>14</sup> The third feature characterizing this intellectual production is its literary emphasis; as a rule, these thinkers were also excellent writers and many poets were among their number. The importance conceded to words, to the beauty of style, to the capacity of expressing ideas original in content and form, necessarily also tended to mould the character of the social analyses that constituted the subject of their writings. Nevertheless—as must be clearly stated for the case of the leading representa-

tives of this group—this by no means implies that their aesthetic demands impaired at all the force, accuracy and veracity of their analyses of the social reality, many of which have come down to us as models of their kind.

These three features of pre-sociological thought—its purpose directed towards the understanding and transformation of a concrete historical reality, the nature of the “thinking”, and its aesthetic demands—did not fail to exert a remarkable influence on the later stages of the development of sociology, in defining the sociologists’ task, his purposes, methods and aims, insofar as these could be grasped by the public and by the sociologists themselves.

The social environment and the intellectual atmosphere that conditioned pre-sociological thought are well-known in general terms.<sup>14</sup> The *elites* who undertook the task of liberation at the beginning of the nineteenth century were acting under the double impact of the profound political and social changes that were happening in Europe and the new currents of ideas which, from as early as the previous century, had been penetrating into the colonial countries of America. Under the influence of the Encyclopedia and the ideas of the Illuminists, the revolutionaries endeavoured to transform the antiquated colonies into modern states; but the facts were otherwise and years of anarchy and dictatorship were to follow the period of the revolution of independence. The attitude originating the so-called “social realism” springs, indeed, from this disappointment, from the awareness that the failure is due to the divorce between the founders’ dreams of naive rationalism and a social reality unfitted for the accomplishment of these ideals, a social reality of which they were wholly ignorant.

The task that the next generation assigned itself, which gave rise to this pre-sociological thought of a “realist” bent, was precisely that of furthering this knowledge. They were to do it with the conceptual apparatus that was meanwhile being offered them by the intellectual currents that in Europe had succeeded Illuminism. In this respect there appear a number of intellectual influences, direct and indirect in their workings: from illuminism to the traditionalists, from Herder to Hegel and Savigny, the French eclectics and the “common sense” school of thought. Upon each of these currents of ideas the Latin-American “thinkers” were to draw for their conceptual instruments, to be applied to the reality of their own countries: “the arms for combating the ingenuous utopism into which the *illustrés* had fallen”, the idea—fundamental for the development of a scientific spirit—that the society is a datum, not reducible to the conglomeration of individuals composing it, no more than to their wills, the sense of an historical continuity and the demand for subjection to the circumstances of time and place, the notion of the individuality of each country, and, finally, the prime requisite of grounding themselves upon a science of

social phenomena as an instrument of knowledge and transformation.<sup>16</sup> Echeverria, one of the most conspicuous members of this group, wished to found "the rudiments of social, scientific and Argentine doctrine" thus initiating, as Orgaz remarks, a typical Latin-American tradition: the idea of "national sociology".<sup>17</sup> In the same sense Alberdi, in whom we already find a positivistic as well as a predominantly idealistic and historicist outlook, formulates in explicit terms the need for a social science. Echeverria, Alberdi and Sarmiento, the three of them Argentines, are probably the most significant representatives of the "realist" trend, but this movement is clearly perceptible in other countries of the continent: Lastarria in Chile, Mora in Mexico, J. A. Saco in Cuba, all before mid-century, and many others afterwards in various Latin-American countries.

This attitude was without any doubt very favourable to the incorporation of positivism which took place in the second half of the 19th century. But even without the antecedent of "social realism", the historical circumstances of the American societies were incentive enough in themselves for the adoption of a doctrine that responded admirably to the needs of the day and those of its élites. Romero speaks of an "environmental positivism" which "emerges from the society as a spontaneous and living product", a "positivism in action", the expression of a constructive epoch, precisely the epoch in which the American Republics "found themselves pressed with the task of laying the effective and concrete bases of national life and organizing the exploitation of their natural resources, so that the focussing of collective interest upon social, political and economic affairs coincided with the spirit of the positivist movement".<sup>18</sup>

This influence spread to all the countries of Latin America, though the local features, not only of an intellectual but above all of a political and social type were conditioned by the particular forms and inclinations that positivism took on in each separate case. "One may speak of a Spanish-American positivism; but also with equal right, of a Mexican positivism, an Argentine, Uruguayan, Chilean, Peruvian, Bolivian or Cuban. In each one of the interpretations offered there is always latent the set of problems that concern those who carry it out".<sup>19</sup> In Sociology one must distinguish above all between two modes of acceptance of positivism. On the one hand, the general treatises, whether speculative or theoretical, connected as a rule with university teaching, in which one finds a somewhat eclectic outlook wherein the several positivist tendencies are set forth; on the other hand, a considerable collection of writings which carry on, in a certain sense, the tradition inaugurated by the "social realists", the tradition of "national and Latin-American sociology" (which also influenced academic sociology). In these studies the positivist currents represent the conceptual apparatus utilized by the writers for their task of describing and explaining the concrete social phenomena they had chosen

to examine. It is here that we find the highest degree of selective adaptation of positivist ideas, an eclecticism of concepts, dictated by the requirements of observation and explanation.

#### V. THE SECOND STAGE OF DEVELOPMENT: SOCIOLOGY IN THE UNIVERSITIES

The predominance of positivism, as has been said, coincided with the period of national organization, from approximately the middle of the last century (with differences as between the various countries). It is also at this moment that the universities were reorganized or new ones created. And by the end of the century Sociology had acquired university status, thus initiating the second—university—phase of sociological studies. Several of the Latin-American universities had been founded during the colonial era; others were added at later dates, but during the tumultuous decades of civil war and tyranny that followed independence, their activities were in most parts severely restricted, if not altogether suppressed. In the reorganization and in the new foundations that took place in many countries where a more stable political structure was achieved, Sociology met with warm welcome.

As far back as 1877 an "Institute of Social Sciences" was created in Caracas, in which Hostos and others taught;<sup>20</sup> since 1882 a chair of Sociology existed at the University of Bogotá,<sup>21</sup> in 1896 in Buenos Aires, in 1900 in Asunción del Paraguay, in 1906 in Ecuador and so on in the remaining countries, so that by the first quarter of the century the university teaching of Sociology was virtually established in all countries and in several cases there were a number of chairs at different universities and faculties within one country. The university institutionalization of Sociology came about rather more slowly in Brazil—1925—but from 1930 it acquired a more rapid rhythm, the chairs were multiplied and the first specific Sociology Schools installed (in 1933 the "Eschola Livre" at San Paulo), thus preceding the other countries in this matter by some twenty years.

The same factors as had lent impetus to "pre-sociological thought" and the acceptance and utilization of positivism naturally explain this rapid development. But this does not suffice; other elements belonging to the university tradition must also be taken into account. The vast majority of early chairs were allotted to the Faculties of Law, and later on (when they came to be established) to those of Philosophy and Educational Science; such was the general situation until the Faculties of Economic Science were also added. As has been observed,<sup>22</sup> Latin American tradition has always felt the teaching of Law to be bound up with the social sciences. It is no mere chance that at the present time a great number of faculties display the name of "Law and Social Sciences" even if in many cases it is, as a matter of fact, only a pro-



fessional school for the training of lawyers. The teaching of political science (under the name of "public law"), of economics, of criminology ("criminal law"), and, finally, the philosophy of law opened the way to the inclusion of Sociology. In fact, there was, in many cases, a close connection (still valid as will be seen) between this last discipline and Sociology. At other times Sociology figures as part of "Introductions" to the study of law, or as "Introductions to the Social Sciences" (as occurred, for instance, in a famous course by J. A. García).<sup>23</sup> The vogue of political law must, of course, be related with the particular needs of the young American societies: the exigency of organizing a government of their own and the enormous difficulties and resistances caused by the social and cultural structure of the countries in question.<sup>24</sup> One must also especially stress the part played by criminal anthropology of a positivist trend in facilitating the institutionalization of Sociology. These connections serve, besides, to explain the subjects preferred by these writers, viz political sociology and criminal sociology.<sup>24</sup>

Finally, the tendencies displayed by "social realism" as regards the need for courses exclusively devoted to the knowledge of each country and of America influenced the establishment of chairs<sup>25</sup> and later on led to the inclusion of subjects which, in title and specific content, referred to "national and Latin American Sociology".

The influence of the association of the teaching of Sociology with the faculties of philosophy was not less than that due to its early connection with the faculties of jurisprudence. A large part of the content and orientation of Sociology in Latin-America, up to the present, has been merely the result of the situation of the subject within the academic organization. This influence not only made itself felt at a purely intellectual level, as theoretical and methodological affinity, but also in the recruiting of professors and the concrete forms assumed by their professional practice. The maximum importance must be accorded to these aspects as factors in the process of the formation of Sociology in the Latin-American continent. There are several points to be stressed here, concerning, above all, the Law and Philosophy Faculties: (a) as a rule, the holding of a university chair did not constitute an exclusive profession; on the contrary, it was, as a matter of fact, often an activity supplementing the main profession; (b) its exercise brought, above all, social prestige and also intellectual satisfaction for those with a particular vocation for the subject; (c) the chairs in the faculties of law and also, in a considerable measure, in those of philosophy were held not only by professionals from the juridical field but often by politicians and prominent public men; (d) there was no criterion of specialization for the selection of the professorial staff, especially for those chairs that were not considered "technical", a feature particularly marked in the case of Sociology: here the same persons might be teaching, simultaneously or successively, for example, Philosophy of Law, Political Law, Introduction to Law, Constitutional Law, Criminal

Law, etc., and Sociology; also very frequent was the association of the teaching of Sociology with that of history or philosophy. Furthermore, the usual situation in these cases was that the professor's most specific training had not been carried out in Sociology but in the other subject (or subjects) especially when the latter referred to the practice of some profession; (e) it should be added that even in the case of professors exclusively devoted to teaching, in most cases they held more than one chair and usually in different subjects; this fact was occasioned by the inadequate level of remuneration; (f) lastly, the type of social structure was usually reflected in the social origin of the university staff: this was recruited with great frequency—or in an exclusive manner—from upper class groups, access being particularly hard for the very small middle class now arising, and practically out of the question for the rest of the population. The recruiting of students was very similar, though less strict.

The situation described above corresponds in its entirety to the period when the universities were being organized, and has doubtless been gradually modified in more recent times; yet one may observe that, except as regards the last point—referring to the social origin of the professors—it still holds good for a considerable number of Latin-American universities. New trends have recently appeared and this renewal of university organization—which also affects Sociology—probably marks the beginning of the third phase in the development of this discipline in the region. But with respect to the second period—starting with the establishment of the first chairs of Sociology—this description is a faithful reflection of the reality.

It should be borne in mind that these features of university teaching did not preclude the publication of a considerable sociological literature, directly or indirectly connected with this teaching. Many lecturers published their courses and others, treatises and compendia, and there was no scarcity of works devoted to special subjects. Hence it is that, with respect to this period, one speaks of a phase of "sociological specialization" as it certainly was, when compared with the vaguer features of the period before, and with the state of sociology in other countries during the first decades of this century. In this literature of university origin one should not look for originality, although several exceptions to this general rule may be pointed out. It possessed, however, the merit of transmitting, often in an organized and systematic manner, the sociological knowledge of the day, at times taking into account particular applications to the Latin-American reality. During these first decades it did indeed furnish a reasonably true reflection of the state of sociological theories as they were then being formulated in the European centres and in North America as well. There was often visible, as Bastide remarks,<sup>27</sup> an evident concern to keep up to date. In consequence, a widespread character of this sociological literature was its eclecticism. If positivist thought, whether of Comte, Spencer,

or others, was predominant at the turn of the century, later other neo-positivist or non-positivist currents began making their way into the universities to mix with or supplant the former. The leading European sociologists from France, Germany, England and Italy, and also the North Americans—up to Ross and Cooley—were known and quoted. Later on, as the antipositivist reaction gathered weight, other currents often of a philosophical character orientated the teaching and literature. If there was no specialization in the lectures, neither was there in the publications: the same writers published works on sociology, philosophy, law and history and often carried on the tradition of political interest associated with all these. And the reciprocal influence from the perspectives, language, and concepts in these fields is discernible in their writings. In noting this lack of specialization and differentiation in the vocations pursued by these writers, as well as in the university curriculum, one must remember that this is in no small way a reflection of the "encyclopedic" and ill-defined character of nineteenth century sociology and even of the condition of this discipline in the first years of the twentieth century in several European countries; in particular, its uncertain position in the university structure, its link with other social sciences, and its still close connection with philosophy.

In the Latin-American countries there were added to this, besides the circumstances regarding the recruiting of professors, and the nature of the teaching, as mentioned in previous paragraphs, further facts that contributed to hampering the formation of exclusive vocations in the field of sociology. We may mention the—merely demographic—fact of the reduced numerical strength of the intellectual élites in many countries of the region and the widespread lack of professorial staff for their numerous and expanding universities. Lastly—as happened in all the countries—the lecturers and all others who worked in Sociology were self-taught as far as this subject was concerned, even though they possessed academic training in other careers. This fact, although it did not prevent the appearance of brilliant figures was indubitably a further element that greatly influenced the lack of specialization remarked upon and one which, in many cases, seriously harmed sociological teaching.

As a rule, teaching was not connected with research. At the university level, research-work was extremely limited or almost non-existent, with some important exceptions occurring well into the second quarter of the century. This does not mean that there was no investigation whatsoever. Defining this term in a non-technical sense, we may point to many works of great importance and scientific value. These were for the most part studies bordering on literature or history, studies of an impressionistic type, in which we meet, above all, with the tradition of "thought" belonging to the first stage, descriptions and analyses of certain sectors of the "social reality", studies whose sole aim was the historical or sociographic knowledge of this same

concrete reality, and not the verification of hypotheses or theories of general validity. The function of the sociological concepts was, in any case, one of facilitating or permitting such concrete knowledge and not that of confirming their validity with a view to contributing in this way to the advancement of sociological theory. In other words, the predominant idea was "national sociology" and, as will be seen, this conception is predominant still. Moreover, many works, notwithstanding their sociological significance, were not laid down along the theoretical lines of this discipline, being totally unconnected with the march of Sociology, and often contributed by persons without any training in this science.

In the second phase we are describing, great importance should be attributed to the anti-positivist accent, which has characterized a certain part of Latin-American Sociology in the last thirty years. Repercussions of the decline of the European positivism of the last century were registered in Latin-America from the first years of this century; in Mexico, for example, where there is a vigorous anti-positivist philosophical movement dating back to 1904. And—a point worth stressing—it is perhaps not without significance that it should have been an outstanding sociologist philosopher of that country, Antonio Caso, who headed the movement. The anti-positivist and post-positivist currents spread into the field of philosophy throughout Latin-America. Yet this fact did not have the same repercussions everywhere as regards Sociology. In several countries—as an important example we may mention Brazil—anti-positivism in philosophy did not greatly affect its development. But in many others—here the typical example is the Argentine—the rise of anti-positivism also marked the temporary eclipse of Sociology as a scientific discipline. Besides their specific effects, the various spiritualist, idealist, and intuitionist currents contributed to the modification of the intellectual atmosphere, strengthening the pre-existing trends and features that already presented (and present) an obstacle to the formation of a mature scientific outlook in Sociology. These repercussions of a diffuse and general type, which affected above all the academic world, the intellectuals, and the educated public, were not confined to a few countries but influenced, with greater or lesser intensity, a large part of Latin-America.

An important sector of the anti-positivist movement went far beyond the surpassing of certain philosophical currents or the reaction to the "scientific" positions of the followers-on of positivism. While on the one hand, it signified a fresh impulse to study and an enrichment of philosophical thought in Latin-America, on the other hand it implied the outbreak of an extreme irrationalism which not only attacked "scientism" but even tended to discredit the true scientific habit of thought. The remarkable changes that had taken place as regards the fundamentals of science were interpreted purely and simply as the "bankruptcy of science" and this mentality particularly affected the

sciences of man: from biology, in which vitalism came to the fore, to psychology, in which Bergsonism and other later forms of intuitionism acquired popularity, and, last but not least, Sociology. Though in a well established science like biology this stand was only shared by the intellectuals (and not by the biologist, so that concrete scientific work remained unaffected), quite the contrary was the case with psychology and Sociology. Here, in some countries at least, there came about a virtual usurpation of the concrete content of these two disciplines by more or less eclectic forms of philosophy.

The most forceful impact was felt in the sphere of methodological foundations. The preponderant influence was German: the whole tradition of the *Geisteswissenschaften* came to be accepted without reserve. The radical separation between "sciences of nature" and "sciences of the spirit, or of culture" constituted, in the eyes of many, the ultimate and definitive solution of the problem, and served to spread an image of Sociology as a discipline of a speculative type, wholly or partly philosophical in content. The proper attitude for the development of research was thus seriously discouraged. Either Sociology was reabsorbed into History or else the alleged inapplicability of "natural science methods" to the sciences of man, the oft-proclaimed identity of subject and object in Sociology, the privileged role accorded to some form or other of intuition, amounted to the elimination of any demand for verification in the field of the sciences of man. In Sociology, truth could (or, rather must) be attained by immediate intuition; the painstaking search for data to confirm hypotheses would be completely sterile, and the procedures of generalization and explanation either impossible or, at any rate, fruitless. By extending the points of view of phenomenology it was laid down as a first task for Sociology that it should determine the essence of its subject, on the basis of an ontology, and the formulation of this was taken to be incumbent upon the sociologist. At least this was done in books and lectures that continued calling themselves "on Sociology", in spite of being devoted almost exclusively to this "first task".

The afore-mentioned channelling of intellectual influences through three countries functioned here in a very efficient way to consolidate and extend this orientation. Nearly everything published in Spain, Mexico, and the Argentine in the last 20 or 25 years may be classified, *grosso modo*, under this heading. We find the whole of Dilthey, works of Rickert and Windelband, many books by Scheler, Vierkandt, Spann, Freyer, and Spranger, and naturally, a great part of Husserl and other phenomenologists. Of more recent date, Sartre, Heidegger, Merleau-Ponty and others have been well received in sociological teaching circles. One must add, of course, the works of Latin-American or Spanish writers; the latter—particularly Ortega y Gasset—considerably influenced the acceptance of the German currents in philosophy and sociology. Besides this influence, in the Argentine and some other

centres, there came an analogous impact on Sociology from the side of neo-Thomism, with varying admixtures of spiritualism and phenomenology of German origin; thus, in the country named, there were not seldom courses of Sociology based on the four Aristotelean causes and the interpretation of this discipline as a version of the "Politics". All this accompanied by the emphatic rejection of "naturalist methods", regarded as an expression of materialism and positivism. It should be made explicitly clear that Catholic university centres in other countries did not share this position, but it undoubtedly exercised a diffuse influence on a considerable proportion of intellectuals of this line of thought.

If we now recall some of the general characteristics of Sociology in Latin-America, such as its low level of specialization and, in particular, its close connection with philosophy, history and law, the predominantly literary and *belle-lettriste* character of many sociological works (whatsoever may have been their value in originality and wealth of observation), we very easily understand how the philosophical orientations referred to above seemed to furnish solid grounds for this manner of approaching the task of "research". After all, "understanding" and direct intuition seemed to be precisely the procedure put into practice in "impressionistic" studies since the days of "pre-sociological thought". Now one was free to affirm that such procedure was really the only "scientific" path to the understanding of society.

The Sociology inspired by these philosophical leanings was, in point of fact, particularly sterile as regards concrete work, which as a rule originated outside the university. It was above all an armchair sociology, devoted almost exclusively to treatises, to methodological problems and to the endless discussion of "first questions". It is understandable that, in the centres where it was able to prevail, it did little to foster strictness in research or any research whatsoever. All this was going on just when, in Europe and North-America, new events of singular significance were about to happen. On the one hand Sociology elsewhere was breaking fresh ground: the generation of the great theoreticians—Durkheim, Pareto, Weber, Simmel, and others—seemed to have closed. Some of these had shown themselves brilliantly capable of combining theory and research and the matter in hand was now that of continuing their work of systematic and organized study, by increasing the efficacy and rigour of the methods applied, and ensuring at the same time theoretical advance of a cumulative character by means of a fruitful interaction between hypothesis, research, new conceptual schemes, further research, and so on. On the other hand, the growing interaction between European and North-American sociology, started in the thirties and intensified under the impact of the second world war, entailed profound modifications and may well be said to have ushered in the dawn of a "world sociology" i.e. the first move to supersede the national connotations that had hitherto characterized its develop-

ment. This process plainly implied something more than a pure intellectual advance: it was also the effect of the universalization of problems, of the rhythm and volume of contemporary social changes, and of the new significance acquired by the sciences of man as the only rational instrument for coping with the new situation.

There was thus, in many European countries, an increase in the number of concrete studies, in the technical refinement of methods, in the internal differentiation in Sociology; and parallel to this, in spite of the solid academic tradition of the Old World, with all its resistances, there was a renewal of structural organization at the university level, with the creation of modern research institutes and schools specially devoted to the teaching of Sociology. In the United States there came about new theoretical developments which signified the overcoming of "provincialism" as well as, to a high degree, the abandonment of planless empiricism.

Of course, this new "world" phase of sociology finds many problems opening up before it; and not the least among them is that of smoothly harmonizing theory and research at levels of increasing generality, and the possibility of establishing *basic research* in Sociology upon a firm foundation, surpassing, for instance, the stage of "inventories" whatever may be their practical value. But these problems, and many others, are those which any science in movement presents and must present. What has been, in the meantime, the reaction of Latin-American Sociology to the new orientations? The answer to this question leads us to the consideration of what we have termed a third stage in the development of Sociology in Latin America.

#### VI. THIRD STAGE IN DEVELOPMENT: THE BEGINNINGS OF A SCIENTIFIC SOCIOLOGY IN LATIN-AMERICA

The title of this section may not, perhaps, be accepted by all the sociologists of Latin-America. One will call in question whether the qualification of "scientific" should be attributed to a discipline which rests on the same methodological bases as do sciences in general, although it departs in certain respects from the so-called "natural" sciences. Under the present circumstances, the question is whether to abandon the type of university Sociology that still dominates in the region, so as to adopt the orientation assumed in the last fifteen years in the most advanced centres of international importance. The present situation might, in fact, be described in the following terms: on the one hand, the state of the discipline is approximately as has been outlined in the previous section: teaching of a speculative type, eclectic in its content, and ill-defined in its limits; little specialization in the selection of the professorial staff; limited research work and this, in any case, of a rather "literary" and "impressionistic" character; scant knowledge of the modern methodology of research; university

organization inadequate to meet the present requirements of teaching and research in Sociology. On the other hand, institutes and schools have been springing up, which have incorporated, or are attempting to incorporate, these latest orientations, in an endeavour to attain to an international working level. Two of these centres—it should be added—have been founded, on the initiative of UNESCO, by the governments of Chile and Brazil (where they are situated) conjointly with those of the remaining Republics of the continent, for their aim is that of serving the entire region. There thus coexist in Latin-America at the moment two types of sociology and the problem set by this co-existence is a very complex one. It is not, in fact, only a matter of “modernizing” a certain part of Sociology in Latin-America, but of deciding upon a change of heart, a re-orientation in the sphere of values, the adoption of a different scientific position, along with substantial changes as regards material organization and composition of the teaching and research staff. There is here, perhaps, also an underlying problem of generations.

A study of the development of Sociology within the region cannot close without an analysis of the factors bearing on the present situation and bringing once again into close relationship elements inherent in the science itself and elements springing from its “social context”. One first element is the way in which many sociologists (whom we might call “traditional”) and a part of the academic world in general understand modern Sociology. Various factors condition the idea they have. The first is simply deficient information. Whereas in the past the Latin-American sociological literature managed to supply and transmit adequate information on the contemporary state of the discipline, in the last few decades this literature has been steadily deteriorating; in practice it has come to a standstill in the state in which Sociology found itself some twenty-five years ago. Hence it is not infrequent in Latin-America to meet with sociologists who are unaware of the problems, concepts and methods that are currently being discussed at scientific centres in Europe and the United States. With the exception of some works on social anthropology and a couple of textbooks, very little has been translated into Spanish (though this situation is now being improved). This deterioration may be due to the growing specialization in Sociology, to the enormous increase in literature, to its more technical language, to the new type of problems; all elements that mean an obstacle to persons trained in the humanities or juridical sciences. The lack of information is often accompanied by certain fragmentary or faulty information. For example, the whole research-work of present day Sociology is known as “sociometry” or “polls”<sup>23</sup> and the sociology in question is taken to be “pragmatic” or “applied”. The conception of all empirical research as “application” is directly connected with the idea, widespread in Latin-America, of an internal subdivision in Sociology into “theoretical or Pure” and “applied”.



The latter is thought of from the traditional standpoint of "National Sociology" and extends no further than the knowledge about an historically and geographically determined object, with no aim of favouring generalizations of a higher level. This circumstance is connected with other factors: there seems to be no notion of basic sociological research. One hears of "investigations" but this term appears to be used in the same sense as "investigation" in philosophy (for example) i.e. as the working-out of ideas, but not as verification through observation and experiment.<sup>31</sup> It is very likely that in this way of conceiving research we encounter again the spiritualist position pointed out above. It resembles in fact the separation between "sociography" and "pure Sociology" current in Germany three decades ago, pure Sociology being understood as "a philosophical science". But it is also the image corresponding to the type of work traditionally performed by university sociology. The new orientations in Sociology are often felt as belonging to the "North-American sociology", defined as "practical". It is thus opposed to a European orientation of a "theoretical" type, "disinterested" and more elaborate from the point of view of philosophical maturity.<sup>32</sup> Face to face here are the national stereotypes attributed to the United States and Latin-America respectively: the former, practical, technical, narrowly, specialized, little given to pure speculation, to art or to "higher things"; quite the contrary, the Latin-American, philosophical and literary in spirit, inclined to the humanities, to thinking along broad lines, unhampered by constricting specializations. In this way, the attitudes towards modern Sociology are often accompanied by all the political and emotional ambivalences that for many Latin-Americans characterize their relations with North-America. Thus, at least for one sector of the university world and for many intellectuals, two conflicting images of Sociology have been set up, both of them completely removed from reality. These misleading images possess great importance insofar as they influence the groups who hold the power of decision in everything concerning the future of teaching and research in Sociology; they are sources of uncertainty as to the nature of Sociology, its content, its methods and its requirements within academic organization.

Furthermore, and this is another weighty factor, the process of rapid change that the Latin-American societies are undergoing is a propelling force towards the renovation of sociological study. Urbanization, industrialization, incorporation of human masses into this type of life in industrial societies, political integration of large sectors of the population—all this has not only created a multiplicity of problems, but has even altered the class-structure, and, in particular, the social origin of both the university student and his professor, as well as the intellectual élites. In this way, on the one hand, the "contemplative" attitude, connected, for instance, with the élites of an aristocratic type, is giving way to a great propensity towards empirical studies, towards a more

scientific training. On the other hand, these are being explicitly called for from different sectors. For purposes of immediate application, industry is demanding experts on labour relations, on publicity, on market research; the state and other educational, welfare and health organizations are calling for experts on social research, on public relations, on organization. Sociology is now expected to furnish the answer to the dilemmas posed by society in a state of rapid change and an explanation of the processes so profoundly affecting individual and community life.<sup>30</sup>

It is plain that these attitudes in the public towards Sociology while, on the one hand, tending to overcome academic resistance and draw teaching and research together, on the other hand spell a danger for the development of scientific Sociology. The emphasis on practical application and the training of professional workers may stunt the growth of basic research in Sociology. And this above all if we take into account the existing traditions in this respect in the region. Nothing is here more significant than the attitude of "traditional" Sociology to the public's demands: it does not fail to insist on the need for research, but it conceives it, as has been seen, as "Sociography", "National Sociology", without major repercussions on "Pure Sociology", whereby the present sphere of the university professor is "protected" against changes. Equally damaging is the uncritical expectancy surrounding Sociology, the urgent hope for well-nigh miraculous solutions, and added to all this, the ignorance of its research methods, of the organizational and technical requisites they demand, and of the degree of training and specialization that is necessary for scientific activity in Sociology.<sup>31</sup>

To this constellation of attitudes, favourable and unfavourable to the development of scientific Sociology, must be added the material state of affairs: lack of staff, of resources, of bibliographical sources, and the university organization often far from adequate for the new necessities.

For all that, considerable advances have been achieved in the last few years. Several schools specializing in Sociology have been founded, a fact of particular significance as it implies the overthrow of the traditional image and will bring systematic training into our discipline. Research institutes have arisen and are in active function, and not merely existing in a formal way as frequently happened in the past. The work of the international organizations, with their regional branches, their meetings and seminars and, in general, the greater communication with more advanced centres is bearing fruit. Some countries are naturally more advanced than others and it is not possible here to examine these national situations in detail. However, the state of sociology in the region may, without too much wishful thinking, be described as promising for the development of scientific Sociology.

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup>There are many books on Latin American Sociology; unfortunately none reflects the present situation. A. Poviña, *Historia de la Sociología en Latinoamérica*, México, Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1941 (a second edition brought up to date is going to be published shortly); C. Lopez Nuñez, *Horizonte doctrinal de la Sociología Hispano Americana*, Sevilla, Escuela de Estudios Hispano Americanos, 1953; C. A. Echanove Trujillo: *La Sociología en Hispanoamérica*, La Habana, Imprenta de la Universidad, 1953; H. E. Davis, *Social Science Trends in Latin America*, Washington, American University Press, 1950 (see chapter on Sociology). There is also a wealth of articles and short studies; we quote here a number of them: R. Bastide: "Sociology in Latin America" in G. Gurvitch and W. E. Moore, *Twentieth Century Sociology*, New York, The Philosophical Library, 1945; A. Poviña: "La Sociología Latino Americana" in *Revue Internationale de Sociologie* 1, No. 2/3; (this author has published many other articles on the subject); H. E. Barnes and H. Becker: "La Sociología en la península ibérica y en la América Latina. II: La América Latina" in *Historia del Pensamiento Social*, México, Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1945, II tomo; L. L. Bernard: "The Social Sciences as Disciplines. IX: Latin America" in *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, New York, MacMillan, 1933; F. Azevedo: "A Sociología na América Latina e particularmente no Brasil", in *Revista de Historia*, 1950; (see of the same author the chapter on Latin American Sociology in *General Sociology*); L. Carneiro Leao: "El sentido de la sociología en las Américas", in *Revista Mexicana de Sociología*, V (1953); L. Mendieta y Nuñez: "Programa para la integración de las investigaciones sociales en América", in *ibid*; R. F. Behrendt: "Problemas de investigación en el terreno de la Sociología y la Ciencia Política en la América Latina", in *ibid.* fl. IX (1947) J. Gillin: "La situación de las ciencias sociales en seis países sudamericanos", in *Ciencias Sociales* (Washington), IV (1953); H. E. Davis: "Un comentario al punto de vista pesimista de J. Gillin", in *ibid.* IV (1953). Very good information may be found in the sociological journals: *Revista Mexicana de Sociología* (Mexico); *Sociología* (Sao Paulo, Brasil); *Boletín del Instituto de Sociología* (Argentina), in the proceedings of the four Latin American congresses: 1951 (Buenos Aires see *Boletín, cit. vol. VI, VII VIII*) 1953 (Rio de Janeiro); 1955 (Quito, *Anales de la Universidad Central*, 1956); 1957 (Santiago de Chile, 1957); in the proceedings of the three seminars on teaching and research in the Social Sciences in the region, held under the auspices of UNESCO: *Mesa Redonda sobre la Enseñanza de las Ciencias Sociales en la América Central y las Antillas*, Cuba, Imprenta de la Universidad, 1955; *Primer Seminario Sul-Americano para o ensino universitario das ciencias sociais*, Rio de Janeiro, 1956; *Seminario Latino Americano sobre metodología de la Enseñanza y la Investigación en Sociología, Ciencia Política y Economía*, Santiago de Chile, 1958 (proceedings to be published); for the seminars held in Rio de Janeiro and in Santiago a number of national reports were prepared. The Centro Latino Americano de Pesquisas em Ciências Sociais (Rio de Janeiro) is preparing a report on the present state of the Social Sciences in the region.

<sup>2</sup>R. Soler: *El pensamiento filosófico y sociológico del positivismo argentino*. Paris, 1956. (Unpublished thesis). Advertencia.

<sup>3</sup>Sources: Th. Crevenna (Ed.): *Materiales para el estudio de la Clase Media en la América Latina*. Washington, Union Panamericana, 1950; 6 vol. R. L. Beals: "Social stratification in Latin America" in *American Journal of Sociology*, LVIII, 4, 1953; Cepal: "La estructura del empleo en América Latina" en *Boletín Económico de América Latina*, vol. II, No. 1, 1957; Naciones Unidas: *Informe sobre la situación social del mundo*, New York, 1957, cap. IX.

<sup>4</sup>R. L. Beals: *op. cit.*

<sup>5</sup>The urban percentage was in 1925, 33% and in 1955, 44%.

<sup>6</sup>Th. Crevenna, *op. cit.*; R. L. Beals, *op. cit.*

<sup>7</sup>Asociación Latino Americana de Sociología, founded in 1950.

<sup>8</sup>Cf. A. Poviña: *Historia de la Sociología en Latinoamérica, cit.*; L. L. Bernard: *op. cit.* etc.

<sup>9</sup>R. Crawford: *A Century of Latin American Thought*; Cambridge Harvard University Press, 1944.

<sup>10</sup>Apud F. Romero: *Sobre la Filosofía en América*, Buenos Aires, Raigal, 1952; p. 23.

<sup>11</sup>L. Zea: *Dos etapas del pensamiento en Hispanoamérica*, México, El Colegio de México, 1949.

<sup>12</sup>A. Poviña: *Historia, cit.*

<sup>13</sup>R. Crawford: *op. cit.*

<sup>14</sup> J. Gaos: "El pensamiento hispanoamericano". *Jornadas 12*; Colegio de México, Centro de Estudios Sociales, 1944 (apud. R. Soler, *op. cit.*).

<sup>15</sup> According to the interpretation of L. Zea, *op. cit.*

<sup>16</sup> L. Zea: *op. cit.* pp. 36-43.

<sup>17</sup> R. Orgaz: *Sociología Argentina*, Córdoba, Assandri, 1950; fl. II oag. 337.

<sup>18</sup> F. Romero: *op. cit.* p. 12.

<sup>19</sup> L. Zea: *op. cit.*, p. 47.

<sup>20</sup> L. Salcedo-Bastardo: "Informe sobre la enseñanza de las Ciencias sociales en Venezuela," report prepared for the UNESCO Seminar in Rio de Janeiro (1956).

<sup>21</sup> R. Bernal Jimenez: "Informe sobre la enseñanza de las ciencias sociales en Colombia"; Seminario *cit.*

<sup>22</sup> L. L. Bernard: *op. cit.*

<sup>23</sup> J. A. Garcia: *Introducción a las ciencias sociales*, Buenos Aires, Claridad, 1938.

<sup>24</sup> R. Soler: *op. cit.*

<sup>25</sup> Cf. R. Bernal Jimenez, *cit.*

<sup>26</sup> A. Povina: "La sociología Latino Americana" *cit.*

<sup>27</sup> R. Bastide: *op. cit.*

<sup>28</sup> Cf.: G. Germani: *La Sociología Científica*, México, Universidad Nacional, 1956, Cap. I; G. Germani: "Una década de discusiones metodológicas en la América Latina", en *Boletín del Instituto de Sociología* (1956).

<sup>29</sup> The book, which is thought to epitomize the new trends in methodology is Lundberg's *Social Research* (1942 edition, translated into Spanish); Moreno's works are known through Gurvitch and an article translated into Spanish. These remarks only apply of course to sociologists outside the modern trends and a section of the intellectuals. After the translation of Sorokin's *Fads and Foibles in Modern Sociology* (published in Spain nearly simultaneously with the publication of the original edition), it is possible that this book will become for many people the chief channel of information on "modern sociology". This kind of misinformation is also to be found elsewhere; see, for instance the book by L. Goldmann, *Sciences humaines et philosophie*, Paris, P.U.F., 1954, (also translated into Spanish).

<sup>30</sup> For instance the impact of social change on the recent development of the social sciences is quite apparent in Brazil. See L. A. Costa Pinto and E. Carneiro: *As ciencias Sociais no Brasil*, Rio de Janeiro, Capes, 1955.

<sup>31</sup> A situation of this type has been recently described by F. Fernandes: *O Padrão de trabalho científico dos Sociólogos Brasileiros*. Minas Gerais, Revista Brasileira de Estudos Políticos. 1958.

## Sociology and Social Mythology in Post-War Poland

JOZEF CHALASINSKI

(Professor of Sociology University of Łódź)

### I

A revival of Polish sociology<sup>1</sup> in the years immediately following the war was interrupted by the increasing pressure<sup>2</sup> of political authorities to make Polish sociologists accept Marxism-Leninism as the one absolutely valid social theory. The tenth—1948—volume of *Przegląd Socjologiczny* (*Sociological Review*), actually published in 1949<sup>3</sup>, was the last till the recent revival in 1957. The most vigorous post-war sociological centre in Łódź, the headquarters of the Polish Sociological Institute, organized by Znaniecki in 1920, was prevented from continuing its promising development. The University Chairs of Sociology were transformed into Chairs of History of Social Thought or Chairs of Marxism. Even the term sociology was condemned and fell out of use.

Although the banning of sociology from Polish Universities and Polish scientific life actually dated from 1951, the symptoms of crisis could be seen much earlier. The controversy in 1947 concerning University reform, which was then proposed and subsequently carried out in 1949 and 1950, was in that respect highly significant.

The conflict broke out around an article by the present author, "The Social Meaning of the University Reform" (in Polish)<sup>4</sup>. The article provoked severe criticism by Marxists. A critic claiming to represent the Marxist party line wrote: "In the article referred to, the sociologist contrasts two methods of social reform: revolutionary and experimental. He accords recognition to the efficacy of the revolutionary method in transforming the political situation of the country, but denies it such efficacy in realising 'the social values of democracy'. As the Professor sees it, the revolutionary method, if applied without restriction, must result in bureaucracy and must obliterate the social objectives of the revolution"<sup>5</sup>.

Which was the assertion in "The Social Meaning of the University Reform" which called down anathema from the party authorities? It was this: "The reduction to a minimum of the role of the state and

the party in that sphere which is usually referred to as 'science, culture and art' is necessary not only from the point of view of the ultimate aim of economic and political reforms but also for the very process of democratization. Autonomy in 'science, culture and art' is indispensable to democracy as being just that sphere in which public opinion is shaped. Without autonomy in that sphere, there can be no public opinion, and without public opinion there can be no democracy".

To return to the critic, his concluding sentences were: "And the Professor should pause over the reflection . . . that his campaign in favour of the autonomy of science, a campaign directed against 'state and party bureaucracy' . . . is hindering social progress. It is time to counter the allegation that Professor Chałasiński's campaign against Marxism is being conducted from positions within the Polish left-wing movement. That suggestion is both useless and harmful . . . His name is becoming the rallying point of opposition not only against the ideological offensive of Marxism in our life, but also against the trend of changes being effected by Polish democrats".

This controversy was intensified in the subsequent years, during which the history of Polish sociology was dominated by political changes. The turning point came with the fusion of the Polish Workers Party and the Polish Socialist Party, the condemnation of the rightist deviation in the Polish labour movement in 1948, and finally with the expulsion of Mr. Gomułka from the Party in 1949, and his subsequent arrest.

The humanities and the social sciences then saw the beginning of the "ideological offensive" based on a sectarian interpretation of Lenin's theory of the two trends in history. That narrow interpretation holds that all interest in research work, all theories and methodological concepts are involved in the struggle between idealism and materialism—a struggle which is as old as philosophy itself—and that that struggle reflects in our times the conflict between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. Judged from that standpoint, the tenth—1948—volume of *Przegląd Socjologiczny* (*Sociological Review*), already referred to, was condemned as a product of Znaniecki's idealist school, and, as such, detrimental to socialism. A Marxist critic wrote in 1950: "It is beyond doubt that Znaniecki's reactionary and idealistic concepts are irreconcilable with the great cause of building socialism . . . Znaniecki's theories . . . are contrary to socialism".

The Znaniecki school was finally anathematized in 1951. *Myśl Filozoficzna* (*Philosophical Thought*), which began to appear in that year, came to be the only Polish periodical devoted to philosophy and sociology; it published in its first issue a statement of the party line as regards sociology: ". . . Sociology, as taught hitherto in Polish

Universities, has clearly been dominated by the direct or indirect influence of the Znaniecki school. That school has imposed the manner of formulating the subject-matter and the method of investigation so typical of contemporary bourgeois sociology; before the war, it conducted largescale field work based on the methodology, thus influencing young Polish sociologists. It is that school, also, which trained Chałasiński, Szczurkiewicz, Szczepański, and others . . . that school wanted to use, for studying and planning social transformations in People's Poland, theories and methods taken from contemporary bourgeois—chiefly Anglo-Saxon—sociology, together with its *Weltanschauung* and concepts . . . This was to be facilitated by the alleged fact that popular democracy in Poland was something between parliamentary democracy and the dictatorship of the proletariat. In that respect, Polish academic sociology conformed to the political views of the Gomułka group and, particularly with the Polish Socialist Party ideology, with revisionism and social-democratic opportunism”.

“The influence of *The Younger Generation of Polish Peasants*<sup>8</sup> would alone justify a discussion centring round the Znaniecki School”—declared *Myśl Filozoficzna*<sup>9</sup>.

From that time on, Znaniecki and his school appear in Marxist writings as the chief opponents of Marxism, and not in only sociology. An outstanding Marxist, in his book on the objective character of the laws of history<sup>10</sup>, stated that Znaniecki's influence was the main source of idealism in Polish historiography.

All criticism boiled down to pointing out that the activity of the Znaniecki school—which published the only Polish sociological periodical *Przegląd Socjologiczny*—was detrimental to socialism. Not more favourable was Marxist opinion concerning the sociological circle centred around the Sociological Seminar of Professor Stanisław Ossowski at Warsaw University.

## II

The Marxist theory of society and social development in its Stalinist version represented at that time the party line, and was an obligatory subject as the “scientific outlook”, in schools and Universities. It emphasized the basic idea of proletarian dictatorship. An outstanding Marxist defended this idea in controversy with a “bourgeois” sociologist. He wrote: “True, theories have been canvassed alleging the degeneration of the Russian Revolution into a system of government by some supra-class bureaucracy which has turned against the masses; but in our opinion the last war has proved beyond doubt the absurdity of these anti-Soviet theories”<sup>11</sup>.

The Communist Party and the state authorities disseminated the idea of “socialist humanism”, based on proletarian dictatorship, and at the same time most severely condemned the idea of “humanistic

socialism". The latter was considered as a bourgeois revisionist import into the socialist camp. For Polish sociologists the issue was no theoretical one. Almost all of them stood for socialism. The controversy began with the question—what kind of socialism and with what methods?

In the 19th century, within progressive circles of Polish intellectuals, sociological interests were combined with the idea of socialism and that of national independence. Typical of this trend was the outstanding sociologist Ludwik Krzywicki (1859-1941). Later, between the wars, there was among sociologists, besides sympathy for socialism, an agrarian-populist trend represented by *The Younger Generation of Polish Peasants*. War and the Nazi occupation enhanced the sympathy for socialism among intellectuals, including sociologists.

The new faith appealed successfully to Polish intellectuals. Sociologists were among them. Czesław Miłosz is right when he writes in *The Captive Mind* that "we are concerned here with questions more significant than mere force"<sup>12</sup>. The sociologist had to consider what social significance attached to his academic position of scholar and teacher in the changed historical circumstances of his nation. He was not able to change historical necessities. And if he did not prefer a homeless existence in exile, or spiritual seclusion in his own country, he was to share in a common experience with the working classes of his nation. Not to withdraw or isolate himself was not simply a methodological rule for him but a matter of the sense of his life and work.

In this respect the story of the sociological centre in Łódź is most characteristic. Sociologists were there participating in a considerable social experiment: to bind the university with the working class of "the Polish Manchester" (as Łódź was called before the war), to make of it the cradle of a new socialist intelligentsia, community centre of high intellectual socialist culture. At the same time it was to observe and investigate the social process going on. This was the main idea of the sociological centre in Łódź when it took part in organizing a university in this industrial city of a million inhabitants, where before the war there was no institution of higher learning.

Two out of three members of the first Organizing Committee were professors of sociology. Later, when a professor of philosophy was appointed Rector of the University, a professor of sociology became Vice-Rector. The second and third rectors of this University (1949-1955) were professors of sociology.

The subject matter of a lecture given by a professor of sociology at the ceremony inaugurating the University in January 1946 was a sociological analysis of the old intelligentsia based on the landed gentry as opposed to the new one only then arising and based on the working classes.



Until 1951, the Sociological Institute of the University was the discussion forum for departments of social sciences and humanities. Undergraduates in sociology were in the forefront of student cultural life. In 1951, as mentioned before, came the banning of sociology. There were no jobs for sociology graduates.

The debates of the First Congress of Polish Science in June 1951 were held in a climate of withdrawal of Polish science out of the sphere of bourgeois influences. The Congress was to manifest the solidarity of intellectuals with the working class in the implementation of the National Six-Year Plan of Economic Development—the basis for a socialist nation. Socialist nation—the term coined on the basis of Stalin's paper—was opposed to bourgeois nation as well as to "national socialism" and "national communism".

Everything for the masses. This element of the myth of the socialist nation made a strong appeal among progressive intellectuals. This myth promised to realise the longing of intellectuals to belong to the masses, to the nation. This myth dictated a conformity with the demands of Marxism-Leninism considered as social philosophy and as a social creed of the working classes advancing to the new historical rôle of a ruling class. This conformism was the price paid by intellectuals for getting out of the social void.

Let us quote from Miłosz again: "The intellectual has once more become *useful* . . . We must not oversimplify . . . the gratifications of personal ambition; they are merely the outward and visible signs of social usefulness, symbols of a recognition that strengthens the intellectual's feeling of *belonging*"<sup>13</sup>.

### III

The Poznań uprising in June 1956 brought to an end the socialist nation myth. The working classes protested against myth-making. Concerning those years of myth-making Władysław Bienkowski, Polish Minister for Education from October 1956, later wrote an article, "Comments on Recent History", published in *Express Wieczorny*, a Warsaw daily, on December 31, 1956. He there summed up the conclusions to be drawn from the past few years: "The greatest deviation from—indeed, the negation of—the revolutionary theory of Marxism-Leninism made in the Stalinist epoch consisted in the fact that the leaders were against the rest of society. Both the working class and all other social forces were placed in the position of a potential enemy of the socialist system, which had its only champion and spokesman in the ruling machinery. All other ideological, political and economic developments were merely the consequences of that fact".

The influence of the socialist-nation myth upon Polish sociologists did not, however, mean that they conformed absolutely to the party line. At one with the Marxists as regards the Six-Year Economic

Plan, they yet repudiated the totalitarian tendency of "proletarian dictatorship". As soon as public expression of criticism became possible, after the death of Stalin, sociologists again took up the cudgels against the deformed Stalinist way to socialism.

It was from among them that there came the article (published early in 1954 in *Nauka Polska*, the quarterly journal of the Polish Academy of Sciences) protesting against the presentation of Polish nineteenth-century culture in terms of a sectarian interpretation of the "theory of two trends". In the years 1955-1956, "bourgeois" sociologists—Chafasiński and Szczepański from Łódź, and Ossowski from Warsaw—were again fighting against substituting sectarian Marxism for scientific sociology.

The "thaw" was already far advanced, and certain elements among the party authorities had started to wonder whether the freedom of the press ought not to be curbed again, when the Znaniecki school unexpectedly experienced a revival probably unprecedented in the history of sociology: sociologists were summoned to Court as experts in the trials of persons accused of crimes during the Poznań riots in June 1956.

In October 1956, following a request by counsel for the defence, three professors of sociology—J. Chafasiński, J. Szczepański and T. Szczurkiewicz—appeared before the Poznań Court as experts on crowd psychology. Znaniecki's school thus made a public appearance in that very city where it had been founded by Florian Znaniecki 30 years earlier.

The experts' opinions concerned both the influence of crowd psychology on motives leading to acts of violence (lynching included) and the psycho-sociology of the armed attack against the office of the security police. In the latter case especially, the sociological diagnosis differed so widely from the original political interpretation of the riots that, although the trial was marked by complete freedom of expression for all parties concerned, the Polish press refrained from reporting all the particulars, including the detailed sociological interpretation of the attack against the security police.

This sociological diagnosis was based on two mutually complementary theses. One of those theses was to the effect that the attack—contrary to the original official version—was not the work of criminals, but a continuation of the workers' demonstration and their reaction to a police régime. Nor was the said attack, the other thesis maintained, an act directed against the social order, the law, and socialism, since in the consciousness of the people who besieged the office of the security police that security police did not stand for the social order, the law, or socialism, if socialism means social justice.

The Znaniecki school experienced on this occasion another satisfaction: at the Poznań trials, where basic working-class problems were involved, its members—"bourgeois sociologists"—were the only representatives of Polish sociology. Whatever the reasons, neither the Court, nor the counsel for the defence, nor the Public Prosecutors had summoned other sociologists as experts.

#### IV

The Poznań uprising began with the singing of religious and patriotic songs. For workers participating in this manifestation, Polish national unity was still symbolized by the religious cult of the Virgin of Czestochowa, Queen of the Polish Crown. The same name was given in 1957 to a new Catholic Church planned for the inhabitants of Nowa Huta. The Church is to be located at the junction of three streets: Karl Marx, Great Proletariat, and Mayakovsky. It must be remembered that the newly built steel town of Nowa Huta (100 thousand inhabitants) was considered by the Communist Party the pride of socialism.

In the light of such a popular mood in 1956-1957, the question arises as to how we should explain the influence of the socialist-nation myth upon intellectuals—in particular upon sociologists—a few years earlier. In fact, the socialist nation myth did not mean the real integration of intellectuals with the working masses. Its function was to produce a moral justification for the collaboration of intellectuals with the proletarian dictatorship, with a ruling Communist Party, in the name of the nation's future. It had, however, some real basis in the democratization process going on in various fields of social relations.

Sociologists, being university professors, absorbed the socialist-nation myth in university classrooms. The tremendous influx of students of peasant and working class origin favoured the socialist-nation myth. The idea of the socialist-nation ran alongside the absence of social justice and the need of moral unity among students as well as among their teachers.

To understand the myth-making process going on among university youth and their professors, one must bear in mind all the historical circumstances of the period following the years of the Polish national agony under Nazi occupation, and after the intellectuals of the nation (liberated by the Red Army) had lost their belief in the Western-Civilisation myth.

The socialist-nation myth came to replace the traditional myth of Poland as a Christian nation, participating in Western Civilisation. The killing of all sociological research work, all exchange of comparative scientific information concerning contemporary societies, the stopping of statistical publications on various aspects of economic and

social relations in the country—all this did not make more attractive the Stalinist model of socialism, but it helped the party line to monopolize the moulding of minds according to the socialist-nation myth.

However, social mythology goes deeper into the web of society than different political systems. There exists in a society a search for social and moral unity. This search is not appeased by specialized sociological research works. Sociology does not give the vision of society in its entirety at the present time and in the future. The appeasement comes from social myths, not from the science of society—even in the case of sociologists themselves.

The sociologist is not, by his scientific profession, freed from the virus of social mythology. In this respect, the story of Polish sociology in the post-war period should be included among the extreme clinical cases of the impact of social mythology on sociologists. In this case, the virus was very malignant and the story is to be explained in terms of the dramatic history of the Polish nation and its intellectuals. But this does not mean that in different historical circumstances, in an intellectual climate of liberalism and freedom, sociology is completely free of the virus of social mythology. Do not sociologists everywhere work within, and under the influence of, a social mythology of some kind?

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup>Theodore Abel, "Sociology in Post-war Poland," in *The American Sociological Review*, February 1950, pp. 104-106. Florian Znaniecki, "European and American Sociology after Two World Wars," *ibid.*, pp. 217-218. November 1950.

<sup>2</sup>J. Chałasiński's book *Inteligencja i naród (The Intelligentsia and the Nation)* though actually in page proofs in 1949, finally failed to appear. A similar fate befell works by Stanisław Ossowski and Czesław Znamierowski which were either ready for printing or already in the press.

<sup>3</sup>This was the third volume of the *Review* published after the Second World War.

<sup>4</sup>In the weekly *Kuźnica*, June 17, 1947.

<sup>5</sup>Stefan Jędrychowski, "A Campaign for the Freedom of Science or a Campaign for the Preservation of the Old Order?" *Kuźnica*, loc. cit.

<sup>6</sup>Jakub Litwin, in a review of *Przegląd Socjologiczny* in *Myśl Współczesna*, January 1950, pp. 161-163.

<sup>7</sup>Julian Hochfeld, "Some Aspects of the Opposition between Historical Materialism and Bourgeois Sociology" (in Polish). *Myśl Filozoficzna*, No. 1-2, 1951, pp. 119-120.

<sup>8</sup>Józef Chałasiński, *Młode pokolenie chłopów (The Younger Generation of Polish Peasants)*, 4 vols, Warsaw 1938, a work intended as a continuation of Thomas and Znaniecki's *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America*.

<sup>9</sup>Adam Schaff, "The Tasks of the Philosophical Front" (in Polish). *Myśl Filozoficzna*, No. 1-2, 1951, p.44.

<sup>10</sup>Adam Schaff, *O obiektywny charakter praw historii*, Warsaw 1955, pp.159.

<sup>11</sup>Stefan Jędrychowski, *op. cit.*

<sup>12</sup>Czesław Miłosz, *The Captive Mind*, N.Y. Vintage Books 1955, p.6.

<sup>13</sup>Czesław Miłosz, *op. cit.*, pp.8-9.

## The Origins of Sociology in Spain

ENRIQUE GÓMEZ ARBOLEYA

(Professor of Sociology, University of Madrid)

Sociology is not merely an accident in the development of modern society. The conditions for the rise of sociology are the end of Feudal society, through the decline of its juridical, economic and ideological backgrounds and the advent and development of the middle class. It is wrong to study modern society without considering, as one of its constituent elements, the successive rationalizations which culminate in the foundation of a positive science of society, and it is equally wrong to write the history of sociology without showing up its social context. Sociology and modern society form a unity which exists even in those cases which the historians of sociology either do not take into consideration or pay little attention to. I hazard the opinion that those cases of sociologically underdeveloped countries reveal in an especial manner this unity: the poor development of the middle class conditions, the poor development of sociology and the co-existence of Feudal elements and old cultural traits, with the new factors, bring about peculiar social and cultural conformations.

The following pages endeavour to study the relations between modern society and sociology in Spain. They are fragmentary in two respects. First, they only offer a scheme of interpretation, based upon many facts and factors, not developed and not even sufficiently substantiated here. Secondly, they only consider the origin of sociology in Spain, until about 1915. I think this period has a particular interest. In any case, this study may be completed by two other works by the present writer: in Spanish, *Sociología en España*, 1958; in English, the contribution to the book of J. S. Roucek (ed.): *Contemporary Sociology*, Philosophical Library, New York, 1958.

### I

During the first half of the XIXth Century a process initiated in the XVIIIth continues: the decline of Feudal society. That becomes apparent on the one hand in the demographic changes; on the other, in the juridical, economic and ideological transformations.

Unfortunately we have very few accurate documents on the population. Using the available ones contemporary writers have already noted the increase. Here we have the probable figures: 1777: 9,307,000 inhabitants; 1803: 10,351,000; 1821: 11,248,000; 1826: 13,712,000; 1834: 14,660,000; 1868: 16,900,000<sup>1</sup>. The increase runs parallel with a relative decline of the privileged estates, clergy and nobility. Concerning the clergy, the causes are clear: the disentanglement of ecclesiastical property, which begins long before Mendizabal. With respect to the total of the population the clergy formed 2% in 1803, 0.9% in 1826. Concerning the nobility, the decrease in number is also great. As is well known, the structure of the nobility is very complicated, comprising the high nobility and the *hidalgos* who often have the most modest professions. The greatest decrease occurred between 1768 and 1787. The *Gaceta de Madrid* shows it as 244,000, Burgoing as 242,205.<sup>2</sup> It was believed that the causes of the difference were census errors or untrue declarations, but the decrease continues. In 1788 the nobility forms 4.8% of the total population, in 1826, 2.9%. Here we meet again the results of an economic and juridical policy, above all against the *mayorazgos*. All these changes favour a group which is rising. The middle class multiplies the number of its members and their occupations. Although commercial and industrial activities are important, the middle class serves above all the State as Civil servants. Caballero instructs us: "It is very difficult to be precise about the number of all those who have salaries from the State . . . Analysing the last Budget, and being as accurate as possible, the result is that from the 1,278,000,000 (of *reales*) voted by the *Cortes*, about 510,000,000 has been absorbed by the civil servants of the ministries"<sup>3</sup>. As some other civil servants are not included here "it will not be an exaggeration to affirm that 350,000 Spaniards live essentially from salaries and pensions"<sup>4</sup>. A part of this middle class has a wretched economic situation; a political change brings about loss of office: the *cesantia*. Besides the civil servants there are the liberal professions, with all their diversity. In the lowest range, comes the Bohemia of writers, journalists, pamphleteers. "The coffee-houses, newspaper offices, and boarding houses are their social environments"<sup>5</sup>. Of special importance are the newspapers. "Since the liberty of the press arose for the third time in our country, the fancy for the newspapers . . . has become unleashed"<sup>6</sup>. The centre of all is Madrid. Everything leads to Madrid. There could be found the poverty and insecurity of many of those strata. Mazade pointed out in 1855: "Le luxe a ses quartiers et la misère a aussi les siens. J'ajouterai une observation particulière à Madrid, c'est qu'entre ces deux conditions extrêmes on cherche vainement un milieu; moins qu'ailleurs on y voit de ces habitations commodes, propres, bien ordonnées, qui presque partout dénotent l'existence d'une classe intermédiaire aisée, intelligente, laborieuse et jouissant d'une convenable bien-être"<sup>7</sup>. Pérez Galdos gives us in his novels a very accurate picture of the standard of living of this middle class. In any

case, under this class there are large strata of agrarian and industrial workers, domestic servants, poor people. In 1868, Caballero gave the following figures, to which it is necessary to add the families to get the real numbers. Tenant farmers: 510,527; Agrarian labourers: 2,354,120; Industrial workers: 146,260; Miners: 23,358; Domestic servants: 818,393; Destitutes: 337,657<sup>8</sup>. The middle class is a threatened stratum.

In spite of that, three lines of change work in favour of the middle class: (a) *Juridical*. It is certain that the legal situation is very changeable. Time and again Constitutions are established and abrogated, privileges are abolished and then reappear, but throughout all these vicissitudes there is a predominant tendency. The legal situation of the middle class is consolidating. The *mayorazgos*, the privileges of the Mesta, the guilds disappear. The disentanglement remains. The oscillations leave as a small but sure precipitate a number of legal victories. (b) The same thing happens in *economic* matters. In spite of the destructions of the Napoleonic and Carlist wars the creation of new wealth continues. The textile industry still progresses. Above all in Catalonia. The figures are numerous. Taking advantage of the protectionist tariffs, Bonaplata lays out a model factory in 1826. The machines are brought up-to-date. English inventions are soon introduced, sometimes against the opposition of the workers, and large-scale factories spread. Metallurgy and mining are developing in Asturias and Vizcaya. But in any case the output of coal, iron, etc., is very low. Only later does it improve. Militating against internal commerce there are the difficulties and insecurities of the highways (the railway does not spread until 1855); against external, the loss of the American markets. Financial life begins then. In 1829 the *Banca de San Fernando* is founded with a capital stock of 60,000,000 reales, distributed in shares of 2,000. Also the *Banco de Fomento* and the *Banco de Ultramar*. During the Carlist war, the *Sociedad catalana de seguros marítimos*, is born. In Madrid, the *Mutua de Seguros contra incendios*, the *Bolsa*. Madoz calculated the nominal capital of the companies formed in Madrid from 1844 to 1846 at 1,363,700,000 reales. The *Compania Madrilenia de Gas* belongs to this epoch, as well as the *Banco de Barcelona*. (c) Finally the *ideological* background. As in the XVIIIth century the parauniversity institutions are much more important than the University itself. *Sociedades economicas de Amigos del Pais*, *Institutos técnicos*, *Academias*, develop. The Academies have a high activity, above all the Academy of History, where two of the most important scholars of the epoch, Martinez and Marina y Madoz, are working. Also, new and more flexible organs appear, the Ateneo, for instance, an outstanding expression of the middle class. Mazade tells us: "C'était un foyer d'idées, de lumières intellectuelles... C'était aussi un foyer d'enseignement politique. Mais c'est là une politique théorique pour ainsi dire"<sup>9</sup>. In addition, the periodical,

"the fourth estate", *el cuarto poder*. Periodicals like the legal rights of the middle class appear and disappear. "You can say that as a result of the bringing out and disappearance of periodicals the dictionary of titles has been exhausted"<sup>10</sup>. "The oldest and those with a high rate of subscribers (are) the *Eco*, the *Castellano*, *Fray Gerundio*, the *Espectador*, the *Posdata* and the *Catolico*, with the invariable *Gaceta*"<sup>11</sup>.

Many more details can be given. But now we have to consider the rise of the middle class itself. At the beginning and during the first half of the century the phenomenon continues, changing its pattern and rhythm. For two reasons: one, general; the other peculiar to Spain. (a) The French Revolution. As in other countries, its influence in Spain is complex. On the one hand it invigorates the old upper classes which are joined by some higher civil servants, craftsmen and common people. On the other hand, the "frenchified people", *los afrancesados*, reaffirm their position and even give it a more practical character. (b) The Napoleonic war. The destruction of the Enlightened State and the endeavour to found a liberal State. It seems that the bourgeoisie is going to reach its goal quickly and happily. But a social change is never rapid. The social world is not ruled by chance. The middle class has to struggle (a) with the upper classes now reinforced by the Monarch. (b) With the people. There is not yet any class tension between bourgeoisie and proletariat. The people are still an undifferentiated, amorphous, powerful whole, neither defined ideologically nor economically. Tension between bourgeoisie and people begins during the Napoleonic war and continues afterwards. (c) With itself. The middle class has no effective weapon of power. Taking advantage of its numerous members who have risen in the army, the middle class make use of it in the conquest of the State: the "pronunciamientos"<sup>12</sup>. But the pronunciamientos are both for and against the interests of the rising class. Moreover, the active group in the middle class is only a minority surrounded by a passive force, which loves peace and order and hates politics: the homely middle class.

In any case the active middle class focuses attention on the conquest of power. Everything becomes a political matter. (a) Concrete political objective. Professor Jover has attempted a typology of attitudes of the political middle class in Spain during the XIXth century. First, the "plotting middle class": the romantic plot is their hobby. Next, the "agitating middle class": "There are the agitators, the politicians of the coffee-houses, half politicians, half writers, generally from the provinces, protagonists of the Madrid bohemia of the third quarter of the XIXth century"<sup>13</sup>. (b) But the concrete objectives are always a consequence of political "ideas". The middle class are moved by ideas. The two central ideas of the period are: (a) The reality as mutable. That could lead, on the one hand, to the acknowledgement of the historical reality and, inside this reality, of the mu-



table elements: epochs, individuals and, in general, the unique, the extraordinary, the picturesque. But on the other hand that could also lead to a romantic expression of the idea of progress. In any case both attitudes produce an awareness of the crisis of the time. Everything is changing. The revolutions rule our lives. The revolution is a great theme in both the liberal and the reactionary rhetoric. (b) The change, the revolution, demands an organization. Revolution claims its order. The middle class has to put order into the revolution, order into chaos. Owing to its social and intellectual circumstances this order is sought for by the middle class in three directions. 1. Juridical solutions. Order is juridical order. Juridical order is an aggregate of norms, in which reason is manifested. Liberty is to be ruled, not by men, but by norms of reason. Reason creates liberty, because it is liberty. The most important thing is to achieve a permanent juridical order. Constitutionalists, doctrinarians, jurists of various kinds, could be classified here. They represent one fundamental tendency of the middle class: to seek security through forms: the formalist tendency. 2. Decisionist solutions. Their most clear exponent is Donoso Cortes. Donoso is a complex personality. In any case the tendency towards security reinforced by historical fear leads a part of the middle class to be disloyal to itself in its demand for power. In spiritual matters, the Church; in temporal, the dictator. The crosier and the sword. Spain provides an important contribution to the paradoxical history of the counter-revolutionary European middle class. 3. But besides this formalism and decisionism, which echo the scholastic polemic between intellectualism and voluntarism, there is a new position. We must not forget that in the development of modern society reason comes to rule all spheres of reality, just as mathematical reason expresses the laws of the physical world. But the mathematical natural sciences were only one among other manifestations of the phenomenon. Modern commerce, industry, towns, homes, etc. were the results of reason ruling life. The science of society is the achievement of this process. Ramón de la Sagra (1798-1871), the founder of sociology in Spain, was a peculiar romantic personality. An indefatigable traveller, he was the first to write a book on the U.S.A. A man of action, he was equally a fervent believer in science, above all in the natural sciences and statistics (he had personal contact with Quetelet and admired him very much). Without being a professor, he belonged to the Institute of France, gave lectures on "Economía Social" at the Ateneo, published many books and was in contact with many of the most important intellectuals of his epoch. Sagra thinks that the fundamental is: 1. The task of the time. "Gone are the times of divine sovereignty, of slavery and even of absolutism". "The destroying spirit of the revolution has purified society of immense abuses", but it is necessary "to steer it in its precipitate course". It is necessary to substitute the political revolution by another one: "a social, tranquil, reasoned revolution". Through it the gains of the rich and

enlightened democracy will be equalled by those of the poor democracy.

2. Role of science. That is only possible by the "science of social progress, which will be a scientific whole, like a body of principles, related and leading towards one and the same aim". Political Economy, Statistics, Administration, Agriculture will be its nearest auxiliary sciences. Because of its subject matter and its auxiliary sciences it should be given the highest place in human knowledge. Social science will put an end to the mistake of believing that political decisions are the only important matters, it will see social reality as a whole, made up of interrelated parts, and it will solve the social problem<sup>14</sup>.

The doctrine of Sagra reflects the social upheaval caused by the political revolutions and the progress of industrialism. The rise of modern industry had an unfavourable influence on the condition of the working class, and this added to the political upheaval. De la Sagra conceived sociology as an intellectual force to maintain both progress and order. Comte thought the same, more profoundly. It is a sign of the times.

## II

It may be said that the second period runs from 1868 to the beginning of the First World War. Economically it is characterized by the development of railways. The development of railways occurs in Spain from 1851 onwards. This implies a mobilization of capital. Part of it is foreign capital: "On peut dire, de façon générale, que les capitaux étrangers contrôlent à peu près exclusivement le système espagnol de transports"<sup>15</sup> But the Spanish financial group undoubtedly takes advantage of the concessions. There is a financial life which, though poor in comparison with those of the industrialised countries, is worthwhile in Spain. In 1848 the Banco de Fomento and the Banco de Ultramar joined together, with a capital of 200,000,000 reales. The Banco Agrícola Peninsular appears. In spite of the crisis of 1867-68 the formation of a financial group continues. The Republic achieves the organization of the Bank of Spain. The contemporary banking structure of Spain takes shape. The colonial disaster of 1898 does not interrupt but encourages the process. Two fundamental causes influence the development. The policy of public finances of Villaverde and the flow of repatriated Spanish capital from America after the war with the United States. The development of the Cajas de Ahorros (Saving Banks) is proved by the following figures: 59 Cajas de Ahorro in 1900 with 180,000,000 pesetas in deposit; 92 in 1910 with 419,000,000. The available capital stock of the Spanish Bank is estimated in 1913 at 1,500,000,000 pesetas, although the available character of this capital has been doubted. All the same, savings per capita reach 20 pesetas only, much below the French and English standards (about 150 pesetas). A second trait is pointed out by

Marvaud. These Banks "sont presque exclusivement des établissements d'escompte et leur initiative en ce qui concerne l'utilisation de leurs dépôts ne dépasse guère les emplois en Bourse"<sup>16</sup>. Only the Vizcaya Banks have close relations with industry. Nevertheless the Spanish industrial development goes on. The relative industrial prosperity is accompanied by a commercial development. Trade has changed by the middle of the century, with the reform of tariffs and taxes of 1849 and 1868. Trade with Europe begins to be predominant. England spoils Spanish commerce with Asia through the Cape of Good Hope and Cadiz, founding the depot of Singapore; articles from China and the Philippines disappear and are replaced by trade in "novelties", novedades (Galdos has written some valuable pages on this in *Fortunata y Jacinta*) "Novelty" is linked with fashion, with change. Appearance is more important than true value. Trade in novelties must appeal to the public through shop windows, advertisements, commercial travellers. Important also in this period is everything else related to a higher standard of living (furniture, jewellery, etc.). "Relaciono estos hechos con la epidemia reinante que llaman pasión de riquezas, fiebre de lujo y comodidades"<sup>17</sup>. The economic and professional life of the commercial world grows richer. At the beginning of the XXth century, the balance of trade is becoming favourable; it really is so in 1912. Spanish capitalism provides the basis for a new upper class. Galdos has characterized it even by its external appearance. He has beautifully described how the Madrid upper class is "softening its colours": "La sociedad española empezaba a presumir de seria, es decir, a vestirse lúgubramente, y el alegre imperio de los colorines se derrumbaba de un modo indudable"<sup>18</sup>. The "softened" bourgeoisie will "take account of the reality of facts". Its representatives will continue being champions of progress, but progress is understood at a lower level: progress means "inventions". "Science and industry are idolized".

A social structure is congruous with itself. Not only in the sense that its different expressions—art, industry, fashions, religion or science—influence and codetermine each other, but in the more precise sense that the specification and development of one stratum implies the specification and development of the others. The development of finance, industry and commerce, the financial upper class, implies an offspring of civil servants and liberal professions. The political and administrative machinery of the State is being completed. The great Codes have been promulgated. Juridical security is crystallizing, both the public one (status of civil servants), and the private one (property, contracts, etc.). The State assumes the superficial appearance of a juridical State. Civil servants are always the result of two factors: on the one hand, of the existence of a State, but on the other of the existence of a professional technical formation guided by a group of "intelligentzia". The development of finance, commerce, industry,

civil service are accompanied by the development of an intellectual group. That means: 1. A group whose only or fundamental task is the intellectual task. 2. A group which claims that its task is independent and not conditioned by other interests, that is to say, a scientific and objective one. (a) In Spain at the beginning of the formation of this intellectual élite, their wretched situation among hostile forces and real dangers, determines their *position*. Not having external liberty and unable to struggle for it, they put internal liberty first. By chance this idealism takes the form of Krausism. Krause, almost unknown in his own country, has a profound influence on Spain. Spanish Krausism emphasises the affirmation of the consciousness and harmonious development of the individual personality. Cultural contacts offer innumerable examples of the transmission of a trait that functions differently in its new context. The nebulous metaphysics of Krause with its stress on the conscience as the seat of the divinity, its pantheism or panentism, and its eschatology of humanity brought security and unity to a group. It is a group of the elect, like new puritans or Jansenists. They believe irrevocably in themselves, in philosophy and in humanity. The attitude is much more important than the doctrine. This could change and in fact does change. Besides Krause there is the influence of Kant and Hegel. The whole of German Idealism gravitates upon Spain<sup>19</sup>. All this serves to form the individual, an élite of individuals. Later this task loses its ambition and reduces itself to the formation of an élite of University scientists. (b) A group dedicated only and objectively to intellectual work demands its own *structure* and *organization*. This Spanish intellectual group takes three successive forms: 1. Apostleship. The University chair is its centre, but a chair with a large projection outwards and a very coherent audience. The Chair as centre of a fraternity. 2. Institution. The élite is withdrawn from the University: they organize their own teaching. The financial help from capitalism is clearly apparent. The *Institución libre de Enseñanza* takes the form of a joint stock company. In its *Boletín* it is possible to follow the development of the faith and of the capital stock. 3. The *Institución* is a university outside, or inside, of the University. Its final achievement is the conquest of the University. The proper centre of this group will be the University<sup>20</sup>. (c) Through all these phases their *activity* has two goals: information and formation. Information is for this group the opening of Spain to foreign influence. Up-to-date knowledge. Progress and science. The intellectual minority will achieve this task in three ways: 1. Through teaching, of course. But also 2. through periodicals. The periodical has always been a tool of the middle class. Here they are cultural periodicals, on thought, sciences, art. The most important periodicals of this epoch are *Revista de España*, *Revista Contemporánea*, *La España moderna*, *La Lectura*, *Nuestro Tiempo*, *Boletín de la Institución Libre de Enseñanza*, etc. Let us say that all these pay attention to sociology, at least to sociological bibliography. 3. Through translations. Within

a period of 25 years, practically all of the important literature on the historical and social sciences is translated into Spanish. With all that, the first task, information, could be considered achieved, but not the second one: formation. Formation demands immediate contact. This contact is threefold. Personal contacts between master and pupil, old and young, initiated and neophyte. This personal contact is asked for and developed by the Krausist professors from the very beginning. Later, in the Institución Libre de Enseñanza, it reaches its highest point. The Institución attempts a real *paideia*. The personality of Francisco Giner de los Rios is very characteristic. The contact has to be, secondly, with reality, nature and motherland. Here we have a statement of the Sociedad de Excursiones, founded by the Institución: "The capital vice of all our culture is to put aside the immediate and direct examination of things. Excursions are a strong protest against it. They bring us to study nature in nature itself; industry, inside the mills; art, in front of the monuments; geography, travelling the world; history, in archives and museums, and even in the spot where the events took place; sociology, speaking and living with the people"<sup>21</sup>. One of the roots of the rediscovery of Spain by the generation of '98 lay here. The contact has to be, thirdly, with foreign countries. The intellectual Spanish group is a travelling group. The travelling is done by young people from the lower middle class with a special aim: to study, "ampliación de estudios". It is a sort of *Wanderjahre* of the middle class intellectuals.

Up till now we have been dealing with the most general traits. In this totality of thought and life, Sociology has paramount importance. Sociology has not a political but a formative and educational task. It helps to integrate the individual in his community. Because of that, the Institución Libre tries to include Sociology in the plans of graduate studies<sup>22</sup>. But this general attitude and belief develops: (a) The first expression is by F. Giner and G. Azcarate. Krause's influence is still very strong, and with it the mystique of personality, of community, and of humanity. Sociology is looked upon as a part of philosophy and an element in mankind's march towards perfection. Its subject is, Azcarate says, to study "the essence, nature and structure of society, the total social organism". Social organism is not like natural organism, Sociology is not a part of biology. The use of biological, psychological or juridical methods in Sociology is erroneous. Sociology is a part of social philosophy. Its function is, says Giner, the formation of an intellectual élite, who shall rule reflexively the life of the metaphysical, organic whole of society<sup>23</sup>. What R. C. Binkley points out of Spencer may also apply to these authors: their magnificent power of intellectual digestion enabled them to mix all. They were sufficiently ambitious, and at the same time sufficiently myopic to put the thought of their generation into a form that would seem to their contemporaries to be the summit of enlightenment and to us a

caricature of the mind of the end of the century<sup>24</sup>. (b) The second expression may be represented by M. Sales y Ferré. He comes from an intellectual group of a large enlightened tradition: the group of Seville. He has contacts with Krause and Hegel. But finally he severs social theory from its connections with philosophy and places it in the orbit of positivism. Sociology is the heir of the philosophy of history. But the a priori method is replaced by induction and experimentation. Only in this way can social laws be formulated. Philosophy must be eliminated. Human evolution is marked by phases, which have their analogical periods. To support this thesis, he draws from a wide range of modern and classical sources: among the moderns: Spencer, Sumner Maine, McLennan, Giraud-Teulon, Espinas, Fustel de Coulanges, Schmidt, Bachofen, etc.; among the classics, from the Book of Genesis to the early historians of America, through the Iliad, the Odyssey, Xenophon, Plutarch, Damascenus, Cook, etc.; and he knows how to select and interpret them. His work still holds many surprises in store for the reader<sup>25</sup>. (c) The most important personality of the Spanish Sociology of this period is A. G. Posada. If Sociology aspires to be a science it has to prove that it is real science. Basic to any science are: a concrete object that lends itself to investigation; the relation of subject to object; the rational classifying of acquired knowledge; and the interpretation of data assembled. Posada, displaying an exhaustive knowledge of currents and tendencies, believes that Sociology, though in its initial stages it offered many problems, now meets all the requirements of a science. Sociology is the study of social reality. Only positive, concrete, empirical investigations can reveal the social reality and bring about an understanding of social forces. Working hypotheses must guide investigations, and the comparative and experimental methods must predominate though intuition enters into the interpretation of data. Statistics and sociological techniques are of capital importance in analysing the structure and functioning of society. Beside A. G. Posada stands S. Aznar, who belongs to the Catholic movement. The social and intellectual position of this middle class group made Sociology evolve towards the form of a scientific, technical discipline included in the University plans. Will it succeed<sup>26</sup>?

But before answering this question, let me say that in this period Sociology as science of society makes a real contribution: a knowledge of Spain. (a) General knowledge, through the foundation of an anthropological science (T. Aranzadi, L. Hoyos); (b) Studies of social psychology and Spanish social psychology (U. Gonzalez Serrano, R. Salillas); (c) Concrete problems and institutions: rural and urban communities (J. Costa, Pedregal, Posada); political parties and "caciquismo" (Azcarate, Posada, Salillas).

The period is very rich in cultural achievements, in fact the beginning of the second golden age of Spanish literature, and seems to be very

promising also in sociological achievements. In a few years, however, the general intellectual richness grows, but Sociology almost disappears. I believe that the two facts have one and the same root. Spanish intellectuals begin to make their influence felt inside and outside the University. They have a high and secure level, but as a technical, specialized group severed from the rest of reality. This group of professors and high civil servants emphasises the State, not the society. Meusel in his studies on the European middle class points out the correlation between the rise of this group of professors and civil servants and the recognition of the supreme worth of the *respublica* over and above all else. The supreme worth of the *respublica* leads in this period to two consequences. The literary part of the group is inclined to the idea of the nation as a metaphysical unity, and they seek a soul of Spain, a peculiar national character, etc. Any positive investigation into the social reality is avoided. The more technical part of the group affirms the supremacy of the State as a systematic and comprehensive set of norms and institutions: they intend to purify the method in the study of law, and to use a sort of "legal logic". Hans Kelsen and his school exerts a stifling influence. The norms, *Sollen*, are the only important matters, society is a kind of natural being, *Sein*, which the jurist can hold in contempt. The attacks against Sociology come from all sides. Historians also repudiate it as a suspect and imperfect science, and the most important of their organs, the *Anuario de Historia del Derecho*, publishes an article denouncing Sociology by G. von Below. Sociology is half journalism, half politics, not real science. In the high "purity" of sciences, law and the humanities, Sociology has no place. Only a philosophy of society or formalist tendencies in Sociology (Simmel, phenomenology) are admitted.

The dynamic of a bourgeois society leads to the crisis of Sociology in Spain. The professional group draws a sharp distinction between themselves (the *élite*) and the masses, upon which they look with disdain. Confronting the bourgeois consciousness there is a rising proletarian consciousness, still incapable of making positive Sociology. Sociology must wait for a new period in which the whole social reality is mobilized, and a new middle class, a new intellectual group appear.

### III

This period begins after the Spanish Civil war. On the one hand the Civil War causes an important intellectual minority to emigrate and brilliantly develop its latent potentialities in a foreign culture. The intellectual Spanish minority, especially those who emigrate to Mexico and Argentina fill the book market with translations. Among them are works of modern German sociology by Toennies, von Martin, Alfred Weber, Max Weber, etc., but in the *Biblioteca de Sociologia* edited by José Medina appear also many English and American ones.

The result is not only a quantitative output, but a modification of the structure of knowledge, that forces broad areas of the humanities to shift towards sociology and penetrates even deeper strata: a new mentality is in the making. New sociologists and sociologists reaching maturity in South and Central America are working far from their own society. Sociology has to develop among the exiles in the form of great systematic works without concrete investigations.

At the same time, and on the other hand, in Spain the war mobilizes the whole social reality in one way or another not only physically but structurally and economically. The scarcity of men in the traditional professional groups, the appearance of new groups of professionals, the complication of social classes, the inflation, etc. change the make-up of post-war Spain. The new intellectual groups, though sometimes lacking the rigid, "arcane" training of their predecessors, have a better grasp of real, immediate problems. Three factors should be noticed. (a) The changing social reality and the political vacuum caused by the victory of a middle-class group, make economy and society important fields of interest in daily life and sciences. (b) The industrialization process, now progressing apace, brings about new problems. The urbanization of the country, internal and external migrations, the mobilization of the female labour market, changes in the family, etc., demand both knowledge and social action. Organization and human relations in industry reach a paramount importance. Sociological studies may be grouped around specific centres: the Faculties of economic, political and commercial sciences, founded in Madrid, Barcelona and Bilbao; the Institute of political studies, the Balmes Institute of sociology, and the Leo XIII Institute of Madrid. An official Institute of human relations is sponsored by the Ministry of Industry and Commerce. Urban and rural communities are studied by an excellent school of human geography. (c) Finally, the ideological factor. The total real situation makes the Spanish bourgeoisie withdraw from the great problems to the positive ones. In spite of all the assertion of idealism, the post-war Spaniard is a pragmatic and positivist. Technique and science are neutral and fruitful and have to be developed. Very often that is more discussed than really done. But in any case the growth of positive knowledge and the great influence of the U.S.A. must be pointed out. Sociology becomes a magic word. Sociological investigations and sociological literature grow slowly but steadily. A mobile middle-class society sees in them two of its most efficient tools.

More details could be given. But it was not the intention of the writer to account for every item of modern sociology in Spain, but to study its origin and broad lines of development. The reader can also consult the already mentioned works: *Sociologia en Espana*, Instituto de Estudios Politicos, Madrid, 1958, and J. S. Roucek (ed.): *Contemporary Sociology*, Philosophical Library, New York, 1958.



## NOTES

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Censo español executado de orden del Rey comunicada por el . . . Conde de Floridablanca, primer secretario de Estado y de Despacho, en el año 1787*, Madrid, 1787; *Censo de la Poblacion de Espana de el año de 1797. Executado . . . 1801*. Madrid, 1801; *Censo poblacion segun recuento 21 mayo 1857, en 25 diciembre 1860*, 2 vols. 1858-63; *Anuario Estadístico de Espana, 1857-67*; Burgoing, J. Fr: *Tableau de l'Espagne moderne*, 4th ed. 3 vols., 1807, vid. I, p. 286 ff; Caballero, F: *Manual geografico administrativo de la Monarquia espanola*, 1844, p. 132-133, 440-441; Moreau de Jonnes, A: *Statistique de l'Espagne*, 1854, p. 32 seq; Caballero, F: *Resena geografica estadística de Espana*, 2nd ed. 1868, p. 44 seq.

<sup>2</sup> *Gaceta de Madrid*, 4 nov. 1789. Burgoing; *Tableau*, I, p. 287.

<sup>3</sup> Caballero: *Manual*, p. 202.

<sup>4</sup> Caballero: *Ibid.*

<sup>5</sup> Jover Zamora, J. M.: *Conciencia obrera y conciencia burguesa en la Espana contemporanea*, 2nd ed., 1956, p. 25.

<sup>6</sup> Caballero: *Manual*, p. 433.

<sup>7</sup> Mazade, Ch. de: *L'Espagne moderne*, 1855, 8-9.

<sup>8</sup> Caballero: *Resena*, p. 54-55.

<sup>9</sup> Mazade, Ch. de: *Op. cit.*, pp. 23 s., 27. Cf. R. M. Labra: *El Ateneo*, 1906.

<sup>10</sup> Caballero: *Manual*, p. 433.

<sup>11</sup> Caballero: *Manual*, p. 435. Cf. E. E. Kellet: "The Press", *Early Victorian England, 1830-1865*, II 2nd impr., 1951, p. 6: "In the newspaper of the time, perhaps more than in those of today we detect an air of omnipotence and omniscience, which strikes us".

<sup>12</sup> Cf. an interesting observation by R. C. Binkley: *Realism and Nationalism, 1852-1871. The Rise of modern Europe*, ed. W. L. Langer, 1935, p. 31: "It is sufficient to note that the army of the late XIXth century came to assume a position analogous to that occupied by the Church in the early part of the century. The officer corps, like the clergy of the era of throne and altar, enjoyed a special position in the State because it was regarded as the indispensable protector of the State's most vital interests. The general staff, like the hierarchie in the time of reaction, worked closely with the civil government, and yet retained its own special character and tradition. The army as a whole, like an established Church touched the lives of all citizens, not only because it was supported by general taxation, but also because it drew all males into membership".

<sup>13</sup> Jover: *op. cit.*, p. 25.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. R. de la Sagra: *Historia economica-politica y estadística de la Isla de Cuba, 1831; Cinco meses en los EE. UU. de la America del Norte, 1836; Lecciones de Economia Social, 1840; Estudios estadísticos sobre Madrid, 1844; Science sociale. Idees preliminaires, 1848; Aphorismes sociaux, 1848, etc.*

<sup>15</sup> Marvaud, A: *L'Espagne au XIXe siècle. Etude politique et économique*, 1913, p. 347.

<sup>16</sup> Marvaud: *op. cit.*, p. 354.

<sup>17</sup> Perez Galdos, B: *La Revolucion de Julio, Obras Completas*, ed. Sainz de Robles, III, p. 26.

<sup>18</sup> Perez Galdos: *Fortunata y Jacinta, Obras*, V, p. 29.

<sup>19</sup> Jobit, P: *Les éducateurs de l'Espagne contemporaine. I. Les Krausistes*, 1936.

<sup>20</sup> *Boletín de la Institucion Libre de Ensenanza*, 1877 seq.

<sup>21</sup> *Boletín Institucion*, 1886, IV, p. 367.

<sup>22</sup> *Boletín Institucion*, Proyecto para el curso 1881-82, II, p. 3.

<sup>23</sup> Cf. G. Azcarate: *Concepto de la Sociología*. Discurso R. Academia Ciencias Morales, 1887; "Plan de Sociologie", *Annales Inst. Intern. Sociol.*, 1899, V, 33 seq. F. Giner: *Obras Completas*.

<sup>24</sup> Binkley: *op. cit.*

<sup>25</sup> M. Sales y Ferre: *Tratado de Sociología*, 4 vols., 1889-1904; *Sociología general*, 1912.

<sup>26</sup> A. Posada: "Los estudios sociológicos en España", *Boletín Institucion*, 1899, 216 seq; *Principios de Sociología*, 1st. 1908, 2nd ed. 2 vols. 1929; *La ciudad moderna*, Discurso R. Academia Ciencias morales, 1915, etc.

# American Sociology in its Social Context

BERNARD BARBER

(Barnard College, Columbia University)

American sociology today has three leading characteristics. First, it is vigorous and growing. Second, it is maturing as a science. And finally, it is inspired predominantly by liberal values and their associated ideologies. Different, though overlapping, sets of social factors help to explain these three characteristics. We shall consider each in turn, not neglecting the important inter-relations among these features themselves and among their social contexts. In undertaking this task, we have two main purposes. The one is to present an essay, in the sociology of science, on the nature and growth of sociology itself. The other is to provide a comparative case designed to help us sociologists understand our own activities and move toward our chosen goals. These purposes are at once scientific and practical. This was to be expected, for the scientific and the practical are inseparable in human affairs.

## VIGOUR AND GROWTH

The vigour and growth of American sociology has many aspects, all a little vague in their fine detail perhaps but clear enough in their larger significance. When one considers the number of teaching and research positions, the volume of books and articles, the energy and devotion to their work of practising sociologists, or even the amount and spirit of their controversies, on the whole the picture is one of vitality and strength. Part of this picture, of course, is the maturing of sociology as a science which we shall describe and explain more fully later. This is a qualitative indicator, but there are also quantitative indicators of vigour and growth. To be sure, size in itself is nothing; the more the sociologist has learned about quantitative methods, the more he has come to abhor numbers for their own sake. But size, as the study of the division of labour in society shows, is related to social possibilities. Only a certain size makes possible that division of labour, that specialization of knowledge and task, which is indispensable in a flourishing science of sociology.

A variety of cultural and social factors seem to have been especially favourable to the growth of sociology in the United States. One of the weightiest is the value Americans have put upon rational understanding and mastery of all aspects of their environment. Since this value derives both from the Protestant Ethic, as Weber argued, and from its

obvious compatibility with effective instrumental action in any society, whatever the religious tradition, Americans share it in greater or less degree with other societies. But in America, as Tocqueville was only the first to suggest, this value has had a strength not surpassed elsewhere. " Their strictly Puritanical origin, their exclusively commercial habits, even the country they inhabit ", he said a hundred and twenty-five years ago, " have singularly concurred to fix the mind of American upon purely practical objects ". Though the picture is over-drawn, and the explanation not entirely adequate, nevertheless Tocqueville's emphasis upon the American passion for practical mastery of their environment still seems justified. Americans have supported sociology for the contributions it can make to what is for them a twentieth-century frontier, their social environment. Not only sociology but social and psychological science as a whole has profited from the great faith Americans have in the value of rationality. In an earlier, though not too far distant, period of American life, when the religious vocabulary was more common even among sociologists, Albion Small bluntly expressed the conviction that sociology is essential for the rational improvement of social life. " In all seriousness, then ", he said, " and with careful weighing of my words, I register my belief that social science is the holiest sacrament open to men . . . The whole circumference of social science is the indicated field for those ' works ' without which the apostle of ' salvation by faith ' declared that faith is dead ". Some, of course, argue that the modern American is no longer cast in the mould that made a man like Small, that we are now more desirous of adjusting to our social environment than of shaping it. But neither their analysis nor their evidence is convincing. What they describe as conformist behaviour can be interpreted, with equal plausibility, as striving after a rational mastery over the cultural and social problems which presently confront us. American sociology is coloured by this striving.

We must look beyond cultural values to structural and organizational factors in American society for other sources of the vigour and growth we notice in its sociology. We may look first in a most obvious place, the educational structure. Since it is still primarily an academically based science, with ninety per cent or more of its members attached to universities and colleges, our sociology finds its fate connected with that of American education as a whole. This connection has been pretty much a favourable one. American education has been marked by expansion and improvement during the last seventy-five years, the period of sociology's existence in academic form. These changes have been proportionately greatest, perhaps, in colleges and university graduate schools, that is, in the immediate environment of sociology. Education and sociology alike have been living in an economy of abundance. In this favourable social context, sociologists have seized the opportunities provided by increasing size to heighten the quality of scientific achievement.

Not only the growth of university graduate instruction in the United States during the last seventy-five years, but also the contemporaneity of its origins with those of sociology furnished the latter with an accommodating context for growth. Around the turn of the century, when the social sciences and other disciplines were relative newcomers to graduate instruction, sociology found it easier to claim a place on the academic stage. In the situation of intellectual and organizational flexibility which existed in the American university in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, sociology was only one new development among many. It was no mere chance that the first department of sociology in the world was founded in 1892 at the brand-new University of Chicago. And in the Columbia Faculty of Political Science, newly organized by J. W. Burgess for graduate instruction in the social sciences, Giddings a little later found the same chance to introduce sociology that had been offered to Albion Small when the University of Chicago was being established.

In the middle-western and southern state universities, sociology was welcomed for somewhat more practical reasons than those that had operated in the private universities like Chicago and Columbia. In the state universities, it was hoped that sociology might prove of service to the public constituencies to whose needs they have always prided themselves on being responsive. In those public universities, for example, located in states where agricultural needs and interests are of major political importance, sociology was accepted for the practical help that might be provided by rural sociology. It was because of this expectation that until quite recently American rural sociologists were of a primarily practical and a-theoretical bent. Another practical need also led to the establishment of sociology in the state universities, and in many undergraduate colleges as well. Unlike European universities, which have provided education for the few, whether in the humanities "for their own sake" or in professional studies, American universities and colleges have devoted themselves to serving the many. For the masses they have served, some academic institutions have developed what is often called the "life-adjustment curriculum", that is, a set of courses to help students develop the ability to meet the everyday practical social and personal problems of a democratic industrial society. Wherever such a curriculum existed, sociology was invited to contribute through courses on such matters as marriage and family problems, race relations, or "social problems" in general. One world of American sociology still lives in this "life-adjustment" atmosphere. Even this world, however, not infrequently develops higher scientific aspirations. By re-defining in more scientifically relevant terms the practical problems which have called it into being, the world of sociologists who are asked to help people with their problems are at once able to help more effectively and make a contribution to the growth of sociological science. In many places there is now distinguished sociological work where once there were only practical pedagogy and fact-finding passing as research.

Although the government has been one of the lesser influences on American sociology, it has still made an important contribution to its vigour and growth. Until recently, the government's support has been based predominantly on the practical interests of public policy. The first sociologists to be employed were the rural sociologists, in the Department of Agriculture, and statistical and population experts, in the Bureau of the Census. Around 1930, increasingly aware of the dynamic character of American society and the consequent danger of social drift, the government asked a group of University of Chicago sociologists to survey the whole social situation and predict its future course. The result was the two-volume work, *Recent Social Trends*, together with supplementary volumes. Another important report commissioned during the 1930's was *Technological Trends and National Policy*, again primarily a University of Chicago product, under the direction of William F. Ogburn. Probably the most directly influential sociological research sponsored by the government was that which was carried on during World War II and subsequently reported in the four volumes of *The American Soldier*. Through their numerous studies, Samuel A. Stouffer and his colleagues tried to help the Armed Forces in answering such policy questions as these: In a democratic army manned almost entirely by men and officers without previous military experience, what patterns of authority, promotion, and information would produce the highest morale and efficiency? Under what conditions could the maximum integration of Negro and White troops occur? And, when the war was over, what principles of priority in demobilization would seem most just to the soldiers and their families? The work done and the answers given probably are the high-water mark in American sociology's influence on public policy. *The American Soldier* also added its bit to fundamental sociological theory and methodology. The conceptions of "relative deprivation" and "reference group", both elaborated by *The American Soldier* and by later work inspired by it, are now a useful part of our basic conceptual equipment. And other products of the Stouffer-led group, such as the Guttman scale and Lazarsfeld's latent structure analysis, are a useful part of our basic methodological equipment. Since the war, with support from the government, sociologists have contributed to the formation of public policy through research on mental health, Russian society, world urbanization, and the organization of the Armed Forces. In addition, sociological research is now being subsidized, free of any direct connection with practical concerns, by the National Science Foundation, which was established by Congress to promote the development of fundamental science.

Like government, business has been one of the lesser sources of support in the growth of American sociology. Like government also, and as might be expected from the structural imperatives of private enterprise, business acceptance of sociology has been for predominantly

practical purposes. Because of their obvious utility in collecting information essential to the improvement of a firm's market position, for example, public opinion polling and survey research techniques have been financed by business, sometimes through university research groups, often through privately established organizations. These are most common in the world of advertising and the mass media. Business has aided sociological research looking toward improved management-employee relations, though much of this has also sprung from a concern on the part of sociologists themselves for what they defined as greater social and economic justice. Some large corporations, among which may be mentioned the American Telephone and Telegraph Co. and the General Electric Co., now employ sociologists on their research staffs to provide help on a variety of problems. As the applicability of sociology increases, this kind of employment has been increasing, as it had previously for economists and psychologists.

With the exception of universities and colleges, nothing in its social context has been more favourable to the vigour and growth of American sociology than the private philanthropic foundation, such as the Rockefeller, Carnegie, Russell Sage, and Ford foundations. Those who endowed the foundations defined them quite explicitly as instruments of humanitarian improvement. Hardly any area of American life has not felt their impact during the last fifty years. The foundations have prided themselves on their role as pioneers, as early supporters of scientific innovations which promised social benefits. As the apparent creator of new and useful knowledge, sociology has benefitted greatly from foundation grants. Indeed, where the foundations once saw medicine as the most important new American frontier, they have latterly tended to see the social world and its problems as a major area in which contemporary America ought to strive for rational understanding and practical mastery. The charter of the Ford Foundation makes this shift of interest quite explicit.

Besides the philanthropic foundations, other voluntary associations, which spring up in every corner of American society, have recently come to be sources of support for sociological research. Associations devoted to the advancement of a variety of social, cultural, religious, and economic interests now employ sociologists on their own staffs or subsidize university research. Thus, the American Jewish Committee includes some staff sociologists in its Division of Scientific Research. The National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, faced by the crisis of near-success in overcoming epidemic poliomyelitis, provided funds for the Bureau of Applied Social Research at Columbia University to make a study of its purposes, members, and clientele with a view to making recommendations about its future character and goals. The Population Reference Council, viewing with alarm some of the consequences of the current "population explosion", has supported Kingsley Davis' work in sociological demography. The Anti-Defamation League has

subsidized Cornell University sociologists in writing a report on "some propositions and research suggestions" on the problem of Negro-white educational desegregation, a problem on which there is still insufficient reliable theory or fact to give a sure guide to practical reform. Voluntary associations centring on occupational interests also now apply to sociologists for policy guidance and research. Workers' trade unions consult sociologists; so also do professional workers' groups such as the Joint Engineers' Council, the American Nurses Association, and the American Institute of Architects. This interest in sociology is paralleled by the increasing practice among graduate professional schools of appointing sociologists to their research and teaching staffs in the hope of improving the quality of professional skills. Perhaps a hundred sociologists now serve on the faculties of graduate schools in medicine, law, business, social work, theology, education, and public health. The Russell Sage Foundation has been the leader in aiding this diffusion of sociology into the graduate professional schools.

#### MATURITY AS A SCIENCE

It should now be clear that American sociology exists in a social context that is highly favourable to its vigour and growth. Moreover, we can safely predict that support for sociology is likely to increase as it becomes better able to achieve the knowledge and applicability for which it is already encouraged in good measure. This favourable environment is, of course, a necessary but not sufficient basis for its maturing as a science, which is one of the leading characteristics of American sociology today. Certain developments internal to sociology itself are also essential. These we can first list, then discuss. Wherever possible we shall analyze the social factors more immediately responsible for these developments, beyond the sources of sociology's growth which we have already described as broadly influential. In general, it is the growing autonomy of sociology in the university which shapes the form which our discipline is now taking.

Five inter-related processes may be taken as indicators of sociology's presently growing maturity as a science. These are: the strengthening of generalized and systematic theory; the improvement of methodology and technique; the closer integration of theory, methodology, and empirical research; the cumulation of research on theoretically and practically significant issues; and, the enlargement of resources for organized empirical research. These processes are inter-related; they are also not apparently unequal in their individual force. The result is a relatively balanced quality in the development of American sociology which is important for its further progress.

Twenty-five years ago, in an essay on "American sociology" prepared as a review of *Methods in Social Science*, edited by Stuart Rice,

Karl Mannheim said, "It seems to me that American sociology suffers from an excessive fear of theories, from a methodological asceticism which either prevents the putting forth of general theories or else keeps such theories as exist isolated from practical research". This is a view with which one can no longer agree. During the last twenty-five years, sociological theory has flourished in the United States. The chief figure in this transformation has been Talcott Parsons, whose work has been much influenced by the British economists, by Marx, Weber, Durkheim, Pareto, Malinowski, and Freud. Through him and others of the present generation, the European imprint on American theory has been strong. Parsons' central and abiding concern has been the development of generalized and systematic theory, a concern without which no discipline could even aspire to scientific maturity. Parsons has also formulated several special theories—of stratification, of religion, of social control, to name but a few—as parts of his more generalized theory. Both kinds, the generalized and the special, have inspired empirical researches in sociology and have affected basic points of view among workers in the other social sciences as well. As Parsons' generalized theory has evolved, it has tended to become more and more abstract, until critics have suggested it was too much so to be empirically testable. Certainly abstractness has increased the difficulty of its empirical testability, but it has by no means made it impossible. The recent work of Robert Bellah on Tokugawa religion and the modernization of Japan and of Neil Smelser on the effects of industrialization in nineteenth-century England on the structure of the working-class family demonstrates the empirical testability and usefulness of Parsons' abstractly formulated general theory. Both studies also reveal the error of those who have denied that Parsons' theory, and that of "structural-functional sociology" in general, can deal with social change. In applying Parsons' theory to historical data, Bellah and Smelser have put the sociological analysis of large-scale social change on a more maturely scientific basis. In criticism of Parsons it has also been asserted that his work is neglectful of social conflict. Perhaps it is somewhat, since Parsons has tended to be primarily interested in the same question as was Durkheim, how is it that a society or other social custom can remain even relatively stable and relatively integrated? Yet Parsons takes it for granted that only a theory of stability will permit us to understand change and only a theory of integration will show us the sources of conflict. In his essay "Social Classes and Class Conflict in the Light of Recent Sociological Theory", for example, he presents a basic analysis of the social sources and "endemic" character of class conflict in modern industrial society. Whatever the shortcomings of Parsons' theory, and we can predict that these will become clearer to our successors than they already are to us, the lustre of the present period in American sociological theory is likely to remain bright for a long time because it produced Parsons and his work.



Another major contributor to recent sociological theory is Robert K. Merton, who has been most directly influenced by Parsons, P. A. Sorokin, and the historian of science, George Sarton. Fortunately for the rounded development of sociological theory, Merton has chosen to concentrate not on generalized models but on systematic special theories, what he has called "theories of the middle range". His special theories in a wide variety of sociological specialties indicate, however, that there is in his work a guiding, if implicit, generalized model of social behaviour. Certain fundamental concerns inform all of Merton's theory. There is his constant emphasis upon the social structural and cultural sources of every kind of behaviour, conforming, innovative, deviant, and rebellious. Equally persistent is his interest in social processes, as in his theory of reference groups, his analysis of role-sets, and in his work on social organization. There is also, to mention only one more of these fundamental concerns, his search for theoretical and methodological clarity, as is clear from his frequent use of paradigms, or in his recent discussion of group-properties, or in his many useful statements on the nature and functions of theory, or, finally, in his insistence upon the uses of codification. During the last fifteen years, Merton's work has been enriched, as he has pointed out, by his close collaboration in Columbia University, and especially in its Bureau of Applied Social Research, with Paul F. Lazarsfeld. They have fruitfully brought theory and empirical research together.

Merton's concentration upon "middle-range theory" has been misinterpreted by some and mis-used by others to question the necessity for generalized theory. But certainly there is no need for confusion on this score. Both kinds of theory are indispensable in any mature science. Moreover, though we strive for as much integration of the two as possible, the world of science is a somewhat untidy place in which generalized theory and the special theories it is supposed to comprehend never quite fit together at all points. The process of fitting through alterations now on the one side, now on the other, is never finished. The demand that generalized theory be discarded altogether unless the fit is perfect seems to be more the result of our youthful compulsiveness about perfection than of adult good judgment about the actual condition of science.

The growing strength of generalized and systematic theory in the United States does not rest only on a few figures like Parsons and Merton. They are joined by such others as Robert Freed Bales, Howard Becker, Kingsley Davis, George Homans, Philip Selznick, and Everett Hughes. Additional contributors could easily be mentioned if further illustration were needed of the growth of theory in American sociology.

No less evident than this recent strengthening of theory in our discipline has been the improvement of methodology and technique. The

results of this improvement, indeed, have been received by our colleagues in other countries, as well as by ourselves, with a more unmixed enthusiasm than has been given to our advances in theory. This is so in part because ideological differences are less sharply outlined by methodological than by theoretical innovations.

The list of methodological and technical areas in which there has been notable inventiveness and improvement during the last twenty-five years is impressively long. It includes public opinion polling, sampling, the panel technique, survey research, Moreno's sociometry, the art of the interview, mathematical models, the Guttman scale, latent structure analysis, and qualitative measurement in general. With practically all of these items the name of Paul F. Lazarsfeld is closely associated. The genius of Lazarsfeld is peculiarly a mixture of European and American elements. His work is the product of both his Viennese training in mathematics and philosophy and his American opportunities for organized empirical research. Although Lazarsfeld has made important substantive contributions in the fields of political sociology and communications, his primary concern has been less with the substantive results than with the methods of doing research.

In some measure the great improvement in methodology and technique is due to the distinctive American preference, in both research and teaching, for the results of first-hand experience, for what are called "field data". This preference has marked American work ever since the rapid passing of the speculative and grand systems of our "founding fathers". The preoccupation with field data has produced a steady pressure for improvement of the techniques of collecting and the methods of ordering such data. A number of elements in our social context are responsible for this preoccupation. One is a practical and reformist disposition. First-hand, up-to-the minute, factual information is an indispensable requirement of any practical policy and any practicable reform. Another element, the egalitarian desire to "see for oneself" what the facts are, was first remarked by Tocqueville. "Those who cultivate the sciences among a democratic people", he said, "are always afraid of losing their way in visionary speculation . . . As they do not easily defer to the mere name of any fellow man, they are never inclined to rest upon any man's authority; but, on the contrary, they are unremitting in their efforts to find out the weaker points of their neighbours' doctrine". A third feature of American society that supports the emphasis on field data is an "openness" which not only Tocqueville but other European visitors have noticed. This openness of "the field" consists in the relative willingness to give up one's privacy, to admit men from other social circles, to subject oneself to objective scrutiny. It has made sociologists free to penetrate nearly every corner of the social world.

Only with regard to the use of historical materials has there not been a marked improvement in the technique of recent American work.

What Howard Becker said twenty-five years ago in urging a return to the historical data that the earliest Americans had handled with ease and familiarity is still essentially correct: "... most Americans, even in academic circles, are historically provincial in the full meaning of the word. History is a tangled skein of kings and dates, or a ragbag full of curious, brightly coloured scraps, or a sampler stitched with symbols of morals and progress, but rarely is it a closely woven tapestry with which the very walls of our minds are hung". The chief fault is with our education. Our secondary schools and even our colleges no longer provide more than a superficial training in history, except for those who specialize in that subject. The graduate student in sociology, moreover, has no time to make up the defect in his knowledge. He is too busy learning field data techniques, which not only are required but have high prestige. But more than the educational curriculum is responsible. Caught up by the practical problems of social life which present themselves to him in the immediate present, the American sociologist is too busy and too involved in the contemporary world to pay much attention to the historical past. Hopes for historical sociology, and even its practice, are not entirely lost, however. At least at California, Columbia, Wisconsin, and Harvard, the use of historical data in doctoral dissertations is strongly encouraged. And men like Homans and Merton are distinguished, if uncommon, examples of sociologists who use historical data with the skill of the professional historians themselves.

The closer integration of theory, methodology, and research is a third indicator of sociology's presently growing maturity as a science. As with generalized theory and "middle-range theories", we sometimes speak as if science does not exist when these three are not perfectly integrated. Yet in fact they do often proceed separately from one another in the short run, eventually of course to be fruitfully synthesized into a more harmonious scientific whole. Still, it is highly desirable that even in the short run as much work as possible show a close integration of theory, methodology, and research.

Because of our more rounded graduate curriculum, which emphasizes training both in theory and in methodology, and because of the greater availability of research skills and facilities, this desirable condition is more fully achieved among us now than it used to be. An especially impressive illustration is the field of small group research. In Bales's work, for example, the theory of group structures and processes, the methodology of observation, measurement, and experiment, and the practice of intensive research all go hand in hand. So also in Lazarsfeld and Berelson's continuing researches on voting, the theory of political democracy and the methodologies of survey and panel analysis have been creatively developed together. Lipset's study, *Union Democracy*, is another example from the sphere of political

sociology of the fruitful union of theory, method, and research. His theoretical problem—the relation between authority and democratic participation in trade unions, political parties, and other voluntary associations—is the same one that Michels had in view. But the methodology of research used by Lipset and the empirical data his interviews and participant observation produced are significantly superior. The requisites of mature scientific work are combined in a way which was not possible fifty years ago for Michels, nor even for his successors as late as twenty years ago. And so it is with increasingly more of our work.

Another sign of growing scientific maturity is the greater cumulation of research on theoretically and practically important issues. Our knowledge is losing some of its emaciated thinness, although it has a considerable way to go to equal the solid weight of the physical and biological sciences. Where one could formerly point only to one or a few researches on a given subject, now there are a dozen or even more. Consider the typical case of research on social class differences in child-rearing behaviour. The pioneering work nearly twenty years ago of the Chicago group for long held lofty but lonely sway in this field. In the absence of other studies, the Chicago results were cited in every quarter, until they seemed to have a finality which should never characterize frontier research in any science. After about ten years, other research on child-rearing was carried out by McGuire in Texas; by Maccoby and Gibbs in Boston; by further work in Chicago; by Rosen in New Haven; by Littman, Moore, and Pierce-Jones in Eugene, Oregon; by White in the South San Francisco Peninsula area; and by a number of others such as Kahl, Aberle and Naegele, Stephenson, Westley and Elkin, Empey, and Schneider and Lysgaard. This cumulation has had important scientific consequences. On the one hand, the consistency of evidence for inter-class differences is so marked that the original finding assumes a new validity. And on the other hand, the discrepancies and inconsistencies have led to other and more specific knowledge about child-rearing patterns. We now know that there are different patterns in the lower-middle and the upper-middle classes, as well as between the middle class as a whole and the lower class. We know more also about intra-class differences, and about their sources in ethnic, educational, family-value, and psychological variables. In fact it now seems mandatory to start research in this field with a multivariate model.

The fact and the advantages of cumulation of research could easily be illustrated in a number of other sociological specialties. Work on small groups and on voting, already mentioned in another connection, comes to mind again. So too does work on the amount of social mobility in the United States during the last one hundred years, on the professions, on workers' incentives, on social structure and personality,

on formal organization or bureaucracy, on the social organization of the hospital, on demography, on informal communications networks, and on the influence or power structure of local communities. The best sign of this cumulation is the increasing number of articles and books that undertake the essential task of theoretical and factual synthesis in fields where the amount of work is large enough to require it. Before long, as has been the case for some time now in psychology, our journals will print more and more review articles on more and more specialized subjects with more and more references to completed research. Such articles will be in part informational, in part creatively theoretical. They will demonstrate how well-trodden is the path we have come and what directions our next steps must take.

The last of the five inter-related features which may be taken as indicators of American sociology's growing maturity as a science is the increase in our resources for organized empirical research. Although we don't know the exact number of specialized, full-time research sociologists in the university, the government, and business, we know that it is growing rapidly, although here again we are out of comparison with the physical and biological sciences. Moreover, the sociological research institute, with its continuing personnel and facilities, has at last come into regular and accepted being. Such institutes now exist at all the major universities. Unfortunately since these institutes are not yet permanently endowed, they have to exist largely on a variety of temporary research grants. Despite this disadvantage, they are already able to provide opportunities for training, for specialization, and for cumulation such as are more firmly established in other sciences.

#### LIBERAL VALUES AND IDEOLOGIES

A third leading characteristic of American sociology is that it is inspired predominantly by liberal values and ideologies. A central concern is to help achieve greater equality in all spheres: for example, social stratification, ethnic group relations, between the sexes, and in education. Another such concern is to help in the realization of greater individual freedom. Hence the protest against any great concentration of political or social power. Government programmes providing for the increased social security of the lower classes are not considered excessive restrictions on individual freedom because of their essential contributions to greater social equality. It is also a part of our liberal values that American sociologists recognize the inevitability of socially structured differences of interest of many kinds in society but are not convinced that these interests must lead to violent conflict. A variety of other processes are considered to be as available, in principle, as violence for the resolution or management of structured differences of interest. Still further, American sociologists hold that society is inherently dynamic and changeful; but they are not committed to social change either for its own sake or for some apparently utopian purpose.

Above all, they are committed to reason and to the necessity of maintaining the integrity of reason; they see it as not subordinate to any other social factor. This commitment to reason means, specifically, a commitment to sociology as a science and as an instrument of reason in the social world. Finally, liberal values express themselves in the practical and reformist bent of American sociology. Since it is dynamic and changeful, society can possibly be re-shaped by growing sociological knowledge in such a way as to achieve equality and individual freedom a little more fully. If we were not too democratic to adopt for ourselves a coat of arms, we would emblazon on our escutcheon Robert S. Lynd's stirring question, "Knowledge for What"?

Various social sources of this reformist liberalism can be suggested. For one thing, as political historians like Louis Hartz and others have recently argued, liberalism is far and away the predominant general American social and political creed. A radical rightism, despising equality and abhorring change, and a radical leftism, despising liberty and rejecting the established order, have seldom had anything but a weak foothold on either American cultural tradition or social practice. Without any sharp cleavages among them with respect to the values of equality and liberty, then, Americans have been and are divided only into the somewhat more reformist liberals and the somewhat more conservative or less reformist liberals. Sociologists are like the rest of their fellow-countrymen in espousing liberal values and ideologies.

Since sociologists are numbered, as Lazarsfeld's book on academic social scientists in a time of crisis shows, among the more rather than the less reformist liberals, other and more specific sources of our values have to be found. One of these is their social role as students of society. As competent professionals, sociologists are likely to know more than most other people about the central values of their society and about its remediable shortcomings. Also, the social class, ethnic, and ideological origins of American sociologists help to account for their reformist liberalism. Although we lack research evidence, it seems to be the fact that members of our profession have been recruited in somewhat disproportionate measure from those ideological groups and those less privileged and less prestigious social class, religious, ethnic, and racial sectors of the society that have the most to gain from the fuller achievement of liberal values and practice. Former socialists, rural populists, Jews, Negroes, and socially mobile men have been drawn to sociology and have helped to mould its predominant values.

Almost any field of sociological work will serve to illustrate this reformist liberal bent. As apt an example as any is the study of race and ethnic relations. It is in this sphere that the liberal values of equality and individual freedom have been least well realized in American society. Through their research and teaching on this subject, our sociologists have tried to expose this felt defect and offer policies for

its improvement. Courses in race and ethnic relations are numerous, and the introductory course in sociology, which is all that the great majority of under-graduates ever take, presents race and ethnic "problems" as one of the essential interests of sociological science. Moreover, an inspection of the race relations chapter in introductory textbooks and of the race relations textbooks themselves quickly reveals that American sociologists define present conditions as an affront to equality and freedom which should be removed from the national life. Indeed, sometimes their values outrun their verified knowledge. Although sociologists have been proud that the United States Supreme Court, in its educational desegregation decision, made reference to a memorandum by social scientists which was appended to the legal brief for desegregation, it is nevertheless true that neither sociological theory nor sociological fact is impressively marshalled in that memorandum.

The field of social stratification is another in which reformist liberalism is apparent. In general, American sociologists have approved the basic character of their society's open-class stratification system. There are few avowed Marxists among them, and only a few more who see the United States as riven by class struggle and therefore in need of fundamental alteration. Instead, they press for equality of opportunity for all and for as much social mobility as possible. Much research has been designed to identify obstacles to equality of opportunity and mobility. For example, a good deal of evidence has been collected to show that differential class access to education restricts equality of opportunity. Similarly, many studies have shown that different class child-rearing patterns hamper the achievement of success in a "middle-class society" by lower-class children. In the 1930's and 1940's, before there were research data to check their impressions, sociologists deplored what they called the "rigidification" of American society because of supposedly decreasing rates of social mobility. As several excellent recent studies of social mobility have shown, this "rigidification" has not in fact occurred. Their liberal dislike for lower rates of mobility seems to have led sociologists to accept as a fact and then to criticize what was only a possibility unsupported by good evidence.

In the area of industrial relations, finally, we can see how American sociology is linked with predominantly liberal values and ideologies. During the last twenty-five years, an increase in relative equality and freedom in this area has meant enlarging the relative social power and economic security of the unskilled and semi-skilled worker. As their writings testify, sociologists have favoured the expansion of trade unions as the essential agency through which a larger measure of equality of opportunity, economic security, and civil liberties could be gained for these workers. They have also favoured governmental and legal

changes to help produce the same results. The liberalism of sociologists has been especially evident in a controversy that has been carried on for some time now among the industrial relations specialists themselves. A large majority of these specialists have vehemently criticized what they call the "managerial sociology" and the "cow sociology" which they claim to see in the research and policy recommendations of a minority, the school deriving from Elton Mayo. The majority denounces "managerial sociology", a little quickly perhaps, as merely an instrument whereby industrial managers can more efficiently exploit workers. In any case, they dislike the explicit unconcern of the Mayo school with the goal of increasing the workers' equality and freedom. Specifically, they deplore in Mayo and his associates the lack of attention to the trade union's functions for the worker. However, more recently as threats to the workers' equality and liberty have begun to appear in some trade unions in the form of autocratic and oligarchic abuses, the liberal critics of "managerial sociology" have been studying the problems of union democracy. Lipset's study of the International Typographical Union is an example. And at a recent conference on these problems attended by trade union leaders as well as industrial relations experts, it was such critics of "cow sociology" as Daniel Bell, Philip Selznick, and Lipset who insisted to the trade union leaders that democratic reforms were now essential in many unions. Sociologists value greater equality and freedom in every realm of social life.

In concluding, a cautionary word may be helpful. It should, of course, be remembered that although its condition is essentially vigorous and increasingly mature, American sociology still has many weaknesses. Some of our research is trivial or ill-designed, some of our theorizing obscure or pointless. The professional journals publish too much which is of little value. Funds are not always available for the work which sociologists would themselves prefer to do. Indifference to sociology, and active hostility, can be found in certain influential quarters. On balance, however, these are minor, if disturbing difficulties. This is a stimulating time for sociological work in American society.



## Sociology in the U.S.S.R.

P. N. FEDOSEEV

(Corresponding Member of the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences)

The main task of sociology is the study of the laws of social progress, its chief driving forces, which determine every aspect of social life.

Society is not a conglomeration of individuals and social groups, existing more or less independently. It is the effect of interaction of the whole mass of people, linked by specific social relations. Social life cannot be reduced to the life and actions of individuals. On the other hand the acts of individuals are determined by the existing general social conditions. Thus, if sociology wishes to establish the motive forces of human behaviour and that of various social groups, it must study the complex interrelations and interactions in society.

The main feature of sociology as a science, in which it differs from other sciences, is that it represents a theoretical synthesis of the social process. Sociology does not deal with separate aspects of social life, but with all social relations, with every aspect of material and spiritual life. Moreover, in revealing the chief laws of social development, Marxist sociology does not claim to supersede economics, law, history and other social sciences. It is a method of acquiring knowledge and in its turn draws from them its general conclusions.

There are two clearly discernible extreme trends in modern Western sociology. Some of its representatives try to preserve its general theoretical character, but by abstracting sociology from the actual social processes turn it into a formal science, systematizing and classifying different social notions. The other more wide-spread trend in modern sociology is characterized by a descriptive approach to facts. Thus, sociological research is deprived of its general theoretical character. Some Western sociologists admit the danger of descriptive data prevailing over theoretical analysis and general conclusions from social phenomena. *The State of the Social Sciences* published in the U.S.A. says: "The fact-gathering becomes so elaborate and monumental that the problem which initiated it disappears along with any possible conclusion." (*The State of the Social Sciences*. Ed. by L. White, University of Chicago Press, 1956, p.352).

In 1956, at the Amsterdam Congress, a number of speakers pointed out that sociology was being dissolved in statistics, had become a

sociography of the various aspects of social life. Sociography of rural, urban, industrial, family, national life, etc., takes the place of sociology. In splitting sociology into individual independent descriptive sciences analysis of the main social processes becomes impossible.

In some countries there have been recent attempts to combine the so-called empirical sociological studies with some general sociological conceptions. In evaluating them one must start from the fact to what extent general sociological notions correspond to actual facts, how typical and more or less comprehensive are the empirical data used by sociologists to prove certain theoretical statements. Marxist sociology harmoniously combines the study of the general laws of historical development with a concrete analysis of various aspects of social life under the conditions existing in the country in question. A general Marxist sociological theory is based on the sum total of all social facts, it takes into consideration the actual historical development and reveals the main social problems suggested by life. As an illustration of such blending of concrete studies with general theory we can mention Marx's *Capital*, Engels' *The Condition of the Working Class in England*, as well as his essay, "The Housing Problem," Lenin's *The Development of Capitalism in Russia* and *Imperialism: the Highest Stage of Capitalism*, as well as his work on agrarian and national problems.

Concrete sociological studies are not a kind of appendage to Marxist sociology. They are the essence of its dynamic practical approach to reality. The need for concrete sociological studies is the direct result of the general aim of Marxism, namely that philosophers must not only interpret the world but assist in transforming it in the interests of a progressive development of mankind.

Owing to the lofty social mission of contemporary sociology, great attention has been paid in the U.S.S.R., particularly for the last few years, to sociological studies and to the teaching of sociology in educational institutions.

Sociological studies are carried out in the corresponding institutes of the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences, the Academies of the constituent republics, departments of social sciences in universities and other higher educational institutions. The centres of sociological studies are the Institutes of Philosophy, Economics, Law, Ethnography and the corresponding departments at the Universities in Moscow, Leningrad, Kiev, Tashkent, Sverdlovsk and other cities. These studies are also promoted by the Association of Soviet Sociologists.

One of the main sources in sociological studies are statistical data on industrial development, agriculture, education, culture and so on, published in Year-Books by the Central Bureau of Statistics. Of great importance are sample studies of the family budget of an industrial

worker, collective farmer, trade-union statistical data, etc. The All-Union census of 1959 will provide great new opportunities for sociological research.

Sociological research in the Soviet Union is carried out on the following main lines.

#### I. GENERAL SOCIOLOGICAL PROBLEMS

Considerable place in sociological studies is occupied by the main methodological problems of the knowledge of social life. This is a natural result of the notion of sociology as a general synthetic theory, a method of all social sciences.

The general problems of sociology are outlined in the publications of the Institute of Philosophy of the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences such as: *The Principles of Marxist Philosophy, Historical Materialism, The Role of Masses and of the Individual in History*, and other publications of a general character.

Let us enumerate some of the general problems of sociology studied in the Soviet Union.

For our sociologists the problems of *the laws of the changes in socio-economic formation in the process of historical development* are of foremost importance. On the basis of numerous historical studies Marxist sociology discovers new proofs of the existence of laws of socio-economic changes in the process of historical development.

There is a considerable number of sociologists in the West who object against dividing history into periods of regularly succeeding changes in the process of historical development. Contrary to a materialist understanding of the process of historical development, various anti-historical conceptions, such as, for instance, the theory of recurring circles or that of isolated cycles of civilization, are put forward.

Studies by Marxist historians refute anti-historical sociological conceptions and prove the existence of successive changes in socio-economic formation. Of great importance in that respect is the *World History* in 10 volumes, published in the Soviet Union. Some volumes have been released already, the rest are being printed or exist as manuscripts. This vast historical material proves that the principles of scientific sociology, which considers social history as a natural historical process, are unshakeable.

A considerable place is also occupied by studies devoted to the problem of *the motive forces of historical development*.

Studies in this field confirm the basic principles of Marxist sociology that the decisive cause in the process of historical development lies ultimately in the production of material goods and that the real creators of history are the masses. Lately, in some countries, attempts have

been made to juxtapose this point of view with the theory of "multiple factors" which denies the existence of a decisive driving force in the process of historical development and considers that historical events are a result of the intercrossing of various lines. One cannot agree with this eclectic point of view. Our sociologists do not deny that many historical factors and events are the result of an interaction of different processes. But sociology should study the interrelation of different factors and among the numerous influences find the principal one, and, if we mean great historical events, this basic principle will always be economics.

In our age of rapid social changes it is natural that great interest is paid to *the main trend of historical development*.

The study of the most important social changes has shown that in the XXth century the concentration of the socialization of the means of production has become of decisive importance. The social outcome of this economic process is the fact that the private capitalist mode of production is being superseded by a socialist one. Socialism is the inevitable outcome of the concentration and the socialization of the means of production.

In that respect Marxist sociology is based on the numerous studies of Soviet and foreign scholars. Concerning the problem of the development of world economy and the social changes of the XXth century one can cite, among others, the works of Professor E. S. Varga, member of the Academy, devoted to the study of post-war economics and politics, *The General Crisis of Capitalism* by M. S. Dragilev, and *An Increase in the Uneven Development of Capitalism as a Result of World War II* by Y. B. Turchins. One can also mention the following books by foreign authors: K. D. Edwards, *International Cartels in Economy and Politics*, U. Burge, *International Cartels*, and G. Myrdal, *World Economy; Problems and Perspectives*. Numerous statistical handbooks and economic surveys are being published on this subject in the U.S.S.R. and other countries.

Among the general problems of sociology, of special importance is that of *the defence of peace and prevention of war*. Sociological studies of the causes of modern wars and the ways of preventing them are important for the solution of the problem of peaceful co-existence. The results of these studies have been summarized in numerous books, pamphlets, articles and theses. Soviet scientists have published a number of works which deal with the problem of peaceful co-existence. Among these we can mention *The Defence of Peace and Crimes against Humanity* by A. N. Trainin, Corresponding Member of the Academy. The book deals with the legal and moral aspects of the responsibility of governments and peoples in the preservation of universal peace. One should also point out *Norms of International Law on the Peaceful Co-existence of States and Nations* by several authors, as well as

*Peaceful Co-existence of the Capitalist and the Socialist System* by Dvorkin, and *Peaceful Co-existence and Co-operation of the Two Systems* by Y. Borissov, and many other books. Over 50 books and 300 articles have been published on this subject in the socio-economic journals of the country during the last few years.

All these publications prove the possibility and the necessity of peaceful co-existence of the peoples, and the development of peaceful competition between socialism and capitalism in economy and culture.

## II. THE LAWS OF DEVELOPMENT OF SOCIALIST SOCIETY

The attention of Soviet sociologists is centred on the study of the general laws of the new socio-economic formation and their concrete manifestation in the various aspects of the life of socialist society. The Socialist system of economy has been firmly established not in one but in a number of countries, which resulted in the development of a new socio-economic formation, as a new step forward in the general historical development of mankind.

First of all the *peculiar conditions of the formation and development of this new system* have been studied. Here we have a new aspect of the problem of the interrelation of the spontaneous and the conscious in the process of social development. While social formations of the past were the result of a spontaneous development, the new socialist socio-economic formation being prepared by the whole course of the preceding historical process did not arise spontaneously, but was brought about by the revolutionary activity of the masses.

The most important feature of this epoch is the vastly increasing role of the masses. The number of people participating in the historical events and their activity and social consciousness has greatly increased. With the establishment of socialism the building of life on scientific principles has become possible. Economic development proceeds according to plans, drawn up on the basis of an all round study of the needs of society. Both scientific institutions and wide masses of the population participate in the drawing up of these plans.

The seven-year-plan of economic development (1959-1965) in the Soviet Union has been prepared and discussed by millions of people.

There are no obstacles to planning in the shape of contradictory private interests and monopolies. The main problem of planning is the problem of accurately estimating the needs and resources, a correct estimate of the amount and rate of progress of various branches of economy, etc. Of course, some miscalculations are always possible. To minimize and eliminate them depends to a great extent on the accuracy of sociological and economic investigation of the needs and the possibilities of society. A great number of sociological studies were devoted to these problems.

Considerable place in sociological research is also occupied by the problem of *the interrelation between the way of life and consciousness under socialism*. The experience of socialist society has shown that the general sociological principle of consciousness being dependent on the way of life remains true for the new stage. Moreover, Marxist sociology discovers new facts on the relation of consciousness and way of life in the epoch of socialism. Conditions have been created for a tremendous development of consciousness connected with the improvement of the living conditions.

Soviet sociologists study the complex process of the formation and development of new morality in Man. We know from experience that this process is uneven and contradictory. Those aspects of social consciousness that are most closely connected with the material basis of society are the first to adapt themselves to the social way of life. These, as we know, are political views and opinions. The political consciousness of the masses in the Soviet Union is permeated with the spirit of socialism and corresponds to the existing socialist economic conditions. That explains the unity in the views and opinions of the Soviet people.

As to those aspects of consciousness that are not so closely related to the economic base, as, for instance, religious beliefs, the process of adaption is much slower in their case. That explains the fact that in spite of the spreading of scientific knowledge in the masses, many still perform religious rites and hold religious beliefs though social conditions have been radically changed.

Thus, sociological studies reveal the contradictions in the development of consciousness, an uneven transition from old views to new ones. Nevertheless the studies have shown that on the whole the change in the conditions of social life sooner or later bring about changes in all aspects of social consciousness and everywhere new ideas gradually supersede old beliefs and ideas. Sociologists also have come to the conclusion that the human mind cannot mechanically change with the development of social life. It adapts itself to new conditions the sooner, the more intensive is the propaganda of progressive views and ideas.

One of the main tasks faced by Soviet sociologists is the study of *the new social relations connected with the changes in the mode of production*.

The transition from privately owned means of production to socially owned ones has radically changed the relations between people, social groups and classes. New harmonious relations of comradesly cooperation and mutual help have arisen between the workers, the peasants and the intellectuals. Under these conditions the spreading and improvement of technical devices, automation and atomic energy used

on a wide scale will have a beneficial effect. With socialized property and planned production technical progress will lead to the establishment of humane relations between people, an improvement of the working conditions, the elimination of hard manual work and an all round development of personality.

One of the basic problems in the development of social relations under socialism is that of overcoming the essential differences between mental and manual work. The reconstruction of the whole system of education now in progress will be a decisive step towards the solution of this problem. Both mental and manual work will contribute to the formation of personality, produce a human being well adapted for producing material goods and activity in the sphere of the spirit. The elimination of the essential difference between mental and manual work will lead to an actual equality among men not only in their relations to the means of production, but also in the distribution of material goods, education and living conditions.

With the spreading of the socialist system to a greater number of countries, sociologists are faced with a new problem: *that of the general laws and characteristic features of the development of a socialist revolution and the building of socialism in various countries.* Considerable work has been done in this respect. Among the latest works on this subject we can mention *Some Problems of the Laws of Development of Soviet Socialist Society* (1957) prepared for publication by the researchers of Yaroslavl and *Problems of Dialectics in the Development of Soviet Society* (1958) by those in Perm. In the nearest future the Institute of Philosophy will publish a voluminous work on the laws of development in socialist society, which sums up the results of the studies of general laws and the specific forms of their manifestation in the development of a socialist socio-economic formation:

### III. ANALYSIS OF CONCRETE PROBLEMS AND VARIOUS ASPECTS OF LIFE IN SOCIALIST SOCIETY

Besides the general laws governing the life of socialist society, sociological studies are devoted to a large number of concrete problems. Of considerable interest are the studies devoted to the problem of *the growth of the cultural and technical level of the working people and the elimination of the essential difference between mental and physical work.*

The growth of the cultural and technical level of the working people is an objective law resulting from the development of the socialist mode of production on the basis of advanced technical achievements.

The work of industrial workers and that of the peasants is more and more based on the use of automation, science and new technical devices.

In our country the growth of the technical and cultural level of the workers is achieved in the main in the two following ways: first, through general secondary education and adult education in a system of correspondence and evening classes, courses, etc., and secondly through widespread vocational training in vocational and technical schools, higher educational institutions and in factories.

The Institute of Philosophy in collaboration with researchers from a number of cities in the Urals prepare for publication *The Growth of the Cultural and Technical Level of the Working-people; Feature of Socialist Society* which gives an analysis of the main aspects of the problem based on the study of concrete data obtained at the plants and factories in the Urals.

In preparing the book for publication a team of scientists consisting of M. T. Iovchuk, T. A. Stepanyan, M. H. Igitkhanyan, M. Rutkevitch and others have studied the problems of the growth of the cultural and technical level of the workers at numerous plants and factories in the Urals. They distributed questionnaires to the workers, called conferences, production meetings, analyzed the statistical data of the local economic administrative boards (Sovnarkhoz) and plants. Interesting material was provided by the most typical life stories of some workers concerning their activities in industry. These data show how new technology brings about a raising of cultural and technical standards and vice versa, the latter lead to a higher productivity of labour. Wide use has been made of the authors' talks with individual workers concerning their work, cultural interests and living conditions, etc.

Sociologists also studied the activities of social organizations in connection with the problem of the cultural and technological development of the workers. They attended the meetings of these organizations in which the management and the trade union representatives also took part.

On the basis of concrete facts our sociologists and *ethnographers study the material and spiritual culture of the various peoples of the Soviet Union, as well as their work, leisure, the evolution of the family and way of life.*

The result has been summarized in monographs written by a team of authors: *Culture and Life of a Tadjik Collective Farmer* (1954), *Middle Asian Ethnographical Essays* (1954), *Caucasian Ethnographical Essays* (1955), *Baltic Ethnographical Essays* (1956), *Siberian Ethnographical Essays* (2 vols. 1952-1957) and many others.

The problems of human relations, customs and morals were outlined in *Principles of Communist Morality* by A. F. Shishkin (1955), *Law and Morality in Socialist Society* by M. P. Kareva (1951), *Marriage*



*and Family in Soviet Society* by A. Kharchev (1955), *Communist Morality and Customs* by V. N. Kolbanovsky (1956), *Soviet Marriage and Family Laws* by G. M. Sverdlov (1949) and a number of other books.

The sociologists of higher educational institutions in Leningrad prepare for publication a comprehensive study of the problems of ethics which will describe the changes in outlook and human relations brought about by the victory of the socialist system.

Considerable attention is also paid to the problems of humanism. While some Western sociologists claim that humanism is incompatible with socialist practice, the theoretical researches of Soviet sociologists prove that the socialist system is the most humane order of society. One should point out some of these theoretical studies, such as *Humanism and Socialism* (1955) by V. P. Volgin, *Socialism and the Individual* (1956) by F. E. Orlovtshev, *Socialist Humanism* (1957) by L. E. Airapetyanz; *Humanism, a Feature of the Moral Character of Soviet Man* (1955) by A. G. Abolentzeva, etc.

The basic changes taking place in the development of the human mind are studied on the basis of the data obtained from a number of industrial and agricultural enterprises. Besides the usual technique of questionnaires and interviews an important role is played by conferences attended by research workers, engineers, technicians and workers. General conclusions are drawn from the obtained data which serve as a basis for scientific research. Thus, the conference at the "Dynamo" plant in Moscow was very important in that respect. It enabled the researchers to study in detail the changes having taken place in the worker's minds and revealed the remnants of old beliefs, and morals, and thus made possible to map out the ways for their elimination.

The subject of comprehensive sociological research is the *solution of the national problem and the future development of national culture.*

Socialism brought about radical changes in the relation between various nationalities and their respective history. Sociologists study the gradual elimination of the former cultural and economic inequality, the processes of economic and cultural development. The results were published in a number of books. Among them we can mention *Socialist Nations in the U.S.S.R.* (1955) by a team of authors, *The Origin and Development of Socialist Nations in the U.S.S.R.* (1952) by V. Galkin, *Socialist Nations—New Type Nations* (1951) by P. I. Kapyrin; *Soviet Multinational State, its Peculiarities and Development* (1958) by I. P. Tsameryan; *The Formation of the Kirghiz Socialist Nation* (1952) by Junusov; *Formation and Development of the Moldavian Socialist Nation* (1955) by A. V. Grekul, *Formation and Development of the Azerbaijan Socialist Nation* (1955) by Y. Nadjafov; *The Formation of the Armenian Nation and its Socialist Development* (1957) by M. A. Melikyan.

Thus, in conclusion we may say that the work of Soviet sociologists combines the study of the general laws of social development and an analysis of their concrete manifestations in various aspects of social life. We do not consider that sociological research in our country in all respects corresponds to the tasks facing it. We realize that sociological research in a certain measure lags behind the rapid development of life and practical tasks and we criticize that. We are not satisfied with the theoretical and scientific standard of many sociological studies. There are a number of important problems that have been insufficiently investigated.

Scientific institutions have vast plans for the intensification of research concerning the new relations between people, new problems of work, culture, customs, family life, morals, urban and rural life in socialist society. Soviet sociologists plan to work out the problems of peaceful co-existence of nations and to study the ways to prevent wars.

Co-operation between Soviet sociologists and their foreign colleagues, an exchange of opinions concerning the problems and methods of research, will promote a further progress in sociological studies.

## Les conditions sociales du développement de la sociologie en Yougoslavie

RADOMIR LUKIC

(Professeur de la théorie du droit et de sociologie à l'Université  
de Belgrade)

### I

Parler du développement de la sociologie en Yougoslavie du point de vue de ses conditions sociales n'est pas une chose très aisée. Tout d'abord, parce que ces conditions ne sont pas suffisamment étudiées pour qu'on puisse facilement faire un résumé de ces recherches spéciales. Ensuite, parce que la Yougoslavie, ou, mieux, les pays qui font la Yougoslavie, ont eu très longtemps, pendant les derniers siècles, une histoire souvent très différente, et, par là, aussi, des conditions sociales très différentes—les uns étaient déjà assez tôt inclus dans le développement du capitalisme, les autres, au contraire, très tard. Ainsi, par exemple, lorsque la Slovénie, étant dans l'Autriche, près de Vienne et de Trieste, se développait d'après le standard du capitalisme de l'Europe Centrale, la Macédoine était sous le joug de l'Empire Ottomane féodale. Aujourd'hui encore, ces différences subsistent, quoique les pays sous-développés jouissent d'un développement très rapide, réglé par la planification socialiste, afin de s'égaliser au plus vite avec les pays développés de Yougoslavie.

C'est pourquoi nous serons contraints, vu le manque de l'espace aussi, de simplifier les problèmes et de ne les exposer que dans les lignes très générales.

L'histoire de la Yougoslavie, ou, mieux, des peuples et des pays Yougoslaves, peut être périodisée en trois périodes très nettement séparées. La première période va jusqu'à la Première guerre mondiale, ou, mieux, jusqu'à 1918, la date à laquelle on fonde la Yougoslavie après la victoire des Alliées, en réunissant les pays différents, qui, jusqu'à là, étaient ou indépendants (Serbie, Montenegro) ou sous la domination étrangère (de l'Autriche-Hongrie ou de l'Empire Ottomane). La deuxième période est celle d'entre deux guerres. La troisième, enfin, actuelle, celle d'après la Deuxième guerre et la Révolution socialiste Yougoslave faite pendant cette guerre. Il y a de très profondes différences entre ces trois périodes, comme c'est facile à voir

déjà à première vue. Nous nous attarderons, bien entendu, à la deuxième et troisième de ces périodes, en mentionnant la première plutôt comme preuve négative de nos affirmations concernant les conditions sociales du développement de la sociologie, c'est-à-dire en expliquant pourquoi, dans cette période, il n'existait pas une sociologie Yougoslave.

## II

Avant d'aborder le développement de la sociologie, il faut se mettre d'accord sur la notion même de la sociologie—une notion bien discutée et imprécise. Il est évident, pourtant, que notre tâche ici ne peut nullement être de discuter cette question à fond et de prendre une position théorique stricte, qui correspondrait à nos vues générales sur ce problème. Quoique nous ayons notre opinion là-dessus (considérant la sociologie comme une science générale de la société, de tous les phénomènes sociaux, qui étudie ce qui est général et commun à toutes les sociétés et à tous les phénomènes sociaux, tandis que les sciences sociales spéciales étudient tout le reste du domaine social), nous sommes contraints ici d'être pratique et de concevoir la sociologie comme elle est conçue couramment. Ainsi conçue, la sociologie embrasse beaucoup des sciences sociales particulières et spéciales, plus ou moins proches de la sociologie théorique stricte comme nous la concevons.

Du reste, lorsqu' on étudie le développement de la sociologie dans ses commencements mêmes, il est tout naturel de le considérer en liaison étroite avec les disciplines voisines, dont la sociologie se sépare lentement et dont elle ne s'est pas encore complètement séparée.

Par conséquent, la naissance et le développement de la sociologie en général, et surtout en Yougoslavie, ne peut pas être compris sans liaison avec le développement de l'histoire, de la géographie, de l'anthropologie, de l'anthropogéographie, de l'éthnographie, de l'éthnologie, du folklore, de l'économie etc. Ce sont ces disciplines qui se sont développées les premières et qui ont entraîné le développement de la sociologie dans le sens strict, surtout de la sociologie théorique, qui, d'ailleurs, ne se développe, strictement parlant, qu'aujourd'hui.

## III

C'est une règle générale, confirmée par l'expérience Yougoslave aussi, que les sciences sociales en général, et la sociologie, comme la plus développée et la plus complexe de ces sciences, se développent beaucoup plus lentement et beaucoup plus tard que les sciences naturelles. Il faut que l'homme ait acquis suffisamment de la connaissance de la nature, du monde extérieur, pour pouvoir commencer à connaître scientifiquement le monde humain et la société. La cause en est la complexité et la subjectivité des phénomènes sociaux.

Evidemment, cela ne veut pas dire que la curiosité de connaître la

société manquait à l'homme, mais seulement qu'elle ne pouvait pas être satisfaite d'une manière scientifique. Ici, comme d'ailleurs dans toutes les autres sciences, la connaissance scientifique de la société commence par l'accumulation des faits qui sont perçus et décrits systématiquement et d'une manière détaillée. Après avoir accumulé de tels faits, on commence par des hypothèses plus ou moins hardies et insuffisamment fondées et, pour cela, inexactes, pour s'approcher, peu à peu, de l'établissement des vrais lois scientifiques, qui constatent l'évolution permanente des faits sociaux et rendent possible, plus ou moins, de prévoir cette évolution et de l'orienter.

Or, à l'échelle mondiale même, il est difficile de dire encore aujourd'hui que nous sommes arrivés au stade lorsqu'on peut dire que tous les sociologues connus sont d'accord que la sociologie puisse vraiment formuler des lois scientifiques qui embrassent les phénomènes sociaux les plus importants et qui nous rendent capables de les prévoir et de les influencer (voir, par ex., le livre *Déterminismes sociaux et liberté humaine* de G. Gurvitch). En tout cas, en comparaison avec les sciences naturelles, il est difficile de nier que la sociologie est encore fort loin de la sûreté et fécondité avec lesquelles elles formulent leurs lois. Même dans les sociétés et les cultures les plus développées le développement de la sociologie, donc, laisse à désirer. D'autant plus dans les sociétés non-développées.

La sociologie est, par conséquent, l'un des derniers fruits du développement scientifique d'une société. Il est à peine 100 ans depuis qu'elle a acquis son nom et, avec lui, la conscience de son indépendance, et la volonté de la conquérir. Il est bien clair que, lorsque la sociologie naquit dans la société développée européenne, il n'était pas question qu'elle se développe tout de suite en Yougoslavie. Il faut une culture bien développée, il faut que les autres sciences aient atteint un certain stade de développement, il faut que les sciences sociales "préparatoires" pour ainsi dire soient constituées et qu'elles aient donné leurs fruits, il faut qu'on sente un "besoin" social pour la sociologie, il faut, enfin, des cadres très spécialisés et beaucoup d'autres conditions encore pour que la sociologie puisse naître. Il n'est pas étrange que tout cela manquait aux pays Yougoslaves tout le long du XIX siècle et jusqu'à la première guerre mondiale. Il suffit de mentionner que dans le pays principal de Yougoslavie, Serbie, au milieu du XIX siècle, il y avait très peu de gens lettrés et que même le prince régnant était analphabète. C'était encore une société à peu près purement paysanne, qui se développait très lentement.

Tout cela explique, donc, pourquoi, dans cette première période, on ne peut pas parler de la sociologie Yougoslave. Mais, si la sociologie ne pouvait pas encore naître, à cause de ces circonstances, il y avait d'autres circonstances qui étaient favorables au développement d'autres sciences sociales, étroitement liées à la sociologie, dont nous avons

parlé, et dans le cadre desquelles on peut trouver déjà beaucoup de matériel proprement sociologique, les premiers embryons de la sociologie.

En effet, avec le développement du capitalisme au XIX siècle en Yougoslavie, commence aussi le développement de la conscience nationale, tout d'abord dans les couches plus étroites de la bourgeoisie et de l'intelligentsia naissante et plus tard dans les masses larges du peuple. Avec la conscience nationale commence la lutte pour la libération du joug des Etats impérialistes qui tenaient les différents pays Yougoslaves—Turquie et Autriche-Hongrie. Dans cette lutte Montenegro et Serbie ont acquis leur indépendance au cours de XIX siècle et continué à lutter pour contribuer à la libération d'autres pays et peuples Yougoslaves. Or, la lutte pour la libération nationale exigeait impérieusement le développement des sciences "nationales", qui sont en premier lieu des sciences sociales, pour bien connaître sa propre nation, pour étudier son caractère et ses ressources, pour la distinguer des autres nations, pour affirmer sa culture nationale. Le nationalisme, lié au mouvement romantique, qui se développait pendant la première moitié du XIX siècle en Europe entière, provoquait, donc, dans les pays Yougoslaves, le développement et le grand épanouissement des sciences nationales sociales. C'est ainsi que se développa l'histoire nationale, le grammaire et la linguistique nationale, qui donnèrent base pour les grands dictionnaires nationaux, l'histoire littéraire etc. Mais, avant tout, on assiste au développement de l'ethnographie, de l'ethnologie, du folklore etc. La tâche essentielle consistait dans la description de la culture autochtone nationale, de la manière de vivre du peuple, de ses créations artistiques et autres. C'est le temps où la poésie et la littérature populaire en général furent rassemblées et publiées, ou on étudiait le mode de vivre, les coutumes, la manière de s'habiller, les moeurs, l'habitation du peuple etc., etc. On étudiait surtout des institutions sociales qu'on considérait comme spécifiquement Yougoslaves, uniques au monde (comme, par exemple, la célèbre famille large patriarcale—*zadruga*).

Le pionnier de ce travail dans tous les domaines mentionnés était le célèbre savant serbe Vuk Stefanović-Karadžić (1787-1864), qui a donné des travaux d'une grande valeur, qui restent encore aujourd'hui la base de toutes les recherches dans ce domaine. Déjà dans les travaux de Vuk et de son école il y a beaucoup de matériel et d'analyses proprement sociologiques. Beaucoup d'institutions sociales qui sont les objets propres de la sociologie ont été étudiées déjà en ce temps-là, surtout la *zadruga*, déjà mentionnée, *pleme* (gens, clan), le mariage, la mobilité sociale, la propriété des terres, le village comme l'unité sociale, même la division de la société en classes.

Après cette première époque de romantisme, dans la seconde moitié du XIX et au commencement du XX siècle, la société et la science en

général étant plus développées, on commence un travail plus systématique et par des méthodes scientifiques plus rigoureuses dans les mêmes domaines des sciences sociales spéciales. En même temps, ces sciences s'approchent de plus en plus de la sociologie. Mais, en principe, tout ce travail peut toujours être caractérisé comme l'accumulation de faits qui doivent attendre une élaboration sociologique propre.

L'histoire devient aussi de plus en plus rigoureuse et critique et s'intéresse plus au milieu social dans lequel se déroulent des événements historiques et à leurs causes sociales. On commence à développer l'histoire du droit et l'histoire sociale en général. Ici doit être mentionné le nom de Valtazar Bogisić (1834-1908), le grand historien du droit, qui, par de vastes enquêtes sociologiques, étudiait surtout les coutumes juridiques qui vivaient dans le peuple, et qui a donné des travaux purement sociologiques (il était président de l'Institut international de sociologie).

Mais, le travail scientifique dans le domaine des sciences sociales nationales a développé surtout des Académies (Serbe à Beograd et Yougoslave à Zagreb), qui deviennent centres de ces recherches. Dans leur cadre se développe, à côté de l'éthnographie, de l'éthnologie, etc., déjà mentionnées, la géographie nationale, avec l'anthropogéographie, qui commencent systématiquement à décrire toutes les agglomérations nationales, avec les migrations nombreuses qui les ont constituées au cours des siècles. Ce travail a été organisé en premier lieu à l'Académie serbe par Jovan Cvijić, au commencement du XX siècle. Dans l'oeuvre très vaste de Cvijić et de son école, qui se poursuit encore aujourd'hui, il y a beaucoup d'éléments sociologiques. Dans une autre direction l'étude de la vie et des moeurs du peuple a été initiée par Antun Radić à l'Académie Yougoslave de Zagreb. Toutes les deux Académies ont publié un grand nombre des volumes avec ce matériel.

A cette période-là on commence avec l'enseignement universitaire de la sociologie (à Zagreb la sociologie commence à être enseignée depuis 1906, à la Faculté du droit, dans le cadre de la chaire de la criminologie, par le professeur E. Miller).

Une autre circonstance favorable pour le développement des sciences sociales, surtout économiques, était la lutte politique et sociale qui se développait de plus en plus avec l'accentuation de la lutte des classes, conséquence du capitalisme développé. Deux mouvements politico-sociaux étaient spécialement favorables au développement de ces recherches scientifiques—le mouvement socialiste ouvrier et le mouvement paysan. Le premier était fort surtout en Serbie et le second en Croatie. Le travail dans ce domaine se rapproche beaucoup plus de la sociologie. Initiateurs de ces mouvements sont Svetozar Marković (1846-1875) et Antun Radić (1868-1919). Ces mouvements ont initié des recherches sur la position économique, sociale et politique des différentes classes et groupes sociaux. C'est le commencement

d'une recherche sociologique réaliste de la structure de la société. Il faut noter que déjà dans le cadre de ces recherches on a étudié le problème de la bureaucratie (surtout Marković).

Au contraire, on doit dire que la classe gouvernante, la bourgeoisie, tant nationale que celle de la nation dominante, n'était pas intéressée à la recherche de ces problèmes. Elle favorisait un romantisme national qui était déjà dépassée ou (en Croatie et en Slovénie, où l'église catholique était très forte et avec une tradition très longue) se confinait dans une philosophie sociale catholique, de préférence thomiste. Cette attitude différente envers les recherches sociales scientifiques de la bourgeoisie d'une part, et du prolétariat et des larges masses du peuple d'autre part va s'accroître de plus en plus, comme nous allons le voir. Ainsi, l'église, la bourgeoisie, les mouvements politiques bourgeois et la politique officielle de l'Etat, qui était dans les mains de la bourgeoisie, étaient des obstacles au développement de la sociologie, tandis que les mouvements ouvriers et paysans et l'intelligentsia issue de ces mouvements, au contraire, le favorisaient.

#### IV

C'est ainsi qu'on arrive à la deuxième période de l'histoire de la sociologie en Yougoslavie, période entre les deux guerres mondiales. Dans cette période-là Yougoslavie est unifiée, la société s'est beaucoup plus développée, l'industrialisation et le capitalisme sont déjà fort évolués, l'appauvrissement des paysans et la migration vers les villes s'accroissent. La société développée, avec les classes sociales bien différenciées, devient le champ des conflits sociaux et politiques très aigus. A cela il faut ajouter aussi les conflits nationaux provoqués par le fait qu'en Yougoslavie unitaire vivent plusieurs nations auxquelles on ne reconnaît pas le droit au développement de leur propre nationalité.

Dans cette société en conflit et en évolution rapide la sociologie va rencontrer des conditions qui favorisent son développement, mais aussi beaucoup d'autres qui l'empêchent. En somme, les conditions favorables n'étaient pas assez fortes pour faire naître une sociologie vigoureuse et bien développée. Elles ne réussissaient que de réaliser les premiers commencements de la sociologie. Les conditions défavorables ont eu pour conséquence que le développement de la sociologie était bien retardé.

Tout d'abord, l'Etat, dans les mains de la bourgeoisie, sa politique et ses institutions officielles, étaient un facteur qui empêchait le développement de la sociologie. Il y avait sans doute là une certaine influence de la tradition et du bureaucratisme, qui d'ordinaire caractérisent si fortement toute action étatique dans le domaine de la culture. Les Académies et les Universités aussi étaient figées dans leur routine



ordinaire et continuaient à travailler d'après les manières accoutumées sans se soucier des disciplines nouvelles et de la sociologie. Ils continuaient leur travail commencé au XIX siècle, qui accumulait les faits sur la vie et les moeurs du peuple. Sans doute, ce travail était mieux organisé, mais il restait encore loin de la méthode sociologique véritable. C'est seulement peu à peu et avec grande peine que la sociologie commença à pénétrer dans les universités. C'est seulement à la veille de la Deuxième guerre mondiale que les Facultés du droit et de l'économie politique à Beograd ont introduit l'enseignement de la sociologie. Mais la tradition et le bureaucratisme n'étaient pas les causes principales de cet état de choses.

Les Académies et les Universités étaient des institutions étatiques et l'Etat n'était guère favorable au développement de la sociologie. C'était bien compréhensible. La raison essentielle en était idéologico-politique.

En effet, la sociologie, et les sciences sociales en général, sont beaucoup plus liées aux problèmes politiques, aux idéologies, aux luttes sociales, que les sciences naturelles. Il n'est guère ici besoin de développer la thèse bien connue, et bien vraie (dont s'occupe, d'ailleurs, une branche de la sociologie, la sociologie de la connaissance), que notre connaissance des faits sociaux est bien influencée et souvent déterminée par notre position sociale, nos intérêts, nos aspirations, etc. De notre point de vue, il est beaucoup plus important de souligner que la sociologie et les sciences sociales en général sont des armes dans les luttes politiques et sociales. Par conséquent, chaque classe, chaque groupe social, prend sa propre position envers ces sciences, en se servant d'elles. Car, dans les luttes politiques et sociales les forces sociales doivent nécessairement se servir de la connaissance de la réalité sociale, donnée par les sciences sociales. La science sociale peut, donc, influencer fortement ces luttes, et cette influence dépendra du contenu de cette science. Et chacun qui est engagé dans les luttes sociales tend nécessairement à construire une telle science sociale qui puisse l'aider dans ces luttes.

Or, dans la Yougoslavie entre les deux guerres les luttes politiques, sociales, nationales étaient très fortes. De plus en plus le règne de la bourgeoisie était menacé par le mouvement ouvrier, socialiste. L'évolution de la société indiquait de plus en plus que le moment de la révolution socialiste s'approche. Une sociologie vraiment scientifique, qui aurait essayé de montrer que la classe ouvrière viendra remplacer la bourgeoisie au pouvoir, conformément aux lois de l'évolution de la société, serait sans doute une arme très forte dans les mains des forces révolutionnaires. Cet élément sociologique scientifique devenait un élément fort important de l'idéologie politique et sociale de la classe ouvrière.

Il est évident, donc, que la bourgeoisie n'avait pas intérêt à aider le

développement d'une sociologie de ce genre. Elle avait deux voies possibles devant elle: ou empêcher le développement de la sociologie scientifique ou promouvoir le développement d'une sociologie qui ne donne pas l'image vraie de la société, qui ne prédit pas la révolution qui s'approche, mais qui s'occupe de ces éléments de la société qui ne touchent pas directement aux problèmes des lois de l'évolution sociale. L'Etat bourgeois et les forces politiques organisées de la bourgeoisie utilisaient les deux voies. D'une part, comme nous l'avons vu, on ne stimulait généralement pas le développement de la sociologie. D'autre part, les défenseurs de l'ordre établi cultivaient volontiers la sociologie formelle (à l'instar de l'école formaliste allemande de von Wiese), qui est expressément hostile à toutes les lois de l'évolution sociale et qui donne une image statique de la société. Le représentant le plus important de cette sociologie, qui a publié une *Introduction à la sociologie* et beaucoup d'autres travaux d'une qualité très haute, était le professeur M. Kosić.

Dans le sein de l'église et de l'intelligentsia catholiques, surtout en Croatie et Slovénie, on développait un autre genre de la sociologie (si l'on peut nommer ainsi cette discipline), qui était conservatrice de l'ordre établi—c'était une science sociale traditionnelle catholique, qui ne se distinguait pas beaucoup de la discipline du même genre cultivée dans le monde catholique entier. Elle s'occupait surtout de la critique du socialisme (V. Aderlić: *La critique sociale du socialisme*). L'écrivain le plus prominent de cette tendance était A. Usenicik en Slovénie.

Aussi bien on commença à traduire des oeuvres sociologiques étrangères de la même tendance. C'est ainsi qu'on a traduit Giddings, Palante, Freyer et d'autres.

Si l'Etat et les forces politiques et sociales dominantes n'étaient guère favorables au développement de la sociologie ou, dans le meilleur cas, s'ils orientaient la sociologie à se détacher de la réalité, ce sont des mouvements politiques et sociaux dominés, souvent persécutés par l'Etat, qui étaient les foyers du développement de cette sociologie qui tâchait de pénétrer le sens de l'évolution de la société et d'aider la révolution qui se préparait. Au centre de ces forces était le mouvement ouvrier socialiste révolutionnaire, basé sur le marxisme, organisé par le Parti communiste. Ses efforts étaient dirigés vers le but d'édifier une sociologie à la base du matérialisme historique, mais qui étudierait d'une façon systématique les problèmes concrets et spécifiques Yougoslaves pour préparer ainsi la future révolution socialiste. Bien entendu, on ne pouvait pas réussir, dans les conditions de la lutte politique quotidienne et de l'illégalité de ce mouvement, persécuté par l'Etat, à réaliser ce programme fort ambitieux: on devait se consacrer aux devoirs plus pratiques et concrets. Un essai systématique de la sociologie marxiste se trouve dans l'oeuvre de F. Filipovic: *L'évolution de la société*. On a aussi posé les bases fondamentales scientifiques

pour l'étude des problèmes Yougoslaves concrets, bases qui ont donné preuve de leur valeur lorsqu'elles ont servi à la solution de ces problèmes dans la révolution. On a surtout étudié le problème national en Yougoslavie et les problèmes de l'idéologie politique. Les meilleurs travaux de ce genre sont ceux d'E. Kardelj (sur le problème national de Slovénie) et de V. Maslesa (sur l'évolution de certaines idéologies politiques). A part cela, il y a un bon nombre d'études des autres problèmes sociaux et politiques.

Le mouvement marxiste avait une influence assez forte sur un large groupe des savants libre-penseurs. Plus les luttes politiques s'aggravaient, plus le mouvement ouvrier gagnait en popularité et plus ce groupe s'orientait vers le marxisme et sympathisait avec le mouvement politique révolutionnaire. C'est surtout la jeunesse universitaire qui s'orientait dans cette direction. Et c'est ainsi qu'on créa une atmosphère politique et idéologique qui, insensiblement mais fortement, influait le développement de la sociologie et des sciences sociales, même chez ceux qui, consciemment, évitaient une telle influence.

Cette intelligentsia libérale était assez active dans le développement de la sociologie. Elle fonda les Sociétés sociologiques, l'une à Zagreb, plus ancienne en date, et la seconde à Beograd, à la veille de la guerre. C'est surtout la Société de Beograd qui était de plus en plus dominée par les idées progressistes et sous l'influence de la pensée marxiste. Cette Société organisait des recherches sur le terrain de la vie rurale et commença à publier un annuaire sociologique, *Socioloski pregled* (*Revue sociologique*), la première publication périodique Yougoslave de sociologie.

D'autre part, le mouvement paysan, qui était fort surtout en Croatie, et ses sympathisants, stimulaient surtout la recherche empirique de la position sociale et des problèmes de la paysannerie. Le surpeuplement agraire, l'industrialisation faible, les crises de l'agriculture, l'endettement paysan comme leur conséquence et beaucoup d'autres problèmes ont incité beaucoup de chercheurs de s'adonner à cette recherche. Initiée ainsi, aussi bien comme par la Société sociologique, la sociologie rurale est la première branche de la sociologie qui en Yougoslavie atteignit un degré important de développement. Ici une place bien haute appartient à Sreten Vukosavljević, qui s'attachait surtout à l'étude de l'évolution historique de la vie rurale dans les régions serbes. Vient ensuite R. Bićanić, qui s'occupait avant tout de la description, par des méthodes plus modernes, de la vie actuelle des paysans croates, et d'autres écrivains (M. Kosić, J. Predavec, A. Pribičević, etc.).

La vieille tradition d'étudier les formes archaïques de l'organisation sociale, comme *zadruga*, *pleme* et d'autres, était continuée, mais par des méthodes plus proprement sociologiques. Ici travaillait surtout

D. Tomasić, qui s'occupait aussi de l'évolution des idéologies, de la stratification sociale et d'autres problèmes.

Le problème de la synthèse de l'évolution de la société croate au XIX siècle intéressait surtout M. Ivisić, qui a écrit *L'évolution de la société croate dans la seconde moitié du XIX siècle*. Il s'est occupé aussi de la sociologie économique, surtout des problèmes paysans.

La sociologie politique était cultivée surtout par S. Jovanović, qui écrivait aussi bien sur les problèmes de la sociologie politique nationale, (serbe, en premier lieu) que sur ceux de la politique étrangère (le livre: *Sociologie politique de la France, de l'Angleterre et de l'Allemagne*), et par Dj. Tasić, inspirateur de la Société sociologique de Beograd, qui traitait surtout des problèmes sociologiques théoriques.

Une circonstance très défavorable au développement de la sociologie dans cette période était le manque de cadres scientifiques sociologiques propres. Il n'y avait aucun institut scientifique qui s'occupait de la sociologie, ni aucun savant qui s'occupait exclusivement de la sociologie. Tout ce qui était fait dans le domaine de la sociologie était fait par des savants d'autres disciplines qui ne s'aventuraient que de temps à temps dans le champ sociologique—c'étaient des historiens, des juristes, des économistes, des géographes, des philosophes, ou bien, même, des publicistes, des journalistes, des politiciens etc. Il manquait aussi des revues sociologiques spécialisées et des ressources matérielles.

Comme l'on voit, à cette époque-là, la sociologie était trop liée à des luttes sociales et politiques et à des idéologies pour pouvoir rester neutre. Le choix des problèmes qu'elle étudiait, ses thèses essentielles, ses méthodes de travail—tout cela était sous l'influence des idéologies des différentes forces sociales en lutte. Il est par conséquent fort compréhensible que dans cette époque le travail sociologique restait fragmentaire, qu'il n'était pas mené systématiquement et qu'il n'a pas donné des résultats bien durables, sauf de rares exceptions. Surtout, on ne peut pas dire que cette époque a réussi à constituer vraiment la sociologie comme une science indépendante. Mais il reste indubitable qu'on a posé déjà quelques bases importantes pour le développement ultérieur de la sociologie et que, surtout, les sciences proches de la sociologie ont accumulé un matériel fort riche pour l'élaboration sociologique théorique ultérieure.

Mais, évidemment, il serait trop simplifier les choses que de penser que la seule raison de tel développement de la sociologie et des sciences sociales était cette liaison de la sociologie avec la lutte des classes et la politique. La tradition scientifique, l'éducation sous l'influence de l'une ou de l'autre philosophie, l'intérêt personnel etc., etc. étaient des facteurs essentiels importants. Il ne reste pourtant pas moins vrai que les facteurs essentiels étaient bien ceux que nous avons essayé d'exposer—la sociologie était une arme de combat et elle était forgée comme telle par ceux qui en avait besoin pour combattre.

## V

Pendant la Deuxième guerre mondiale et la révolution socialiste la société Yougoslave a subi de très grands changements. Tous les problèmes se posaient d'une manière bien différente qu'avant la révolution et celui de la sociologie aussi.

Il est évident que la sociologie ne pouvait pas être développée dans une mesure très grande pendant cette courte période d'un peu plus qu'une dizaine d'années. Mais on ne peut pas nier qu'elle se développait beaucoup plus vite pendant ce temps en comparaison avec les périodes précédentes et qu'elle se développait d'une manière beaucoup plus systématique et dans des conditions beaucoup plus favorables. On ne peut pas dire que la sociologie Yougoslave ait atteint le niveau de la sociologie dans les pays développés ni, même, qu'elle est près de l'atteindre. Mais on peut bien dire qu'elle est déjà constituée et a posé les bases de son développement ultérieur.

La condition essentielle qui favorisait le développement de la sociologie à cette époque était le renversement révolutionnaire, qui a brisé les obstacles idéologiques et politiques de ce développement. Les forces politiques et sociales dominantes ne sont plus hostiles à la sociologie, elles n'évitent pas la vérité sur la société. Bien au contraire, la société nouvelle est très intéressée à connaître cette vérité pour s'en servir.

En effet, la société Yougoslave est une société dans laquelle on construit le socialisme, une société toute nouvelle. Cette construction, cette édification de la société socialiste est, donc, un acte conscient, réfléchi de la volonté sociale. L'évolution sociale ne se fait pas spontanément—c'est l'homme, sa conscience et sa volonté, qui interviennent pour orienter le cours de l'évolution dans la direction voulue. L'évolution de la société est planifiée.

Or, édifier la société nouvelle, cela ne dépend pas exclusivement de la volonté des hommes. Cette édification est conditionnée par les facteurs objectifs, qui déterminent aussi bien la volonté que les possibilités qu'elle a pour orienter le cours de l'évolution sociale. En un mot, l'intervention de la volonté humaine, la planification sociale, peut atteindre le but seulement sous la condition qu'elle est conforme aux possibilités réelles. Le socialisme sera édifié s'il est réellement possible. Cela veut dire que l'action consciente doit être basée sur la vérité objective sociale. Si la science sociale, la sociologie, la connaissance de la société et des lois de son développement, ne sont pas objectivement vrais, l'action de l'édification sera absolument impossible. Et, de même, elle aura beaucoup plus de difficultés à surmonter si cette connaissance n'est que partiellement vraie.

Le développement de la société et de la connaissance des lois de son développement, pourtant, ont atteint le stade où l'on peut bien

planifier avec succès au moins les directions les plus générales et les plus importantes de l'évolution ultérieure. Mais, pour pouvoir le faire, il faut développer, dans la mesure la plus grande, la sociologie et les sciences sociales en général, il faut connaître la vérité objective sociale. Si la société socialiste doit être une société bâtie scientifiquement, il faut bien que la science, sa base, soit bien développée.

C'est pourquoi dans la société Yougoslave il existe un grand besoin social, une "demande" sociale pour la sociologie. Bien entendu, cette demande ne suffit pas à elle seule pour créer la sociologie, mais elle est un facteur important à cette fin.

Le besoin social de la sociologie ne se sent pas seulement par rapport au problème le plus général de l'évolution totale de la société. Il existe aussi par rapport à un grand nombre de problèmes sociaux plus spéciaux, mais urgents et importants. Ces problèmes ne peuvent pas être résolus d'une manière adéquate sans la recherche sociologique. Comme un pays agricole qui devait s'industrialiser, la Yougoslavie se trouvaient devant les problèmes du passage des paysans dans l'industrie, de l'urbanisation, de l'éducation des cadres qualifiés, etc. Comme un pays à plusieurs nationalités qui ont acquis la liberté du développement de leur culture nationale, le problème national de l'unité Yougoslave dans cette spécificité de la culture se posait ainsi. Le problème de la position de la femme dans la nouvelle société, de la position de la famille etc., etc. devenaient urgents avec les changements rapides dans l'économie et la structure sociale. Les problèmes démographiques se posaient aussi en termes nouveaux et beaucoup d'autres problèmes encore. Tout cela attendait une recherche scientifique approfondie et détaillée.

La révolution socialiste en Yougoslavie avait pris des formes spécifiques et originales par rapport à d'autres révolutions pareilles, ce qui était dû à la spécificité de la société Yougoslave. La caractéristique la plus générale de ces formes c'est la démocratisation du gouvernement social par l'autogestion ouvrière et par d'autres genres de l'autogestion, qui signifiaient le commencement du "dépérissement de l'Etat", qui perdait de plus en plus ses compétences en faveur de ces nouvelles formes démocratiques. Ces formes provoquaient l'inclusion des larges masses du peuple dans les différents organes de gouvernement et de gestion sociale. Le fonctionnement rationnel de ce système exigeait la recherche sociologique de l'effet et du rendement de ces nouvelles formes et en même temps fournissait aux sociologues un champs de recherche tout nouveau et passionnément intéressant.

La recherche sociologique de ces problèmes concrets et actuels ne pouvait pas être menée par des méthodes verbales et au niveau exclusivement théorique—elle devait s'appuyer sur des méthodes de recherche strictes et "exactes" pour ainsi dire. La sociologie Yougoslave n'avait pas de tradition dans ce domaine et le devoir se posait d'introduire et

de développer de telles méthodes, en s'inspirant surtout de la méthodologie sociologique des pays développés. Par ces méthodes on pouvait accumuler les faits précis et exacts dont dépendait la solution des problèmes mentionnés.

Comme l'on voit, les besoins sociaux, qui dictaient le développement de la sociologie en Yougoslavie socialiste, étaient très nombreux. Mais, il y avait aussi des facteurs qui n'étaient pas favorables à ce développement ou, au moins, qui le rendaient plus lent qu'il n'aurait pas été sans leur influence.

Ici on doit rappeler tout d'abord des conditions matérielles, objectives. La société nouvelle avait tant de besoins de tous ordres qu'elle ne pouvait pas les satisfaire tous et en même temps, pour des raisons matérielles, indépendantes de la volonté—manque des cadres et des ressources matérielles. Ici aussi le principe appliqué était: *primum vivere deinde philosophari*. Cela veut dire que les besoins de jeter les premières bases matérielles de la nouvelle société, de commencer l'industrialisation, étaient jugés comme prioritaires par rapport au besoin de développer les sciences sociales, et particulièrement la sociologie. La plupart des ressources matérielles et des cadres ont été usés à cette fin. C'était surtout le cas dans les premières années après la révolution.

D'autre part, les besoins culturels en général étaient très grands de tous les points de vue—par exemple, l'analphabétisme était un problème très important, et il est encore dans une certaine mesure. Il fallait satisfaire tous ces énormes besoins. C'est ainsi que le nombre des écoles de toutes sortes s'est beaucoup accru. Ici, de nouveau, les écoles qui préparaient des cadres techniques étaient de beaucoup plus nombreuses que les autres. Il était difficile d'avoir suffisamment des cadres pour la sociologie et les sciences sociales. Comme nous le savons, les cadres manquaient déjà dans l'ancienne Yougoslavie et c'est pourquoi il était encore plus difficile de créer des cadres tout nouveaux.

Il faut mentionner aussi que la jeunesse se passionne beaucoup plus des sciences techniques et naturelles en général que des sciences humaines et sociales. Le prestige des sciences du premier genre est de beaucoup plus grand. A cela contribuait sans doute aussi le fait que ceux qui étudiaient les sciences naturelles et techniques étaient mieux payés que ceux qui s'adonnaient aux sciences sociales.

Tout cela contribuait à ce que les institutions pour les recherches sociologiques manquaient. Les Académies, traditionnellement conservatrices, s'ouvraient très lentement aux nouvelles recherches, qui exigeaient des méthodes toutes nouvelles. Les publications des Académies dans le domaine sociologique proprement dit étaient très peu nombreuses. Les Universités aussi s'ouvraient lentement à la sociologie et nous allons voir tout à l'heure une des raisons principales de

cette attitude. C'est pendant ces dernières quelques années qu'on a commencé à créer les nouvelles institutions, spécialement consacrées aux recherches sociologiques.

Le marxisme, l'idéologie marxiste, qui est dominante en Yougoslavie, et qui était très importante, comme nous l'avons vu, déjà à la veille de la Deuxième guerre mondiale, a eu une influence bienfaisante à l'orientation et au développement d'une sociologie objective, correspondant à la vérité réelle sociale. Par son esprit scientifique, par la tendance de créer la société nouvelle socialiste d'après les données scientifiques, par son antidogmatisme, par sa méthode dialectique, par son esprit révolutionnaire, le marxisme sans doute contribua à ce que la sociologie se développe dans un sens strictement scientifique, qu'elle soit hardi et conséquente dans sa recherche de la vérité.

Mais le marxisme, et le matérialisme historique, comme base de la sociologie marxiste, cachaient aussi un certain danger du dogmatisme. Ce danger se sentait surtout pendant les premières années après la révolution. Les recherches empiriques des problèmes sociologiques concrets Yougoslaves n'étaient pas encore bien avancées alors pour qu'on put en abstraire les principes plus généraux et ainsi adapter le matérialisme historique à l'expérience Yougoslave, le développer à travers cette expérience. Le matérialisme historique était conçu et enseigné d'après les schémas qui étaient déjà en beaucoup de points vieillies à la lumière de l'expérience nouvelle tant Yougoslave qu'universelle.

Dans le matérialisme historique ainsi conçu il y avait une certaine hostilité envers la sociologie. Même le terme "sociologie" n'était pas considéré comme adéquat. La sociologie en général était considérée comme une création bourgeoise, une "science fausse", dominée par l'élément idéologique, dont on n'a rien à apprendre. Cette tendance nihilistique n'était pas dirigée seulement contre les théories générales sociologiques idéalistiques de la sociologie bourgeoise, ce qui serait justifié, mais aussi contre toute la méthodologie et technique de la recherche sociologique moderne qui s'est largement développée surtout ces derniers temps dans cette sociologie. Or, sans ces méthodes et techniques aucune recherche sérieuse des problèmes concrets n'était possible et risquait de se transformer en une scholastique vide qui manierait des schémas générales là où on avait besoin des faits concrets.

Dans les Universités on avait introduit l'enseignement du matérialisme historique ainsi conçu et cela empêchait le développement de la sociologie aux Universités. Cela durait jusqu'à l'année 1949-50.

Mais déjà dans cette période-là il y avait des essais à rompre ce dogmatisme et schématisme hérité du passé et de raviver le matérialisme historique aussi bien que de rechercher les ponts entre lui et la sociologie. Cette tendance a prévalu complètement après cette période, à



quoi contribua la dispute théorique connue avec les Soviëts. Après cette période on cessa l'enseignement du matérialisme historique et ces dernières années on a introduit l'enseignement de la sociologie sous différents noms. Elle est enseignée dans une mesure suffisamment large dans les facultés des sciences sociales (droit, économie, philosophie, histoire, psychologie etc.) et, dans une mesure restreinte, dans les facultés des sciences naturelles et techniques, adaptée au caractère de ces facultés.

Aussi bien on a commencé à créer des institutions spéciales pour les recherches sociologiques. Déjà dans le cadre des Académies certains instituts déjà traditionnels, comme ceux de l'éthnographie ou de l'histoire, ont commencé à introduire plus de l'esprit et de la méthodologie sociologiques. Dans le cadre de l'Académie serbe on avait même créé un institut spécial pour la sociologie rurale, laquelle, comme nous l'avons vu, avait une tradition déjà assez longue. Plus tard, pourtant, cet institut était inclus à l'Institut de l'éthnographie. Mais, on a fondé à Beograd l'année dernière un Institut des sciences sociales avec une section de sociologie qui est tout spécialement destinée à la recherche sociologique. A part cet Institut, il y a d'autres instituts qui s'occupent des recherches spéciales qui aussi tiennent plus ou moins de la sociologie. Ce sont surtout des instituts statistiques, qui s'occupent surtout des problèmes démographiques, des instituts économiques, comme aussi certains instituts plus spécialisés, comme par exemple l'Institut de l'autogestion sociale, l'Institut de la productivité du travail, l'Institut des problèmes sociaux, etc.

Dans l'activité qui avait pour but de faire revivre et de développer la sociologie il y avait une place importante aussi pour l'initiative sociale libre. C'est ainsi que fut créée en 1954 la Société Yougoslave de sociologie, qui était organisée en plusieurs sections (Beograd, Zagreb, Ljubljana, Sarajevo, Skoplje). Cette société organisait des discussions sur des travaux sociologiques, instituait une collaboration entre les sociologues et d'autres spécialistes, organisait des conférences de travail de tous les sociologues Yougoslaves où on traitait des problèmes importants, organisait la collaboration des sociologues Yougoslaves avec les sociologues étrangers, surtout dans le sein de l'Association Internationale de Sociologie, etc. En 1956 cette société s'associa avec la Société Yougoslave de philosophie en une Association Yougoslave de philosophie et de sociologie. Cette Association commença à éditer sa revue, *Jugoslovenski casopis za filozofiju i sociologiju* (*La Revue Yougoslave de philosophie et de sociologie*), qui est la première revue spécialisée de ces deux disciplines.

La Société de sociologie travaille à la propagande de la sociologie. Elle a commencé de publier une bibliothèque populaire sociologique et prépare la publication d'une bibliothèque sociologique scientifique. Déjà parmi les jeunes il y a beaucoup plus d'intérêt pour la sociologie

et les sciences sociales. Il y a déjà un bon nombre de diplômés de la philosophie, du droit, de l'économie politique, de la psychologie, qui se consacrent aux études de sociologie, en préparant le doctorat de cette discipline. On a déjà soutenu plusieurs thèses de doctorat de sociologie, parmi lesquelles il y en a de très bonnes. Un certain nombre des jeunes spécialistes ont été envoyés aux pays où la sociologie est plus développée pour l'y étudier. Il n'y pas de doute que tout cela va contribuer largement au développement de la sociologie.

Ce qui est important de noter surtout c'est que le dogmatisme du style nihilistique est complètement dépassé. Malgré tous ses défauts, la sociologie dite "bourgeoise" a eu des résultats appréciables en accumulant les faits et en donnant des explications théoriques, au moins partielles sinon complètes et totales. On reconnaît surtout le besoin de bien connaître et d'adopter, avec le criticisme nécessaire, la méthodologie moderne de cette sociologie. C'est pourquoi dans la sociologie contemporaine Yougoslave on étudie cette méthodologie et en général la sociologie, aussi bien occidentale qu'orientale, pour y puiser ce qui est utile. Aussi bien on commence à mener des recherches concrètes par des méthodes modernes, adaptées aux circonstances du pays. De même on commence à traduire des oeuvres sociologiques étrangères importantes (Lévy-Bruhl, Friedmann, Moreno, etc.).

Un certain retard des sciences sociales en général par rapport aux sciences naturelles et surtout de la sociologie a été bien senti aussi de la part de l'Etat ces derniers temps. C'est pourquoi le nouvel organe de la coordination et de l'aide à la science—le Conseil scientifique—a pour tâche surtout de contribuer au développement relativement plus vite de la sociologie et des sciences sociales en général.

Si l'on jette un regard sur le choix des sujets de recherche sociologique à la lumière de ce qui est dit de l'influence des divers facteurs sociaux à son développement, on peut bien reconnaître que cette influence se reflète ici aussi. C'est ainsi que le besoin de poser des bases théoriques de la sociologie, surtout à la lumière de son rapport avec le matérialisme historique, a suscité un bon nombre d'études qui discutent ce rapport. Il y a deux opinions principales sur ce problème: l'une considère que le matérialisme historique doit être une sociologie marxiste, loin du dogmatisme, orienté vers la réalité concrète; l'autre, que l'auteur de ces lignes à lui aussi défendu à plusieurs reprises dans ses travaux, soutient que le matérialisme historique est une théorie sociologique scientifique, tandis que la sociologie embrasse un champ beaucoup plus vaste. Quoiqu'il en soit, ce qui importe c'est que ni l'une ni l'autre de ces opinions n'oppose la sociologie au matérialisme historique, mais bien cherche à en faire une synthèse. L'auteur de ces lignes a essayé d'exposer un système sociologique basé sur cette synthèse dans son *Introduction à la sociologie*. D'autres auteurs ont de nouveau exposé le système du matérialisme historique, en essayant

de le rapprocher plus ou moins à la sociologie et de le libérer des schémas anciennes (B. Zihlerl, I. Kosanović). J. Goricar a donné un exposé systématique de la sociologie dans son *Introduction aux sciences sociales*.

La sociologie politique, surtout les problèmes de l'édification du socialisme et le problème de la bureaucratie, ont été recherchés assez souvent par des sociologues Yougoslaves et il y a un bon nombre d'études dans ce domaine (J. Djodrdjević, J. Goricar, R. Lukić, O. Mandić, N. Pasić, R. Ratković etc.). A cela est lié le problème de la structure des classes de la société moderne et on a discuté beaucoup le problème de la notion de classe sociale, son rapport avec les castes et d'autres phénomènes sociaux, surtout celui de l'exploitation etc. (Goricar, Lukić et surtout Mandić, qui a publié une monographie sur les classes et les castes). V. Bogdanov a publié des monographies sur les luttes sociales et politiques en Croatie et sur le rôle historique des classes sociales dans la solution du problème national en Yougoslavie.

La sociologie des idéologies a aussi attiré beaucoup d'attention. Ainsi, O. Mandić a publié une monographie sur l'évolution sociale de la religion, S. Zarković—sur l'origine de la religion, V. Ribar—sur le rôle historique du christianisme. R. Supek a publié une monographie sur le problème de l'existentialisme et de la décadence bourgeoise. D'autres écrivains ont étudié le développement des idées politiques en Yougoslavie (Janković, Cubrilović, Culinović).

Les problèmes méthodologiques tiennent, comme nous l'avons vu, une place importante dans la sociologie Yougoslave. Ces problèmes sont étudiés aussi bien dans leur aspect théorique que pratique. Les meilleurs travaux dans ce domaine sont ceux de V. Milić (qui a fait une excellente thèse de doctorat sur la méthodologie de la sociologie), J. Goricar etc.

D'autres problèmes de la sociologie théorique sont étudiés par des écrivains différents. Le plus productif parmi eux est Lj. Zivković, qui a écrit des monographies sur l'origine de l'homme, sur l'évolution de la conscience humaine et, surtout, sur la base économique de la société.

Quant à la recherche des problèmes sociaux concrets actuels, qui se développe de plus en plus, les problèmes démographiques et les problèmes de la structure de la classe ouvrière sont étudiés en premier lieu. Les services statistiques Yougoslaves étant très bien organisés, ils donnent une grande masse de faits rassemblés très soigneusement et avec une méthode rigoureuse. Ce matériel sert comme base solide à ces recherches. Ici il faut mentionner les travaux de M. Macura, V. Milić et de beaucoup d'autres sociologues.

Dans ce champs d'études une place spéciale est réservée au problème du passage des paysans à la classe des ouvriers industriels et aux problèmes de la mobilité sociale et de l'urbanisation. Un problème encore plus spécifique et très important pour l'industrialisation

Yougoslave a plus particulièrement retenu l'attention des sociologues: celui des paysans-ouvriers, c'est-à-dire des paysans qui travaillent dans l'industrie tout en restant paysans, car ils habitent le village et travaillent aussi à leurs domaines agricoles. La sociologie dite "industrielle" ("human relations") commence aussi à se développer en Yougoslavie, stimulée par une industrialisation rapide. Ces problèmes sont étudiés par: R. Supek, C. Kostić, I. Stanojčić, I. Perić, etc.

Les problèmes de la famille, de la position de la femme, de l'éducation des enfants et de la jeunesse et d'autres du domaine de la politique sociale (de la délinquance, surtout des jeunes, de l'inadaptation sociale etc.), sont étudiés de plus en plus, leur étude étant stimulée surtout par des organisations sociales correspondantes des femmes, des amis de l'enfance et de la jeunesse, des organisations des jeunes etc. Ici vient aussi l'étude des budgets familiaux, de la consommation, du mode de se nourrir etc. Les travaux les plus importants dans ce domaine sont ceux de R. Bičanić, I. Stanojčić, V. Bonac, B. Savić, B. Šefer et d'autres.

La sociologie économique, surtout les problèmes de l'industrialisation, de la transformation socialiste de l'agriculture, et plus particulièrement du mouvement coopératif, font l'objet des travaux de R. Bičanić, M. Vučković et d'autres.

La sociologie rurale, qui a une longue tradition, se développe aussi. Les résultats les plus importants peuvent se trouver dans le livre de S. Vukosavljević sur l'évolution de la propriété agricole. Il a aussi écrit une monographie importante sur l'ancien problème du *pleme* Yougoslave.

Enfin, il faut mentionner aussi que les recherches traditionnelles, déjà menées dans le cadre des Académies, continuent à être faites, si bien que beaucoup de matériel sociologique peut encore être trouvé là comme autrefois. C'est ainsi que les travaux historiques, anthropogéographiques, ethnographiques, ethnologiques etc. recherchent les problèmes plus ou moins liés à la sociologie. Justement, le devoir de la sociologie Yougoslave, basée sur des méthodes et conceptions modernes, doit être d'étudier ce matériel très riche, accumulé par des sciences avec une longue tradition, et en une collaboration étroite avec ces sciences. D'autre part, pour moderniser ses méthodes et élargir son horizon scientifique, chaque science sociale spéciale doit s'imprégner d'un esprit sociologique.

Comme l'on voit bien, les conditions nécessaires pour le développement rapide et fécond de la sociologie sont déjà en principe réalisées en Yougoslavie et la sociologie commence déjà à donner des résultats appréciables. Bien entendu, toutes les difficultés ne sont pas encore surmontées et le manque des cadres surtout va se sentir encore assez longtemps. Mais, s'il est en général permis de faire des prévisions sociologiques, on peut prévoir un développement assez rapide de la sociologie Yougoslave.