以下に英文原稿は、昨年12月10日弘前館地下第二教室において行われたスタンフォード・ライマン教授の講演会の記録である。テープ録音を当日の通訳者であった森川義規雄先生が原稿にし、それにライマン教授が加筆訂正を加え、掲載にあたっては教授の了解および同志社大学人文学会の許可を得た。本来は訳出すべきものであろうが、あえてそうはしなかった。

ライマン教授は昨年8月から本年1月中旬までフルブライト・プロフェッサーとして本学に来られ、英文学科の「アメリカ研究特論」を担当され、社会学科の学生のための交流の機会を申し出たところ好評され、講演会の開催になったのである。「アメリカ社会学の歴史」という演題のもとに、いまや世界の社会学となったアメリカ社会学の理論的主流をなしてきてきた機能主義＝実証主義の考え方がいかに継承され、そして批判されてきたかを摂取する。彼の話のなかで、われわれにとって興味深いのは、アメリカにおいて発展する社会学がその当初より実践もしくは政策的な観点と深く結びついていたことであろう。一般に、人間の知的分野が一箇の学問として制度化されるためには、それ自体の概念群と理論的文脈の確立に加えて、人の・物的な支柱を必要とするが、その支柱の強弱は実践もしくは政策がその学問をどれほど必要とするかに依存するという面のあることもあると見通すことはできない。とは言え、今日の社会学における機能主義＝実証主義のその理論的「正統」としての影響力の衰退は、その政策的有効性自体が問われ、ために社会学関係の補助金がカットされたことによる道は言えようもない。数学モデルや統計的手法に依頼する社会学はなお弱力であり、覚える気配さえないが、「対抗パラダイム」の挑戦によって理論は混迷し、分極化ないしは中心不在の多様化が現状である。しかし、それは社会学の学問としての「危機」ではない、ライマン教授は言う。社会学に理論的な中心地が存在すべきだとするなら、それは「危機」であるかもしれないが、むしろ多様であるときに社会学は多産であったと社会史が教えるなら今日の状況は創造の前の混沌として考えようというのが教授の結論である。

彼の話のなかでうっとう注目したいのは、形成期のアメリカ社会学において「どこで誰が何を教えていたか」ということがその伝統を形成するのに非常に重要であったと思われることである。言うまでもないかもしれないが、研究機関と人脈との結びつきが「学派」を形成し、創始者の基本的アイデアは継承される。これに普通われわれがポジティブに用いる「学風」とは異なって、方法論の総本山が
まえがき
いかに多くの信条をもつかの研究争いであるので、栄光と没落はつきものである。
（現代アメリカ社会学の諸学派の系譜関係についてはN. C. Mullins, *Theories and Theory Groups in Contemporary American Sociology*, 1973 が詳しい。）しかし、それにしてもパーソンズやラザースフェルドのような宗祖の死によって研究組織まで解体されるのだろうか、それとも他の財政的な理由によるのだろうか——これについては聞き漏らしてしまった。
ライマン教授の経歴と業績について多少ふれておこう。履歴書によると、1933年サンフランシスコで生まれ、ベーグレーのカリフォルニア大学を1955年に卒業し、61年に同校で Ph. D を受けている。博士論文は“The Structure of Chinese Society in Nineteenth Century America”というものであった。1972年以来ニューヨークのニュー・スクール・フォ・ソーシャル・リサーチ（New School for Social Research）の社会学教授である。著書は共著、編著を含めて以下の通り。

1) *The Oriental in North America*, 1962
2) *The Asian in the West*, 1970
3) *A Sociology of the Absurd*, 1970 (M. Scott との共著)
4) *The Revolt of the Students*, 1970
5) *The Black American in Sociological Thought*, 1972
6) *Chinese Americans*, 1974
7) *The Drama of Social Reality*, 1975（『ドラマとしての社会』清水博之訳
新曜社 1981）
8) *The Asian in North America*, 1977
9) *The Seven Deadly Sins*, 1978
10) *Structure, Consciousness and History*, 1978 (R. H. Brown との編著)

著書およびここには掲げないが他の論文やエッセイから察するかぎりでは、彼の主要な仕事は東洋系アメリカ人のエスニック・スタディにあるように思われる。これは中国人や日本人のような東洋系マイノリティの多いサンフランシスコで彼が生まれ育ったことと関係がありそうだ。彼自身、少年時代に多くの中国系アメリカ人の友人を得たことがアメリカの中国人社会とその文化に関心を持つ契機になったと言う。（6）参照）

日本においてライマン教授の業績にふれた社会学の文献はほとんどなく、したがってあまり知られていない、と言ってよいだろう。わずかに井上俊氏が『遊びの社会学』（1977 世界思想社）においてライマンとスコット（Marvin B. Scott）両氏
まえがき

によるエッセイ "Coolness in Everyday Life" (M. Truzzi, ed. The Sociology of Everyday Life, 1968) および "Accounts" (American Sociological Review Feb. 1968) を紹介したもの以外、著者にして知らない。しかし、アメリカの社会学関係の文献にはしばしばその名を発見することができ、とりわけ A Sociology of the Absurd は著名のようである。これは先の二論文を含むスコットとの論文集であり、かつかった社会学における理論的立場を表明したものである。「Accounts」は、行為の相互作用過程で時に要求される動機の説明が「釈明」というかたちをとることがあること、すなわち期待される行為もしくは予知された行為とは異なった行為をしたり、されたりする場合、その理由を説明する必要が生じるが、そうした説明（talk）はそうしなければ危くなる社会関係を修復したり回復したりするのに重要であり、「釈明」はそうした場合に採用される言葉の工夫である、ということを示そうとしたものである。この論文はニクソン大統領のウォーターゲート事件に関する行為の釈明のしかたに用いられたりして評価されもしたと聞く。『不条理の社会学』とでも読すべきこの著書は、機能主義＝実証主義の社会学に対して、70年間後から現われた「ラベリング理論」「エスノメソドロジー」「ネオ・シンポリック・インタラクションズム」などの社会学における「新しい波」といわれる系譜につながるものであるが、いまそれを論評する余裕はない。このような観点の応用篇とも言うべき著書が7の『ドラマとしての社会』で、日本においても新聞、雑誌などの書評では高い評価を受けている。訳者の清水氏のあがきを読みと、むしろ社会学以外の人びとによって注目されているようだが、邦訳によってさらに多くの読者を得ることができるであろう。確かに、ゴフマンやライマン＝スコットは＜世界＞の見方のおもしろさを教えてくれる。しかし読後感じられる何とはなしのシネシズムに、ひとは飲し続けられることによってより生きるのではないか、とも思うのである。（青木康容）
The Rise and Decline of the Functionalist-Positivist
Paradigm: a Chapter in
The History of American Sociology

—A Lecture by Professor Stanford M. Lyman
Given at Doshisha University on December 10, 1981.—

Today I wish to address you on the current crisis in American sociology. I hope to explain what that crisis is, and to provide you with the background of that crisis as it has developed in the past one hundred years of sociology in the U. S. A.

There are two aspects of the crisis in American sociology. One is intellectual, and the other is economic. The intellectual crisis has arisen as a result of the recent overthrow of the ruling school of thought in American sociology. That school of thought is called Structural-Functionalism and is associated with the writings of Talcott Parsons and Robert Merton and their many followers. That school argues that society should be looked at as if it were an organism, and that this societal organism always returns, no matter what happens to it, to a state of equilibrium. Recent events as well as a sustained intellectual attack have brought this school of thought into disrepute and decline.

Closely associated with Structural-Functionalism is a methodological position called Positivism. Without going into great philosophical detail, let me just say that in American sociology Positivism finds its expression in an emphasis on statistical study and mathematical models. This methodology, though still in wide usage, has been subject to considerable criticism both by intellectuals and by students and is no longer regarded as the only legitimate research orientation available to sociology.
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The economic aspect of the current crisis is perhaps more familiar to sociologists in Japan because some of the same problems are found here. Recently there has been a noticeable drop in the number of students enrolling in American universities and especially in graduate study in the social sciences. This decrease in enrollment has persisted almost ten years and is creating a problem for the continuation of certain graduate programs. Related to the drop in enrollment is a decline in job and career opportunities for university graduates of sociology. There is now an academic job shortage; many people have attained the doctorate but are unable to find permanent position. Lastly, and closely related to the aforementioned, there has been an enormous cut-back in the Government subsidy for sociological research in the past decade. This loss in Government subsidy has been very great. The research sociologists are disturbed; they have become used to living off the Government subsidy. The universities are equally concerned; they benefited from the government subsidy by taking portion of each research grant for university expenses.

To understand the background of this double-sided crisis, we have to turn back the clock to the late nineteenth century, to the very beginning of American sociology. American Sociology differed from its European counterpart in that it grew out of religion. The first American sociologists, with only a few exceptions, were Protestant ministers. And they were Protestant ministers inspired by a religious mission. America, it was argued in late nineteenth century Protestant theology, was to be the redeemed nation, the nation in which Jesus would appear. Therefore, it became the duty of all Christians, the argument went, to make America perfect and thus prepare it for the coming of God. In order to make America perfect, the argument continued, Christians would have to attack the problems of America scientifically. These problems could not be combatted and overcome by sentiment, or feeling, or simple charity. Thus, several Christian
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Theologians and ministers gave up the ministry and entered the university as teachers of sociology and practitioners of the science that they hoped would cure America's social ills and perfect it.

Sociology students in the late nineteen century were often inspired by this Christian idea to leave the classroom and go into the poorer sections of the cities of America and set up what were called settlement houses. In these settlement houses sociology students hoped to teach poor people and immigrants how to live in America, how to improve their life in America, and why they should avoid criminal and immoral activities. The students were deeply moved by the belief that they might “save” America by acting as practitioners of what was called the Social Gospel. The Social Gospel movement thrived until the end of the first world war, at which time its inspiration was lost, and it disappeared.

There were two major intellectual opponents of the Social Gospel point of view. But, they were also opponents of each other. The great sociologist, William Graham Sumner, of Yale University, was convinced that he was living in a moment of great moral chaos in America. Such a moment, he said, foreclosed the possibility that something could be done to reform or redeem America. America's basic customs, which he called "Folkways", had been destroyed by the Civil War that had ended in 1865. Therefore, he argued, Americans must wait until such time as new customs will have formed and new ways of life will have developed before they could reform the society. Sumner especially opposed reform through legislation. He argued his position quite eloquently in his classroom and in his essays, and he convinced many people of it. Today Sumner's ideas survive not in sociology, where they have been all but forgotten, but, in modified form, in the ideology of the Republican Party of the United States.

The other opponent of the Social Gospel movement was the great sociologist Lester Ward. Ward's opposition was to religion. He was a champion
of atheism and argued against all religions, believing that religion was pernicious and hurtful to the progressive development of society. However, Ward believed that reform *was* possible. It was possible, he argued, through scientifically based legislation. Therefore, Ward proposed that secular sociologists be appointed to governmental posts where they would prepare, on a scientific basis, the appropriate legislation that would reform society. Ward's ideas are often forgotten in today's sociology, but they survive, in part, in the ideology of the Democratic Party of the United States.

The school of sociological thought that would eventually triumph over all of its competitors developed at Columbia University in the late 1890s. Its founder was Franklin Henry Giddings, whose background was engineering and whose father was a Congregational minister. Professor Giddings championed what he called the "American Empire". He believed that an American Empire, based on democracy and science, could not only reform America but extend itself to reform the world. The main emphasis of professor Giddings' sociology was statistical study, and he required that all his students be carefully trained in the ability to collect, analyse and use statistics. Although his own particular ideology of Empire and democracy has been discarded, his idea that statistical sociology is the only truly scientific sociology has achieved a paramount position in American social scientific thought.

It became the practice of the Columbia University Sociology Department to train its students very carefully and then send them out to become chairmen of departments in other parts of the United States. This practice developed into a kind of missionary movement in behalf of statistical sociology through which other sociology departments were to be converted to the "true faith," i.e., the persuasion. Two important students of Giddings who carried out this mission were William Fielding Ogburn, who eventu-
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tally went to the University of Chicago, and Howard W. Odum, who went to the University of North Carolina. Ogburn is perhaps the more important for understanding the beginnings of what I call the crisis in sociology. Ogburn's appointment to the University of Chicago spelled the beginning of the end, or nearly the end, of a rival school of sociological thought. "The Chicago School" did not share the perspectives of Columbia's sociology department, but it made the mistake of hiring William Ogburn as a professor of sociology.

The Chicago School of Sociology was in fact a descendant of the little known Harvard School of Sociology that had developed in the 1890s. Few American sociologists even today know about sociology at Harvard in the 1890s. However, it was very important. Among the students produced by Harvard in the 1890s were Robert Ezra Park, who became the great leader of the Chicago School many years later, William Edward Burghardt DuBois, black sociologist and black leader, who spent his early years teaching at Negro colleges in the Midwest and the South, and also the "Chicago School" philosopher-sociologist George Herbert Mead. All three of these scholars were influenced by a single teacher, the philosopher William James, and it was a variation on James' idea of the study of society that inspired each of them to pursue sociology in his own way. Emphasis in this Harvard-Chicago School was placed on participant observation, on becoming a member of a community in order to study it, on realizing the "living" and "feeling" relationships of the people in that community. That mode of study contrasted with Columbia's statistical survey approach, and the two schools competed. When Ogburn was appointed to Chicago in 1927, his first student was Samuel Stouffer and Samuel Stouffer's doctoral dissertation was a comparative analysis of the methodologies of the Chicago and Columbia Schools.

The tactics through which the Columbia School of Sociology became
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"The American School of Sociology" can be documented in three major events. The first was the formation of The Social Science Research Council in 1923. This organization was funded by the Rockefeller Foundation. Its aim was to systematize and rationalize social science. William F. Ogburn became its sociologist representative, and he remained for many years a leader in the Council. He also became the president of The American Statistical Association. The rationalization of American sociology turned out to be the "statisticalization" of American sociology. The only way to make sociology uniform and rational, The Social Science Research Council argued, was to make it entirely mathematical and statistical. Since The Social Science Research Council had money to give out for research, every university was encouraged to form its own local chapter of The Social Research Council. This chapter in turn would funnel the request for money for research to the national organization. It was understood that only the appropriate kind of research would be funded, and that meant statistical sociology. That was the first step in the triumph of Columbia University's sociology.

The second major step occurred with the establishment of The National Commission on Recent Social Trends. This commission was appointed by the President of the United States, Herbert Hoover. The commission was composed of social scientists who were asked to study the trends in all aspects of American life, including medicine, family formation, industrial development, religion, criminology, customs, welfare, child rearing, and so on. Everything was to be studied in terms of "trends." The actual commission was composed almost exclusively of members of The Social Science Research Council. And the chairman of the commission was, of course, William Fielding Ogburn, the assistant chairman was Howard W. Odum, and the statistical advisor was Samuel Stouffer. Every single member of this commission, I have discovered by doing some rather careful
research, was not only a member of or sympathizer with The Social Science Research Council, but also a student or colleague of Franklin Henry Giddings or of Odum or Ogburn or Stouffer. No other kind of sociologist was permitted to be on this commission. If a sociologist on this commission did not know how to present his materials in statistical form, Samuel Stouffer was sent to supervise the writing of his report. All the reports came out looking the same. This illustrated the standardization of social science. The Commission Report entitled "Recent Social Trends", was released in 1933 and was 1500 pages long; it was still being read as a textbook in sociology when I was an undergraduate in the 1950s. In this report, the chairman and the commission proposed that a national social science research council be established permanently by the United States government so that there would be a permanent social science study program sponsored by the State. That proposal was turned down by the United States Government, and no such organization has ever come into existence.

The third and final step in the triumph of Columbia's sociology was effected through an attack on the Chicago school. This attack had several different forms, but the major development was the displacement of *The American Journal of Sociology*, a magazine dominated by the Chicago School, and the establishment, in 1935, of *The American Sociological Review* as the official national journal of the discipline. Ever since, with only an occasional exception, (including, I should add, the publication of an article by Marvin Scott and me,) *The American Sociological Review* has encouraged statistical sociology. In 1936 there appeared a major book by one of the Columbia-trained sociologists, George Lundberg, who wrote "Can Science Save Us?" This book, still in print today, argues that the sociologist has no duty to present a moral position on any subject whatsoever. Instead, it says, the sociologist must provide the technics by which
any policy can be effected. The policy makers are to be the employers of sociologists. Professor Lundberg went so far as to argue that a sociologist could work just as easily for a communist, a fascist or a democrat. It made no difference because the sociologist’s duty was only to provide the means to effect the policy but never to decide or even criticise the policy itself. That vulgarized but popular version of Positivist thought came to dominate the Positivist School.

The statistical sociology that had won so many victories in its struggle against ethnographic sociology in the 1930s was further validated during the second world war, when academic sociologists became part of the American war effort. Two important studies will, I think, illustrate this. The United States Army was very concerned about two questions during the second world war. One question was “What is the basis of the morale of the American soldier? Why is he willing to fight?”. The second question was “What would be the best way to demobilize the army, to discharge the soldiers when the war is over so that there is not massive unemployment in the cities of the United States?” (At the end of the first world war, when the government had demobilized the army, there had been riots in major cities of the United States; these had sometimes erupted into race riots, when white ex-soldiers objected to blacks having jobs that white people wanted.) The army wanted to prevent that from happening again. To answer these two questions sociologists were encouraged to study the American soldier. The leader of this army research team was Samuel Stouffer. Stouffer’s team of sociologists were in fact fourth generation descendants of Giddings’ style of sociology. These sociologists entered into the fighting front, sometimes interviewing soldiers while they were in the trenches. (It was very dangerous to be a sociologist in those days.) At the end of their massive study, they produced a five volume work, full of statistical tables. It was called “The American Soldier”.

— II —
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Sotuffer and his colleagues had answers for the Army. They could tell what made soldiers fight. What made the soldier fight was not patriotism, not loyalty to America, but having a friend in the trench with him, having what in America we call a "buddy". And so the Army encouraged the "buddy" system after that. As for demobilization, Stouffer and his colleagues discovered that American soldiers believed in any system that is characterized by fair play. If they could devise a system of "fair play", then the soldiers would not object even if they were not discharged all at once. And Stouffer and his colleagues did devise a system of "fair play," a system of "points". Soldiers could earn "points" for fighting in certain places, for being in certain war zones, for enlisting at a certain time; thus, each soldier was kept busy collecting his "points", and it was understood that no soldier would be discharged necessarily on the same day as any other soldier, because each would have a different set of "points". This system, it was discovered, was regarded as very fair. The soldiers did not object. This was one more example of the American merit system. The Army was very indebted to the sociologists for having solved these two problems.

The second major study done during the war validating the importance of sociologists also concerned population control. This time it was the population of detained Japanese Americans. In 1942, under orders of the Commanding General of the West Coast, one-hundred and twenty thousand persons of Japanese descent were incarcerated in specially built prison camps in the United States. The commanders of these prison camps were military officers. However, some of these military commanders were also social scientists. The most important was Alexander Leighton, a Marine Corps colonel, but also a very well known social anthropologist. Commander Leighton was in charge of Poston camp in Arizona, where several thousand Japanese Americans were detained, and there was a revolt in that camp.
while he was the commander. He not only administered this camp and put down the revolt, but also studied it as a policy administrator. He wrote a book, entitled "The Governing of Men". This book became a classic guide to public administration in the postwar years and is widely studied and read today. Another sociologist, Dorothy Swaine Thomas, the wife of former Chicago sociologist William I. Thomas, studied the Japanese Americans in two different camps. She studied those Japanese Americans who had resisted, revolted, or become angry over the incarceration and had been segregated into a special camp. She called this group "the Spoilage". And she studied those Japanese Americans who had more or less tolerated their removal into prison camps, and she called them "the Salvage". In these studies she employed both the Chicago and the Columbia methods, because Dorothy Thomas, while the wife of Chicago sociologist, Thomas, was also the former student of William Fielding Ogburn. She brought the life history method together with the statistical method. The war-time studies were important in showing, among other things, how sociology might be used in public policy.

After the war, the center of sociology seemed to move to Harvard University. There, Talcott Parsons, who had come to Harvard in the 1920s after having studied in Germany, became chairman of a new department called Social Relations, combining sociology, anthropology, and psychology into what he hoped would be a single discipline. His two colleagues in this endeavor were the anthropologist, Clyde Kluckhohn, and the psychologist, Gordon Allport. Together with other sociologists, including most importantly Edward Shils of the University of Chicago, they developed the "theory of action" and the principles of the "social system". In this lecture, which is on the history of sociology, I cannot give you the details of those very complex ideas, but let me suggest that in this integration of the social sciences, the Parsons group thought also to present a kind
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of integrated understanding of American society. It could be understood interdependently, from the angles of psychology, anthropology, and sociology, brought together under the overall perspective of the “Social System.” The emphasis here was on American society in “dynamic equilibrium.” Whatever troubles there were in American society would eventually be resolved by the forces at work in the society to restore balance. This became the single most important idea in post-war sociology in America, from 1950 until around 1972.

There developed in this period a coming together of statistical sociology and the Parsonian position. That is not because Parsons favored it. As a matter of fact, Parsons opposed it and regarded Positivism as the wrong kind of sociology. But it did not make any difference. There developed a coalescence of these two approaches. George Lundberg, who had written “Can Science Save Us?” in 1936, in 1964 wrote “The Foundations of Sociology”, in which he argued that there was no intellectual quarrel between Positivism and Functionalism, that the Giddings’ school of thought and the Parsonian school of thought were compatible. During the same period, Robert Merton, a student of Parsons who was at Columbia, became a kind of mediator between the Positivists and Functionalists and proposed a division of labor among them. According to Merton, and to Edward Shils of Chicago, there could be a pyramid within sociology. At the top would be a great theorist like Talcott Parsons, who would engage in pure theorizing. In the middle would be the “middle range” researchers, persons like Merton and his students, who study particular institutions or particular social processes. And at the base of the pyramid could be the Positivists, gathering data which could be used by the middle range theorists and eventually interpreted by the abstract theorist. This pyramid of sociology also became a reigning idea. In fact, even people who were not aware of it supported its basic premise. Thousands of sociologists
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were working at the base of the pyramid, busy gathering facts, sometimes not even knowing why; others were working at the middle level, busy studying this or that institution or this or that process. And at the top, a bit lonely perhaps, Talcott Parsons sat thinking about all of these. This kind of sociology remained dominant, and is still prevalent in America today.

This kind of sociology thrived during the cold war period. Indeed, it was given ideological justification in an essay by sociologist Daniel Bell, entitled "The End of Ideology". In this essay Professor Bell argued that no longer would social science be dominated by left wing utopian ideologies. For the present and future technical reform would be the major effort. Societies were already perfected in their cultural goals. What was needed was only continuous reform within the system. Ideology, therefore, was no longer necessary. No sooner had Professor Bell published this essay, than a whole series of revolts broke out in America, suggesting that, perhaps, he had been wrong in announcing the end of ideology in 1959. There were essentially two kinds of revolts in America. The first was in behalf of civil rights for minorities, especially blacks. The second swept across the university campuses all over the United States during the 60s, directed against the Vietnam war and against the impersonal administrative style that seemed to prevail in universities. Sociology became a target of both of these revolts. As the great Chicago sociologist, Everett Hughes asked in his presidential address in 1964, "Where was the sociological imagination when the civil rights revolt began? Why hadn't the sociologists predicted that?" Here was a voice from Chicago, reminding sociologists that there was a position that they had neglected and put aside to their detriment. And students in general thought sociology had become too attached to the administrative state, had become too much the servant of power, and too little the independent critic of society. This
attacked on sociology and on the universities included an attack on the
dominant schools of thought, Functionalism and Positivism. Those two
schools, in the minds of students, came to represent all that was wrong with
sociology: an excessive interest in reform without criticism; an excessive
interest in technics without thought; an excessive interest in statistics
without human feeling. Even though the students may have lacked a
theoretical base, they had put their finger on a basic problem. Thus there
began the erosion of these schools of thought.

Perhaps a sign of the decline of this reigning paradigm of thought can be
seen in the following: When Talcott Parsons died in 1977, the Department
of Social Relations at Harvard was abolished. Harvard is now trying to
re-build a sociology department, an anthropology department, and a psy-
chology department as separate disciplinary units. Shortly after Paul
Lazersfeld, the Positivist who had come from Austria and become a leading
Columbia sociologist, died, the Bureau of Applied Social Research at Co-
lumbia was disbanded and the great “Statistical Machine” that had been
Columbia began to disintegrate. But with the decline of these schools,
there has arisen a new struggle, a competition. New schools, each wanting
to be the reigning school, now demand attention. What are these new
schools? Some really are not new. Some are old. For example, since
the 1930s symbolic interactionism, derived from the philosophy of George
Herbert Mead and represented by the great sociologist at the University
of California, Herbert Blumer, had demanded its place in sociology, and
there are a number of young and middle aged sociologists who are fol-
lowers of this tradition. Erving Goffman, an unusually gifted young man
who had appeared at Chicago in the 1950s, and who, many thought then,
would never make any significant contribution, because of the peculiar
interest he had in the “dramatic” ways that people behaved, became a
major figure and force in sociology. His students are important members
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of the profession, developing and enhancing the "dramaturgical" approach to sociology. The work of Alfred Schutz, who taught at The New School for Social Research from 1940 to 1959, and who once engaged in a brilliant and somewhat tragic correspondence with Talcott Parsons, trying to find a way to bring together the insights of Parsons with the phenomenology of Europe, has become extremely important. Sociologists who had studied in the traditions of symbolic interactionism, phenomenology, or dramaturgy now try to forge some kind of synthesis of these. My colleague Marvin Socott and I tried to create such a synthesis in 1970 in our book "Sociology of the Absurd", and we have continued to try to develop that synthesis in our subsequent books, including "The Drama of Social Reality", which has just been translated into Japanese. None of these new schools has succeeded in becoming the single dominant school of sociological thought. Instead, they compete with one another. And, the competition is very fierce, the criticism quite rugged.

And there is something else new. Between 1945 and 1970, the United States was the world capital of sociology. Sociology all over the world looked to the United States for guidance and leadership. Even the Soviet Union invited Talcott Parsons to teach sociology during the cold war! American sociology had become world sociology then. This was partly because the European countries had been so ravaged by the war that intellectual recovery took a long time. At any rate, beginning in the 1970s, we suddenly see new ideas coming out of Europe, coming into America, and challenging American sociology. There is, for example, the hermeneutical sociology of Jurgen Habermas, who, I understand, spoke recently in Kyoto, and who, though very difficult to understand, draws remarkable numbers of followers and students in his attempts to synthesize American pragmatic thought with European phenomenology and Marxism. There is also the thought of the French Structuralists, represented originally by Claude
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Levi-Strauss, and by those who have gone beyond Levi-Strauss, such as Michel Foucault, and the very difficult and challenging philosopher, Jacques Derrida.

And there is the historical Durkheimian, Fernand Braudel, who has attempted to reconceive all of modern European history within the framework of the theory of civilization developed by Durkheim and his nephew, Marcel Mauss. And there are the varieties of Neo-Marxism, represented by a kind of Neo-Stalinism in the work of the French Marxist Louis Althusser; Or by a kind of militant democratic socialism in the work of British historian-sociologist E. P. Thompson. Or by the attempt to focus on pre-capitalist-societies in the work of E. J. Hobsbawn; Or by the attempt to combine Weber and Marx in the work of the British Marxist, Perry Miller. All of these pose new challenges to sociology, and make it a cockpit of competitive schools.

Let me conclude by saying this: Many people today say that sociology in America is in a grave crisis. Certainly it is in a grave economic and financial crisis. There can be no doubt about that. Higher education is in a grave financial crisis. But I do not believe that it is the case that we should regard sociology as being in a grave intellectual crisis. The belief that sociology is in an intellectual crisis stems from the contention that there ought to be only one school of thought that dominates the field. My own examination of the history of sociology suggests to me that sociology is better off when it is competitive, when there are many schools of thought, when there are different voices contending with one another, and when each sociologist and each student is called upon to think for himself, and develop for himself a vision of society. That is the current situation. Rather than seeing it as a crisis, I think it is a challenge to the best of minds, and that the present is an exciting time to be a sociologist.
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