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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION TO THE DISSERTATION PROBLEM

Dissertation problems in sociological theory have frequently involved the analysis of some theorist, (a particular) theory, or even a body of theory -- once the ideas have become more or less articulated and systematically developed and presented and after some lapse of time to gain perspective. But it is relatively uncommon and perhaps even unique for a dissertation to take its problematic from a preliminarily articulated and still inchoately developed set of ideas of an emergent orientation and endeavor to elaborate therefrom a relatively extended, complete, and systematic statement of the position. Indeed, such is the objective of this dissertation for the emerging humanistic sociological theory.

Clearly, then, this dissertation falls within the domain of sociological theory and its major traditions. And if the problematic is to be grasped, what is to be undertaken must be understood within the perspective of the historical development of the main polemics in the traditions of sociological theory. Humanistic sociology -- sociological theory arose self-consciously in the United States in the
later 1970's and in opposition to many of the features of "mainstream" American sociology and sociological theory. Consequently, it is important to examine preliminarily the main characteristics of the two opposing and contending notions and, indeed, traditions of sociological theory and theorizing. One of the two has tended to envisage theory in terms of a natural science model. The other has distinctively rejected such a model. The former construes theory as assuming a deductive-nomological format and as providing (deductive) explanation. The latter more or less derives from a hermeneutic or hermeneutic-dialectical perspective and accepts interpretation (rather than explanation) as its intellectual objective. Manifestly, explanation and interpretation assume very divergent stances and require further commentary.

During the 1960's, the recurrent argument in European and American theory over explanation versus interpretation culminated in sharp exchanges between the protagonists of the respective positions. Theory as explanation views sociology as part of the natural or biophysical sciences. Human phenomena are held to be fundamentally similar to, if not also continuous with the rest of biophysical nature. Social phenomena are thus construed to be natural objects or natural systems. Such a theory tends to assume a form characteristic of physics. At the core of such a theory is a series of invariant laws which are asserted to be deductively
interrelated. Characteristically, its concepts are believed to be \textit{a priori} in nature. Rigid experimental procedures are used to test the subsidiary principles in the deductively constructed hierarchy. Empiricism, which is grounded on sensory experience, is the predominant epistemology associated with this view of theory. Objectivity and statistical procedures are considered to be the criteria for determining the level of truth contained in any hypothesis that might be tested. Validity is presumed automatically to be universal in character.

Theory as interpretation, on the other hand, holds that sociology is part of the human or cultural sciences. By virtue of its creation of meanings which are embodied in cultures, humankind is believed to be fundamentally different from biophysical nature. The core of this type of theory is not a set of invariant laws, but rather cultural meanings which are thought to be more or less circumscribed by a particular tradition. These meanings are not discovered through experimentation based on \textit{a priori} schemes. They arise rather through interpretation, i.e., by an attempt to understand social phenomena in the broader context of their location in a specific cultural tradition. The epistemology associated with this theory is not empiricism, which asserts that knowledge is gained from the passive reception of sense-data. It insists rather on the resort to consciousness and reason in order to discover knowledge in the context of
tradition. The adequacy or truth of a statement, moreover, is not assessed in terms of objectivity or statistical probability. Instead all truths are judged by their experiential relevance in a particular setting. When a truthful or lawful relationship is discovered according to this view of theory, it is not automatically conceived to be universal in nature. It is, instead, initially regarded to be a contextually limited truth which may attain a more general acceptance. Out of this context of contending traditions in sociological theory a conscious and self-designating humanistic sociology-sociological theory arose in the later 1970's. Its initial formulations have been fragmentary and incomplete. Accordingly, the dissertation objective is to formulate and develop an explicit and more or less systematic and extended statement of the position. But it is not proposed to carry out this task ex nihilo or de novo. Rather, it is hoped to use certain kinds of related orientations as auxiliary resources to this end.

So stated, the problem seems to dictate a certain sequence of analysis and mode of procedure:

1. In order to be able to identify what the basic characteristics of an emergent humanistic orientation are and to be able to specify what other orientations are similar and thus of potential aid in offering a fuller statement of the humanistic orientation, it is necessary to develop a (generalized) analytic scheme which distinguishes the most
fundamental positions on basic questions of explicit or implicit major concern in sociological theory.

2. Using this analytic scheme, the distinctive features of humanistic sociological theory are identified.

3. Components of the scheme are also employed to analyze other related orientations (e.g., Blumerian symbolic interactionism, Schutzian phenomenological sociology, critical theory, and Yugoslavian praxis marxism) as potential resources to elaborate and expand a statement of humanistic sociological theory.

4. Finally, a reformulated and expanded statement of a humanistic sociological theory is offered. Its point of departure is still the scheme referred to above (and below).

The seven chapters (i.e., two through eight) develop the analytic procedure just outlined. So Chapter II, for instance, provides a scheme for analyzing the basic assumptions of general sociological theory. Basically, it argues that sociological theory has traditionally been constituted by certain assumptions about the nature of the social (or social ontology) and by certain assumptions about how the social can be known and studied (or social epistemology-methodology).

Two general and antagonistic positions have existed in the epistemological-methodological domain, one reflecting the natural science deductive explanatory model and the other the cultural science interpretative stance. The former
adopts an empiricist epistemology and a positivistic methodology. Like other natural phenomena, social phenomena are assumed to display natural regularities or laws. They can be studied by the use of objective, experimental, statistical procedures characteristic of the physical sciences. The latter or second position argues that social phenomena are distinctive and can only be known and studied distinctively. Its epistemological position derives from idealism and its methodology is humanistic. Because social phenomena are viewed as meaningful, they must be interpreted or understood in their own experiential context.

Two distinctive social ontological positions have also emerged. One can be identified as social realism. The social is conceived to be a force or body operating outside of consciousness and the intentions of the particular individual participants in interaction. The (social) whole is different from or greater than the sum of (individual) parts. A second social ontological position has been designated as social nominalism. The (social) whole is only an aggregate of individuals and their characteristics and not some supra-individual force or entity.

Chapter III seeks to analyze the distinguishing epistemological-methodological and (social) ontological assumptions of emerging humanistic sociology-sociological theory. Arising in the mid-1970's, this orientation has been associated with the work of a few key figures (e.g., Alfred McClung
Lee, Thomas Ford Hoult, John Glass, and David Gil) who have coalesced around a particular journal, *Humanity and Society*. The purpose of this chapter is primarily to identify the epistemological-methodological and social ontological positions of humanism (and secondarily to determine the completeness and consistency of the statements of its advocates). These humanists are basically reacting against the natural scientific epistemological-methodological and social realistic ontological positions which constitute mainstream sociology. Admittedly, their efforts at formulating a humanistic sociological theory are relatively recent, and (as this chapter indicates) manifest some inconsistencies in their epistemological-methodological and social ontological position. Proponents of this nascent orientation have, however, posed some trenchant and insightful objections to mainstream sociology and do reveal some promise of a fully developed sociological theory. The subsequent sections of this dissertation thus constitutes an examination of intellectual resources which might aid in extending and elaborating this position.

Chapters IV, V, VI, and VII offer analyses of possibly allied theoretical orientations. Each is examined to identify its characteristic epistemological-methodological and social ontological positions. On balance, they do contain certain clues, hints, and suggestions for expanding and making more complete many of the formulations of humanistic
social theory.

Chapter IV studies the epistemological-methodological and social ontological positions of Blumerian symbolic interactionism. As the designation indicates, Herbert Blumer is the major author whose work is examined. This chapter is devoted to analyzing his book, Symbolic Interactionism: Perspective and Method. A collection of his essays which he was asked to assemble in order to provide a coherent picture of his theoretical position, this book seems to be the most appropriate focus of analysis.

In Chapter V the basic theoretical tenets of Schutzean phenomenology are analyzed. The key figure in this analysis is the phenomenologist and sociologist Alfred Schutz. Inquiry centers on his Collected Papers (Vol. I and II) and his book Phenomenology of the Social World.

Chapter VI attempts to provide a coherent study of the social epistemological-methodological and ontological stances of the social theory which has come to be known as critical theory. This theory actually embodies the work of a number of authors who coalesced around the Frankfurt Institute for Social Research in the early 1930's. Because this group is so diverse, a few authors who have been central to the development of this theory will receive the focus of attention in this chapter. These authors are Max Horkheimer, Theodor Adorno, Walter Benjamin, Herbert Marcuse, and the key "second generation" critical theorist, Jürgen Habermas. The
primary resources consulted in this chapter are Horkheimer's *Eclipse of Reason* and his essays on critical theory which appear in *Critical Theory: Selected Essays*, Adorno's *Negative Dialectics*, Benjamin's *Reflections* and *Illuminations*, Marcuse's *Negations* and his *Five Lectures*, and Habermas' *Legitimation Crisis* and his seminal essays on culture and language, particularly those which deal with the fundamental social issue of communicative competence.

In the following chapter (Chapter VII) the works of key members of a group of Yugoslav marxists are analyzed to ascertain the epistemological-methodological and social ontological positions they advance. These authors coalesced around *Praxis*, a philosophy journal published in Yugoslavia during the early and mid-1960's. These theorists, therefore, became affectionately known as the "Praxis Group". In this chapter attention is especially devoted to Mihailo Marković's *From Affluence to Praxis* and *The Contemporary Marx*, Gajo Petrović's *Marx In The Mid-Twentieth Century*, and Svetozar Stojanović's numerous essays on the social ontology of marxism. These authors share an anti-Stalinistic or anti-dogmatic marxist theory.

Chapter VIII provides a summary analysis-interpretation of humanistic sociological theory and each of the other allied orientations, along with their potential contributions toward the development of a fully formulated humanistic sociological theory. This chapter endeavors to distill from
the four allied theories the common theoretical (epistemological-methodological and social ontological) themes which unite them, and which also represent theoretical advances over those initially but fragmentarily articulated by humanistic sociology. Each of these allied theories has placed the "human quotient"* at the center of its social theory, which is the theoretical objective of humanistic sociology. These common themes are subsequently formulated into a few basic tenets which can serve as the cornerstone of a humanistic sociological theory.

*At this time it will be helpful to stipulate what the term "human quotient" means, even though its implications will be expatiated upon throughout this text. The meaning of this term will change in terms of how it applies to humanistic sociology and to the four cognate theories which are discussed. It is the belief of this author that a shift must be made from how it is used by humanistic sociology to how it is employed by the four cognate theories if a humanistic sociological theory is ever to be formulated. Nevertheless, when it is used in terms of humanistic sociology it is synonymous with subjectivity, which means that the individual subject must actualize in an objective world. When it is used with reference to the four cognate theories, it is neither subjective nor objective, but rather embodies a principle which encompasses both subjectivity and objectivity. Recently in social theory this "human quotient" has been referred to as "Dasein", or "being there". This notion of "Dasein" implies the following: (1) the world is neither subjective nor objective, but is comprised of the inextricable unity of both principles, (2) the "being" or meaning of any phenomenon can no longer be viewed as metaphysically secured in an absolute manner, but instead must be treated as embodying the human sentiment which is ubiquitous to "Dasein", and (3) the social world cannot be understood as body or form which is categorically removed from the individual. Rather, the individual as "Dasein" is both individual and worldly; the social world is a product of "Dasein's" movement. In this sense, the "human quotient" is the fundamental principle of existence itself.
In fine, the general thrust of this dissertation is to assist in the formulation of an expanded humanistic sociological theory. Although this dissertation may appear, at times, to be reacting harshly to the theoretical position which has thus far been advanced by humanistic sociology, this criticism is meant, however, to be constructive, so that the present shortcomings of this theoretical position might be rectified. Having succeeded, each in its own way, in placing the "human quotient" at the center of their respective theories and thus allowing for the unfettered growth of human potential in terms of the world-view each conveys, each of the allied theories has some potential for contributing to the realization of the similar goal of humanistic sociology.
CHAPTER II

A SCHEME FOR ANALYZING THE BASIC ASSUMPTIONS
OF GENERAL SOCIOLOGICAL THEORY

This chapter develops a crucial methodological device in the pursuit of the basic dissertation objective. If humanistic sociology—sociological theory is to be distinguished in terms of its major or crucial features, such statements can be made fruitfully only in relation to what can be argued to be the most basic and distinguishing general problems of sociological theory. Furthermore, if — as seems to be the case initially — humanistic sociological theory has emerged somewhat fragmentarily and incompletely and thus seems to require theoretical expansion, such an endeavor can be undertaken meaningfully only if more critical general problems and positions have already been identified. Consequently, the development of a general scheme for analyzing (and characterizing) the basic assumptions of general sociological theory is indispensable for the dissertation.

When the basic problem of what makes theory sociological is posed, two basic questions immediately move into focus. One pertains to the nature of the social and the
other concerns how the social is known and is studied.
Indeed, Timasheff has already noted that such questions are
central to the sociological enterprise. Undeniably,
philosophers have for ages raised these questions about
the fundamental questions of existence. Many sociologists
and kindred professionals have posed similar questions in
the domain of social existence. Of course, the referent of
the questions of sociologists is social life and not existence
per se.¹

Prior Attempts at Classifying
Theory in Terms of Epistemology-
Methodology.

The first problem of sociological theory concerns the
ways in which various sociologists have believed the "social"
can be known and studied. This component of sociological
theory will be examined first only because sociologists have
tended to talk more in terms of epistemological-methodological
problems, instead of in terms of ontological problems. At
the cost of considerable simplification, sociologists have
tended to couch their epistemological-methodological schemes
in the differentiation made between the various approaches
to science outlined by the Geisteswissenschaften-Naturwissens-
chaften controversy.² Stated simply, this debate, which took
on a variety of forms, was concerned with the alleged
scientific status of the cultural sciences, and how the object
of study of those sciences should be conceived. One group of
theorists believed that the cultural sciences should attempt to emulate the epistemology and methodology of the natural sciences, so that they might begin to outline natural and, thus, supposedly invariant social laws. The other position in this debate has asserted that the cultural sciences like sociology should not conceive of themselves as similar to the natural sciences in their object of study and the related methods.

What this controversy did was to bring into focus for the social or cultural sciences an issue which had been smoldering for years. Before the formal outbreak of this debate, for example, Comte had suggested an epistemological-methodological scheme which could be used to classify sciences. Montesquieu, likewise, also spoke to the issue of categorizing sciences. Dilthey and Croce were also proposing ways in which the possible approaches to analyzing history could be classified. Such luminaries as Mannheim and Scheler, who have been identified as at the center of the Sociology of Knowledge movement, were also suggesting various ways in which the social world could be studied. Most of these persons, of course, had a view of their own which they felt should be adopted so that social life might be studied properly. Nevertheless, what each of these persons did in h/her own way was to suggest a primitive classificatory scheme which could be used to systematically outline the various ways in which social life could be known, and the methodology to be
used to adequately grasp that knowledge. What these persons began to suggest, however, was that the object of study for the social sciences can be conceived differently, which therefore requires that other methodological approaches be used to study those objects.

In the United States, the epistemological-methodological dispute was also manifested, although in a variety of forms. The lines of emergence of a scheme for classifying sociological epistemological-methodological theory were certainly present in the United States from the time speculation about social issues began. These divisions were not, of course, as formalized as they would later come to be in both the United States and Europe, but were merely suggestive of the underlying controversy surrounding the manner in which sociologists should view social knowledge and the proper mode of its systematic acquisition. Again, as in Europe, the debate raged particularly over whether or not sociologists should use what is commonly called the case study method or statistical method for studying and aggregating social knowledge. ³ This controversy also took the form of the subjective-objective controversy which would manifest itself not only in America, but throughout the sociological world. What is being suggested here, however, is that a smoldering debate similar to that in Europe was beginning to suggest to various modern sociologists a line of demarcation which could be used to identify sociological epistemological-methodological
positions. Again, as in the case of Europe, the debate pertained to the issue of how the "social" was to be known, and how the "social" should be properly investigated. However, these differing epistemological and methodological positions presupposed alternative views on the social "object" to be investigated, which in turn somewhat mandates the style of methodology which should be used to assess those differing phenomena.

When these original controversies became translated into formal sociological arguments, a variety of suggestions for schemes appeared. As suggested by Hinkle, Bristol contributed significantly to the initial salvo made by sociologists pertaining to the nature of the epistemological-methodological and social ontological questions which are thought to be well within the purview of the sociologist to ask. In his book on the nature of sociological adaptation, Bristol spends a significant amount of time talking about the ways in which knowledge can be acquired, and which are believed to be most appropriate. At this time, however, nothing much more substantial is advanced than that knowledge can be acquired by, for example, statistical and analogical means. Around the same time, of course, C.H. Cooley was offering his oppositional view on the nature of social epistemology-methodology relative to the more positive methodology promulgated by those who have been referred to as occupying the central place in the founding
A little later, of course, Becker, MacIver, and Parsons would also advance an opposing epistemological-methodological position traditionally associated with "action theory", subsequent to its formal development by Parsons. George Lundberg, in contrast, developed what is commonly referred to as a neo-positivist epistemological-methodological position, which would challenge the early version of "action theory". A little later in the history of sociological theory in the United States the students of G.H. Mead would formulate a theoretical position which had a thrust which was intentionally epistemological-methodological, and which, as is by now well known, was thought to be antagonistic to the epistemological-methodological position adhered to by Lundberg. The point here is not to be exhaustive relative to outlining the numerous epistemological-methodological positions which have been advanced throughout the history of the development of sociological theory. Instead, what is at issue here is to illustrate that epistemological-methodological problems were seen throughout the history of sociological theory as important, and that most discussions vacillated between two primary modes of epistemology-methodology.

Those authors who wrote about sociological theory in both Europe and the United States tended to classify sociological theory in terms of methodology and epistemology. As mentioned earlier, Bristol seemed to think that social theory
could be extremely rigorous or statistical or that it could be less rigorous and analogical in terms of its method. Park and Burgess in their now classic introductory treatise to the field of sociology open their book with a discussion of epistemological issues. They also tended to recognize that the cultural or historical sciences and the natural sciences are increasingly considered to be different. Because of this difference, they approach their respective objects of investigation differently. These two views on the nature of epistemology-methodology are thought to advance varying views on the nature of sociological theory which are different not merely in degree, but in kind. F.N. House, in his discussion of Thomas' and Znaniecki's work, suggests that an objective and subjective methodological differentiation should be made, the former dealing with fact and the latter with value. Around the same time Sorokin was writing that not only theoretical systems but entire cultures could be identified along epistemological-methodological lines. Barnes and Becker suggest that sociologists should take more seriously the process of raising epistemological-methodological questions, in addition to suggesting that both a statistically and an ideal-typically substantiated comparative methodology can be used. What this early theoretical work in the United States seems to suggest is that, in a manner similar to those who wrote in Europe in terms of the Geisteswissenschaften-Naturwissenschaften dispute, sociological theory could
be classified in terms of basic epistemological-
methodological principles.

More recent theorists have tended to classify theory
in terms of its epistemological-methodological assumption
being either subjective or objective in nature. More recent theorists have tended to classify theory
in terms of its epistemological-methodological assumption
being either subjective or objective in nature. At
issue in this particular attempt at a classificatory taxonomy
is the nature of social facticity and the way in which
certain renditions of the status of social facts demand that
"objects" of investigation be studied differently.
Martindale identifies two categorically differentiated
epistemological-methodological positions into which socio-
logical theories can be separated. He refers to these as
positivistic and anti-positivistic epistemological-
methodological theories. Following the original typology
outlined by Dilthey, Stark tends to classify sociological
theory relative to its epistemological-methodological assump-
tions as being either naturalistic, objectively idealistic,
or subjectively idealistic. The most comprehensive
classificatory scheme developed thus far for the purpose of
cataloguing sociological theory is that advanced by Hinkle. Hinkle seems to suggest that social theory can be differ-
entiated along epistemological-methodological lines in terms
of what he refers to as positivistic and humanistic theory.
As has been suggested throughout this discussion so far,
each one of these classificatory categories outlines a par-
ticular epistemological status for the social phenomenon to
be known, with an accompanying methodology which is thought to be appropriate for studying that phenomenon.

The thrust of this brief exposition is to illustrate that throughout the history of sociological theory epistemological-methodological questions have been viewed as important to both those who have theorized about the "social" and those who have attempted to classify the authors who have written about the "social". It is many times thought that to raise such questions of an epistemological-methodological nature is primarily a philosophical endeavor, and therefore solely the occupation of philosophers. As should be immediately noted, however, sociologists have perennially raised epistemological-methodological questions, and have, likewise, tended to recognize that sociological theory could legitimately be classified in terms of epistemological-methodological assumptions. Admittedly, attempts at this type of classification have become sophisticated only recently. Nevertheless, this domain of sociological theory has always appeared to be within the purview of the bona fide sociologist. The primary epistemological-methodological positions, including their social implications will be formally outlined shortly.
Prior Attempts At Classifying Sociological Theory In Terms Of Social Ontological Issues

Throughout the history of sociological thought authors have advanced models pertaining to how the basic nature of the "social" should be conceived. For example, some theorists have proposed that social order should be understood to be similar in many ways to a living body, most often the human body, while others have attempted to describe social life by employing a machine analogy. Some theorists have held that social order is a process, while simultaneously other authors have outlined the nature of the social in terms of its being a stable structure. Sometimes social life has been portrayed as a network of individuals in interaction and at other times it has been outlined in terms of its possessing an exalted status divorced from actual inter-individual interaction. Nevertheless, throughout the history of sociological thought a controversy similar to that which raged between those who assumed varying social epistemological-methodological positions also was present among those who advanced differing positions about what was believed to be the fundamental nature of the social. In a manner also similar to the epistemological-methodological dispute just mentioned, this more or less smoldering debate eventually resulted in sociological theories coming to be classified in terms of how the nature of the "social" is understood.
The various forms of this debate, and the myriad of participants, are so numerous that only a few will be mentioned in order to give the reader an idea of how this issue of the nature of the "social" actually emerged and, subsequently, affected sociological theory. This debate over the nature of the social, as with the aforementioned epistemological-methodological dispute, did not originate with sociologists. Rather, the debate over how society should be conceptualized antedates Aristotle, is present in the Middle Ages in the form of theological disputes, and came to fruition during the Enlightenment Period. These debates most often, however, did not have at their center of attention the question of the social, although this issue was certainly part and parcel of the philosophical discussions which did take place. When sociologists got into these types of ontological discussions, their primary concern was the nature of social life, and not necessarily existence per se. As Bristol points out throughout his early treatise on sociological theory, the controversy over the nature of the "social" surrounded the differing conceptions of social life advanced by, for example, Comte and Spencer. This controversy was continued and somewhat expanded through its re-enactment by Durkheim in his debate with the work of Spencer, Wundt, and Kant, relative to how the fundamental nature of social life should be conceived. At the same time Durkheim was embroiled in a similar debate with Tarde over
the manner in which the individual should be portrayed in terms of h/her position in relation to the "social" order. This debate was also present in the United States in sociological circles, and, as was the case in Europe, revolved around questions pertaining to, for example, the origin of social life, primordial social structures, and the nature of modern society in general. As with those who were writing on the issue of the nature of the "social" in Europe, the Americans also tended to become grouped into fundamentally opposing theoretical positions. The point which should be remembered at this juncture is that sociologists throughout the history of that discipline have raised fundamental questions of the "social", and have tended to separate themselves into different theoretical camps in terms of how they have answered those questions.

As a result of this perennial debate among sociologists over the nature of the "social", those who were then writing about those who were theorizing about the "social" also began to classify sociological theories relative to how they portrayed the nature of the "social". Bristol, for example, seems to think that sociologists have divided themselves into two positions, those who he refers to as advancing social realism and those are not realists, and therefore adhere to a position on the nature of the social opposite to that advanced by Durkheim. Bristol, however, does not really identify the view which these opposing individuals
have of the "social", although at the end of his book he seems to suggest the individual is understood to be inordinately important. Park and Burgess tend to also view those who raise questions of the nature of the social as falling into two opposing camps and they used the work of Spencer and Comte as exemplar notions of writers who would hold opposing positions on this topic. Spencer is referred to as a nominalist, while Comte is thought to be a realist. \(^{18}\) Sorokin expands the manner in which he believes sociological theory should be classified relative to the manner in which what he refers to as this fundamental ontological question is answered. Nevertheless, he also holds on to the nominalistic-realistic distinction mentioned by Park and Burgess. \(^{19}\) House also talks in these terms while referring to Giddings, Tarde, and Pareto as sociological nominalists. \(^{20}\) In terms of this early stage in the development of sociological theory in the United States, Barnes and Becker also referred to various sociological theoretical positions relative to how they conceived of the nature of the "social". They tend to view social theories as focusing either on the individual or on some more abstract social body which is conceived realistically. \(^{21}\)

More recent authors who tend to classify sociological theory in terms of social ontological issues have also divided conceptions of the nature of the social into two types. Martindale, for example, classifies theory in terms of the
social ontological structure being (what he refers to as) either holistically or elemetaristically ordered.\textsuperscript{22} This typology, of course, parallels the realistic-nominalistic differentiation used by the earlier theorists. Stark at around the same time assesses sociological conceptions of social reality as being either nominalistically or realistically structured.\textsuperscript{23} Another recent theorist, Walter Wallace, has shifted terminology again, but closely follows the rationale offered by previous sociologists for classifying sociological theories along a social ontological dimension.\textsuperscript{24} This particular sociologist uses terms such as micro- and macro- to refer to the approach which various sociological theories might take relative to outlining the fundamental structure of social analysis. In the most fully developed scheme to date used for analyzing and classifying sociological conceptions of the nature of the "social", Hinkle basically views the nature of the social described throughout the history of American sociological theory to be either realistically or nominalistically disposed.\textsuperscript{25}

Again, the point here has not been to be exhaustive relative to identifying all the persons who have tended to classify sociological theories in terms of how they conceived of the fundamental nature of the social, or in terms of all the possible ways in which the nature of the "social" can be outlined. Rather, the attempt has been made to merely suggest social ontological analysis has always been
viewed as well within the theoretical domain of the sociologist, and should be viewed as a legitimate concern of the sociologist. In order to properly comprehend the thrust of this type of theoretical endeavor might have on social theory, the epistemological-methodological and social ontological categories to be used in this particular work must be specified, specifically in terms of how this type of analysis has any relevance to properly conceptualizing the nature of what has been identified as humanistic sociology in the United States.

**Traditional Social Epistemological-Methodological Positions And Their Social Implications**

Following Hinkle, the main epistemological positions will be characterized as empiricistic or rationalistic in nature, while the central methodological views will be referred to as positivistic or humanistic. In order properly to understand what these designations mean, a brief statement must be made relative to what is implied when these designations are translated into social epistemological and methodological beliefs. Traditionally, epistemology has referred to that branch of philosophy which has concerned itself with how knowledge is known or how an individual knows anything. Whenever epistemological questions are raised, a relationship is presupposed to exist between a knower and what is known. Stated simply all epistemological theories
posit an object of knowledge which is provided with a certain epistemological status, while also stipulating the manner in which the individual is able to apprehend the objects of such knowledge. In terms of sociological theory, this traditional view of epistemology would translate into the idea that social objects of knowledge have a certain status, and that individuals, likewise, are understood to have a certain prescribed ability to know those objects; the "social" has a status which delineates the manner in which it can be known by the individuals who supposedly inhabit the social world. Social methodology, as the etymology of that term indicates, is the procedures which are formally thought to be used to adequately capture the knowledge that is assumed to be associated with the "social".

Nevertheless, now it is necessary to indicate what it means to say that the dominant positions in the epistemological-ontological domain are empiricistic or rationalistic and positivistic or humanistic in character. When it is stated that knowledge is based on the principles of empiricism, it means that the objects of knowledge associated with the "social" are thought to possess a self-contained (and atomistic) status, and that the knowledge related to those objects does not require supplementation by a knower for it to exist. In a word, knowledge of the social and its structure are believed to be isomorphic, and because of this is understood, in the classic sense, to be objective. The
knower, in this case, is thought to be a passive receptacle for objective sense-data, and subsequently the object associated with all knowledge is believed to possess a hegemonic status relative to the knower. This epistemological position implies, for instance, that social facts are believed to be objective, and therefore are thought to have a superior status relative to that allotted to the knower, or social individual. Therefore, given the relation assumed to exist between knower and known, any phenomenon which is presumed to be associated with the social is believed to be epistemologically apodictic, and beyond question by the knower.

Due to the fact that this social epistemological position (1) views the knower as an unreliable source of knowledge and (2) ancillary relative to determining the epistemological identity of the "social", the methodology which is used under such conditions minimizes the attention paid to the knower's possible influence in determining the meaning of a social object (or the "social"). According to this epistemological position social knowledge is usually explained in terms of categorical, formal or empirical referents which make no attempt to account for knowledge in terms of criteria stipulated as relevant for the knower. Most often it is believed that sociology is just like any other science, and should adopt the procedures perfected by the physical sciences to acquire knowledge, so
that natural or universal causal-like laws can be eventually formulated. What should be noted at this juncture is that this view of the nature of knowledge acquisition does not portray a very positive picture of the individual relative to his/her ability to raise serious epistemologically related questions about the social world. This idea will be important later on in this dissertation.

In terms of its actual research implementation, the positivistic methodology usually associated with empiricism exhibits the following characteristic principles. First, by virtue of its belief that all valid knowledge is objective, positivism approaches knowledge as if its genesis is the result of a researcher adequately capturing the empirical nature of a phenomenon. Therefore, second, this type of obtrusive knowledge can only be obtained if its acquisition is divorced from the unreliability associated with human subjectivity. In consequence, positivism, third, universalizes (or objectifies) all methodological procedures by their operationalization in terms of assumed standardized techniques which supposedly remove all metaphysical (or subjective) residues. Fourth, the rigorous experimental (formal logical) procedures which are usually associated with the physical sciences are invoked to generate knowledge because they are thought to be unbiased by the values of any social actor. As a point of fact, some positivists contend that the methods of physics, for example, are the only ones
which can produce valid and reliable knowledge. Accordingly, fifth, positivism tends to conceptualize knowledge primarily in quantitative terms. (The paragon mode or organizing knowledge is thought to be mathematical or logical [or formal] formulae.) And finally, sixth, positivism holds that by following these axioms universal (causal) laws can eventually be formulated pertaining to the nature of human behavior. Positivistic sociologists view their goal to be the development of natural "if ... then ..." laws about the nature of social order. Traditionally, theorists such as J.S. Mill, Spencer, and Comte have been viewed as positivists.

A rationalistic social epistemology tends to view the object of all knowledge and, thus, the relationship existing between the knower and the known quite differently. In this case the object of knowledge, or the "social", is not believed to be self-sustaining, and its meaning isomorphic with its (empirical) structure. Instead, this view on the nature of social epistemology advances the belief that the knower attributes knowledge or significance to social phenomena, and therefore the "social" cannot be understood to be objective, but is rather imbued with social (or experiential) meaning. When the "social" is understood in this way, the knower or social individual can no longer be assessed as ancillary to the object of knowledge presupposed by this knowledge acquisition process. Therefore, the object of social knowledge must be viewed as acquiring its
epistemological identity as a result of the so-called subjective intentions of the knower. When this is the case, social knowledge cannot be understood to be hegemonic in character in terms of its relationship to the subject, and, moreover, cannot be thought to be beyond the possible critique proffered by a knower.

The methodology employed systematically to capture knowledge under such social epistemological conditions is also quite different. In this case abstract epistemological-methodological categories and procedures are not believed to be appropriate for knowledge of the "social" to be adequately captured. Knowledge of social phenomena is not supposed to be explained in terms of criteria unrelated to the social intentions of the knower, and therefore social sciences such as sociology are thought to be in need of a methodology which is categorically different from that promulgated by the physical sciences. In terms of the humanistic methodological position, any knowledge of the "social" is supposed to be interpreted so that it reflects the meaning which has been attributed to it by the knower who lives in the social world. Social knowledge is not supposed to be formally explained, but instead interpreted in terms of its social meaning. Accordingly, social laws are not believed to be causally regulated, but are thought to be socially negotiated as meaningful social relations. It is necessary to caution that the humanistic methodological position will be viewed
as genuinely humanistic only if the knower is assumed to possess a knowledge generating capacity.

Most often humanistic methodology is associated with what is referred to as a Verstehen research strategy. As used by sociologists, this methodology tends to have the following features. First, because all knowledge is thought to be a correlate of human consciousness, attention is directed to capturing its experiential nature. Therefore, second, a Verstehen methodology contends that valid knowledge is obtained only when its experiential dimension is tapped. Subsequently, third, a Verstehen research strategy is not necessarily concerned with creating techniques which are standardized and, moreover, universally applicable to capture data on any social setting, but instead develops methodological categories (e.g., concepts and logic) which reflect the values and meanings of the social setting undergoing investigation. What this means, fourth, is that the social world is not explained in some abstract terms (used, for example, by the physical sciences), but obversely what is thought to be factual (or real) in a social setting must be interpreted in terms of the perspective of the social world held by those to be investigated. The researcher must, stated simply, take the role of the persons involved in a study, and not the role of the "objective" scientist. Fifth, a Verstehen methodologist does not strive to describe the social world in any one set of terms (be they
mathematical or formal logical), but organizes the social world in terms of the linguistic expressions of its participants. And finally, sixth, the goal of a Verstehen methodology is the discovery of social laws which have situational relevance, and which are not automatically conceived to have the status of natural or universal laws. Classically, writers such as Dilthey, Weber, and Cooley have been cited as advancing this type of humanistic methodology.

Traditional Social Ontological Positions And Their Social Implications

Throughout the history of sociological thought authors have raised fundamental questions of the nature of the "social", and concomitantly sociologists have attempted to classify sociological theory in terms of the answers which have been provided to these questions. When a sociologist raises questions pertaining to the nature of the "social", these have traditionally been referred to as ontological questions. Again, as with raising questions related to epistemological-methodological issues, sociologists were not the first group of persons to raise ontological questions. Philosophers raised ontological questions long before sociologists did. Nevertheless, the process is the same for both parties, but, as should be immediately noted, the referent of ontological inquiry differ for the sociologist
as opposed to the philosopher. As the term ontology, or *onta-logos*, suggests, the individual who pursues an ontological inquiry is thought to be interested in securing an understanding of the nature of being. Translated into more sociological terms, the sociologist who raises ontological questions wants to discover the essence or being of the "social". Stated in terms already used, the sociologist who theorizes in terms of ontological categories makes the attempt to identify the fundamental nature of the "social".

Traditionally ontological analysis is thought to have two tasks. The first pertains to the actual identification of the basic structure or morphology of the "social", while the second relates to the identification of the ontological ground of that structure. Throughout the history of sociological theory the answers to ontological questions have assumed two dominant forms. That is, to borrow some terminology made popular by some scholastic philosophers during the Medieval Period, the social world was conceived to exist either nominalistically or realistically. As Hinkle notes, however, various different ontological grounds have been used to substantiate these two renditions of social ontological morphology. For example, both materialistic and idealistic philosophies have been utilized for that purpose. This relationship of a social ontological structure to its ground will be significant later on in the analysis of humanistic sociology. Nevertheless, definitions
of social ontological nominalism and realism must be offered.

As defined by Stark, nominalism contains several critical features. It maintains that only individuals are real, the human beings whom we can see and hear and touch and name, and that society is merely a word. Moreover, this position advances the belief that society is simply the sum of all individuals. In this sense, the focus of a nominalistic ontological analysis would be disparate-acting individuals. Many times this view of the structure of social life has also been referred to as atomism, in that social life is conceived of as nothing more than individuals, who pursue their own interests, and who are somehow brought into harmony.

Social realism does not view the basic structure of social life in this manner. Instead, social ontological realism insists that the ontological realm occupied by the "social" is categorically different from that allotted to the individual. As Stark says, society or the social is a "higher kind of reality" which possesses its own reality sui generis. Social realism is also sometimes referred to as wholism, in that the focus of analysis is not supposed to be the individual acting either individually or in harmony with others, but is the region of the "social" which is believed to have an existence superior to both of those phenomenon. This view of social reality has also been
referred to as "sociologism", in that the belief also accompanies realistic portrayals of the nature of the "social" that the "social" actually creates the individual. Throughout the history of sociological theory, such writers as Comte, Schäffle, and Durkheim have been identified as social realists.

Durkheim's social realist notion of social reality is actually associated with a doctrine of ontological pluralism, i.e., a plurality of domains of reality exists in a hierarchy, each level emerging from a prior level (or levels). At the top is the human social which presupposes the (prior) existence of a plurality of individual human organisms, each of whom is or can become conscious as an individual. For Durkheim, association (i.e., interaction as opposed to mere physical juxtaposition) among and within the plurality can eventually engender collective effervescence and, accordingly, a new level of existence or reality, i.e., the social or societal. It is a new whole which is different from and - Durkheim sometimes asserts - greater than the sum of its parts (individuals). Effervescence fuses particular sentiments into one common sentiment; individual consciousnesses are combined, compounded, fused and transformed into a social or collective consciousness. It is a whole that is qualitatively different from the mere sum or aggregate of individual parts (e.g. consciousnesses) in a situational context. Durkheim argues that the level of the
social comes to have a life of its own (it is *sui generis*), with its own distinctive (collective) consciousness, conscience (or morality), mind (or culture), solidarity, and force. What is social, therefore, possesses its own factual nature and can exert a force (i.e., a collective force) and so constrain individual action; what is social becomes external to each individual as an individual.

What both these social ontological positions tacitly detail is a range of possible social action, in that they each outline a structural or morphological imperative which stipulates the manner in which social action should optimally proceed. In fact, throughout the history of sociological thought these ontological positions have been identified with differing positions pertaining to the nature of social moral order. When combined with a particular style of ontological ground explicit demands are made on the social actor relative to what type of relationship is presumed to exist between such actors and any assumed social order. This relationship which is implicitly, and many times explicitly, outlined between social actors and the normative order resulting from the ontological form of the "social" has social implications which will be important later on in this analysis. However, what remains to be accomplished is to be more explicit relative to stating the relevance of subjecting the emerging form of humanistic sociology in the United States to an
epistemological-methodological and social ontological analysis.

Relevance of an Epistemological-Methodological and Social Ontological Analysis For Understanding Humanistic Sociology

As was suggested in the previous sections, the dominant epistemological-methodological and ontological positions in sociological theory do have definite social implications in terms of their general social application. These implications pertain, for example, to how social knowledge is acquired and to whom has the capability of creating social knowledge. Likewise, the epistemological-methodological assumptions of the various positions just outlined specify the extent to which social individuals can critique a certain knowledge base, and the latitude which individuals are believed to have in terms of questioning the social institutions which are substantiated by a particular knowledge base. What is at issue here, stated simply, is what might be called human expressibility, and particularly the degree to which a certain social epistemological-methodological orientation facilitates or inhibits expressivity (i.e., the ability of individuals to consciously create social knowledge).

In a similar manner, social ontological theories also advance accompanying social ontological implications pertaining to, for example, the nature of social institutions.
Every social ontological orientation inadvertently prescribes a relationship which is thought to exist between the substantiating base of the "social" and individual or social action. And this relationship, in turn, stipulates the extent to which social institutions reflect or manipulate human or social action.

Accordingly, it should be very evident why the incipient sociological or theoretical position which refers to itself as humanistic sociology should be subjected to an epistemological-methodological and social ontological analysis. Specifically, humanistic sociology purports to want to re-introduce to sociology the "human quotient" which it believes has been systematically reduced in significance in terms of sociological theory. The question that might be raised at this juncture is, however, has humanistic sociology developed an epistemological-methodological and social ontological orientation which is consistent with its stated goal of increasing the presence of the "human quotient" in the theoretical views employed by sociologists to describe the world? Stated simply, has humanistic sociology outlined a view of the social world which would allow humanism or humanistically substantiated social action to flourish? One way to rationally answer this question would be to subject humanistic sociology to an epistemological-methodological and social ontological analysis, in order to determine how much latitude its member's portrayal of social life allows for the
so-called currently missing "human quotient" in socio-
logical theory to be reintroduced.

Therefore, the task of the following chapter is to
examine how humanistic sociology has initially formulated
its basic epistemological-methodological and social ontologi-
cal orientation, so as to determine whether or not its
general theoretical position can allow for an unfettered re-
introduction of the "human quotient" into social life.
What is implied here is that certain epistemological-
methodological and social ontological formulations may not
allow for this type of task to be sufficiently accomplished;
this idea should be kept in mind when reading the next
chapter.
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CHAPTER III

THE EMERGING HUMANISTIC SOCIOLOGICAL THEORY

Although a self-identified humanistic sociology in the United States seems to have been formed only during the decade of the 1970's, it certainly had much earlier anticipations in American sociology. Cooley, Thomas, Park, MacIver, Znaniecki, (Howard P.) Becker, and Parsons advanced aspects of what might (now) be termed a humanistic theoretical stance. Both prior to and concurrent with the ascendance of structural functionalism, sociological orientations having antecedents as diverse as pragmatism and phenomenology claimed to be restoring the human component that functionalism was believed to have substantially excluded from sociological theory.

But this dissertation is concerned only with the recent self-identified humanistic movement which seems to have coalesced around a few key authors and a particular journal. In October, 1976 the Association of Humanistic Sociology was founded at a conference at Miami University, Oxford, Ohio. Subsequent to this conference, a group of sociologists began to forge out a position which would eventually come to be known as the "humanist perspective" in...
The major figures in this movement are John Glass, Thomas Ford Hoult, Alfred McClung Lee, and David G. Gil, and the journal to which they are intimately related is *Humanity and Society*.

Although these authors readily admit that they are building on a long humanistic tradition which can be found in both the United States and Europe, they seem to be intent upon building their own theoretical edifice. For example, Lee, in his book devoted to discussing what he views to be the basis of a humanistic sociology, seems to be suggesting that his work should be characterized as "existential humanist" in nature, while at the same time not wanting to identify himself closely with the traditional existential or humanist movements. Hoult also suggests that the movement in sociology which he identifies as humanistic in nature should not immediately be related to such schools of thought in sociology as Ethnomethodology, Phenomenology, or Symbolic Interactionism. Warshay, for example, also recognizes a plethora of sociological positions which could be conceived of as radical and humanistic, yet he tends to separately identify the humanistic position headed by Glass and Lee. Lee, in his (1976) presidential address to the Association of Humanistic Sociology, also states that humanistic sociology cannot and should not merely mimic theoretical and methodological formulas which have been developed in the past, but instead should attempt to forge out its own
unique general theoretical position. The question remains, however, what exactly is the theoretical position which has been developed by the key authors who comprise the core of this humanistic group of sociologists, and by the authors in *Humanity and Society* who have been sanctioned by the editors as developing the "humanistic aspects" of the discipline of sociology?

Before the (social) epistemological-methodological and (social) ontological assumptions of this (newer) humanistic orientation can be analyzed and elaborated, it is necessary to offer a brief statement of the rationale underpinning the orientation. Since the formal formation of this group, policy positions have been disseminated which provide insight into what these humanistic sociologists hope to accomplish relative to the development of a general theoretical orientation. The core members of the humanistic sociology group view themselves to be calling for a radical shift away from what they understand to be mainstream sociology. Four themes are evident in their rejection of dominant sociology -- sociological theory. In general, however, these humanists believe that sociology has been just too abstract, bent on legitimizing the political status quo in the United States, and not really concerned with promoting the overall welfare of mankind. As Lee states, mainstream sociology to these humanists is thought to be "highly bureaucratic, technocratic, plutocratic, and imperialistic
in nature." To these self-styled humanists mainstream sociology does not necessarily collect information so as to improve the lot of mankind, but instead merely labors to maintain itself as a legitimate discipline through the advancement of particular theories and methodologies. In point of fact, Lee understands his type of humanism to be akin to that style advocated by F.W. Matson's book The Broken Image, in which Matson suggests that educational and cultural needs should not be dictated by science, but that science should be enlisted to promote the cause of man. The focus of sociology should not, therefore, be its own scientific development, but instead should be man.

In terms of this statement of overall displeasure with the general theoretical and methodological posture taken by mainstream sociology, as suggested earlier four distinct themes are present in which these humanistic sociologist have couched their jeremiad against what they refer to as mainstream sociology. When one begins to delve into the work of the writers who have identified themselves as belonging to this new wave of sociological humanism, the first theme the reader encounters pertains to their belief that sociology is a self-contained entity, which has no fundamental commitment to promoting the future development of mankind. They do not believe this was always the case, but subsequent to what they call the faddish scientism of Ward, Lundberg, Lazarsfeld, and Stauffer man has not been the focus of
Lee thinks that sociology has become entrapped in either what he refers to as the "management-bureaucratic" paradigm or the "problematic-technical paradigm", and must move to "humanist existential paradigm". If this type of paradigmatic shift takes place, these humanistic sociologists believe that sociology will no longer be primarily concerned with its own internal development and, thus, legitimation, but instead will be overtly concerned with how it is used to facilitate the promotion of individual or human growth.

A second major theme encountered in perusing the work of these humanistic sociologists is an indictment of mainstream sociology for legitimizing the stifling of individual growth by implicitly and sometimes explicitly endorsing current social arrangements. The point here is that humanistic sociology believes that the assumed immense range of human potential possessed by individuals is severely truncated due to the type of social relations which are currently in operation. The goal of the humanistic sociologist is to "demystify" this oppressive social structure, so that human self-actualization may flourish. What these humanistic sociologists seem to have in mind is a plan which would accentuate the worth and integrity of the individual, thus hopefully resulting in the development of a social order which desires to promote human growth and personal individuation. In this sense, humanistic sociology understands
its basic urge to be the liberation of human potential, which it believes has been seriously stifled by the prevailing image of social life which it contends is promulgated by mainstream sociology. This theme is most forcefully reiterated by John Glass in a paper which he presented at the American Sociological Association Meeting in 1971. In this brief paper Glass states that Humanistic Sociology should be "man centered" and focus on the thorough development of human potential.

The third theme is the demand that social change be fomented. The key authors associated with this burgeoning trend in sociology do not view the present social conditions to be very favorable to the promotion of personal growth, and therefore humanistic sociologists should thus advance and stimulate social change. Moreover, the social world should not be portrayed as if it were in fact static and intractable to change its nature. Instead, humanistic sociology tends to believe that what Lee refers to as the old styled, "gutsy" type of sociology should be resuscitated, whereby sociology serves as the moral conscience of society through its perennial vigilence over social policymaking. In this sense, humanistic sociology believes that the sociologist has an inherent capacity to promote social change through social critique; and thus it advances the idea that not only is social change possible, but that change is a vital part of life itself.
The fourth major theme in the current call for a humanistic sociology is an advocacy of social dissent on the part of students and the American public in general. The humanistic sociologist should not only emphasize the idea of social change in h/her theorizing, but simultaneously should be a vehicle of social change. In short, anyone who claims to be an advocate of humanistic sociology should be a social activist, one who desires to promote the advancement of humankind.

In essence, humanistic sociologists want to reintroduce the "human quotient" into sociology, which they feel has been blantly stifled by mainstream sociology. These theorists do advance a sociological-theoretical position which seeks to achieve this fundamental aim. Their arguments do imply an epistemological-methodological and social ontological position which facilitates the reintroduction of this currently missing "human quotient" back into sociology. In pursuing this goal, these humanistic sociologists do seriously challenge the epistemological-methodological and social ontological position of mainstream sociology and advocate an opposing theoretical stance.
Epistemological-Methodological Position Advanced By Humanistic Sociology

- A Critique of Mainstream Methodology -

Humanistic sociology invokes attacks on mainstream sociology for its value-free position, its abstract nature, and especially its methodology for its technological, manipulative (anti-humanistic), and conservative implications. These various authors in their own way have objected to what has come to be commonly referred to in sociological circles as positivism. Their somewhat uncoordinated protests were unified in one separate issue of Humanity and Society which was devoted to outlining what these humanists refer to as an alternative and more humanistically oriented methodology. In their view, positivism is insensitive to the human predicament, and thus cannot possibly provide an accurate account of social life. Such a statement, however, poses more questions than it immediately answers. For example, why do these humanistic sociologists believe that positivism could not be humanistically inclined, and what type of epistemological-methodological position do they offer as a suitable replacement? These questions must be answered before an adequate account of the epistemological-methodological advocated by humanistic sociology can be formulated.
As Anthony Giddens suggests, positivism throughout its history has not only assumed the form of a methodology, but has also taken on the posture of an entire "world-view". What this means is that along with its stress on the obtrusive nature of facticity, including the rigorous methodology advanced by such proponents as Comte, Mill, or, more recently, Hempel and Braithwaite, positivism presupposes a belief in the autonomous nature of social or institutional life, along with an extremely passive image of the social actor. The key members of this group of humanistic sociologists hold a similar belief that positivism is not a mere methodology, but additionally demands that the social world be portrayed as comprised of individuals who are incapable of actively shaping the social world so that human potential can come to unencumbered fruition. Therefore, these humanistic sociologists believe that a countervailing "world-view" is needed, one which is more humanistic in nature than is positivism.

The major complaint which these humanistic sociologists have registered en masse against positivism is that it ignores human experience. Quoting Victor F. Weisskopf, Lee has the following to say on this issue:

The activity of science is necessarily embedded in a much wider realm of human experience than is specified traditionally for a discipline itself.

These authors argue that positivism, even though it would not
admit to participating in such a fundamental error, is advancing its own a priori scheme into which all social knowledge must be inserted. As Lee says,

Facts they (positivists) develop about poverty or sexism that might disgust sources of subsidies would thus be the uncontrolled products of a priori methods and procedures, not of their own abilities or judgments.27

Lee refers to this inability of positivism to critically interpret social knowledge other than in terms of a priori principles as "scientism".28

For these humanists this construct conveys three important ideas. First, the categories sometimes associated with human experience are by nature ephemeral and, thus, unreliable sources of personal or social knowledge. Accordingly (second), reliable knowledge cannot be adequately grasped by human experience or subjectivity, and, in point of fact, human experience or subjectivity is presumed to distort information which otherwise would be considered to be objective by nature. Therefore, third, objective or reliable knowledge can only be conveyed when it is systematically reduced to the classificatory scheme used by the natural sciences to capture knowledge. The knowing individual, in this sense, is denied any ability to actively acquire knowledge. Likewise, all reliable social knowledge is presumed to reside beyond the reach of subjective experience, or, in other terms, it is held to be objective in nature.
These humanistic sociologists believe that "scientism" manifests a variety of forms and excesses in its quest to acquire objective social knowledge. They tend to agree that mainstream sociology places too much emphasis on experimentation. The mistake here, as these humanists view it, is that logical accuracy and data validity are equated, while there is little or no evidence to suggest that such a belief should be seriously entertained. When experimentation is the focus of a sociological investigation, the scientist may

... be enticed into oversimplifying or otherwise distorting his data through the overuse or inappropriate use of gadgetry such as a computer or of stage sets such as a laboratory. Such artifacts can too easily become ends in themselves, ends that obscure the scientists' basic jobs.

Also, mainstream sociology engages in what might be referred to as the over-quantification of all knowledge. Positivism adheres to the erroneous position that the language of mathematics is an abstract and, thus, universal language, and therefore is not subjective and supposedly limited in character. Positivism wants "... to make the social scientific process of investigation and generalization as impersonal and thus unbiased as possible", and thus the quantification of all findings is promoted. As Lee goes on to say, this move to quantification "helps to free positivist sociologists to erect a scientific fabric of symbols which presumably reflects 'reality'". Mainstream
sociology has been excessively preoccupied in its efforts to perfect its technical skills, e.g., in the form of cybernetic schemes and digital computers, in the hope of developing the most scientific methods to remove human error from the data analysis process. Accordingly, even when mainstream sociology investigates people in terms other than the sterile confines of an experimental laboratory, its questionnaires and interview schedules are so designed that they meet the requirements of "predetermined and standardized rules", and not the cultural or social requirements of the individuals to be investigated.\textsuperscript{34}

Taken to the extreme, mainstream sociology thoroughly believes that this natural scientific approach to knowledge acquisition can eventually discover natural laws of human behavior.\textsuperscript{35} Humanistic sociologists refer to this belief derogatorily as a "cultist claim", which is really nothing more than an attempt to resurrect "divine law" in the form of "natural law".\textsuperscript{36}

But these humanists hold that social and natural laws are of an entirely different nature, and if social regularities are to be properly assessed this difference should be immediately recognized. Sociology must view itself and its belief in "value freedom" critically.\textsuperscript{37} Mainstream sociology must recognize that "social-scientific knowledge ... [is] a human construction, an art form, that should reflect social realities as accurately as possible."\textsuperscript{38} In a word, the
humanistic sociologist should not presume a priori that truth does exist, and that sociology should proceed in an abstract manner that would allow for its capture.

As authors such as Glass and Lee suggest, the positivistic approach to knowledge acquisition is disruptive because it systematically distorts social knowledge. A less interventionist type of knowledge acquisition strategy should be used if accurate social knowledge is to ever be gathered. Because, as Huer suggests, all data have a fundamental historical nature, a non-interventionist research strategy should be employed which does not distort the historical (contextual) meaning of all data. Humanistic sociology believes that the historical nature of data must be captured if its validity is to be preserved.

In summary, these humanists hold that sociologists should not attempt to explain behavior in terms of a priori schemes, should not view social laws as similar in character to natural laws, should not take for granted that either a person living in the world or a sociologists could ever be "value free" while simultaneously maintaining a social existence, or, stated simply, should not engage in any type of "scientism".

**A Methodological Reconstruction For Humanistic Sociology**

In opposition to positivism, these humanists believe that sociology should instead employ an approach to
conducting social research which is much more sensitive to
social meanings and their context. Humanistic methodologies are "not to be diverted into searches for such
will-o-the-wisps as universals, absolutes, or essences. It
deals especially with what has been happening...."
Instead of attempting to ground its methodology in a priori explanatory schemes, and beliefs in objective facticity,
these humanistic sociologists believe that sociology should
use a methodology which seriously takes into account
experience and empathy as valid means of ingress to acquire
knowledge. As Lee says,

A humanist social scientist has to have
sufficient sense of empathy and of par-
ticipation to gain understanding through
joining in the emotions and activities of
those observed to the extent that that
might be possible or practical.

or

They [sociologists] try to understand
social structures and to empathize with
people in their predicaments ...

To these humanists researchers should not attempt to
impute a specific type of assumed human rationality to
individuals in order to provide a sensible account of their
behavior. Lee goes on to say that "too many sociologists
think they can learn about the nature of social behavior
without empathy". Instead sociologists should attempt
to gather social knowledge through "reason-disciplined-by-
observation", whereby the researcher attempts to empathize
with how the world is viewed by those to be investigated.

In the view of these humanistic sociologists nature and humanity must be understood to be categorically different in terms of the type of knowledge which can be thought to be associated with each domain.  

In order for the sociologist to truly grasp the sensibility of a social setting, humanistic sociologists believe that researchers must actually penetrate that setting, as opposed to apprehending it from a distance in the manner proposed by the positive scientists.

A social scientist tries to see violence -- as he tries to perceive all social behavior -- in its context.  

When this methodological tack is taken, the contextual meaning of any phenomenon can be uncovered. This requires that the investigator experience what Lee refers to as "culture shock" -- a type of reflexivity producing an awareness on the part of the investigator that h/she must abandon h/her own prejudices in order to understand another culture or social order.  

Quoting Phillip K. Bock, Lee says,

Genuine culture shock is largely an emotional matter; but it also implies the attempt to understand an alien way of life, by choice or out of necessity.

To understand a social setting means to view it from the perspective of its inhabitants. Manifestly, the discovery of naturalistic, universal, or abstract social laws can no longer be the aim of social science.
Social scientists respect the residues of human experience as important for observation and consideration, but they cannot permit their views of man and society to be circumscribed by a moral philosophy based on one cultural tradition. In short, the humanistic sociologist should not be reductionistic and attempt to interpret the social world in a universal manner.

Such an approach to data stresses the element of human experience. All data is thought to exist in situ, and accordingly any social regularities which are thought to be discovered must be viewed to be situationally established. This social methodology for these humanistic sociologists is an art form, and not an ossified technology, and when conceived in this manner is believed to be capable of capturing socially relevant information. The competent investigator must be creative and flexible during any investigation, so that h/she might be able to interpret (understand) the social world in new and more sensitive ways.

For these humanistic sociologists social knowledge is thought to be related to human interests, and not abstract methodological claims. Therefore, the sociologist must make the attempt to apprehend those interests if accurate knowledge is ever to be gathered. In this sense, these humanistic sociologists believe that the sociologist must make the effort to be as unprejudiced as possible in order to actually assess any particular social setting.
In an article designed to provide a summary statement pertaining to the overall theoretical perspective taken by humanistic sociology, Ballard basically says that humanistic sociologists tend to reject "scientism", and instead must make the attempt to interpret social settings. The epistemological-methodological position which is cited as most appropriate for humanistic sociology is that which has traditionally been referred to as **Verstehen**. When this type of methodological strategy is observed, it is believed that the sanctity of the social situation will not be disturbed and data of increasing validity will be garnered. Additionally, these humanistic authors believe that when this methodological tack is taken, sociological knowledge cannot be oppressive. This is simply the case due to the fact that information gathered through the efforts of a **Verstehen** methodology emerges out of a setting, and cannot simultaneously be imposed on that setting. This type of interpretive methodology cannot be manipulative, and thus is more consistent with their stated aims to increase the presence of the "human quotient" in sociological theory.

In contrast to positivism, a **Verstehen** approach attempts to interpret social behavior through "active interpretation", instead of explaining it in terms of some "objectifying method." Only when a social situation is analyzed as a living (situationally constructed) context by a social investigator will valid, relevant data be produced.
To these humanists social laws are therefore the product of consciously developed (or defined in terms of) human action, which demands that they be assessed in a manner different than that proposed by the natural scientist. Quoting Protagoras, Lee says "man is the measure of all things ..."; and therefore "the buck of responsibility in a social-scientific investigation cannot be passed on to a set of methods or a computing machine." Thus, sociologists must not be merely "technicians of method", but instead "creative observers".

The Social Ontological Position of Humanistic Sociology

- Critique of Mainstream Social Ontology -

Throughout the writing of these humanistic sociologists there is present a constant call for social reform. Particularly, many of these authors are calling for a new social order. Such a social order is supposed to be more humanistic and tolerant than the one currently in place, and will hopefully allow for more overt expressivity on the part of all social actors.

This means that an effective transformation strategy needs to incorporate democratic, egalitarian and cooperative values and practices, which alone seem conducive to the emergence of an alternative, livable world order.

These humanists have been referred to this new social order as "humanistic democracy", "democratic socialism", or
simply as "egalitarian". It is thought to represent a movement away from authoritarianism toward more individual autonomy for the individual relative to developing social policy. Clearly, these humanistic sociologists do have, on the one hand, an image of a social order which is not in general beneficial to human development, and on the other a visible alternative to this presumably oppressive arrangement.

The social world which is not conducive to the facilitation of human growth is referred to as "the system". It is believed to dominate the individual and thus seriously truncates h/her ability to truly express h/herself socially. As Lee says "Man is not a tool; society is not a system".

Continuing, he remarks that

Our unresolved problems are staggering, but social pressures are gathering to cope with them more effectively. These social pressures spring chiefly from human dissatisfaction with the depersonalizing demands made by those in control of social power in the so-called social system. [emphasis J.M.]

Further on Lee describes "the system" as follows:

The notion of 'system' is also, because of its enticements and widespread acceptance, one of the tyrannies over our minds that we need to understand. [emphasis J.M.]

In other words, "the system" is assumed to have ontological priority over the existential demands of individuals, and therefore can make explicit behavioral demands on them. When this is the case a type of normative humanism can be
invoked, which merely outlines a broader, yet still limited, rendition of what type of behavior should be viewed as humanly acceptable. Nevertheless, this style of limited humanism is not what these humanists want to advance.

As Lee suggests, the idea of a social "system" is a myth. "Society" per se does not in fact exist, but is merely a mental image. In turn, this myth of a "social" order is associated with the belief that some type of overarching social architectonic in fact underpins social life and gives it its presumed stability. The "system" is believed to possess its own autonomy, while every individual is understood to have a particular social position which should be filled. These humanistic sociologists believe that this myth of the existence of an autonomous social order has been perpetrated and perpetuated by the various analogies which mainstream sociology has used over the years to describe the fundamental nature of social life. For example, the organic, mechanical, systemic, and functional analogies used by many sociologists to portray the nature of social each in its own inimitable way labors to convey the idea that something called the "social" does in fact exist in excess of the individual, and that the individual must in each of these analogies be viewed as ontologically ancillary to the "system".

To entertain this image of social life seriously is to jeopardize the "human quotient" which is assumed to be
present in the social order. Governments are believed to be the integrating factor of social life although they are not conceived of as a real social product. Social laws, likewise, are provided a similar seigneurial ontological status. Social institutions are thought to possess a similar type of ontological autonomy. Accordingly, the ground of innovative human action is cut out from under the individual social actor, and subsequently the focus of the social "system" becomes predominately the maintenance of social order and control. The social world comes to be understood as mono-perspectival in character because social life is inadvertently dominated by the perspective which the "system" itself is thought to be advancing. Accordingly, the pluralism which these humanists so fervently advocate is systematically obscured in favor of a domineering social ideology. Indeed, the stage is set for an anti-humanistic or authoritarian social order to be installed.

As should be immediately noted these humanistic sociologists are revolting against one particular way in which the fundamental nature of social life has been traditionally described. Specifically, they are rebelling against the social ontological position which is commonly referred to as social realism, and particularly the effects of the "sociologism" which has been cited as accompanying the social development of this social ontological point of view. Nevertheless, if they are in fact displeased with what
they believe to be the social implications of social ontological realism, what type of social ontological position do they then advocate?

A Possibly Reconstructed Humanistic Social Ontology

Ballard's article which attempts to describe the possible paradigmatic characteristics of humanistic sociology conspicuously ignores a major facet of a general sociological theory. Specifically, it makes no mention of what a humanistic social ontology would resemble. As Ballard suggests, humanistic sociologists have not as yet taken upon themselves the responsibility for engaging in this type of theoretical endeavor. Nevertheless, the works of a few key members of this group of humanistic sociologists do contain some suggestions as to how the fundamental nature of social life is to be conceived. These suggestions will now be examined.

Even though these humanistic sociologists tend to agree that social structure is only an appearance, and that the "social" per se has no real existence, they themselves come dangerously close to again describing the nature of the "social" in realistic social ontological terms. For example Lee makes an initially valiant attempt to describe social life as a product of social interaction, which would therefore provide the nature of the "social" with an
ontological status similar to that which is allotted to the individual or a collection of individuals acting in concert. In this sense, the nature of the "social" is not something opposing the individual, but rather literally owes its existence to human growth or action. As Lee says, there is not "an objective mechanism" called "the social system", but it is a "widely accepted myth". But then Lee refers to group life as always a "social reification," "a social thing which is different from the individuals making it up".  

[emphasis J.M.]

Lee also proceeds to suggest that individuals and societies each have their own separate boundaries, which seems to imply that "society" does possess an ontological existence which is categorically different from that allotted to individual or collective action. What seems to be emerging at this juncture is not that Lee is afraid to have the nature of the social provided an ontological status which is entirely different from that given to the individual, but that he does not want the implied subtending character of the social to be static in nature. To this end, Lee characterizes social life as patterns of behaviors, or as "endlessly repeated routines". Lee implies, however, that these patterns, or roles, have an autonomous existence to which the individual can adapt or not. At this juncture dynamism is introduced into social life by Lee; yet the actual nature of social roles per se is still treated as
This implication is evident in Lee's rendition of socialization, which conveys the idea that the sole function of socialization is to insure social conformity, and not necessarily to offer the individual a range of possible social options, any one of which may be legitimately selected. Nevertheless, the "social" is portrayed as possessing an enveloping character, which is characterized as capable of demand something that individuals cannot demand of another individual.

Subsequently, Lee again attempts to provide social life with its own ontological status, by his assertion that those who attempt to explain social behavior in terms of interactive behavior are guilty of "reductionism".

It is temptingly easy but inaccurate to assume that society or an organization has what amounts to a "mind" and can be understood on terms similar to those appropriate for an individual.

But this affirmation contrasts with his declaration that a society's "being consists, at a given time and place, of the interaction process itself as it operates and is conditioned by its current situation and its participants". What is curious at this juncture, nevertheless, is that Lee suggests that this interaction process is itself not self-developed but is conditioned by the social circumstances which are present at the time. This way of construing the nature of social interaction seems to harbor an insidious type of ontological dualism which is present throughout the
work of these humanistic sociologists.

In another place the nature of social life is characterized as "an infinitely overlapping patchwork or a bewildering intertwined crosshatching of groups". Social order is also designated as being "all of us". Elsewhere, the nature of the social is said to be "only a patchwork of many devoutly held myths". Each of a society's many groups is permitted, according to this rendition of social order, to interpret these myths differently. In each one of these instances there is no doubt that Lee is attempting to avoid social realism, and that he wants to portray social life not as a monological architectonic, but instead as a plurality of groups and persons. Nevertheless, these characterizations do not really inform the reader as to how these collectives and their myths are structured or maintained. It does appear, however, that Lee is leaning toward the position on the nature of the "social" which has been traditionally associated with social ontological nominalism, and likewise he seems to be encountering a problem which has also been viewed as indigenous to nominalistic portrayals of social life. Specifically, social life must be portrayed as either personal or social, with the former resulting in solipsism, while the latter results in obtrusive realism. When the social world is portrayed as solely personal, it is no longer social, but when the social world is thought to be categorically, i.e., ontologically, removed from the realm
occupied by the individual, it can out of ontological necessity dominate the existence of the individual. Both of these modes of portraying social life are unacceptable to these humanistic sociologists, because they both deny the individual the unencumbered freedom which they believed should be reintroduced into sociological theory.

Problems of the Epistemological-Methodological and Social Ontological Position Formulated By Humanistic Sociology

Although the previous sections of this chapter constitute in essence an acknowledgement that humanistic sociology does not contain an explicit and systematically elaborated social epistemology-methodology and social ontology, they do indicate that it is possible to infer basically what the position of humanistic sociology in these two domains is. But undeniably major difficulties do exist. The statements about social epistemology-methodology and social ontology are frequently fragmentary, incomplete, ambiguous, and inconsistent or contradictory. Difficulties can be cited in each domain.

In the realm of social epistemology-methodology, the following defects are illustrative:

1. To assert Protagoras' notion that man is the measure of all things and that knowledge is substantiated by the principles of experience and empathy is not necessarily to provide the basis of knowledge. A positivist or
systems theory might also accept these views. Humanist sociology offers no explicit and unambiguous statement of how social knowledge is actually grounded.

2. The call for the researcher to experience "cultural shock" or "marginality" scarcely indicates how the meanings of a social phenomenon are to be understood in (or on) its own terms. The process of "culture shock" needs to be expanded to illustrate how knowledge is "reflexively" grasped, so that accurate knowledge of the Other might be secured.

3. How mutual or social understanding is formulated between the researcher and people in the world or between people who occupy the same social location is not directly or substantially examined. Any assumption that empathy or some empathic capacity is sufficient to maintain social life because empathy is equatable with understanding simply cannot be sustained since Scheler's work.87

4. Some humanistic sociologists, such as Ballard and Hoult, entertain serious ambiguities about the relation of knowledge to the human actor. They do not seem to know whether knowledge is subjective or objective, or partially subjective-objective.

In the realm of social ontology equally serious problems have appeared:

1. Humanistic sociologists have not adopted a consistent and sharply demarked position in social ontology.
They vacillate between nominalism and realism.

2. Although they affirm that social life is grounded in human action and deny its foundation in an abstract system, they are vague about the source of the unity in social order. They do not explicitly consider how types of necessary social universals can be created without simultaneously being viewed as oppressive.

3. Even in the one instance in which social organization is recognized to be a problem, the author was uncertain as to whether social institutions were grounded subjectively or objectively. Generally, humanistic sociologists have ignored a theory of social organization.

4. Although humanistic sociologists are characteristically committed to the freedom of the individual, they do not have explicitly and rigorously conceived notions of choice, freedom, and creativity. They assert that the individual should be autonomous (apparently as defined relative to "self-determination") and should be free (be able to "cope" effectively with social exigencies vs. "upsetting or waybreaking"). However, Lee concurs with Fratto that the humanistic sociologists should focus "on individuals striving for freedom and creativity within the confines and opportunities of nature, culture, and society." [emphasis J.M.].

But merely to cite difficulties is not simultaneously to solve them. At the minimum the previous paragraphs do
suggest the desirability, if not indeed the necessity, of an examination of similar, related theoretical stances for their potential contributions in systematically supplementing, modifying, extending, specifying, and clarifying the content of humanistic sociological theory. To this end, Chapters IV, V, VI, and VII undertake inquiries into the social epistemologies-methodologies and social ontologies of (Blumer's) symbolic interactionism, critical theory, (Schutzean) sociological phenomenology, and Yugoslavian Marxism respectively. Chapter VIII, the final chapter, will endeavor to assess the potentialities of these four theoretical stances, both positively and negatively, for resolving the difficulties identified in Chapter III and will offer a revised and expanded statement of a humanistic sociological theory.
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CHAPTER IV

BLUMERIAN SYMBOLIC INTERACTIONISM

In this chapter the attempt will be made to illustrate the distinct social epistemological-methodological and social position which he views to be associated with his version of symbolic interactionism. Blumer outlined his theoretical position in his 1969 publication, Symbolic Interactionism: Perspective and Method, which is actually a compilation of articles which he had previously published over the years. Of particular importance in this volume are his long introductory article on the methodological position of symbolic interactionism and his other articles on the psychological facets of group life and society as symbolic interaction, the latter of which contain the basic elements of his social ontology.

Blumer conceives of his own theoretical efforts as differing fundamentally from the traditional sociological positions on the nature of social knowledge and social reality. Blumer tends to think that the prevailing views on the nature of social knowledge and social reality suffer from a fundamental malady. This glaring problem, as Blumer
views it, has tended to place the entire sociological enterprise in jeopardy, and therefore has resulted in the relevance of sociological theory for the social world being called into serious question. As Blumer says, "Social theory in general shows grave shortcomings; its divorcement from the empirical world is glaring." What Blumer seems to be saying, in short, is that prevailing or traditional social theories are just too abstract to have anything to say about social life. He then goes on to say that this abstract approach to doing sociological theory is truly stifling in that it tends to restrict research problems, coerce empirical findings, and demands that social planning fit into a preconceived "mold". Blumer seems to be suggesting that this approach to theorizing certainly contains a latent normative structure, although many times it is quite manifest, which he finds unacceptable. In this sense, Blumer wants to render social theory less abstract and, thus, more socially grounded, so that the social world might be capable of being captured in terms of the way in which it is ordered by those who live it. This way of viewing the manner in which social theory should be developed would certainly be acceptable to humanistic sociology, in that it tends to assert that social life should not be conceived in an abstractly rigid manner, and that it should not be investigated as if it is in fact structured that way. Yet, humanistic sociology should take a lesson from Blumer
relative to how social theory and, thus, the social world should be restructured, so as to avoid the positing of this type of rigid normativeness which he too finds unacceptable.

**Blumerian Symbolic Interactionism: Epistemological-Methodological Position**

Blumer grounds the social world in a manner which is consistent with his desire to have sociological theory assume a less abstract nature. To Blumer the ground of social life is thoroughly socially or interactionally substantiated in that for him it cannot be understood to be either subjective or objective, idealistic or crudely materialistic. As Blumer notes, both "realism" and (what he refers to as) the process of "psychical accretion" are unacceptable as a ground of social life. For him, these two views for comprehending the ground of social life are too abstract, in that they tend to advance the idea that both social knowledge and, subsequently, the nature of the social are substantiated by principles which are not social in origin or socially responsible.

More specifically he objects to grounding social life on a basis substantiated by "realism" or "psychical accretion" because both of these approaches to legitimating social existence tend to "explain the meaning of a thing by isolating the particular psychological elements that produced the meaning" and also divorce the assumed
fundamental dimension of social existence from experience.

As Blumer says,

> The life of a human society, or any segment of it, or of any organization in it, or of its participants consists of the action and experience of people as they meet the situations that arise in their respective worlds.⁴

The only valid ground of social existence for Blumer is experience, which is synonymous with social action. However, when social life is substantiated by some base assumed to exist outside of experience or social action, social existence can become ordered in terms of ahistorical or objective demands or subjective or psychological needs. The ground of social life must always be understood to exist in situ, or else it must be abstract and, thus, not subject to human control.⁵ For Blumer, all social grounds or fundamental themes are "mediated" by social action, and therefore their meaning must be thought to be created by such "mediation".⁶ Therefore, the proper ground of social theory, and accordingly the social world, should be social action.

In taking this tack to substantiating social existence, Blumer does imply an epistemological-methodological position. Specifically, social knowledge and the process whereby it is systematically excavated must also be viewed as mediated, and therefore must be articulated in vivo and understood to be interactional by nature. For Blumer, a valid epistemological-methodological position should not be
concerned with discovering or advancing abstract or
ahistorical social truths.

What Blumer seems to be saying is that social know­
ledge cannot be thought to exist in vacuo and that neither
the self nor the world can be assumed to possess a positively
(objectively) disposed existence.

Human group life is a vast process of
such defining to others what to do and
of interpreting their definitions; through
this process people come to fit their
activities to one another and to form
their individual conduct. Both such joint
activity and individual conduct are formed
in and through this ongoing process; they
are not mere expressions or products of
what people bring to their interaction or
of conditions that are antecedent to their
interaction.7

Both the self and all social phenomena are objects of con­
scious appropriation and gain their meaning through the
social activity provided by the gesture. As Blumer says,
"The conscious life of the human being ... is a continual
flow of self-indications", and through such activity the
individual "is involved in interpreting the actions of
others", in order "to point out to oneself that the action
has this or that meaning or character".8

Blumer describes the creation of meaning as follows:

The meaning of a thing for a person
grows out of the ways in which other
persons act toward the person with
regard to the thing. Their actions
operate to define the thing for the
person. Thus symbolic interactionism
sees meanings as social products, as
creations that are formed in and through
the defining activities of people as they interact.⁹

This idea will be important later and should be remembered when both Blumer's epistemological-methodological and social-ontological positions are fully outlined. The most important point here is that social life is thoroughly mediated by the interpretive process, and therefore cannot be grounded on naturalistic or idealistic imperatives.

As Blumer says, his version of symbolic interactionism is based on three fundamental tenets. The first is that individuals act toward things (i.e., objects and people) on the basis of the meaning such phenomena have for them. The second holds that such meaning arises out of social action, whereby people define the meaning which phenomena have for them. And the third says that these meanings are constantly being modified by continued or on-going social action. Presumably, Blumer does not understand the knowledge which is usually associated with the social object to be obtrusive or objective in character. Yet, he does not merely view social action to be a response to some meaning thought to be attached to an object; nor does he believe that social action is merely a conduit through which meaning assumed to be established *sui generis* can pass.¹¹ As Blumer says, social action should not merely be conceived by the sociologist to be an "intervening" variable, as if some object does possess an autonomous status in every social act which motivates all social action. This means,
stated simply that all social meaning must be understood to be biographical; it results from a definitional capacity which Blumer asserts is indigenous to all acting individuals. Thus, all types of social meaning must be understood to be socially or interpersonally constructed.

Of course, this approach to viewing the way in which the social meaning of the world is thought to be constituted has implications relative to how that meaning should be systematically captured by the sociologist. In a word, the way meaning is understood to exist in the world suggests also that it should be approached in a manner which is consistent with that status. Blumer certainly recognizes this. As Blumer says,

(1) methodology embraces the entire scientific quest and not some selected portion or aspect of that quest;

(2) each part of the scientific quest as well as the complete scientific act, itself, has to fit the obdurate character of the empirical world under study; therefore, methods of study are subservient to that world and should be subject to test by it; and

(3) the empirical world under study and not some model of scientific inquiry provides the ultimate and decisive answer to the test.12

What Blumer is suggesting here involves two major points. The first is that methodology contains an ontological problematic, in that it too must be conceived as a social act and, therefore, capable of creating meaning. And second,
all methodology must overcome its own particular meaning creating capacity, so that it might be able to capture social meaning as it actually exists in the social context to the investigated. The meaning of all social phenomena, of course, is the product of social action. In order that the meaning of all social phenomena might be adequately grasped, sociology must use (what he refers to as) a "sensitizing" methodology.\(^{13}\)

Blumer's methodological position is decisively at variance with the prevailing natural scientific or positivistic scientific orientation. He rejects the equation of methodology with "quantitative procedures", whereby relations among variables are thought to be most adequately determined in terms of "sophisticated statistical and mathematical techniques", and the rationale best used for this entire enterprise is believed to be that which is assumed to underpin the "special canons of research design".\(^ {14}\) Manifestly, Blumer objects to

The overwhelming bulk of what passes today as methodology [which] is made up of such preoccupations as the following: the devising and use of sophisticated research techniques, usually of an advanced statistical character; the construction of logical and mathematical models, all too frequently guided by a criterion of elegance; the elaboration of formal schemes on how to construct concepts and theories; valient application of imported schemes, such as input-out analysis, systems analysis, and stochastic analysis; studious conformity to the canons of research design; and the promotion of a particular procedure, such a survey research
The major problem with these procedures, in Blumer's view, is their apparent justification by an assumed inherently systemic nature, which lends them an air of objective legitimacy. Their strength is believed to be in their internal consistancy and coherency, and not necessarily their social applicability. In a word, they view themselves as justifiable on a priori grounds, and not in terms of their relevance or sensitivity to the empirical world.

Blumer thus argues that methodologies which are thought to be developed on sui generis grounds are not appropriate for sociology. When methodology is understood in this manner its strength is usually thought to be its "standardized" nature, which suggests that it can be generalized to any or all social settings. It is this erroneous belief that leads Blumer to violently reject most of the work done in the field of attitude assessment, as epitomized by the process of intelligence testing. Blumer believes that such a procedure for assessing social life is basically at variance with social life itself, in that it posits what he calls "an unknown X" and an equally abstract methodology to grasp its meaning. Although he agrees that such a methodological approach tends to lend a sense of stability to any investigation, it does not do justice to the setting to be investigated. For Blumer, variables are not abstract.
Intelligence is not, for example, something that can be well circumscribed by mathematical logic, but is what Blumer calls a "common sense" construct. With this idea Blumer seems again to be "suggesting that methodology should always take its orders from the world of everyday experience", and not from the abstract dictates of methodology per se.

Blumer indicts the approach used by the physical sciences which tends to create a "sterilizing conception of social reality". The physical sciences, at least as Blumer views them, portray social existence as a "perpetually fixed form", and simultaneously create a scheme which they believe can adequately capture that form. Such an approach to science avoids "here and now" discoveries, and is what Blumer refers to as "philosophical doctrinizing". Blumer contends that sociology should separate and distinguish itself from this view of science because all social phenomena and their meaning are understood by him to be the product of social action. Accordingly,

We do not cleave aside what gives each instance its peculiar character and restrict ourselves to what it has in common with the other instances in the class covered by the concept. To the contrary, we seem forced to reach what is common by accepting and using what is distinctive to the given empirical instance.

An adequate sociological methodology should not subordinate all empirical findings to some deductively or
a priori conceived scheme, but instead should attempt to grasp what "is expressed in a distinctive manner in each empirical instance", if the "common" meaning which is in use in a particular social setting is to be adequately understood. Therefore, the methodology used by sociology must be "sensitizing" in character as opposed to being definitive and abstract. As Blumer says, "whereas definitive concepts provide presumptions of what to see, sensitizing concepts merely suggest directions along which to look."

The major point here is that a "sensitizing methodology is not guided by abstract prescriptions, which in essence coerce and, thus, explain all data in terms of some abstract scheme. Instead, sensitizing methodological concepts are basically reflexive in character, in that they are understood to know the limits of their applicability and are therefore more sensitive to the meaning of the social world as it is created by the persons who live it.

The type of studies which Blumer believes the sociologist should undertake is referred to as "naturalistic". In Blumer's words, a naturalistic investigation is one which "is directed to a given empirical world in its natural, ongoing character instead of to a simulation of such a world, or to an abstraction from it (as in the case of laboratory experimentation), or to a substitute for the world in the form of a preset image of it". Stated simply, "it respects and stays close to the empirical domain."
Blumer also, for example, believes that participant observation is an appropriate way to conduct a naturalistic study. However, Blumer is quick to point out, the adequate collection of information cannot be insured by merely equating physical closeness with a proper understanding of a particular setting. Rather, an adequately conceived naturalistic inquiry must contain two particular component elements if data is to be properly collected. Blumer refers to these two elements or phases of a naturalistic investigation as "exploration" and "inspection".

During the exploratory phase of study the investigator adopts a "flexible" orientation which enables her to "shift from one line of inquiry to another", adopt "new points of observation", and change her "recognition of what are relevant data as he acquires more information and a better understanding". Exploration "is the way by which a research scholar can form a close and comprehensive acquaintance with a sphere of social life that is unfamiliar and hence unknown to him", while also "developing and sharpening his inquiry so that his problem, his directions of inquiry, data, analytic relations, and interpretations arise out of, and remain grounded in the empirical life under study". Blumer believes that this approach to methodology significantly differs from the so-called (traditional) scientific method, by attempting to adjust itself to the world to be investigated and not vice versa. Accordingly,
a naturalistic investigation necessarily initiates itself with an orientation, but this orientation is sharpened as a result of the investigation itself and can at any time be jettisoned if it proves to be irrelevant. The real purpose of the exploratory phase of a naturalistic investigation "is to move toward a clearer understanding of how one's problem is to be posed, to learn what are the appropriate data, to develop ideas of what are significant lines of relation, and to evolve one's conceptual tools in light of what one is learning about the area of life".\textsuperscript{35} Research which proceeds according to so-called "scientific protocol" is not exploratory, in that its scheme is presumed to be universally applicable \textit{sui generis}.

Accordingly, Blumer says that the investigator may use direct observation, interviews, public records, or accounts of personal life histories in order to gain adequate data.\textsuperscript{36} What Blumer is stressing here is that the social investigator should not automatically preclude the use of any methodological technique. The choice of a technique should be made on the basis of its "propriety and fruitfulness".\textsuperscript{37} The investigator should not be entrapped by pre-conceived "images" about a society or in terms of how it should be investigated.\textsuperscript{38} The procedure of exploration is designed so that the investigator will have to ask h/herself serious questions about all the facets of an investigation, so that none are taken for granted and subsequently applied
inappropriately. Blumer, of course, demands that all of the
techniques that are applied to a social setting be viewed as
fruitful only if they are true to the setting to be investi­
gated, or investigate it in its terms.

Once an adequate picture of the social world is gained
through exploration, the content of any particular social
world must be analyzed. That is, Blumer does not believe
that the sociologist should merely strive to produce a des­
cription of a social setting. Rather,

The research scholar who engages in
direct examination should aim at
casting his problem in a theoretical
form, at unearthing generic relations,
at sharpening the connotative reference
of his concepts, and at formulating
theoretical propositions.39

If the researcher is to succeed in adequately
theoretically integrating the descriptive elements of a
social setting, h/she cannot follow the prevailing pro­
cedures which use an abstract model to explain the relations
between concepts, transform those concepts into variable
relations, collect data, and use the assumed model to explain
the relations among the data that is collected.40 Such an
approach is circular and is insensitive to the empirical
nature of the social setting itself. Responsible investiga­
tors should use an analytic technique which is commensurate
with the strategy of "inspection". By inspection Blumer
means,
An intensive focused examination of the empirical content of whatever analytical elements are used for purposes of analysis, and this same kind of examination of the empirical nature of the relations between such elements.41

What he means by inspection becomes clearer in his discussion of analytic elements and the characterization of their inter-relations. Such a characterization "may refer to processes, organization, relations, networks of relations, states of being, elements of personal organization, and happenings".42 The general purpose of inspection should be the "isolation of relations between these elements",43 which is accomplished through the meticulous but flexible examination of the empirical referents covered by the analytic element in question.44 Such inspection is to be conducted "in the context of the empirical area in which they take place".45 If the investigator is thorough in h/her work, i.e., if h/she views all analytic elements in different settings, from different positions, and compares them with one another, the ultimate result should be the development of a "generic picture" of each analytic element which is investigated.46 Such a generic picture might be termed a concrete universal, in that it is empirically derived from a specific social setting, while still considered to be social or generalizable in nature. In this sense, the analytic or component elements of a social order are not outlined and understood in terms of abstract schemes, but instead are hopefully grasped in their contextual meaning.
As Blumer says, "inspection is not preset, routinized, or prescribed" and does not give a "nature" to an analytic element. Rather, it attempts to grasp its nature in the empirical world which is mediated through human action or the "life experiences" of the persons to be studied.

The contention that people act on the basis of the meaning of their objects has profound methodological implications. It signifies immediately that if the scholar wishes to understand the action of people it is necessary for him to see their objects as they see them.

When Blumer is viewed in terms of the traditional typology used to classify sociological theory, he appears to be an exponent of a humanistic methodology. Blumer maintains that social meaning and the research methodology used to capture meaning are constituted by social action which unites human activities and the world into a medium which is neither totally objective nor subjective. Social meaning is developed through social action into social principles, which cannot by definition be subjective. Yet, the creative capacity of the social actor is at the heart of Blumer's methodology. Social action is not to be explained in terms of abstract systems of meaning, but rather is to be understood in terms of its own meaning. In this sense, social systems of meaning can be developed which do not have to be viewed as opposing or oppressing the individual actor.

Systems of meaning for Blumer must be understood to be the
extension of human action, and therefore are not antagonistic to the human actors *sui generis*.

**Blumerian Symbolic Interactionism: Social Ontological Position**

Just as Blumer refuses to provide an abstract basis for his social epistemology, so he objects to any abstract foundation for his social ontology. Like his social epistemology-methodology, his social ontology is grounded in human action. In order to accomplish this Blumer proceeds to refute two traditional themes which are usually employed so as to provide an adequate account of "social life". Specifically, Blumer insists that the standard approaches to describing social life in terms of some species-like instincts or a "general will" are not adequate to explain how social life is ordered. Also, he goes on to say that the analogues which are used most often by sociologists to describe the functioning of social life, e.g., the mechanical and organic, are likewise not appropriate for giving an accurate account of social existence. The major common flaw in these analogues is that they represent what Blumer calls "importations", and as such do not faithfully reflect the empirical world. Blumer believes that these traditional conceptions are formulated by "accommodating some philosophical notion", "philosophical speculation", or by relying on empirical observations which are not concerned with
human association per se.\textsuperscript{53} Blumer understand the "social" to be conceptualized in terms of real on-going human inter-action, with meaning and interpretation constantly involved. In his view, "the most important feature of human association is that the participants take each other into account".\textsuperscript{54} The question that remains to be answered is, however, how does this occur, or through what type of process does this take place? Blumer gives a clue to the answer to this inquiry when he says that social life is a process whereby persons "are brought into a relation of subject to subject, not of object to object, nor even subject to object".\textsuperscript{55} Presumably, the "social" cannot be viewed as merely a body of objects in close spatial proximity. The procedure whereby individuals come to act together, and act in a social manner, is much more intricate and complex. However, the real core of this process of interaction remains to be developed.

As Blumer says, individuals may act singly, collectively, or as representatives of some organization, yet such actions are always carried out in a social situation.\textsuperscript{56} What is important to remember is that all personal action must be seen as socially constructed through individuals acting in situations which must be interpreted, in that when an actor acts in situ h/she is basing the appropriateness of specific actions on criteria that are not grounded on
solipsistic judgements. Stated simply, Blumer contends that an individual always acts with reference to the Other. As Blumer asserts

... interaction in human society is characteristically and predominately on the symbolic level; as individuals acting individually, collectively, or as agents of some organization encounter one another they are necessarily required to take account of the actions of one another as they form their own action.57

When an actor acts on the symbolic level, h/she must "interpret" the action of the other, and not merely act on some standards which are presumed to be legitimate sui generis.58 However, this process for Blumer gets somewhat more complex.

What must be reiterated is that Blumer views all knowledge as mediated knowledge, and therefore as interpretive in character.59 Knowledge is mediated because individuals act in terms of how social phenomena are defined, and not merely in terms of their supposed "objective" nature. Moreover, all knowledge can be accurately apprehended only in terms of how it is socially defined. However, Blumer faces the problem of insuring that "social" knowledge is common knowledge without being abstractly conceived. What Blumer in fact does is to outline a process whereby social knowledge can be interpretive in character without being subjective and, thus, solipsistic in nature. It is through this process that the nature of
the "social" for Blumer emerges.

As Blumer says, individuals live in "worlds" which they recognize and know, because these worlds are the product of individual creative activities.

Human group life on the level of symbolic interaction is a vast process in which people are forming, sustaining, and transforming the objects of their world as they come to give meaning to objects.60

A clue as to how individual creative propensities are turned into group action is provided in the following passage:

One has to catch the other as a subject, or in terms of his being the initiator and director of his acts; thus one is led to identify what the person means, what are his intentions and how he may act. Each party to the interaction does this and thus not only takes the other into account, but takes him into account as one who, in turn is taking him into account.61

What Blumer seems to be suggesting here is that both persons who are involved in some type of interaction become fundamentally reflexive. That is, the actor realizes not only that his/her action establishes a horizon within which the Other's action will gain meaning, but also comes to realize that the meaning of his/her actions is subject to interpretation. This awareness establishes the framework for the acting individual to take the role of the other if meaningful interaction is to ever take place. When the actor has grasped the role of the other, and vice versa, Blumer calls the resulting occurrence a "transaction" --
which is a "fitting of the developing action of each actor to that of the other to form a joint or overbridging action." In this sense, each actor conducts h/her affairs in view of how they will be interpreted by the other, with special consideration to how they will effect the behavior of the other, and vice versa. Through this type of inter-action individuals are eventually capable of reaching what Blumer refers to as "common definitions" of how social action should be conducted. In this sense, social behavior is truly symbolic in that it is interpretive in nature, while also being inter-action, or action which is oriented to the needs, wishes, desires, etc., of other actors.

What is important to remember at this juncture is that the social actor has a lot of discretionary power relative to how h/she will act in any social situation. As Blumer says, "it is the position of symbolic interactionism that the social action of the actor is constructed by him...." The actor is not required to act in any particular way in a social setting, but instead "has to mold a line of action on the basis of what it [the acting organism] takes into account instead of merely releasing a response to the play of some factor on its organization". In this sense, the actor does not merely encounter an environment to which h/she must merely respond in a determined manner, but rather a world to be interpreted in order to act. As Blumer asserts:
He [the actor] has to construct and guide his action instead of merely releasing it in response to factors on or operating through him. He may do a miserable job in constructing his action, but he has to construct it.65

Such an existential statement is reminiscent of Sartre's reminder that the social actor is "condemned to freedom".

The general term which Blumer uses to characterize this type of Other and self-oriented interaction is "joint action".66 Joint action should not be interpreted as merely a set of single acts which are concatenated. Rather "joint or collective action is an outcome of such a process of interpretive interaction".67 The resulting social implications which can be derived from Blumer's notion of social order being conceived as fundamentally joint action are as follows: First, individual action must be built up into social action through all social actors attempting to fit their behavior within the realm of expectations advanced by the other. The implication here is that individuals can define their social situations differently, and therefore if social action is to take place these possibly disparate existential orientations must be at least temporarily wedded together. Second, social action is always subject to change, through actors' redefining their situation. Third, social existence must be viewed to be merely recurrent patterns of behavior which are grounded.
on social action. As Blumer goes on to say, such traditional, sociological notions as custom, tradition norms, and values are derived from social action, and cannot be substantiated on any force other than such action.

Therefore Blumer tends to ground his view of the "social" neither nominalistically or realistically. That is, he does not want to substantiate social life with reference to inherent psychic properties which are believed to be naturally disposed, nor does he want to view social life to be the product of "realistically" substantiated forces which would preclude the social actor from constructing the social setting. Rather, Blumer grounds social life on social action, which for him is articulated in terms of joint action. This view of the fundamental nature of the "social", of course, has implications, in terms of how the actor's freedom to act should be conceived.

Concluding Statement: Social Order and Human Freedom

Blumerian symbolic interactionism is conceived in a manner which is consistent with the demands of a humanistic sociology. Specifically, Blumer develops his theory so that it could not possibly advance a normative style of humanism. That is, he makes sure that all social knowledge is based on human action, and that this "human quotient" is
at the center of all social activity. In the words of Blumer, "one has to get inside the defining process of the actor in order to understand his action". Such a radical position on the generation of social knowledge places the acting individual at the center of social development. The "individual does not merely encounter a world to which he can merely respond, but instead actually constructs the world through acts of interpretation".

Fundamentally, action on the part of a human being consists of taking account of various things that he notes and forging a line of conduct on the basis of how he interprets them.

As should be noted, the individual is not thought to encounter objective but definitional limits to human action, in that human action is believed by Blumer to be guided by "indication and interpretation".

Blumer even goes so far as to suggest that social institutions are also nothing more than agreed upon patterns of social action. As Blumer says, social collectivity is actually nothing more than "discussion, counseling, and debate".

Instead of accounting for the activity of the [social] organization and its parts in terms of organizational principles or system principles, it [symbolic interactionism] seeks explanation in the way the participants define, interpret, and meet the situations at their respective points.

In this sense, again he seems to be stressing the idea that the individual cannot be thought to be ontologically
coerced by a social system, but that h/she must create all social organization. The individual does not merely respond to the play of factors operating in the world, but instead "has to cope with and handle such factors and who, in so doing, has to forge and direct his line of action". Through the process of "self-indication" the individual is able to stand over-against situations, so that they might be critically reflected upon, and changed if such activity is viewed as desirable.

Blumer's general theory of the nature of the "social" is consistent with the way in which he grounds social life and, additionally, social knowledge. Specifically, Blumer objects to any theory which suggests that individuals be understood as forced into action by something called the "social", be it psychologically or realistically derived. The "social" for Blumer is also substantiated by socially creative action, referred to as joint action. The "social" is synonymous with recurrent action which is interpersonally defined.

... From the standpoint of symbolic interactionism the organization of a human society is the framework inside of which social action takes place and is not the determinate of that action.77 [emphasis J.M.]

In brief, Blumer offers a general theoretical position on the nature of the social which is systematic but not deterministic; it is a "social" theory which is grounded on
inter-individual or inter-personal action. Blumer, therefore, basically sees social action as self-determining and not socially determined. The individual is free to create and re-create social order, and not necessarily be constrained by some obdurate or intractable social system. For Blumer, the individual is always situationally located, but always capable of interpreting and thus, creating that situation anew. In fine, the individual "projects out different possibilities, selects among them, makes decisions, and revises his plans as he takes account of something new".78

The humanistic sociologist might, therefore, learn something by following the manner in which Blumer develops his theory. It is logically developed, in that all his theoretical themes faithfully follow from his basic premise: All social life is grounded on social action. Once he establishes this principle he proceeds to outline a theory of social knowledge and methodology which is congruent with this idea. Blumer's social ontology is, likewise, based on social action, and therefore neither abstract or solipsistic in nature. If the humanistic sociologist were to adhere to Blumer's mode of theoretical development, h/she might be better able to proffer the reader a social but individually grounded social theory.
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CHAPTER V

SCHUTZEAN PHENOMENOLOGICAL SOCIOLOGY

Phenomenology as a philosophy was born in the midst of a controversy between idealists and empiricists. The empiricists, for example, tended to believe that the only type of valid knowledge was that which could be generated through sense experience. Sense experience was thought to reflect the empirical properties of the objects which were presumed to exist in the world. The assumption here is that actual or "objective" phenomena do subsist in the world, and that they can only be correctly apprehended when the perceiver can purge h/herself of all subjective judgments, beliefs, etc., which might interfere with the accurate perception of their empirical qualities. When purged of all subjectivity, it was the belief that pure sense qualia could be grasped in the form of sense-data or experience. This sense-data was alleged to represent or embody pure knowledge.

When primacy is given to sense-data relative to providing an apodictic ground to knowledge immediate problems result. For example, an objective reality is presupposed which cannot theoretically be known, in that sense-data
merely represent atomistic pieces of reality. In terms of sense-data providing the ground of knowledge, the mind of the perceiver is understood to be merely a passive receptacle into which these sense-data are interjected. The mind, therefore, cannot be thought to order such sense-based information. In this sense, it must merely be assumed that an objective reality exists, and a procedure must be invented to insure that its qualities can be organized into conglomerates of meaningful sense experience. This belief in an objective world has come to be known as the "natural attitude", while the procedure which is assumed to adequately capture knowledge about that natural realm is referred to as "scientism". Although, as Dickens suggests, Husserl did want to trace knowledge back to experience, it was not the style of experience proffered by either empiricism or scientism.

What this means is that Husserl did not want to advance the belief that knowledge does in fact exist divorced from human consciousness, or that it should be associated with any specific type of experience. When one promotes the idea that sense-data has an autonomous existence relative to perception, this type of formal statement inadvertently advances a content which becomes associated with objective knowledge. Likewise, when the principles of natural science are assumed to be divorced from so-called "subjectivity", and therefore are able to convey
unadulterated knowledge, the form of those sciences also conveys content which comes to be viewed as the paragon measure of valid knowledge. This view of science is "scientism". Nevertheless, Husserl rejected both these modes of conceptualizing the content of experience because they are just too abstract, or, as Schutz says, neither has a "here within the social world" from which to grasp experience as it is actually experienced. Neither scientism or empiricism is really concerned with how living persons experience their world; they both reduce and, thus, analyze human experience in terms of abstract analytic schemes. For Husserl, and phenomenologists in general, such a stance is inappropriate.

However, Husserl was not an advocate of idealism, such as that advanced by Hegel or Kant. Although both of these philosophers attempted to restore experience to a living subject, they accomplished this end (in Husserl's view) while simultaneously obscuring the social world. Both the Hegelian "spirit" and the Kantian "categories" can be regarded not only as a priori in character, but also as ethereal, in that they are not grounded in social life. When the ground of experience is so understood it becomes as abstract as that advanced by both empiricism and scientism.

In order to counter these two trends in understanding the fundamental nature of experience, Husserl proposed his now famous definition of experience. He does this through
a philosophical move which he says constitutes the central theme of phenomenology. This theoretical move actually announces the introduction of what has come to be known as "intentionality". When experience is described in terms of intentionality, human consciousness must always be viewed as "consciousness of ... something". At first this phrase might sound quite banal, yet by describing human experience in this manner Husserl undercut the entire prior tradition in terms of understanding the nature of human experience. Instead of assuming that phenomena exist in the world divorced from human consciousness, or that phenomena are constituted through the activity of an abstract "spirit" or "categories", every object must, in the words of Schutz, be known as an "intentional object". As Schutz continues,

... these intentional objects are no longer the things of the outer world as they exist and as they really are, but the phenomena as they appear to me.

This distinction must be expatiated upon, so that its importance can be understood relative to the way phenomena have been understood in terms of both idealism and empiricism.

In terms of both empiricism and idealism phenomena appear to consciousness ex post facto, and it is this mode of presentation which provides them with their traditionally assumed objective status. Empiricism says that sense-data is known only after it is registered by a perceptual apparatus, and therefore is believed to exist in excess of
consciousness. Idealism, on the other hand, states that knowledge is acquired only after it has been constituted by certain epistemological categories. In either case, a phenomenon does not exist "as it appears to me". It's meaning is thought to be attributable to the phenomenon itself, and not to an experience of that phenomenon. In both cases there is assumed to be no essential connection between a knower and what is known; a subject and object. When Husserl says that consciousness is always "consciousness of ... something", this entire dualistic tradition advanced by both idealism and empiricism is undercut. Four major consequences result from this shift in understanding human experience. First, subjectivity and objectivity are essentially related. Second, subjectivity and objectivity are always mediated by consciousness, and their separation can only be understood to be purely analytic. Third, subjectivity and objectivity must be viewed as possessing an identical ground of historical constitution, in that they are both subject to identical conditions of contextual generation (not ex nihilo). And fourth, both subjectivity and objectivity must be viewed to obtain their meaning from the mediational efforts of consciousness. Schutz summarizes the result of this theoretical move as follows:

... the 'already given' refers back to one's own activity or to the activity of Others, of which it is the sediment.
The point here has been to suggest that phenomenology understands itself to be rebelling against the then two dominant theoretical positions relative to outlining the nature of human experience. Both empiricism and idealism portray experience abstractly, in terms of it not being intimately associated with consciousness, but merely as a by-product of sense qualities which are generated either materially or ideally. As should be noted from the discussion in the foregoing paragraph, phenomenology understands the nature of experience differently. Experience for phenomenology is always embodied experience, and not the disembodied experience portrayed by empiricism and idealism. To say that experience is embodied is to suggest that experience is aware of its total constitution, and not merely its anonymous arrival, and that experience cannot be separated from the meaning of any phenomenon, or the world.

In the words of Schutz, when human experience is comprehended in terms of the postulates of empiricism or idealism the individual is portrayed as a "homunculus". That is, the human actor does not have a biography which h/she is thought to have constructed in terms of social and individual meaning or experience but instead is treated as an anonymous figure who is guided by abstractly conceived forces. As such, social knowledge is also conceived abstractly, in that it is not believed to be directly related to an embodied human consciousness. This difference between
embodied and disembodied consciousness marks the distinction between living in the world and having a world. The inert object is merely placed in the world, while the individual, if perceived as embodied consciousness, has a world which takes the form of a cohesive experiential fabric. However, in the case of both empiricism and idealism consciousness is not essentially connected to the world, which therefore renders both the individual and the world abstract. As Husserl notes, however, all "natural knowledge" begins with experience which embodies the world, and "it is from this world of experience that all investigations should begin".

Phenomenology has much in common with humanistic sociology in its effort to theorize concretely in terms of the social world. Like humanistic sociology phenomenology does not want to eviscerate the individual, by portraying the individual and the social world so abstractly that they have no real human referent. Humanistic sociology and phenomenology also both want to elevate human experience in comparison to its conception by most traditional theories. However, phenomenology, particularly as it has been applied to sociology by certain key authors, e.g., Schutz, O'Neill, Grathoff, and Berger and Luckman, has developed a much more comprehensive epistemological-methodological and social ontological position. Therefore it might serve as a more adequate guide for humanistic sociology to develop a fully
formulated social theory.

This chapter will focus on Schutz's work contained in his *Collected Papers* (Vol. I and II), his book *Phenomenology of the Social World*, and will be supplemented by some of the writings of the other authors just mentioned.

**Phenomenology: Epistemological and Methodological Position**

As is suggested by Wolff, phenomenology seeks a ground of knowledge which is significantly different than that traditionally advanced by either empiricism or idealism. The same is also reiterated by Tiryakian in his most recent comparison of Durkheim and Husserl. What each of these social theorists seem to be saying is that both empiricism and idealism tend to conceive of the ground of knowledge in a manner which is simply too abstract. That is, both of these theories tend to remove the ground of knowledge from the possible contaminating influence of human consciousness, so that pure or "objective" knowledge might be discovered. When this belief in the possibility of securing this type of pure or "objective" knowledge is advanced, a *reductio ad absurdum* results. Specifically, all knowledge must be based on pure speculation and not observation, which accordingly is not consistent with the idea of procuring "objective" knowledge. Nevertheless, when consciousness is precluded from the process of grounding or securing knowledge a metaphysical ground
of knowledge is inadvertently advanced. These authors both tend to assert that a solution to this problem of grounding knowledge less abstractly was proposed by Husserl in his posthumously published work usually referred to as simply The Crisis. As Tiryakian says, modern science "ignores and dismisses its own foundations, the substratum of the 'life-world'" that might serve as a more adequate ground of knowledge than the abstract ground which is offered by empiricism or idealism. This is the theme which is proposed by Husserl in The Crisis. What, however, is this "life-world"?

In Husserl's later work his notion of intentionality became somewhat expanded, in that it was no longer conceived to have merely epistemological implications, but additionally was thought to suggest a new type of ontological grounding for the world. This new grounding of the world is referred to as the Lebenswelt or "life-world". As Schutz suggests, "phenomenological philosophy claims to be a philosophy of this life-world ...", which essentially means that it is "concerned with the demonstration and explanation of consciousness of the transcendent subjectivity within which this life-world is constituted". The point here is that the "life-world" is "constituted" by human consciousness, which essentially means that the life-world is the product of intentionality. Phenomenology, moreover, wants to begin and end its theorizing from the
"life-world". But such an understanding of the central core of philosophy demands a radical change in the way in which social knowledge is substantiated. Prior theories sought to establish the indubitable ground of knowledge abstractly, while phenomenology always wants to theorize from within the "life-world" of conscious experience.

To be more specific: Schutz characterizes the "life-world" as "... a subjective formation resulting from the activities of the pre-scientific life". This classic definition of the "life-world" essentially means that the world in which an individual lives is basically thought to be constructed through the effort of subjective experience, before the world is provided the objective status which natural science accords it. When the ground of knowledge is understood to be the "life-world", the "whole objective world exists for me, by virtue of the fact that I experience it, perceive it, remember it, etc." Accordingly, the "life-world" is not merely a context of existence which science is thought to over-look, but instead is the actual experiential ground of knowledge which science is believed to obscure. The "life-world", therefore, serves as the fundamental seat of existence, due to the fact that it is an intentional structure and, thus, "the domain of lived experience and the locus of the phenomenological grounding of knowledge, science, and history".
This attempt of phenomology to ground knowledge on conscious experience has a variety of implications. If the "life-world" cannot be understood to be an "object among other objects", but a "product of intentional consciousness", then the possibility of advancing a so-called objective ground of knowledge is seriously challenged. Due to the fact all knowledge must be intentional if it is to be known, and thus a product of the "life-world", no purely objective knowledge can be discovered. This argument has profound impact on the way in which natural science is conceived.

As stated by Schutz, "the basis of meaning of every science is the pre-scientific life-world."

Whereas natural science would like to promote the notion that it grounds itself and its findings objectively, its now assumed essential relationship to the "life-world" presupposes that "everything which represents the life-world to the natural scientists as 'objectively actual and true nature' is clothed by this [a] garment of symbols and disguised". The point that Schutz is trying to make is that phenomenology understands natural science to be a product of the "life-world", and as such it cannot be thought to be objective. Rather, natural science is presumed to be a symbolic universe which carries its own meaning, and thus constitutes an intentional structure which is a correlate of conscious experience.
In his analysis of the "life-world" as being the fundament of social existence, Schutz asserts that even "nature ... [is] an element of the life-world. ..." What Schutz is attempting to demonstrate with this assertion is that not only are the so-called objective procedures of science a product of the "life-world", but even the so-called object of natural science "has its place exclusively in the mental (geistig) sphere". Accordingly, Schutz eventually challenges all prior ontologies with established provinces of Being which are thought to possess a so-called real or objective status. He therefore declares:

We speak of provinces of meaning and not sub-universes [of Being] because it is the meaning of our experiences and not the ontological structure of the objects which constitutes reality.

With these proclamations Schutz affirms the fundamental phenomenological axiom that the ground of all realms of existence is experience; the ground of all ontologies is the "life-world".

In terms of the sociological theory promulgated by phenomenology, this new ontological ground proffered in the form of the "life-world" has implications relative to such traditional sociological notions as social meaning and social rationality. What Schutz does, for example, is to describe the social world as ultimately based on "common-sense" thinking. This idea that the social world is based on some type of common-sense phenomenon is not new to the
history of social thought. Most often, however, the phenomenon which is believed to be indigenous to common-sense is provided the status of a naively realistically constituted datum. As Schutz says, however, "... the so-called concrete facts of common-sense perception are not so concrete as it seems". Citing Whitehead, Schutz seems to say that if the content of common-sense thought is approached naively, any so-called fact that is discovered might be imbued with "misplaced concreteness". As Schutz goes on to say, "... there are no such things as facts, pure and simple". In a manner totally consistent with the idea that the "life-world" is the ground of all knowledge, Schutz adds the following:

All facts are from the outset facts selected from a context by the activities of our mind.32

In order to insure that the reader does not misunderstand him, Schutz makes sure that the social actor is not thought to be merely able to select among objects in an already constructed context. If this were the case, the conscious intentionality of the "life-world" could not be thought to ground this selection process. As Schutz says, however, "relevance is not inherent in nature as such, it is the result of the selective and interpretive activity of man within nature or observing nature". This means that facts are "always interpreted facts".34
Accordingly, what is meant by common-sense for phenomenology is that the *sensus communis* of the social world can no longer be viewed to be naively real, but instead should be seen as "typical" in nature. As Schutz says, the consistency of the common-sense realm is not a consequence "of natural laws, but that of typical sequences and relations". Although social common-sense is not to be understood as substantiated by naturally disposed phenomena, what does it mean to say that social regularities are grounded "typicalities"? To Schutz, when a meaning is thought to be typical it does not mean that it is obviously characteristic of a particular social situation. Rather, Schutz suggests that typifications are a product of an individual's "biographically determined situation".

"... [a] typification depends upon my problem at hand for the definition and solution of which the type has been formed."

As this statement by Schutz suggests, "typifications" are a product of conscious experience, are mechanisms used to order experience, and are thoroughly pragmatic in character. These "typicalities" which are thought to regulate experience are not by nature idiosyncratic, but instead can be communicated to other individuals and serve as a common ground on which to base social interaction in specific situations.

What has been suggested thus far is that social facts are not obtrusive by nature, and that social laws are
habituated typifications, whereby a particular mode of classifying phenomena becomes the standard way of viewing things. The general upshot of this is that social existence itself cannot be viewed as objectively regulated, but is substantiated on what Schutz refers to as the "epoché of the natural attitude". What this essentially means is that a specific "typicality" which has gained some general acceptance, but because of its biographical origin could be questioned at any time, is thought to be beyond question by a variety of people. Through this theoretical maneuver Schutz has grounded social life itself on a biographically sedimented world, i.e., the "life-world". This conception of social existence will be elaborated later in this chapter; yet a word should be said at this time concerning how this view of common-sense or social life impacts on the nature of social action. For it is in social action that the sociologist is supposedly interested.

Schutz's conception of social action is consistent with his view of the "life-world" as the ground of knowledge and social reality. Having critiqued behaviorism because it erects a "fictional-world in the attempt to comprehend social behavior", Schutz suggests that social behavior can only be properly assessed when it is understood to be based on subjectivity. For Schutz, subjectivity is "the experience of the actor who lives in his ongoing process of activity". Behaviorism does not understand individual
behavior to be based on conscious, volitional action, but instead merely views the social actor as an organism capable of responding to stimuli. The behaviorist does not assess behavior in terms of its experiential properties, but instead relative to response potentials. Schutz contends, however, that "the distinguishing characteristic of action is that it is determined by a project which precedes it in time". Action, therefore, does not occur *ex post facto*, as presumed by the behaviorist, but occurs "in accordance with a plan of projected behavior". Behavior for phenomenology is not the product of some reflex action, but rather a project of action.

With this in mind Schutz outlines two types of personal motives: in-order-to and because motives. In Schutz's words, "... in-order-to motives are integrated into subjective systems of planning", whereas because motives refers to a rationale for behavior based on "past experiences". The point here is that behaviorism does not allow for behavior to be accounted for in terms of either type of motive, since it does not consider behavioral expectation or recollection as real. Every stimulus must occur, as Mead says, on that "knife-edge present", which does not have a future or a past. What Schutz says, in opposition to behaviorism, is that "human activities are only made understandable by showing their in-order-to or because motives". In line with his belief that the "life-world"
is the ground of all knowledge, Schutz seems to be suggesting that human behavior itself cannot be understood in terms of so-called objective actions, or overt behavior, as it is called by the behaviorist. Rather, behavior is "biographically determined", in that "it is the sedimentation of all his [the actor's] previous subjective experiences".  

Schutz grounds all types of knowledge on human experience, and this conception of knowledge certainly suggests a way in which knowledge might be properly excavated. Stated simply, if knowledge is to be properly apprehended, the methodology used to gather knowledge will have to also be sensitive to the exigencies of the "life-world".

Reacting against the version of science which is advanced by the "physical" scientist, Schutz insists that the social scientist should not employ the methods of the "empirical social sciences", or those based on some ultimately rational model of common-sense. Schutz believes that the natural scientist does not attempt to explain social reality as it is "experienced by man living his everyday life within the social world". When social science opts for the methods of the natural sciences, it inevitably employs what Schutz refers to as a type of "intellectual shorthand" when investigating the social world. The naturalistically inclined social scientist
replaces the thought objects of common-sense thought relating to unique events and occurrences by constructing a model of a sector of the social world within which merely those typified events occur that are relevant to the scientist's problem under scrutiny.51

Moreover, Schutz critiques the positivistically disposed social scientist's belief that valid knowledge can best be discovered when "... the social scientist detaches himself from his biographical situation within the social world".52 Such detachment changes the scientist's relevancies and priorities; h/she no longer operates in accordance with commonly accepted social rules, but instead "in accordance with pre-established rules, called the scientific method".53 The important point here for Schutz is that the frame of reference for the positivistically disposed social scientist is not the "life-world" of the individuals to be investigated, but instead is the stock of knowledge accumulated by science. It is within this realm of knowledge that the naturalistically inclined social scientist selects problems and makes decisions. What Schutz refers to as the "scientific situation" begins to supersede the biographical situation of social actors who are living in the world. As Schutz says,

The [positivistically inclined] social scientist has no 'Here' within the social world or, more precisely, he considers his position within it and the system of relevancies attached hereto as irrelevant for this scientific undertaking. 54
The positivistically inclined social scientist, as Schutz suggests, chooses to employ the stock of knowledge accumulated by science to guide h/her investigation, in that it supposedly embodies procedures which have stood the test of forming epistemological constructs in a sound way.

When science is conceived in this manner the scientist uses "abstractions, generalizations, formalizations", and "idealizations" when conducting research, in that the concepts and procedures that are employed are ideal types in the worst sense: they are abstractions with no empirical or social frame of reference. When human beings are conceptualized in this manner, they are merely viewed as "puppets", that is abstract social actors which are "not subjected to the ontological conditions of human beings". To be a puppet means that the social scientist imputes a "specious" consciousness to all those individuals in the social world, and deprives them of their biographical situation which has been created through social action. In short, the positivistically inclined social scientist creates an artificial intelligence for the social actor which is thought to guide all social actions. What Schutz is suggesting is that positive science has substituted idealities of human action for the "life-world".

In opposition to this positivistic view of science, Schutz has expanded upon the original work of Max Weber and asserts that sociologists should be concerned with the
"phenomenon of meaning". As Schutz says,

The primary goal of the social sciences is to obtain organized knowledge of social reality. By the term 'social reality' I wish to be understood the sum of total objects and occurrences within the social cultural world as experienced by the common-sense thinking of men living their daily lives among their fellow men.

Schutz believes that all forms of "naturalism" and "logical empiricism" merely take for granted the structure of social reality and treat it as if its meaning were objective or obtrusive by nature. Therefore, natural science essentially uses what Schutz refers to as "second level" concepts which reflect this objectivity and obscure the social ground of those constructs. In a word, natural science tends to establish its methodology in terms of major assumptions it makes about the social world, and subsequently uses second level constructs to explain behavior simply because they are one-step removed from the social life which defines their meaning.

As opposed to these "second level" constructs, Schutz suggests that social behavior should be accounted for in terms of common-sense experience. Common-sense experience, as suggested earlier, is biographically located. Common-sense experience is also guided by what Schutz refers to as Verstehen. To Schutz, social life itself is ordered in terms of Verstehen, in that actors must interpret and anticipate the behavior of other actors if social life is to
have any coherency. If the social scientist is to com-
prehend social life, h/she will have to penetrate the
"first level" constructs upon which all social existence is
ordered. These "first level" constructs are those which
are used by the social actors themselves to comprehend their
own behavior and the behavior of the other participants in
the social world. As Schutz goes on to say

... if the social sciences aim indeed
at explaining social reality, then the
scientific constructs on the second
level, too, must include a reference
to the subjective meaning an action has
for the actor."63

This type of understanding is not merely representative of
empathy. Instead, through the use of the epoché all pre-
conceived or sterotypically conceived notions of the social
world are put out of play, which sets the stage for the
investigator to be able to interpret the social world as it
is experienced through the common-sense categories used by
social actors to construct the social world.

Consequently, a new ground of rationality will have
to be erected in order to give an adequate account of social
behavior. In general, Schutz believes that phenomenology
has the following task:

The phenomenologist, we may say, does
not have to do with the objects [of
science] themselves; he is interested
in their meaning, as it is constituted
by the activities of our mind.64
In this sense, the conception of rationality which the sociologist uses should reflect the meaning of behavior, and not merely the so-called objective or overt characteristics of behavior. This idea reflects Husserl's original intent that phenomenology should be a science of essences (or meanings) and not facts. When this phenomenological axiom is translated into a sociological methodology, it makes the following demand:

The rational course-of-action and personal types have to be constructed in such a way that an actor in the life-world would perform the typified action if he had a perfectly clear and distinct knowledge of all the elements, and only of the elements, assumed by the social scientist as being relevant to this action. ... The models of rationality which are used to account for human behavior must be those which the social actors themselves use. In order to insure that social behavior is interpreted in "its settings in terms of the actor", the subjects involved in any investigation must themselves reaffirm the results of the methodology used by the researcher.

This approach to research poses two significant problems for sociologists who are used to employing positivistically grounded methodologies. What Schutz says is that those who employ an "interpretive" (verstehende) methodology must now be concerned with "causal" and "meaning" adequacy.
Specifically, no longer can causality be conceptualized in terms of the logical properties of temporal priority, necessary and sufficient conditions, and non-spuriousness. Neither can causality be articulated either in terms of Millian or Humean association. Rather, as Schutz says, causality can only be correctly interpreted in terms of "intended" meaning. An account of behavior is only causally adequate if it is consistent with "past experience." Accordingly, a causal relationship is not something for Schutz that is mechanical, but something that is a property of conscious intentions. What this means essentially is that the lawful relationships which the social scientist hopes to discover must be developed only in terms of how social actors view their own behavior. Social laws, therefore, must embody the intended meaning of actor's actions, and if this is thought to be the case by sociologists, then those meanings will be viewed as adequate in their portrayal of social action.

In sum, it must be said that phenomenology did not want to ground knowledge abstractly, but instead wanted to have all knowledge substantiated by conscious intentionality or, in more social terms, the "life-world". Accordingly, it objects to any methodology which is not sensitive to the exigencies of the "life-world". Schutz felt that social knowledge could only be correctly comprehended if it were interpreted in terms of how social actors view it
from their socially defined (life-world) situation.

**Phenomenology: Social Ontological Position**

Because phenomenology wanted to dispense with all metaphysical abstractions in its theorizing about the world, it might also be expected to propose a theory of the nature of the social which avoids metaphysical substantiation. To be specific, phenomenology would presumably also attempt to portray the social world as an intentional correlate of consciousness, and thus substantiate it on experience. In this way, the social world could not be understood to be essentially abstract, but rather a social product.

Schutz provides some insight into the direction he will take in formulating a phenomenological ontology by a few statements he makes about Durkheim, and how the social world should not be conceived. Using Husserl's work as a backdrop, Schutz proceeds to assert that the individual is thoroughly social, in that h/she is born into a world which is not by nature anonymous, but is a shared world. The individual is never *solus ipse*, but always exists outside h/herself in the world. The individual can also adapt to this world by submitting to the socializing forces which are present, and therefore the social world can even, in the Durkheimian sense, be viewed as a constraining force. Yet, as Schutz says, "There is ... no such thing as a collective social or a collective consciousness".
contrast to Durkheim, Schutz affirms that "social relations are always interindividual". 73

Presumably, Schutz is rejecting the sometimes alleged abstract nature of the way Durkheim conceptualized the fundamental character of social life. In another place he makes this point clear. Social life does not consist of "my environment nor your environment nor even the two added. ..." Rather, social life "is an inter-subjective world within reach of our common experience". 74 The social world should not be understood to be a concatenated world comprised of separate individual, nor should it be viewed to exist in excess of individuals as some super-additive form. Instead, the social world should be viewed as inter-subjective.

Specifically, Schutz contends that social interaction is based on what he refers to as the "reciprocity of motives". 75 In simple terms, Schutz defines this notion of the reciprocity of motives as follows: "That the actor's in-order-to motives will become the because-motives of his partner and vice versa". 76 Keeping in mind the definition of these types of motives presented earlier, what Schutz is saying is that an actor bases h/her future actions on the previous actions of another actor, merely linking these actors together in the form of an ongoing chain of actions. However, as Schutz illustrates, the ability of one actor to base h/her future actions on the past behavior of
another actor is not as simple as it at first appears because these motives are biographically situated.\textsuperscript{73} Therefore, actors who are involved in any type of exchange might face a problem of "synchronization",\textsuperscript{78} in that the experiences which are embodied in the actors' various motives might not at all be identical.

Furthermore, since all behavioral acts are intention­al, they are simultaneously temporal or the product of conscious \textit{dureé}.\textsuperscript{79} As a result, an actor cannot ration­ally base h/her behavior on what appears to be the overt significance of another actor's motives. Rather, an actor must "grasp" the "lived experience" of another actor's acts if real communication is to ever take place. When one actor has grasped the "significative function" of another actor's behavior, h/she views a motive as a complex of meaning which must be understood as intended by the original actor. If this occurs, the actors are thought to be in synchrony. As Schutz says,

\begin{quote}
... if I project a rational action which requires an interlocking of my and the Other's motives of action to be carried out..., I must, by a curious mirror-effect, have sufficient knowledge of what he, the Other, knows ..., and this knowledge of his is supposed to include sufficient acquaintance with what I know.\textsuperscript{80}
\end{quote}

This type of social relationship is referred to as the "\textit{we-}\textit{relationship}", and the actors involved are not treated as
other objects, but as "counter-subjects". When actors' experiences are merged into simultaneity, Schutz says that people have "grown older together".

As Schutz points out, however, social life is not conceptualized by actors only in terms of direct face-to-face relationships, whereby the actor can observe "the concrete manifestations of his subjective experiences in the common stream of the we-relation". Instead, as suggested also by Grathoff, the social world does tend to be experienced as having a more encompassing existence.

In addition to this direct experience of social reality, most people have what Schutz refers to as an indirect understanding of social existence related to shifts in social distance. As one moves away from the face-to-face relationship social relationships tend to get progressively anonymous. For example, an actor may have knowledge about h/her contemporaries, but never has or never will have a direct relationship with them. Even a direct relationship can be merely a "They" and not a "We" relationship. In such instances the actor does not act directly on the basis of the Other's subjective intentions, but in accordance with what are believed to be generally held motives.

The point here is that Schutz did not believe that every type of interaction could be based on a face-to-face encounter so that individuals might interact on the basis of reciprocally examined motives. In fact, Schutz contends
that a large part of our everyday actions are based on standards which are believed to be generally held by everyone. What is important to remember, however, is that phenomenology asserts that even these more anonymous (abstract) types of social interaction are the product of conscious intentionality. Schutz says that these more anonymous relationships are still consciously "oriented" relationships. Accordingly, a "They" relationship can always be transformed into a We-relation which is comprised of various direct actors. To Schutz even the most anonymous social relationship is not *sui generis* in nature, but is based on conscious or intentional action. Thus, Schutz avoids having these anonymous relationships coming to be viewed as ontologically abstract, instead of experientially general.

These anonymous meanings which Schutz speaks of are sometimes thought to be institutionalized. However, as Berger and Luckmann also show, these anonymous or institutional meanings maintain their assumed general nature only as a result of what they refer to as "habituation". They note that "institutionalization occurs whenever there is a reciprocal typification of habituated actions by types of actors". The establishment of institutional meanings proceeds through three stages which Berger and Luckmann identify as externalization, objectification, and internalization. In the first stage the actor intends or externalizes
actions, and, second, through reciprocal action negotiates those externalizations into commonly held objectives. The third stage is completed when those objectifications are retrojected through socialization. As a result of this process continuing over time, the meanings which are socialized tend to be viewed as habitual or anonymous relative to the socialization process itself. As Berger and Luckmann remind the reader, however, they do not "acquire an ontological status apart from the human activity that produced it [them]." 88

The point of citing the work of Berger and Luckmann is to illustrate how some sociologists have expanded upon Schutz's original work on the nature of anonymous social relationship, in order to provide an account of social institutions. This contention that social institutional meanings are social constructions has not remained, however, purely conjectural. The work of various ethnomethodologists, who claim to owe a large intellectual debt to Schutz, tends to support his contention. 89 Silverman and Jones, for example, illustrate that throughout the process of selecting individuals for employment, in an organization specifically established for that purpose, no clear cut criteria readily emerges to suggest how that activity is actually accomplished. Garfinkel and Zimmerman's work in social service organizations tends to suggest that workers conduct their everyday affairs on the basis of assumptions
that are not organizationally explicit. In terms of Bittner's long time work analyzing the nature of organizations, particularly police organizations, he has come to the conclusion that they are "corroborative" or contextually constructed.\textsuperscript{90} This phenomenologically informed research illustrates what Berger and Luckmann have called the "habituated" nature of institutional meanings; that is, individuals do not act on the basis of objective institutional meanings, but on assumptions about what should be done in a specific setting.

In sum, phenomenology adopts a version of social ontology as intentionally substantiated in a fashion similar to the way it grounds knowledge. Phenomenology does not understand the essence of the social to be grounded outside conscious experience and therefore does not comprehend the nature of the social to be either realistically or nominalistically grounded, but it is instead based on intersubjective action. When this is the case, all types of social structures must be understood to be the product of the "life-world" or human (inter-) action, even those institutional meanings which appear to be most anonymous. The "social" nature of group life, according to phenomenology, is based on a reciprocity of interlocked motives and, thus, the synchronization of the subjective experiences of various actors. This synchronization of inter-individual
experience is the ontological ground of the social world for phenomenology.

Concluding Statement: Social Order and Human Freedom

Schutz's social phenomenology, as phenomenology in general, states that social knowledge is not substantiated on some objective ground. Rather, all knowledge is believed to be an intentional correlate of human consciousness, and the activity of human consciousness is thought to specify the meaning of all worldly phenomena. Accordingly, phenomenology does not contend that the researcher should employ methodological procedures designed for the purpose of standardizing the data collectors process, so that objective information might be collected. In a neo-Kantian fashion, Schutz contends that a fully mediated Verstehen procedure should be employed for the purpose of capturing social knowledge. The researcher must understand the Other in her own terms if valid knowledge is ever to be maintained.

In line with this epistemological-methodological position, Schutz also says that the social world cannot be conceived as some supra-individual structure, à la Durkheim. Social life for Schutz is not some abstract entity, but instead is understood to be a process whereby interacting individuals mutually negotiate a set of "motivational" relevancies which guide interpersonal action. As Schutz suggests, the social world is based on an agreement which is
not supposed to be questioned; it is an interactive construction. The social world does not constrain the individual, but instead is subtended by conscious, intentional action.

Schutz was well aware of the general social implications of the way in which he, and phenomenology in general, outlined the ground of knowledge and the nature or ontological structure of social life. This is made particularly evident in an article which he wrote entitled "Equality and the Meaning Structure of the Social World". In this article Schutz reiterates the basic phenomenological claim that "all so-called objective meaning -- or better, meanings -- are again relative to the observer. ...". When understood in this manner he says that the social world is merely a system of "typifications", and that this conception of social life renders all systems "relativ". With this in mind he goes on to say that his view of the basic nature of social life immediately distinguishes his theory from that by Hobbes, Locke, Rousseau, and those theorists which he refers to as promulgating the modern theory of a Right of Nature. Schutz suggests that these authors are advancing a "general state of Nature", while he is not. What, however, is the importance of this distinction for Schutz?

To Schutz such concepts as equality and inequality, for example, are "relational notions", and as such have to
be defined relative to the "domain of relevancies to which they pertain". What Schutz is suggesting is that personal characteristics cannot be understood to have an absolute status, but instead must be viewed to be socially constructed. Stated simply, personal characteristics represent typifications which are defined. As Schutz goes on to contend, prejudices are the result of typifications becoming institutionalized, so that they support a myth, for instance, of racial inferiority. These typifications then become imposed on a particular group, and the group feels oppressed because its members do not view themselves prejoratively. These discriminatory practices do not represent a state of nature, but a social state.

For Schutz, this view on the nature of social institutions suggests new ways in which peoples' desire for freedom should be conceived. First, that legal rights should be based only on actions substantiated on social meaning, and not some a priori conceived characteristics. Second, sociologists should begin to think in terms of real and not merely formal equality before the law. That is, equality should not merely be equated with the successful assimilation of a minority group to the demands of a dominant social code. And third, freedom should not be understood to be merely an objective property, but is instead a subjectively held orientation. Schutz suggests that mere so-called objective overtures to freedom may have
little or no impact relative to ever providing a group with the ability to be self-determining. With this in mind the individual should have

the right to the pursuit of happiness ...
in terms of his own definition ... [and]
the maximum self-realization which this situation in social reality permits.\(^96\) [emphasis J.M.]

In an early article O'Neill raised the question "can phenomenology be critical?"\(^97\) From the exposition just provided by Schutz's notion of equality, I think the answer to this question is quite clear. That is, Schutz does seem to view this theory to be critical of all merely formal attempts to provide the individual with freedom. What Schutz suggests is that freedom can only be really actualized when the individual is capable of attaining self-actualization. Freedom, in this sense, is self-determination; self-determination as the realization of the intentionality which is indigenous to every actor. What Schutz contends is that there does in fact exist a "dialectic of the subjective and so-called objective meaning of laws", and "it is on this basis that human actions should be judged".\(^98\) This conception of freedom, of course, is totally consistent with his belief that all dimensions of social life are a product of the "life-world", in that all typifications must be viewed as relative (relativ, to Schutz) and not absolute. In this sense, Schutz's phenomenology is
certainly consistent with humanistic sociology, in that it grounds social life on human action and, thus, opens the door for unencumbered human expression.

Because the social actor, according to Schutz, does not encounter a social world which can be considered absolute or (metaphysically) objective, h/she has the capacity to shape the world in accordance with the intentional desires of consciousness. Freedom, therefore, is not primordially constrained (or formal) but is the essential or fundamental characteristic of intentionality, and can formulate an unlimited member of social (behavioral) options. When Schutz says that the sociologist should be concerned with real freedom, he is saying that the social actor should be viewed as capable of defining the parameters of the social world and, subsequently, should be allowed to act within the self-imposed limits of that definition.
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CHAPTER VI

CRITICAL THEORY

Critical theory is a term usually reserved to describe the type of theory advanced by a group of social philosophers which comprised what has come to be known as the "Frankfurt School", a label which was applied to these theorists ex post facto. The members of this group who will be specifically dealt with here will be Theodor Adorno, Max Horkheimer, Walter Benjamin, Herbert Marcuse, and Jürgen Habermas, in that they have perennially remained central to working out the fundamental theoretical themes of critical theory. The basic nature of this theory was originally outlined in two early seminal essays, one by Horkheimer and the other by Marcuse. Nevertheless, critical theory represents a style of enlightenment theorizing which runs from Kant to Marx, although in this instance the former is certainly subordinate to the latter. As might be expected, this intellectual heritage resulted in critical theory coming to view itself as anti-dogmatic, while simultaneously concerned with promoting social change due to its association with the thought of Karl Marx. In this sense, critical theory understood itself to be an oppositional
theory relative to that which was dominating philosophical and sociological circles at the time.

In Horkheimer's programmatic article on the nature of critical theory he basically contrasts critical theory with "traditional theory" in order to illustrate their respective points of view. He contends that traditional theory can be traced, for example, to the work of Descartes and Husserl. He believes that these individuals hold the key to understanding traditional theory because they both made major contributions to the development of the type of logic which it employs. These theorists in the opinion of Horkheimer advanced the idea that theory is correctly conceived when it is assumed to take the form of a deductively assembled chain of concepts. In order to insure that this is the case, Horkheimer says that "this traditional conception of theory shows a tendency ... towards a purely mathematical system of symbols". As a result of this tendency, "there are fewer names of experiential objects and ever more numerous mathematical symbols". What Horkheimer is asserting is that the sciences of man and society have attempted to follow the lead of the natural sciences, and that this has resulted in the systematic eliminating of human experience from the process of theorizing.

As a result of this approach to theorizing traditional theory has assumed an abstract form. Horkheimer believes that traditional theory's concern with maintaining the
pristine character of its deductively substantiated formulations has resulted in it being concerned with only data-collection, the formation of primary categories, the development of a logical calculus of behavioral probability, the separation of the investigator from the social world, and, finally, in the establishment of an abstract, closed system of thought. As Horkheimer says, "the general goal of all [traditional] theory is a universal systematic science, not limited to any particular subject matter but embracing all possible objects" [emphasis J.M.]. This approach to theory, however, results in its absolutization: As Horkheimer says,

Whenever the concept of theory ... is made autonomous (as if this concept were established by reference to the 'essence' of knowledge, or by some other ahistorical procedure), the concept is transformed into a reified, ideological category.

In short, traditional theory has become just too abstract, and as such has no essential connection to social life.

The concrete conception of theory advanced by critical theory stipulates another major difference between it and traditional theory. As Horkheimer states: "The critical theory of society ... has for its object men as producers of their own historical way of life in its totality". In a word, critical theory does not view itself to be ahistorical or fundamentally abstract in character, but instead perceives itself to be directly implicated in the world of
real social actors.

Its [critical theory's] opposition to the traditional concept of theory springs in general from a difference not so much of objects as of subjects. For men of the critical mind, the facts, as they emerge from the work of society, are not extrinsic in the same degree as they are for the savant or for members of other professions who will think like little savants.10 [emphasis J.M.]

Critical theory is not considered to be in the business of grand system building, the result of which might be the Cartesian style of behavioral explanation which Horkheimer finds so undesirable. This mode of accounting for individual actions is based solely on formal logic and not experience. For critical theory, instead, all theoretical development "rests on knowledge of man and nature which is stored up in the sciences and in historical experience".12

What Horkheimer appears to be doing is attempting to place theory on a more socially accessible base. Theory, as theoria, is no longer to be viewed in the traditional sense of pure speculation.13 As Horkheimer contends,

If we take individual concepts and judgments out of their context in the theory and compare them with concepts and judgments from an earlier version of the theory, contradictions arise.14

Theory is viewed by critical theory to be a historically grounded phenomenon which "constructs a developing picture of a society as a whole, an existential judgment with a historical dimension".15 What Horkheimer wants to do is render theory thoroughly social in nature, so that its
critical and developmental capacity might be used in the
service of human development. Stated succinctly, "its
[critical theory's] goal is man's emancipation from
slavery", and not the erection or reification of some
abstractly conceived system. Critical theory should
be able to work for and not against the social actor.

The fact that theory may rise into the
rarefied atmosphere of a hollow and
bloodless idealism or sink into
tiresome and empty phrasemongering,
does not mean that these forms are its
ture forms.

A similar line of thinking is also found in Marcuse's
portrayal of critical theory. Marcuse, likewise, believes
that theory should not be ethereal in nature. As he says,

What is true in philosophical concepts
was arrived at by abstracting from the
concrete status of man and is true only
in such abstraction.

Also like Horkheimer, any theory that is not grounded on
social experience is ideology. The truth of theory is not
to be found in an eternal consciousness, but only in the
consciousness of social actors who are continually develop­
ing. Traditional theory for Marcuse is interested in only
"pure" theoretical achievements, and because of this
"implies an avowal of bad facticity."

Critical theory means to show only
the specific social conditions at the
root of philosophy's inability to pose
the problem [of truth] in a more compre­
hensive way, and to indicate that any
other solution lay beyond that
philosophy's boundaries. [emphasis J.M.]
In a manner similar to Horkheimer, Marcuse believes that a valid theory is one which substantiates itself on the basis of a situationally developed social existence, instead of trying to determine what a specific social reality might potentially be *in abstracto*.

Marcuse also goes on to say that critical theory has as its aim the liberation of mankind. Liberation in this context refers to the "overcoming" of "mere necessity", so that the individual might be capable of action substantiated on the basis of reason and not compulsion. Liberation, therefore, means that persons should not be dominated by social institutions which are construed to be reified, and thus in opposition to the desires of social actors. Critical theory believes it is better able to accomplish this liberation as a result of it not being abstract, and concerned therefore with the erection of abstract truths which supposedly possess their own destiny. As Marcuse contends,

> Critical theory must concern itself to a hitherto unknown extent with the past -- precisely insofar as it is concerned with the future.

Previous theories, according to Marcuse, were only concerned with the collection of facts, a process which proceeded abstractly or *in vacuo*. When this is the case, human reason is presumed to be merely able to reflect those facts, and not capable of acting on or changing those facts. Critical
The point here has been to suggest that critical theory views itself to be an oppositional theory in a variety of ways. First, critical theory is not comprised of deductively established axioms, buttressed by abstract mathematical symbols. Second, critical theory does not attempt to divorce theory from the social world, in the form of abstract system building. Third, critical theory views social life to be a network of human activity, and not some functional or abstract scheme in which individuals are trapped. And fourth, critical theory does not view itself to be in the business of merely recording facts, to which social actors can merely respond, but instead believes that actors should be able to expose the validity limits of any fact, so that they might be capable of acting without reference to some scheme which is thought to be a priori valid in a universal manner.

Nevertheless, critical theory is somewhat more rigorous than humanistic sociology concerning the development of a comprehensive oppositional sociological theory. What this means can be stated quite simply. As central to its theoretical program it did formulate an oppositional stance relative to the traditional position taken on the nature social epistemology-methodology and social ontology. That is, due to the fact that critical theory is fundamentally concerned with facilitating human liberation, it might logically be
assumed that it would accordingly advance a social epistemological-methodological and social ontological position commensurate with this ideal. In fact, this is precisely the case. It is also the contention here that humanistic sociology might profit if it followed the developmental logic employed by critical theory in the attempt to advance a humanistic social theory. The task now, however, is to outline the developmental logic used by critical theory in formulating its general theoretical position.

Critical Theory: Epistemological-Methodological Position

In line with its general thrust to render social theory less abstract, critical theory advances an epistemological-methodological position which is substantiated on principles which have a social origin. In fact, the theorists who have generally been associated with critical theory tend to agree that social knowledge does not have some ethereally substantiated metaphysical base which is assumed to exist outside the social world, but instead is thought to be the product of historically situated social actors, (e.g., Adorno, Benjamin, Marcuse, Horkheimer and Habermas). These theorists also believe that this knowledge can only be uncovered by a methodology which is sensitive to the exigencies of social history.

Marcuse initiates his attempt to ground all knowledge on human action in an article in which he discusses what
he views to be the relationship between phenomenology and science. He rejects the traditional view of science as possessing an objective or trans-historical ground of existence, and as such producing truths which are thought to be untainted with the relativity which accompanies any historically grounded phenomenon. Marcuse is in full agreement with Husserl that science is grounded on what Husserl refers to as the Lebenswelt, or the "life-world".

As "our own empirical day-to-day world as it is given in immediate experience", the Lebenswelt is not merely the realm in which the so-called "pure" concepts of science receive their application. Instead, "the empirical reality [life-world] constitutes, in a specific sense, the very concepts which science believes are pure theoretical concepts". Because science attempts to leave the Lebenswelt (through its claim of value freedom), Marcuse argues, it "cancels the data and truth of immediate experience", while simultaneously preserving "them in a higher form, namely, in the ideational idealized form of universal validity".

The major point here, however, is that Marcuse is suggesting that scientific knowledge is a product of the human Lebenswelt, and therefore is not objective in character. As Marcuse says, "as long as this empirical a priori [Lebenswelt] remains hidden and unexamined, scientific rationality itself contains its inner and own irrational
core which it cannot master". Although he questions whether or not Husserl's philosophical program will result in knowledge being returned to its human ground, Marcuse wants all knowledge to be viewed as substantiated by the Lebenswelt, and not by some domain that possesses a telos divorced from human projects.

Both Marcuse and Adorno make a similar point in their respective discussions of the idea of essence, which has traditionally implied that a type of ahistorical knowledge could be uncovered which is capable of surviving the passing change of all appearances. What Marcuse wants to do is to "historicize" the notion of essence, and by doing so eliminate its oppressive potential when conceived ahistorically. He therefore conceptualizes an essence as

... the totality of the social process as it is organized in a particular historical epoch.30

[emphasis J.M.]

Marcuse holds that positivism, even though it originally revolted against such metaphysical notions as essence, has advanced another form of essence in the form of its adherence to ideas such as "presuppositionlessness", "pure theory", and "ethical neutrality", which results in the belief in absolutely real facts. In the face of this newest attempt to resurrect a belief in the existence of essences, Adorno contends that

In sharp contrast to the usual ideal of science, the objectivity of dialetical
cognition needs not less subjectivity but more.\textsuperscript{32}

Here, again, the attempt is made to ground knowledge on social existence.

This idea that knowledge must be grounded in the experience of social life is also manifest in the ontologizing efforts of both Adorno and Marcuse. In his debate with Husserl's work Adorno indicates that Husserl has absolutized the fundamental nature of all phenomena by prescribing them an abstract essence.\textsuperscript{33} Adorno even suggests that Being itself is thoroughly linguistic in nature, and therefore not a mere theoretical substance.\textsuperscript{*}

It is a fact that if concepts are to be concepts at all they must mean something, and this fact serves as a vehicle for the thesis that their ντοκειμενον [hypokeimenon] Being itself, must be meaningful because it is not otherwise than as a concept, a linguistic meaning.\textsuperscript{34}

In this sense, Being is intimately associated with linguisticity. This approach to grounding knowledge will also appear in the work of Benjamin. Nevertheless, for Adorno the word "is ... has a 'state of facts' corresponding to it". But, as Adorno goes on to say, "the 'state of facts' is a matter of intentionality, not of being".\textsuperscript{35}

Marcuse's attempt at ontologizing was not so much concerned with characterizing the nature of Being, as with

\textsuperscript{*}Being in this context refers to the meaning of a social phenomenon, or its "essential" social characteristics.
establishing a possible (less abstract) ontological ground for a more rational social order. At first Marcuse appears to be advancing a biological ground for social order possibly similar to that which is promulgated by early American sociologists in the form of "social forces". However, Marcuse definitely has something different in mind, for he does not say that social life is grounded on a set of principles thought to exist *sui generis*, as do those who believe that social existence is sustained by metaphysical factors such as "social forces". Rather, Marcuse says that all biological principles are "mediated", which means that their form is a result of "the individual's own doing and undoing". The biological realm, for Marcuse, does not refer to a metaphysical ground of social life, but rather to a "living space" which is thoroughly articulated in terms of human action. The human individual is thought by Marcuse to possess a "polymorph perverse" character, in that all fundamental or sustaining factors of social life are believed shaped by human labor, and therefore do not possess an ahistorical or *a priori* meaning. Marcuse attempts to ground social life on this humanly developed biological sphere.

Benjamin's attempt at grounding existence takes a linguistic form similar to that suggested earlier when discussing Adorno's reproach to the traditional conception of Being, or the ground of existence. As Benjamin says,
An existence entirely without relationship to language is an idea; but this idea can bear no fruit even within that realm of ideas whose circumference defines the idea of God.39

The question which Benjamin goes on to ask is, however, what does language communicate? His answer is as follows:

"Language therefore communicates the linguistic being of things...."40

Benjamin, nevertheless, is much more specific about the relationship of language to the being of things, and the implications of the way in which he views this relationship. Language does not have a speaker who merely conveys an object of meaning which has an existence which exceeds the dimension filled and expanded by language.

For in language the situation is thus:
the linguistic being of all things is their language.41

What Benjamin is suggesting is that the "is" of any thing must be assessed in terms of its linguistic signification and not some external measure. On this point Benjamin has the following comment:

For just because nothing is communicated through language, what is communicated in language cannot be externally limited or measured, and therefore all language contains its own uncommensurable, uniquely constituted infinity.42

In Benjamin's view man's being itself is linguistic, and it is through this being that the world gains its meaning. It is the human ability to name, or intensify the world linguistically, which differentiates the language of humankind
from that of things.

For Benjamin the task of every individual is to convey the being of the world "mediated" in language. For if the individual does not name the world, Benjamin believes that no world will appear.

Later on Habermas attempts to avoid the erection of "pure" knowledge as the ground of social life by insisting that all knowledge is grounded on human "interests". Indeed, socially unmediated knowledge is an impossibility. As Habermas contends,

Knowledge-constitutive interests
mediate the natural history of the
human species with the logic of its
self-formative process.43

These interests exist coterminously with the emergence of the human species, in the constitution of its basic nature through "work and interaction". In this sense, the so-called basic condition of life itself is mediated through "knowledge-constitutive interests", both in terms of biological or evolutionary demands.

Manifestly, Habermas rejects the traditional (positivistic) meaning of pure theory which "severs the cognitive process from the life contexts in principle".44 Instead he holds that cognitive processes are in all life structures and accordingly, "a life structure" is an interest structure.45 In accordance with this mediation-al process, Habermas asserts that "interest is attached to
actions that both establish the conditions of possible knowledge and depend on cognitive processes". "Knowledge-constitutive interests" are, moreover, grounded on self-reflective action, that is socially grounded action.

This sampling of the writing of a variety of the key figures associated with critical theory does reveal that they ground knowledge on human experience or action, be it linguistically or cognitively outlined. Each of these authors suggests that he rejects a tradition which tends to remove the ground of knowledge or reason from the social world, in order to establish it as an abstract form. For these critical theorists this mode of grounding knowledge is simply not appropriate.

In line with this desire to ground knowledge on a base which is substantiated by human action, critical theory also employs a method of securing knowledge which is not abstract in nature. On this issue of delimiting an appropriate social methodology, critical theory also views itself to be in direct opposition to mainstream sociology. The position against which critical theory is reacting has gone by a variety of names, e.g., empiricism, abstract rationalism, logical-positivism, but most often is referred to as simply positivism.

Critical theory objects to positivism in that out of its zealously "for clarity and exactness, it could fail
to apprehend that which it intends to apprehend". That is, positivism could totally miss the social life which it purports to be able to circumscribe without bias. As Adorno says, however, "methods do not rest on methodological ideals but rather upon reality". Adorno argues that positivism tends to develop methods for their own sake, and therefore has systematically ignored social life as it is actually lived. As Adorno asserts, these methods have frequently remained inappropriate to the living tradition of knowledge; they have trimmed the latter in accordance with a conception of science, an inductive or deductive continuum, which is alien and external to this living tradition.

In short, positivism to Adorno is just too abstract in its conceptualization of social life. If sociology is not to succumb to dogmatism, Adorno states that "it must transform the concepts that it brings from the outside into those which the object [of investigation] by itself has ...", so that social life can be correctly apprehended. [emphasis J.M.]

The point here is that for critical theory positivism is not an appropriate methodology for gathering socially grounded information. This is due to the fact that positivism engages in what Horkheimer sees as the manipulation of "concepts as though they were intellectual atoms". He sees this as a strategy of natural science, which results in the piecing together of statements which in turn are
formulated into indirectly related systems of thought of a mechanical character. This mechanical nature is held together by "traditional logic", which means that

The positivist would discriminate against any kind of thought that does not conform perfectly to the postulates of organized science.52

For Horkheimer such a hypostatization of the human condition is not valid, and actually comprises what refers to in another article as "the latest attack on metaphysics".53

What is at issue here is the way in which positivism conceptualizes data and the way it believes such information can be most profitably gathered. As Horkheimer says,

The ideal it [positivism] pursues is knowledge in the form of a mathematically formulated universal science deducible from the smallest possible number of axioms, a system which assures the calculation of the probable occurrence of all events.54

To this end, "empiricism rejects the notion of the subject in toto".55 By pursuing this path, however, science has eliminated the discerning facet of social life which actually specifies the significance of data. Horkheimer goes on to assert,

Empiricism, however, by eliminating the subject has eliminated the critically discriminating factor, and has therefore obliterated all distinction between the concept of the datum and anything else, so that datum, fact, and object merely seem to possess determinate meaning.56 [emphasis J.M.]
Of course this view results in a belief in the obtrusiveness of facticity, and a *de facto* denial of the "human quotient" in social life. However, as Horkheimer notes, empiricism fails completely when it has to produce "a picture of living things" which becomes clear "only at the close of the intellectual process".\(^{57}\) [emphasis J.M.]

In carrying out the mandates of this type of abstract science, Horkheimer objects to its over-reliance upon mathematics, algebraic logic, the syllogism, and the highly formal operations which are used to gather social data, because they remove the element of judgment from the entire research process, and with it social meaning.\(^{58}\) In social life, however,

> The 'given' is not something immediate, common to all, but is mediated by the whole configuration of knowledge in which these [protocol] sentences occur....\(^{59}\)

Horkheimer then goes on to suggest that the abstract protocol sentences of algebraic logic, for example, have an entirely different historical meaning than, say, the language of everyday life, and that one cannot ontologically be reduced to the other if either is to be properly understood. However, when primacy is given to the abstract protocol sentences of science when gathering information, inadvertently concern is not directed to the "interpretation of living reality, to thought in process, but merely to static expression".\(^{60}\) Science, therefore, misses the social world.
Adorno also suggests that positivism uses classificatory concepts which are insensitive to the social process because of their alliance with formal logic. He also insists that positivism's use of statistical procedures produces a style of information which is "turned into statements which, following the laws of probability, are generalizable and independent of individual variations". However, he contends that this procedure has tended to paint an obscure picture of social life.

Society ... the aggregate of all the relationships ... within whose context men act, is something which the empirical methods ... have ignored....” Adorno even goes on to suggest that these positivistic methods, because of their adherence to supposedly universal classificatory categories, labor to create the data they collect, and, in Adorno's words, hold "a Medusa-like mirror to a society similarly atomized and organized according to abstract classificatory categories". These categories are quantitative or technological in the worst sense, while Adorno goes on to say that social data has a fundamentally "qualitative" dimension which positivism ignores. When the positivist formulates social laws on the basis of a distinction between the quantitative and qualitative dimensions of social life, the particularity or the meaning which is indigenous to a social setting is not readily reconciled with the universal world of facts.
In his debate with Popper's work over the merits of positivism as a proper method for social scientific inquiry, Habermas makes the following comment:

One would thus recognize the concept of 'facts' in positivism as a fetish which merely grants to the mediated the illusion of immediacy. 67

Although stated in somewhat obscure Hegelian language, this is Habermas' way of stating that positivism is not sensitive to the world of daily life which is always mediated, and therefore conceptualizes that life quite abstractly. Elsewhere Habermas says that knowledge as it is conceived by the (traditional) empirical sciences "is not on the same level as the action-orienting self-understanding of social groups". 68 This is the case as a result of the fact that "they create a deductive connection which excludes a retrospective correction of the standards [used for measurement] through the thing measured". 69 To Habermas when sociology is conceived to be "a strict behavioral [empirical-analytical] science questions relating to the self-understanding of social groups cannot be formulated". 70 [emphasis J.M.] Stated simply, positivism cannot therefore gather accurate or concrete social data, in "that the replacement of epistemology by the philosophy of science is visible in that the knowing subject is no longer the system of reference", and all subsequent information which it portrays by positivism. 66
collects is as metaphysical as that formulated by the speculative theories which positivism set out to criticise.

In opposition to positivism critical theory advances an alternative view of how data should be conceptualized. This alternative view takes two forms: (1) a dialectical and (2) a hermeneutic methodology. In both cases, however, the main point is that the researcher should be sensitive to the way social actors define the meaning of the social setting to be investigated, as opposed to being concerned with mere methodological rigor.

The thrust of these theorists' dialectical methodology will be addressed first. As Horkheimer asserts,

Dialectical logic has reference to thought involved in the interpretation of living reality, to thought in process, and not to mere static expression.\textsuperscript{72}

This process involves both the Darstellung-Forschung problematic.\textsuperscript{73} In order to describe how dialectical logic differs from formal logic Horkheimer cites how Hegel's logic advanced, for example, over that proposed by Aristotle. According to formal logic its general categories are supposed to be conceived as established \textit{sui generis}, and are thought to be merely sharpened by the so-called particulars that are uncovered during any investigation. Nevertheless, the general concepts which are assumed from the outset of any investigation are used to identify and classify potential data without their applicability ever being called into
question. Dialectical logic, on the other hand, realizes that it must not only collect or "research" data, but that it must also "present" or construct such information. The implication here is that through the process of researching data it can be illustrated that its presentation might best proceed through a reconstruction of the original categories which were used to orient the investigation. In this sense, the original categories are not only sharpened by an investigation, but can be transformed so as to adequately grasp the actual situation to be investigated.

As Horkheimer goes on to say,

Dialectical thought integrates the empirical constituents into structures of experience which are important not only for the limited purposes served by science, but also for the historical interests with which dialectic thought is connected.74

Dialectical methodology is thought to be embedded in historical interests, while simultaneously being capable of adequately grasping the experience of those interests. In short, according to the dialectical method "... individual facts always appear in a definite connection which enters into every concept and which seeks to reflect reality in its totality".75

Adorno also proposes a methodology as a substitute for positivism which he understands to be dialectical in character.76 As Adorno asserts, "dialectics would like to confront scientism in the latter's own sphere in so far as it strives
for a more correct recognition of contemporary reality". What Adorno contends is that dialectics help to subvert the curtain that science creates which in fact eventually labors to cover reality. This cover, to Adorno, pertains to the facade of generality which positivism claims to be capable of weaving around social facticity. In contrast to this way of viewing the social world,

The crucial difference between the dialectical concept of totality is that the dialectical concept of totality is intended 'objectively', namely, for the understanding of every social individual observation, whilst positivistic systems theories wish, in an uncontradictory manner, to incorporate observations in a logical continuism, simply through the selection of categories as general as possible. The only objectivity for Adorno is that which is contextually or socially defined. What Adorno is saying, basically, is that the social world can only be clearly understood when it is understood in its own terms. In Adorno's words, "clarity is only accorded to subjective consciousness". In order that this type of clarity might be obtained, social phenomena must be interpreted, which means to "perceive something in the features of totality's social givenness". This givenness is provided only linguistically.

Dialectics appropriates for the power of thought what historically seemed to be a flaw in thinking: its link with language which nothing can wholly break.
As Adorno states, "assured of the real determination of phenomena by their concept, our experience cannot pro-
pound this concept ontologically, as truth-in-itself". 82 Although Adorno uses Kantian language his point is clear. That is, dialectics does not attempt to uncover social truth on a vacuum, as an objective "in-itself", but rather in terms of its "social constellation", or subjectively created context". 83 With this in mind, Adorno says the following:

The most modest task for empirical social research ... would be for it to confront all its statements on the subjective experience, conscious and unconscious, of human beings and human groups, with the objective factors determining their existence. The differences which thereby become apparent between social objectivity and the consciousness ... of that objectivity marks a point at which empirical research breaks through the analysis of society.84 Objectivity is the self-consciousness schema under which the subject brings its otherness.85

In a dialectical manner Adorno tends to believe that only through social consciousness rupturing with itself, that is, by looking at the contradictory nature of objectivity claims which are substantiated consciously, can a social context be investigated in terms of its constellation

*A constellation in this case does not merely refer to a backdrop or context with which all behavior is supposed to take place. A constellation, for Adorno, is thought to be the action frame of reference which is defined as the point of departure for properly understanding all social behavior.
meaning, or the "subjective thoughts, feelings of those whom it [science] is investigating". This analysis is objective, however, in that individuals are not to be analyzed in isolation from their social setting, which is social and not radically subjective.

In his discussion of the problems associated with positivism, Habermas advances a strange hybrid methodology. Habermas suggests that a methodology is appropriate when it does not employ concepts which exist outside the phenomenon to be investigated in order to provide an adequate account of it. As Habermas says, the social world cannot be fruitfully investigated

... by any a priori or empiricist immediacy of approach, but is rather only to be explored dialectically in conjunction with the natural hermeneutics of the social life-world.

Accordingly, "the hypothetico-deductive system of statements is replaced by a hermeneutic explanation of meaning". In this sense, the meaning of symbols gain its determinacy through their integration into a context of meaning. The social world cannot, therefore, for Habermas be formally described if it is to be accurately portrayed. It must be unveiled in terms of

... pre-scientifically accumulated experience which has not yet excluded, as merely subjective elements, the basic resonance of a life-historically centered social environment, that is, the education acquired by the total human subject.
Sometimes Habermas refers to the methodology which he is advancing as hermeneutic, while at other times it is called dialectic. In the words of Habermas, a dialectical methodology also "retains the subjectively intended meaning in the examination of the prevailing traditions". It is well known that Habermas was critical of the hermeneutic tradition for its conservative tendencies, yet he always seems to have believed that both the hermeneutic and dialectical method could produce more accurate data than is possible by positivism.

In terms of advancing an epistemological-methodological position the following can be said of critical theory. Critical theory grounds social knowledge within the realm filled by social or human experience. By doing this it wants to avoid the possibility of advancing a base on which ahistorical truths could be established. These critical theorists believe this can be accomplished by proclaiming that all truths must be historical, or, as Adorno says, all Being must have its "fundamentum in re". For these theorists only traditional theory hopes to substantiate itself on rarefied principles. Totally in line with this epistemological position, these theorists also believe that a methodology should likewise have an allegiance to the social world and not to a set of absolute or formal standards. These theorists contend that positivism is concerned with maintaining its own methodological integrity to
the extent that it is not sensitive to the nuances of the social world. In opposition to positivism these authors advance a dialectic methodology and a dialectical-hermeneutical methodology, both of which, even though they belong to different intellectual traditions, they believe can better capture the individually and collectively intended meanings of a social setting than is possible with positivism. It is believed by these theorists that only a methodology which can capture social meanings is an appropriate methodology for the social sciences.

Critical Theory: Social Ontological Position

Throughout the history of critical theory its proponents have advanced what has come to be known as a critique of domination. Accordingly, in the Hegelian terms used by Marcuse, this means that the "immediacy" of society would have to be dissolved, so that it might be rendered "mediate" and not mimetic. For social domination to be dissolved, social order would have to be understood as arriving through human action, which would make it a rational "project", to use the Sartrean term again suggested by Marcuse. In this sense it might be expected that the social ontology which these critical theorists outline will likewise be "mediated", which, in the traditional sense, means that it could not be grounded sui generis or operate "behind the backs" of individual social actors to insure
social order.

In an introductory sociology textbook published under the auspices of the Frankfurt Institute for Social Research a preliminary clue is provided as to the direction these critical theorists will take in terms of developing their social ontology. In this book the social ontological positions which are usually referred to as social nominalism and social realism are critiqued. When the "reality" of the social world is conceived in either of these two ways the real on-going (inter-actional) nature of social life tends to be overlooked. A similar concern is echoed by Marcuse in his critique of the classic rendition of the liberal state. Marcuse seems to like the liberal conception of the state in that at least in theory it tends to place the responsibility for constructing social existence on the individual. Nevertheless, the metaphysical ground of the liberal state is just too formal for Marcuse to accept. To Marcuse the liberal conception of social order simultaneously advances a state mechanism for securing social cohesion which is abstract, in that it is thought to embody the alienated power of individuals. At this point, however, Marcuse instructs the reader that "... there is no such thing as 'society' as a subject outside the individual". He then goes on to quote Marx to say that "the individual is the social being", and that society is an abstraction when conceived vis-a-vis the individual. Horkheimer
suggests a similar theme when in his discussion on the nature of authority and the family he says that society should not be conceived as separate from the individual, in that such an arrangement results in individual repression. Instead he argues that felicity is possible only when there is "a living awareness in each member of a self-determining human society that all happiness flows from work in common".99

The point here is that these theorists do not want "society" to be conceived abstractly, so that it can be reified and take on a form which can suppress individual propensities for action. Yet the question remains to be answered, how did these critical theorists conceive society to be ordered? Some insight into the answer to this question was provided by the earlier generation of Frankfurt theorists, while more in-depth answers were provided to this inquiry by a variety of persons associated with the later development of critical theory.

Adorno, for example, has the following to say about the nature of the "social".

Social totality does not lead a life of its own over and above that which it unites and of which it, in its turn, is composed.100

Adorno then goes on to say that a society can produce and reproduce itself through "its individual moments".101 Again in Hegelian language this notion of individual "mementos"
refers to historically created manifestations. In the Hegelian sense, however, all "moments" are mediated by human action, and therefore

This totality [social] can no more be detached from life, from the co-operation and the antagonism of its elements than can an element be understood merely as it functions without insight into the whole which has its source [Wesen] in the motion of the individual himself.102

As should be immediately noted Adorno is not describing the nature of the social as a reality sui generis, or as the mere sum of individuals subsisting in a basically ontologically individual manner. Instead, Adorno says that the "system and individual entity are reciprocal and can only be apprehended in their reciprocity".103

Habermas goes on to say that Adorno's conception of the "social" is dialectical, in the Hegelian sense.104 He also contends that Adorno's view on the nature of the social fundamentally subverts the Gestalt axiom that the sum of any phenomenon is more than its parts. Because Adorno's theory of the nature of the social is Hegelian in character, the reader can assume that the individual and the social interpenetrate, in a manner similar to the categories of Hegelian logic. Nevertheless, the reader does not have to merely speculate about the nature of this interpenetration, for Adorno does supply some additional insight into exactly how the individual moments of a social
order are united. As Adorno says, essential relationships determine the nature of society.\textsuperscript{105} These relations, again to use a Hegelian term of which Adorno is fond of employing, are mediated, not by the immediacy of exchange value, but in terms of use-value. When Adorno says this he is advancing a marxian distinction between abstract value and value which is grounded on human sensuousness. Therefore when he suggests that the relationships which are social reality are the embodiment of activities which create use-value, he is simultaneously asserting these relationships are the result of human action, and are not coordinated through the efforts of some abstract vehicle. What Adorno says elsewhere is that mechanical causes cannot be understood to unite the whole, but this can be done "only in the concept, in the purpose".\textsuperscript{106} The "concept", another Hegelian term which Adorno recurrently employs, in this sense does not refer to an abstract telos or to unmediated ratio (reason), but instead to the gradual unfolding of human action.

In the general sociology text published by the Frankfurt Institute, although Connerton suggests that the book was mostly written by Adorno and Horkheimer,\textsuperscript{107} the nature of the social is described in the following manner:

\begin{quote}
The two, individual and society, are complementary concepts.\textsuperscript{108}
\end{quote}

Following this, the reader is informed that

\begin{quote}
The pure concept of society is just as abstract as the pure concept of the
individual, and abstract too is the allegedly external antithesis between the two. 109

What the reader is being told is that "human life is essentially and not merely accidentally, social life". 110 To the authors of this text social life is not the mere product of some abstract force, nor the result of some haphazard connection made between social atoms. Rather, social life is social action.

Although the next tack to outlining the nature of the social was certainly suggested in the work of Benjamin 111 and Marcuse, 112 Habermas was the critical theorist who tried to explain most concretely just how the norms which guide the exchange process suggested by Adorno are established. In the case of Benjamin, the social world is portrayed as a story which needs to be retold, and the storyteller is believed to provide counsel for those who are interested in the meaning of a particular social world. Marcuse, on the other hand, suggests that a rational social order is developed only on the basis of the possibility of the Other and the I creating a mutually acceptable social domain. In a word, social life is thought to be a hermeneutic encounter, in that language is at the base of both authors' view of how social order might be created. Habermas tends to bring this latent tradition in critical theory to a head when he proclaims that "social systems are seen here as life-worlds that are symbolically structured." 113
Habermas, however, is clearer elsewhere as to what he means by this mode of securing social order. What should be remembered at this juncture is that he is grounding social life on the Husserlian notion of the "life-world", which is the social ground of individual/social experience. What Habermas contends is that the current state of theory only allows individuals "to encounter one another indirectly, that is, across an objective something that they themselves are not".114 This type of ordering principle for Habermas is not rational, in that it is objective and therefore not thought to be ontologically related to the individuals who inhabit the social world. Habermas, rather, wants to ground social order on "generalizable interests, which can become general because they "can be communicatively shared", not because they are objective a priori.115 With this in mind, the following conception of the social promulgated by Habermas can begin to be brought into focus.

Societies are also systems, but their mode of development does not follow solely the logic of the expansion of system autonomy (power); social evolution transpires within the bounds of the logic of the life-world, the structures of which are determined by linguistically produced intersubjectivity and are based on criticizable validity claims.116

True to the originators of critical theory, Habermas says that all systems of institutions are thoroughly "socially related".117
As Habermas then goes on to say,

Institutionalization again means the organization of consensual action resting on inter-subjectively recognized validity claims. These legitimacy claims are not, however, grounded on the type of objective standards which substantiate the style of inter-subjectivity, for example, which is present in the consensus theories of meaning advanced by Chomsky or positive science. Rather, "social systems can be viewed as networks of communicative action...." Communicative action is, moreover, based on norms that "link reciprocal expectations". The background norms which underpin, as Habermas says, the ability of a "we" to be understood as you's which can become a you for another person, is based on contingency and not absolute or objective standards. Instead, the ground of all reciprocity must be "reciprocally defined". In this sense, the base of all social interaction is based on an inter-subjectively negotiated frame of "communicative competence". As Habermas goes on to say, therefore, "a theory of communicative competence can thus be developed in terms of universal pragmatics".

The point here is that Habermas understands the entire process of outlining reciprocal expectations to be linguistic, and the social world itself is the interlocking of these expectations. Authors such as Apel have picked up this theme and proceeded to ground social life
transcendently, so that normative social order comes to be understood to be "transcendental semiotic". Luhmann, likewise, expanded upon Habermas' initial theme, and in so doing began to describe social life as a network of "social relevancies" which are grounded on social or temporal possibilities. Another critical theory devotee, Claus Offe, tends to believe that social order is based on ideology which must be inculcated, in that to him no real or material social linkages in fact exist to unite the "social". Without going into extreme detail concerning these newest developments in critical theory, it can be said that each of these theorists wanted to ground the nature of the social on interaction per se, which is hermeneutically and not structurally substantiated.

All-in-all, it can be stated that these critical theorists strove through their theorizing to ground social life on social action. In this sense, social life was not to be understood to be abstractly realistic or nominastic in character. In an Hegelian sense, the social and the individual were to be interpenetrating moments in the development of the social. Later on, primarily in the work of Habermas, this abstract Hegelian rendition of social order was dropped for one that is based on linguistic competence which must be rendered through the fusion of "life-worlds". Nevertheless, throughout the history of critical theory the nature of the "social" was not reified,
but instead thoroughly grounded on social action so that it would have to remain responsive to individual demands.

Concluding Comment: Social Order and Human Freedom

To use Habermas' term, critical theory in general views all knowledge to be grounded on human "interests", although this notion assumes a different form with each respective critical theorist. Social knowledge, therefore, is not for critical theory thought to be objective by nature, rather it is presumed to be a human product. As a result of this, critical theory advances two methodological positions, both of which, however, claim to make an advance over positivism. Critical theory contends that both a dialectical and a hermeneutic methodology are more sensitive than positivism to the human meaning which is believed to be intrinsic to any object of knowledge. Both of these methods are grounded on the assumption that a methodology should be self-reflective, so that it can grasp the fragile meaning of social objects as they reside in their humanly constructed milieu.

Critical theory, likewise, does not believe that the social is something which exists as an object categorically divorced from human "interests". In a true Hegelian sense, critical theory asserts that the individual and the social are both moments in one singular movement. To be more specific, throughout the development of critical theory
the social world has been portrayed as a hermeneutic encounter, in which social actors inter-personally establish standards of communicative competence serving as the evaluative criterion against which all behavior is to be judged. In short, the social world is also thought by critical theory to be a human product, and not some abstract system within which legitimate social action must be actualized.

The general social theory which has been advanced by critical theory embodies what Marcuse refers to as the Great Refusal.\textsuperscript{125} The current society is thought by Marcuse to be "irrational as a whole."\textsuperscript{126} This irrationality stems from the fact that it is viewed by Marcuse to be "destructive of the free development of human need and facilities...."\textsuperscript{127} Critical theory is thought to oppose this state of affairs in that it is believed to proffer a theory of "transcendence."\textsuperscript{128} That is, critical theory strives to open the world for social action, instead of attempting to reconcile all human possibilities with the prevailing social structure, which critical theory believes truncates the range of possible human action. What critical theory wants to accomplish is the resurrection of the original faculty of choice which labored to establish the current social order, and which has been forgotten. The result of this forgottenness has been the erection of a social order which is no longer thought to be responsive
to human needs, and therefore dictates what is humanly possible. In opposition to this, critical theory wants to have all social order viewed as a "project". As Marcuse suggests, when social life is understood to be a project (in the Sartrean sense) human freedom "is the possibility, even the necessity, of going beyond, negating every given situation in existence, because in relation to men's possibilities every situation itself is negativity, a barrier, 'something other'". In short, when social life is viewed to be the result of a human project (creation) it does not limit behavior, but defines it, and therefore opens the world for unencumbered freedom.

The present technological society is thought by critical theory to be oppressive because it is understood to be abstractly universal. When this is the case society is hypostatized so that the parts of the assumed social order are dominated by the whole. Critical theory believes that this state of affairs is reinforced by epistemological theories such as empiricism and positivism which portray social life as objective, and essentially unconnected to social action. The hypostatization of the social world is also believed to be the result of it being portrayed in a cosmological-like fashion, which conveys the idea that society is an autonomous system of functions. As Marcuse contends, however, it is the particular powers which have organized the whole of society. This is what
Marcuse has in mind when he proclaims that society is a project, in that in actuality society embodies the freedom of choice which constructed it. Marcuse describes the existence of social life as follows:

Through the various individual agents and layers of experience, through the different "projects" which guide the modes of thought from the business of everyday life of science and philosophy, the interaction between a collective subject and a common world persists and constitutes the objective validity of the universals.134

As should be immediately noted, this view on the nature of social life is expressed in the epistemological-methodological and social ontological position advanced by critical theory. Critical theory grounds all knowledge on social action and experience, while its methodology attempts to preserve the integrity of all human experience. The social ontology which critical theory advances is also thoroughly mediated by human action, and its individual moments interpenetrate like the categories of Hegelian logic. Society and the individual are not therefore mutually exclusive logical categories, but substantiate each other. In this sense, individual action is thoroughly social and capable of self-direction. As Habermas says, therefore,

The validity claims of [social] norms is grounded not in the irrational volitional acts of the contrasting parties, but in the rationally motivated recognition of norms, which may be questioned at any time.135
As Habermas suggests, such normative action is rational in that it is based on the freedom produced by a self-reflective questioning process and not compulsion.

The general social theory which critical theory unveils is certainly consistent with this desire to have society grounded on rationally motivated human action in that society has no hidden metaphysical base on which a compulsively established (restrictive) social order might eventually be established. Therefore, as Adorno says, freedom cannot be based on "reaction", but "spontaneity" which unites internality (the person) and externality (the social), so that the resulting social world is the agent of, and not the barrier to, human expression. Social laws, for example, are no longer thought to be the legitimate ground of choice, but instead social action. Social action (project) outlines its own boundaries, and is therefore ultimately self-determining. The subject is now primordially free because it constitutes its own identity, while simultaneously providing the social with its identity. Fundamental freedom is present here, in that freedom is not conceived to be merely a reaction to social demands (which would limit freedom), but additionally encompasses the ability of the individual to create those demands.
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CHAPTER VII

YUGOSLAVIAN (PRAXIS) MARXISM

Yugoslavian marxism in this dissertation refers to the style of marxist philosophy advanced by what has come to be known as the "Praxis Group". This group of marxist philosophers and sociologists have come to be widely known as "... Marxist heretics in a socialist country whose hallmark has been the rejection of Marxist dogma...." As Erich Fromm says in his Forward to Marković's book, From Affluence to Praxis, the marxism of the "Praxis Group" represents to him an attempt to resurrent the original sentiments of marxist humanism, and not the perpetuation of the type of dogmatic, naturalistic marxism which he believes is promulgated by, for example, the Soviet Union. As Fromm sees it, these marxists did not attempt to base their theory on pure speculation, the end result of which would be the establishment of a complete metaphysical system. Instead, Fromm believes that these marxists have attempted to outline a social theory which has its roots in man. Marković, one of the most influential members of the "Praxis Group", says that his theoretical view is definitely marxist, but not "lazy", superficial, reductive
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The "Praxis Group" is an amorphous group of social theorists who coalesced around the philosophy journal *Praxis*, published in Yugoslavia. In this chapter, the work of a few key members of this group is analyzed, i.e., Petrović, Marković, and Stojanović, in that their work is representative of this group and also readily available to the English reader.

In Marković's portrayal of the basic philosophical tenets of the "Praxis Group" he begins to outline the general implications of their mode of marxist philosophy. He says that these implications pertain to five generic areas of inquiry. These are as follows: (1) the conception of philosophy, (2) the starting point of philosophy, (3) philosophical method, (5) ontological, epistemological, and axiological views, and (5) social action. These implications pertain to the general direction which these "Praxis Group" philosophers believe marxist philosophy should take, however their theoretical invectives were directed to a real political adversary, and it is in terms of this adversary that their actual theoretical program must be understood. This adversary is what is commonly referred to as Stalinism.

These Yugoslav marxists believe that philosophy should not merely represent the attempt to accumulate abstract fragments of knowledge. Rather, it should attempt
to capture any social situation in total, as a total form. Likewise, philosophy should take the form of a critical consciousness, rather than "a totality of positive scientific knowledge." In this sense, the philosophy of the "Praxis Group" is to embody a critical assessment of social knowledge as it presents itself in its historically situated location, and not abstractly.

The philosophy of the "Praxis Group" also seeks a new philosophical starting point. This starting point should not be the usual "abstract, ahistorical, and dualistic" ground from which traditional philosophy extends. Instead, the central problem for these philosophers is not the resuscitation of the perennial question of Being, but instead is the social world, and its substantiation by praxis. These philosophers are more concerned with how the social world is grounded, and how that grounding can be secured in a manner that will promote "human self-realization". They do not want to pursue rarefied questions, but instead are only interested in initiating their philosophical endeavors from a concrete base, or the social world.

Because of this stress on maintaining a less abstract ground of philosophizing than is usually the case, these Yugoslavs likewise want to employ a methodology which is also not abstract. These marxists believe that the so-called orthodox marxists have advanced a rendition of the
dialectical method which has taken the form of "a set of ready-made fixed, \textit{a priori} rules that could be applied to any given context, celestial mechanics as well as the history of a revolution".\textsuperscript{10} In opposition to this, Marković says that the

Dialectic according to this [the Praxis Groups] conception is neither a structure of an absolute, abstract spirit (as in Hegel) nor a general structure of nature (as in Engels) but a general structure of human historical praxis and its essential aspect -- critical thinking.\textsuperscript{11}

When conceived in this manner, social reality can "be approached as a concrete totality rather than as an association of parts to be analyzed in isolation from each other".\textsuperscript{12} Accordingly, the researcher does not investigate the social world in an abstract or insensitive manner, but instead is able to tap the living fabric of social life which is characterized by the self-determination of praxis.\textsuperscript{13}

Given this view of methodology, these marxists believe that the responsible philosopher can no longer speak about, for example, "reality 'in-itself', truth 'in-itself', or values 'in-themselves'."\textsuperscript{14} As Marković goes on to say

\ldots whatever we come to know and say meaningfully and concretely about material and cultural reality has been mediated by the specific, historically determined features of our practical activity.\textsuperscript{15}
With this production it is the hope of these Yugoslavs that they can avoid all types of reification in their philosophizing about the social world. When the researcher substantiates his efforts on any type of principles, to use the Kantian distinction, which are thought to exist "in-themselves", the social world is most often believed to possess an ahistorical ultimate ground, while, subsequently, human action is conceptualized in terms of motivational axioms which exist sui generis. To these philosophers, however, the human being creates h/her social conditions, and therefore all proposals pertaining to the possible erection of a fundamental ground of values or knowledge must take this into account.

These Yugoslavs also believe that philosophy must constantly direct its vigilant eye to the social world, so as to be able to propose a critique of political institutions. They want philosophy to serve as the tool which might guard against the gradual objectification of social institutions, and subsequently the eventual stifling of the human creative capacity. What these marxists want to insure is that social institutions embody the wants and the needs of the social milieu in which they subsist.¹⁶

Clearly, the philosophy of these Yugoslavs does not want to be in the business of abstract system building. Instead, it wants to focus on, and ground itself in, the social world. Particularly, it wants to insure that the
social world embodies the human creative capacity which these authors believe is indigenous to existence itself. This, of course, is reflective of the original suggestion mentioned by Marković that marxism should not be lazy or reductive in its assessment of the social world. As alluded to earlier, however, these marxists did not develop their conception of philosophy in a vacuum, but did so in response to what they viewed to be the attempted destruction of marxist philosophy by Stalin and his followers. Therefore, in order to fully grasp the basically radical thrust of the philosophical efforts of the "Praxis Group", their reconstruction of Marxist philosophy must be briefly viewed relative to its Stalinist counterpart.

The first facet of Stalinism which these authors violently reject is that theory's unabashed dogmatism. Specifically, they argued that Stalin's view of theory was not at all critical, and accordingly represented a constant search for an indubitable ground of truth. The philosophers of the "Praxis Group" tend to believe that when theory is conceived in that way it becomes absolutist in nature, and systemically closed once the sought after ground is believed to have been discovered. The marxists of the "Praxis Group" hold that such a view of theory will eventually labor to inhibit human growth, through its portrayal of social life as an absolute form.
The second theoretical notion of Stalinism to which the "Praxis Group" objected is its use of the phrase "dialectical materialism". The problem which the "Praxis Group" sees with Stalin's use of this idea is that he differentiates between what is dialectical and what is material. Three major theoretical problems, in the view of the "Praxis Group", result from this unwarranted differentiation. First, because the dialectic is no longer thought to be worldly or material it comes to be viewed as formal. Therefore, the categories assumed to be associated with the dialectic come to be understood to be static, absolute, and universally applicable relative to determining the truth claims of any situation. Second, what are thought to be the material conditions of social life are assumed to be unmediated by the dialectical activity of consciousness. The result of this is that whatever is presumed to be material in character is provided an autonomous existence relative to consciousness. Therefore, the individual is conceived to be passive in the knowledge acquisition process. And third, because what is dialectical and what is material are not thought to be mutually mediating, social or material laws are believed to be historically uniform. What all this means is that Stalin inadvertently promulgated both a static methodology and ontology.

The third general theoretical theme of Stalinism which the "Praxis Group" finds objectionable pertains to
the manner in which Stalin discussed the nature of "Man". These marxist theorists belive that Stalin portrayed the human being as an abstract category. Stated simply, these Yugoslav marxists did not believe that Stalin payed much attention to the element of human consciousness, in terms of how it labors in the form of praxis to create itself and the social world.\textsuperscript{18} The "Praxis Group" took Marx's critique of Feuerbach seriously on this issue, while it believed Stalin did not. In this sense, it was relatively easy for Stalin to portray the human being as \textit{Homo economicus}, instead of \textit{Homo laboran}.

The fourth criticism which the "Praxis Group" lodged against Stalinism actually stems from the one mentioned in the previous paragraph. Because Stalin does not regard the individual as instrumental in the creation of the social world, all social order is not understood by him to be a diacritical but instead a lawful nexus of relationships. Therefore, because Stalin's view of the dialectic is systemic and not diacritical, his understanding of social order is also heavily systemic. The members of the "Praxis Group" assert that Stalin's view that the state apparatus is the only adequate vehicle for maintaining social order is a logical extension of his understanding of both the dialectic and human action. Nevertheless, these Yugoslav marxists believe Stalin has seriously misunderstood what Marx had in mind when he spoke to the issue of a socialistically
ordered society. The "Praxis" theorists contend that Stalin's conception of the state as the proper ordering principle of a socialistically conceived society is thoroughly abstract and, thus, metaphysical. Again, the members of the "Praxis Group" have taken Marx's identical critique of Rousseau and Hegel on this issue seriously, while believing that Stalin did not.

What is important to remember at this juncture is that the members of the "Praxis Group" always thought of themselves as advancing a philosophy opposed to the then dominant Stalinist methodological and ontological position. In point of fact, these Yugoslav theorists were especially struggling against what they thought were the dehumanizing effects of Stalin's philosophy. In particular, they believe that Stalin's rigidified dialectic is too insensitive to capture the social meanings that are expressed by the individuals who live in a specific social setting, but at best can only make vague generalizations about what is going on in the social world. These Yugoslav marxists contend that Stalin's statist social ontology is totally abstract, yet at the same time they believe that its use stifles human expression. Apparently the members of the "Praxis Group" and those who are interested in advancing the cause of humanistic sociology have similar interests. Again, however, these Yugoslave philosophers are much more comprehensive in their theorizing, and therefore can also
serve as a guide which can assist humanistic sociology to improve its general theoretical position.

Yugoslavian Marxism:
Epistemological-Methodological Position

The members of the "Praxis Group" also proceed to ground knowledge in a concrete manner, as might well be expected. The discussion of exactly how these theorists believe knowledge is grounded revolves around three fundamental concerns: (1) the nature of the human being, (2) the relationship of praxis to the world, and (3) the nature of the dialectic. In each case, these "Praxis" philosophers suggest how they believe the relationship that is presumed to exist between the knower and what is known should be comprehended, and thus establish the boundaries of the ground of all knowledge.

Petrović raises the question, "What does it mean, for example, to be a man?, and then proceeds to use the work of Marx to provide an answer to this initial inquiry. Petrović's first tactic, however, is to delve into what he believes to be etymology of the word "man", in order to understand what it means to be a "human being". After taking the reader through the etymology of the word "man" supplied by the Romance languages, the Germanic tradition, and the tradition of the Slavs, Petrović concludes that the word "man" has at various times throughout its history been
associated with the earth, mind, activity, community, and freedom. What is important at this juncture, however, is that Petrović does not understand the human being to be merely an inert body which can merely respond to the demands of the so-called natural world, as does the animal, but instead, quoting Engels, asserts that while "the animal merely uses external nature and brings about changes in it simply by his presence; man by his changes makes it serve his ends, masters it". In this sense, Petrović seems to be suggesting that throughout the history of the word "man" it has been assumed that man is intimately associated with the fundamental ground of existence, and through h/her activity can shape that ground.

Following this initial tactic Petrović resurrects the perennial debate concerning whether or not the human being is solely an economic animal. At issue in this debate is whether or not human beings receive their motivation to action from some assumed material ground, to which they are related in an ancilliary manner, or are capable of self-determination. According to the marxist tradition against which the "Praxis Group" is polemicising, the economic factor is that which is thought to dominate social life and, thus, determine its direction. In this sense, the human being would again be capable of merely responding to a ground which is objective and in possession of its own autonomy. In contrast to this belief Petrović says that
"there exists only one factor of historical development, namely social man." Petrović suggests that the human being can rise above the level of existence of political economy, and can exist as "... a practical, hence free, universal, creative and self-creative social being". Through this creative activity the human being is able to overcome any material condition thought to be an objective obstacle to human action. Quoting Marx, Petrović says that this type of free activity "is not determined by the compulsion of an outward purpose".

What is at issue here pertains to what type of mechanism should be placed at the core of social or historical development. Should it be an autonomous ground, such as that represented by a material economic base, or should it be a self-determining social being? Quoting Erich Fromm, Petrović contends that "... the whole of what is called world history is nothing but the creation of man by human labor...." What Petrović is asserting is that human action itself is the ground of all history, and "by means of it nature appears as his work and his reality". In his view the socio-historical world is thought to be the result of "a universal-creative self-creative activity, activity by which man transforms and creates his world and himself". This creative activity is referred to by Petrović as praxis.
According to these "Praxis" theorists this concept of praxis is to represent a new ground of all knowledge and meaning, and as such should serve as a substitute for the prevailing notion of an "in-itself" which is believed to substantiate all meaning. These Yugoslav theorists contend that praxis is not to be understood as similar to what is usually meant by "practice". As Petrović says, praxis should not be understood to refer to custom or habits, experience, or the type of exercise which is usually thought to bring about the perfection of a performance. Each one of these renditions does not even begin to touch upon the radical manner in which these Yugoslavs conceive of praxis. For example, each one of these conceptions of the nature of praxis presuppose the existence of phenomena in the world which are merely manipulated, and therefore autonomous relative to the human touch. Such phenomena, therefore, could be assessed as possessing their own epistemological demands. As Petrović rhetorically says, however, "is not praxis the starting point that makes it possible for us to see ... the meaning of Being 'in general'?"

This view on the nature of praxis becomes readily visible when Petrović addresses the issues of meaning and truth. Specifically, Petrović views "human Being" to be the result of "free creative activity", or praxis. In terms of his discussion of meaning and truth, this belief
concerning the nature of praxis takes the form of a general refutation of what is commonly known as the reflection theory of knowledge. This theory, which is many times associated with the epistemological work of Lenin, presupposes that objective or autonomous knowledge exists in the world, and that for it to be correctly apprehended by a knower it must be adequately reflected in the knower's mind. Accordingly, the traditional definition of truth is invoked: adaequatio rei et intellectus. This conception of truth holds that all meaning exists untrammeled by a constitutive connection to the knower's mind, and that such truth can only be known if the mind can passively approximate the self-contained knowledge which is thought to exist in the world. In this sense, the Being of truth would not rely on conscious praxis, but on the capriciousness of "Being-itself".

As alluded in the foregoing paragraph Petrović does not believe that knowledge, meaning, or truth is constituted by the abstract self-movement of "Being-itself". Petrović says: "... the theory of reflection is not successful, either as a theory of the truth of man's living, or as a theory about the essence of consciousness or as a theory about the truth of our thinking". What Petrović is suggesting is that the human being is not a passive or ancillary vehicle in the process of acquiring knowledge, and therefore thinking is not merely the process whereby
knowledge of the world is reflected in the mind. Instead, Petrović holds that thinking is "a form of man's practical activities", and consequently, "meaning is a phenomenon tied to man". To these "Praxis" theorists meaning does not possess an autonomous ground, as implied by the reflection theory of knowledge, and neither does the human being passively reflect knowledge as it presents itself in the world. Instead,

Meaning is present only when man is an agent — not man as a physical object or biological being, but man as a being of praxis.

Marković characterizes this view on the epistemological ground advanced by these Yugoslavs in these terms:

Social phenomena are not simply given, they are produced by men as a result of conscious choice from among various possibilities. Perception is not simply contemplation and passive reflection of phenomena, but their selection and interpretation from one or another point of view.

This idea that knowledge can only be substantiated with reference to human action can also be discovered in the "Praxis" theorists discussion of the dialectic. Specifically, the dialectic according to these Yugoslav authors has both a "subjective" and an "objective" moment, both of which interpenetrate each other. The dialectic, therefore, must have its initial moment of appropriation linked to its secondary moment of demonstration. When
conceived in this manner, the dialectic does not represent two parallel movements, but one movement which ruptures with itself to illustrate each moment's essential limits. The dialectic cannot then be understood to represent merely a conceptual scheme that becomes refined during an investigation, but it is more fundamentally the procedure through which all knowledge is simultaneously created and illustrated. All knowledge is, therefore, mediated (in the Hegelian sense), in that through this dialectically conceived subject-object movement all epistemological categories can be reflected upon and seen in terms of the limited validity and applicability of the knowledge which is engendered through their respective creative efforts.

To these "Praxis" theorists the dialectic represents the movement of the human being, as a subject-object activity, coming to fruition in the form of social history. As Marković says:

The [Marxian] dialectical process, just as in Hegel, does not make sense in brute, not yet humanized nature, but in the interaction of man in nature, in human production -- in praxis.

Even in their conception of the dialectic these Yugoslav Marxists seek to avoid any dualism which might remove the human being from the fundamental ground of the social world.

As should be immediately noted in their discussion of the nature of what it means to be a human being, the nature
of praxis, and the structure of the dialectic, these Yugoslav Marxists continually reiterate one major theme. It is that the relationship between the knower and what is known, or the social actor and the ground of knowledge, is thought to be an essential relationship whereby the ground of knowledge and social action are co-constituted. The ground of social knowledge is held to be thoroughly mediated by creative human action, and therefore should not be understood to exist "in-itself". Accordingly, such features of social life as truth and meaning must likewise be viewed to be intimately related to human action or, as these marxists call it, praxis. In this sense, objective knowledge exists only when constructed through human action. In the simplest terms, then, all knowledge must be understood to be a social product, and not something that can be appropriated abstractly.

As a result of this conception of the epistemological ground of knowledge advanced by these Yugoslav theorists, the reader should not be surprised when Marković begins to characterize their methodology with the following statement.

The methods of inquiry employed in the natural sciences must be taken with necessary reservations when applied to the social process.40

Clearly,

They [the methods of the natural sciences] must be supplemented by some additional methods which allow us to grasp the dimension of human subjectivity in social processes.41
As Marković suggests, the dominant positivistic approach to science closely resembles ideology. In the view of these authors, positive science does not have a real historical ground, and is thoroughly abstract in its conception of the social world. Quoting Marx, Marković characterizes ideology as follows:

If in all ideology men and their circumstances appear upside down as in a camera obscura, this phenomena arises just as much from their historical life process as the inversion of objects on the retina does from their physical life process. In essence, ideology works to distort the social reality of those who live in the world, turns it into something that it is not, and subsequently makes it appear as something foreign and strange. Still the question remains: how can positive science be understood to be an ideology?

To Marković positivism represents a mode of thinking which he refers to as philosophical intellectualism or formalism. Positivism is concerned merely with the "logic of reason" and not the "logic of the heart". In an effort to free itself from making unverifiable assumptions based on theology and mythology, modern science has from its inception attempted to eliminate a concern for value judgments. Instead of substantiating itself on the basis of speculative or subjective judgments, positive science conceives of itself as firmly grounded on technically verifiable procedures which are to be objective in nature, e.g.,
statistical analysis, covering law explanations and experimentation. To Marković, however, this belief in the universal applicability of a set of intellectual instruments inadvertently results in their reification. When the methodological concepts of any science become reified their utility becomes simultaneously mystified. That is, the procedures themselves become viewed as the truth producing agents of any investigation. In this sense, positive science has certainly advanced to new levels of methodological precision and consistancy; Marković believes that the price paid is too high. That is, by virtue of its concern for methodological rigor per se, "it [positive science] will never do full justice to actual human behavior and we should be aware of that". Accordingly, its research methodology dictates what is knowable and not the social situation to be investigated.

By virtue of its concern for maintaining a so-called objective posture, positive science also seeks merely to describe and "explain what there is", and from that data possibly "extrapolate what there might probably be". In this sense, whatever is not believed to be empirically unverifiable is not significant in an investigation. Therefore, social phenomena such as needs, feelings, and ideals -- not to mention factors like ethical or aesthetic standards -- are assessed from the scientific point of view as extraneous to the discovery of social truths. The overall result of
this assertion of positive science is that it collects "facts" which are truly atomistic in character: they are thought to be essentially unconnected to human needs and desires. By virtue of this procedure, Marković contends that positive science is essentially ideology; it portrays social life as it sees it, and not as it is lived by the social participants themselves. Most often, therefore, positive science conveys an abstract rendition of social life -- one which is quite foreign to the social inhabitants. This is also due to the fact that positive science's methods are based on the categories of formal logic, which Marković contends are thoroughly abstract.

As Marković suggests, the "full meaning" of what is going on in a social setting can only be correctly apprehended when "intimate contacts" are made with the people who live in the community to be "investigated." Interestingly, these "Praxis" theorists do not advocate the general use of a Verstehen methodology by those who want to do social research. Marković certainly recognizes that "social facts are not things and cannot be examined as things..." but he also argues that behavior is not subjective. Rather, it "comes to expression in external, objective, material forms." If social behavior is understood to be merely subjective, it is viewed to be ephemeral in nature. It lacks any truth-giving capacity, and, most important for these marxists, it is unable to
challenge any social institutional form which is provided a so-called objective designation. For Marković, all data are objective or external because they are "intersubjective"; they always have their meaning relative to the "Other person's introspective statements". This is not to say that all meaning is based on some potentially inter-subjectively verified invariant or objective principle, but that all knowledge is social and can possibly be formulated into generalizations.

Accordingly, Marković suggests that valid social knowledge cannot be conceived to be either subjective or objective. If the former is the case, all social meaning is precluded from discovery. If the latter is the case, knowledge becomes a reified thing. Similarly, Marković holds that a proper methodology cannot be either subjective or objective in character. Thus, he suggests that neither a Verstehen nor Erklären methodology (alone) is appropriate for the social sciences. Rather, each of these methods must be viewed "as two special moments within the [a] new whole". Marković refers to these two styles of investigation in one method as "dialectic".

It must be noted initially that Verstehen and Erklären as moments of the dialectic exist together and are co-constituted. The first movement of the dialectic away from itself is Erklären in nature, in that it represents a fundamentally unexamined generalization which is advanced
about the nature of reality. This Erklären movement not
only conceptualizes but also creates reality through its
generative ability. Therefore, both the initial moment
of the dialectic and its concomitant reality are thoroughly
mediated by the movement of the dialectic. Following this
initial moment, the moment which was just formulated is
transcended (aufgehoben). What this means is that both
the conceptual scheme and the reality outlined by that
initial movement are assessed in their limitations. Accord­
ingly, this moment shows the initially a priori conceptual
scheme advanced by the dialectic as transparent; that is, it
discloses the limits of its applicability, and demonstrates
the need for the accompanying reality to be interpreted,
due to it having been created. The third moment in the
dialectic is then Verstehen in nature, in that through
retaining the original scheme at this higher or more
reflective level it not only "understands" itself, but also
can begin to be used in the attempt to grasp the meaning
of a specific social world by recognition of its own limita­
tions. As Marković notes, this is the "principle of the
negation of the negation". 58

When methodology is conceived in this way, Marković
believes that the researcher does not have to be entrapped
by the type of reification that can associate with both the
Erklären and Verstehen methods. Because the dialectic as
conceived by these "Praxis" theorists embodies the
subject-object movement of each moment of the dialectic, knowledge is neither subjective (and, thus, solipsistic) in character, nor is it objective (or "thing-like"). Rather, all knowledge is fully mediated or created by the subject-object activity of the dialectic; and thus it is historically specific in nature, and simultaneously capable of coming to be viewed as a collective (or social) understanding.

In fine, these "Praxis" theorists understand the epistemological ground of knowledge to be human action. Specifically, at the base of all knowledge is the human creative activity of praxis. Accordingly, these authors believe that positive science is not an appropriate approach for investigating the social world. Positive science is not sensitive enough to the lived-meanings of the world of social actors; for it fundamentally has an abstract formulation. As opposed to the standard positive methodology, these "Praxis" philosophers advance a dialectic methodology. By using this type of methodology, the researcher can be sensitive to the exigencies of social life, and can view social knowledge as somewhat stable due to its essential connection to inter-subjective human action. Social knowledge is social but not necessarily objective in character.
Yugoslavian Marxism:
Social Ontological Position

In their development of a social ontology the members of the "Praxis Group" were waging a war on basically two fronts. Specifically, these authors reject any basis of social order in "statism", or in the "atomization of social processes". Statism is present if the state apparatus becomes independent from social classes, and essentially turns against all classes. When statism is present social ownership of the means of production is reduced to mere "group" ownership. What this means is that the group which has control over the state apparatus is able to exert oligarchic rule over the remaining members of the social order. The state becomes an abstract mechanism of social control, which is hierarchically organized and regulated by a bureaucratic elite. So Marcović asserts, quoting Marx, that in this circumstance people are "... no longer governed directly by people but by abstract reified social forces". Yet the extreme atomization or decentralization of government to which these Yugoslav marxists object "in principle at least, opposes any planning and direction". These "Praxis" theorists do not believe that social order can be rationally developed on the basis of abstract forces or in the absence of any attempt to provide some order to social relations.
Thus, these two traditional views on the nature of social order stem from a particular, and in the opinion of these Yugoslavs an erroneous view of what it means to live a human existence. They refer to the traditional rendition of the human being as "Hōmo-duplex". In this form, the human being is either an "abstract citizen" or a "private individual". The individual is either an actor who conducts his/her affairs in an atomistic manner, and is in fact believed to be regulated by some abstract mechanism, e.g., the market, or is a member of a collective as a result of being united into a community by some abstract universal, such as a collective identity. Both of these views on the nature of the "social", in the opinion of these Yugoslav marxists, are based on the idea that social life can only be indirectly ordered, and are therefore substantiated by principles which can at best be viewed as speculative. Instead of invoking these indirect mechanisms for securing the fundamental nature of the social, these marxists propose what they call an "integral" social ontology.

An "integral" or "integrated" social reality is supposed to represent, in Marx's original terminology, the "power of united individuals", a "free association of producers", and, most importantly, a "withering away of the state". As is suggested, an "integral" social order is not substantiated on abstract principles, either in the form of an absolute state, or indirectly connected
individual actors. Instead, an "integrally" related social order is grounded on direct self-government. As Stojanović points out, usually this type of self-government is associated with the "renunciation of general norms, and not the transformation of the nature of the agent of these norms..." However, a "directly" grounded organizational principle does not signify simply the absence of a general mechanism which can supply social order; it merely suggests that the nature of the social must be conceived less abstractly. In opposition to the substantiation of social existence by the traditional abstract universal, these marxists believe that social order should arise from what they refer to as a "concrete universal". "What is needed", Marković suggests, "is a concrete historical, not an abstract, transcendental universalism" if society is to be ordered around the actual needs of the human actor. Only recently have the universal, the human, and the critical components of social life been categorically or ontologically removed from each other. They must, however, be reunited if a rationally ordered society is to ever be developed.

This notion of a "concrete universal" is a Hegelian term. It attempts to convey the idea that the traditional concepts of individual and particular are not separate, but are mutually mediating, which means that every particular becomes universal only by being recognized by others. In short, because the particular and universal are thought
to be mutually mediating or interpenetrating, all so-called
universals must be viewed as having the same ontological
properties as particulars, and as such can only become
universal by coming to be expanded or negotiated into
universal or, more accurately, quasi-universal principles.
To these Yugoslav marxists the establishment of a rational
social order follows a similar process. A humane social
order is thought by Marković to be based on "... an activity
which has universal character and concerns each human
individual". This universal activity is praxis, which
"... establishes valuable and warm links with other human
beings ...." Through the creative exercise of praxis
the individual becomes a "species being": "an individual
who is in the same time a social being" [emphasis J.M.].
In this sense the individual, who is a particular, recog­
nizes h/herself in the other, and therefore become a
"species being".

In a true marxist sense these Yugoslavs believe that
labor is the process by which praxis is actualized and,
accordingly, is the activity through which the individual's
"species being" is generated. In the words of Marković,

The product of labor mediates between
one individual and another and this
establishes a social relation between
them; the product will satisfy a need
of the other man, add to his being in a
certain way, and, at the same time,
project and confirm the being of its
producer.
Labor, in this sense, is the process whereby the individual creates h/herself through the exercise of creativity, and through this activity can establish the identity of a self-concept. Through the development of a self, the worker recognizes h/herself as a sensuous human possibility, and the "other" as a self. By acting creatively the individual thus comes to realize that h/she produces not only for h/herself, but as a result of producing h/herself the being of the "Other" is simultaneously supplemented. In this sense, the creative producer becomes intimately associated with the being of the other persons involved in the production process, and therefore recognizes h/her own generic being. Quoting Marx, Marković says that this process results in the development of a "true human community", in that "each man affirms himself and the other man". Truly creative labor sets the stage for individuals to be involved in complimentary relationships. Furthermore, it also establishes the human "species-being" as the concrete universal of social order -- "a general conception which embraces all the wealth of the specific and individual cases".

Certainly, it follows from this argument as Horvat insists -- that self-management is an association of direct producers. Individuals who produce under conditions in which praxis can be embodied in the products of their work are direct producers in two ways. First, they are directly
related to the products of their production, because they reflect their creative capacity. Secondly, they are in direct connection with their fellow human beings, because their directly produced products serve as the medium of exchange for individual communication. Through this type of exchange, each person in the exchange process complements the other — implying a direct connection of personal sets of (social) identity and difference. The interconnectedness of this identity and difference is the "species-being" which supplies the generic ground for social order. In the modern parlance of Roland Barthes, this type of social relationship is "diacritical"; through the production process the individual acts of one person complement the other. The autonomy and interconnectedness of social actors are thus disclosed.

*The term "diacritical" has recently emerged among those who adhere to the philosophies of structuralism, structural linguistics, and phenomenology. In the work of de Saussure the term "diacritical" refers to the idea that an adequate analysis of language cannot hope to uncover basic, atomistic components of language, but that language only has meaning when it is viewed as a systemic whole. For Barthes, likewise, language is diacritical because it has meaning only when it is conceived to be a pattern of inter-locked signs. To Merleau-Ponty, the term diacritical denotes the sentiments of de Saussure and Barthes, while also advancing an understanding of social life which is particularly important at this juncture. Specifically, for Merleau-Ponty language emerges as the activity which outlines the parameters of human action, and because of this is self-generating both in terms of (1) any particular act and (2) the implicative structure of that act. This means that language (and the social world) is diacritical in both its creative and
What this means, to use the Hegelian term employed by Marković, is that interpersonal relationships are thoroughly mediated. This means that all social relationships are substantiated on human action, or praxis, and therefore are not immediate or abstractly connected. Moreover, the products of production reflect both the self and other, in that they are thoroughly mediated by the productive acts of the self and other. A social order which is based on this concrete universal "species-being" is integrally ordered, for the inter-connectedness of its parts represent the totality of the social order. As Stojanović suggests, this integrally structured rendition of social order recognizes so-called individual parts of society as representing society as a whole. Marković declares that "social man is not simply the individual who lives together with other individuals, or who simply conforms to the given norms of a society". Marković is apparently suggesting that neither social realism nor nominalism is adequate to describe exactly how society is ordered. Quoting Marx, Marković says that the individual "... in his individual existence is at the same time a social being". [emphasis J.M.]. For Marković, the human essence is "the ensemble of social relationships".

integrative (or integral) nature. In terms of Yugoslav marxism, the implication is that their social ontology is produced by generatio aequivoca (Marx) through work, and because of this each individual as the embodiment of work presupposes the Other. The resulting integral structure (species-beings) is therefore referred to as diacritical in this context.
Both social (ontological) realism and nominalism are rejected as adequate characteristics of the nature of the social. These theorists reject any abstract ordering of society. They believe that a truly human community can only be mediated by *praxis*, and is therefore integrally united in the form of the individual's "species-being". This "species-being" is a concrete universal, for it contains all individual elements, and in fact embodies the cumulative total of those elements. Accordingly, the image of the social conveyed by these "Praxis" theorists is grounded in each individual's action which simultaneously encompasses the Other in the form of mediated production relations. Accordingly, the integrity of the individual or "human quotient" is maintained without having to obscure the basic nature of the social world.

**Concluding Comment: Social Order and Human Freedom**

Following the lead of Marx, Yugoslav theorists contend that social knowledge is grounded on human *praxis*. *Praxis* is the realization of human sensuousness which imbues all social objects with their meaning; *praxis* is human action which creates the value (use-value) of all objects of human labor. Accordingly, to these marxists social objects cannot be thought to possess their own objective meaning, but instead must be considered to be human products and, thus, a valid understanding of those products
must take into account the human meaning which has been attributed to them. With this imperative in mind, these Yugoslavs suggest the use of a methodology to capture the meaning of these objects which they believe is more appropriate than positivism. Because they believe positivism is not sensitive to human meanings, they contend that the researcher should use a dialectical methodology.

These Yugoslav's version of the dialectic has two component parts (Erklären and Verstehen) which become expressed in the three traditional (Hegelian) moments. The first moment of the dialectic is called Erklären because it is unreflective and insensitive to the exigencies of the social world. The second moment represents a transcendence of the first Erklären moment, which therefore illuminates its limits and applicability. The third moment, accordingly, is Verstehen in character, in that its dimensions are thought to have the nature of a limiting construct, which allows them to recognize their own limits and, thus, be sensitive to the meaning of the situation to be investigated. To these Yugoslavs, this type of methodology allows the praxis which they believe is indigenous to all social objects to be adequately captured.

These Yugoslavs also follow Marx in their conception of the fundamental nature of social order. Social order for them is also thought to be the result of praxis. Through a labor process which they contend embodies human
praxis the image of the human being as homo duplex is subverted. That is, the individual is no longer thought to be an individual and a social being, but instead is understood to be simultaneously an individual social being. Though work, these Marxists believe that each individual creates h/erself, while concomitantly presupposing and supplementing the identity of the Other. When the individual and the Other are thought to be fundamentally united in this manner, their collective identity is referred to as their "species-being". This "species-being" is the social, in that it embodies human relationships which are integrally established through labor. This type of labor, moreover, is referred to as self-management, in that the social order (or "species-being") is thought to be determined by human action or labor. The individual is, therefore, literally considered to be capable of shaping h/er own identity and the identity of the social world.

These Yugoslavs believe that an integrally structured social order is indicative of social self-management for a fundamental reason. As Marković says, "... self-management rests on a general philosophical principle -- that of self-determination". He goes on to say that self-determination is not external determination, whereby actions are determined by some force which is thought to exist outside the ontological realm occupied by the individual. When the social order is thought to be integrally substantiated by a
social "species-being" all social knowledge and the exchange process which embodies social order are believed to be mediated and, thus, determined by individual *praxis*. Because of this, as Marković suggests, social order only constitutes a "framework of possibilities", and as such individual choice "... is autonomous, genuinely free and not heteronomous and compulsory". 85

This idea that a self-managed society is self-determining is very important to these Yugoslavs. These "Praxis" marxists believe that a rationally ordered society is one that is "supported from below", and not on some abstract principles. 86 When social order is based on abstract doctrines, those principles must be understood to be ideological, in that their Being or meaning is not thought to be associated with social action or *praxis*. As such, these abstract belief systems advance a normative structure which labors to dictate what is humanly possible, as opposed to having those so-called normative action possibilities substantiated by human action. These "Praxis" theorists find this normative approach to describing individual and social order totally unacceptable; they believe that the individual is "... what he *potentially* is, i.e., what he *could be*," 87 and not merely as h/she is defined in terms of social roles outlined in advance. 88 These theorists do no want to portray a truncated rendition of what is humanly possible, but instead want to suggest a
self-managed conception of social order which will allow the individual to express a manifold of human possibilities. The way in which these theorists have outlined the ground of knowledge and the nature of the social is certainly consistent with their belief that the individual should be self-determining and not externally determined.

These Yugoslavs believe that this view of a self-managed or self-determined social order represents a "radical humanization" of social life. The term radical is used by these authors in a manner similar to that suggested by Marx. Accordingly, a self-managed society is one in which all facets of social order have their root in man, and therefore are not autonomous. Therefore, society is grounded on praxis, whereby social knowledge and the nature of the social world embodies creative Being, free Being, historical Being, and a Being of the future. [emphasis J.M.]. What is suggested here by Petrović is that when a social order is self-managed, and its basic components are grounded on human action, the stage is set for Being itself to be established in the form of social or human action. In this sense, all normative schemes are social and not a priori or abstract in character, and the individual is free to constitute the Being of social knowledge and social order.* The "human quotient", therefore,

*Being in this case refers to the ultimate or fundamental meaning of social order and, thus, human existence itself.
serves to ground the Being of human or social existence; the social actor is, therefore, fundamentally free to construct (self-manage) social life, so that it can assume an unlimited number of forms.

The point here is that the individual is ultimately free, in that the traditionally most fundamental category of life itself (Being) can be shaped by the freedom now accorded to human action.
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CHAPTER VIII

SUMMARY AND INTERPRETIVE CONCLUSION

- Humanistic Sociology in Review -

Humanistic sociology is engaged in a polemic against what it conceives to be mainstream sociology. In general, humanistic sociology contends that mainstream sociology is just too abstract in nature and unconcerned with promoting the overall welfare of mankind. Manifestly, these humanistic sociologists seem to believe that this state of affairs stems substantially from the type of social epistemological-methodological and social ontological position assumed to be valid by mainstream sociology. They have argued, therefore, for a social epistemological-methodological and ontological position differing from mainstream sociology -- one which is less abstract and more sensitive to the concerns of those who live in the social world.

Humanistic sociology has attacked the epistemological-methodological position of mainstream sociology for its value-free and abstract nature, and particularly its manipulative and conservative implications. Stated succinctly, these humanists are reacting against mainstream sociology's
endorsement of positivism as the most valid epistemological-methodological position for use by sociologists. Their major objection to positivism is that it ignores human experience as a possible ground of knowledge. For positivism valid knowledge is objective in nature, and the individual is uninvolved in the creation of such knowledge. In consequence, mainstream sociology inadvertently promotes the view that only what is objective in the social world is important, and anything that cannot be treated as objective is secondary in importance or unimportant. Therefore, these humanists contend that mainstream sociology is too concerned with perfecting the logical rigor of its methods, and too unconcerned with the values and desires of the people it studies. Real people are but ancillary to the perfection of its research methods and, thus, to the discovery of so-called objective knowledge which is not contaminated by personal predilections.

This abstract view of social knowledge is also reflected in mainstream sociology's understanding of the ontological character of social order. Social life is conceived to be a "system", which regulates or orders the lives of those who live in the social world. Mainstream sociology tends to focus on the maintenance of this abstract conception of social existence, instead of promoting the individual or personal development of its assumed members. Under such conditions, the so-called needs of the system are given priority
over the wishes of the individual social members, and the
human element of existence is not thought to be central to
social life. For the humanists, such a belief seriously
limits the range of possible human action in a manner
similar to that when the capturing of objective facts
becomes more important than human desires and values.

Humanistic sociology is explicit about the
epistemological-methodological and social ontological
position to which it objects. It rejects sociologists'
use of methods of natural science and any (social) realis­
tic conception of society as a systemic architectonic which
dominates the lives of its individual members. Neverthe­
less, the outlines of a general humanistic theoretical
position are not thoroughly consistent and often not
fully formulated.

In opposition to positivism, humanistic sociology
conceives of its epistemological-methodological position as
an art form, and is more interested in uncovering the mean­
ings and sentiments which social actors attribute to social
phenomena than it is with technological rigor. These
humanists agree that valid knowledge is not necessarily
objective in character, but instead is sustained by human or
social experience. Therefore, they assert that sociolo­
gists should employ a Verstehen methodology, which is more
concerned with comprehending information situationally than
with its explanation in terms of abstract methodological
axioms. As a substitute for the abstract methodology of positivism, these humanists call for sociologist to use "creative observation" to gather social data.

In contrast to those who view social life as a reified, abstract "system", humanistic sociology conceives of social existence more concretely. Indeed, the idea of an objective mechanism called a social system is actually a myth. Social life is really nothing more or less than the interaction of individual actors. Decisively different from mainstream sociology's social order, such a conception places the needs of the individual at the center of social existence.

As suggested earlier, however, the general theoretical position advanced by these humanists is not totally consistent, and in some instances not fully formulated. First, even though humanistic sociology does not believe that social knowledge is objective in character, it does not really offer a systematically developed alternative approach to grounding knowledge. Accordingly, second, it is sometimes presupposed that a ground of knowledge does exist sui generis, and therefore knowledge is sometimes referred to as objective and at other times as subjective, while the real relationship between these two modes of knowledge is not examined. And third, the intricate procedure necessary to secure a situated understanding of personal behavior is not explored. These humanists seem to suggest that mere empathy
and participant observation is adequate to generate this type of understanding. This methodological conception is, however, consistent with the tacit assumption that an a priori ground of knowledge does exist. If an a priori ground of knowledge were to exist, then close spatial or emotional proximity might be sufficient to insure that it is understood.

The social ontological position of these humanists is also plagued by serious problems. In particular, they vacillate between characterizing social life in nominalistic and realistic terms; they are unsure whether social life is the sum of all individuals or a force which is sui generis and, thus, ontologically superior to that possessed by all individuals. In short, they seem to waffle between viewing social life objectively and subjectively, and it becomes difficult to specify where the universals necessary to secure social order should be lodged. If they are objective, they are viewed as oppressive (and anti-humanistic); yet if they are merely subjective, they are not social. This makes difficult any development of a uniform theory of social order and, thus, personal freedom. They continually equivocate about whether social order is grounded on social action, or social action is constrained by the social order. Again, this uncertainty is traceable to the subjective-objective dualism which pervades humanistic theory, and which traditionally results in a similar vacillation between
a concern for the "human quotient" associated with subjectivity, and a desire for the social order which only objectivity is thought to supply.

A General Review of the Other Four Cognate Theories

The four supplementary theories described above have all made a theoretical advance which should prove useful to humanistic sociology in its attempt to produce a unified sociological theory. Each of these theories adheres to a developmental logic which allows for the "human quotient" to be placed at the center of social life, while simultaneously being able to substantiate the universals necessary to secure social order. Accordingly, none of these theories believes that the "human quotient" must be supplemented by some type of objective ground for insuring social regularity. These theories, therefore, contend that social action should not be encumbered by a social "system", but instead should be allowed to come to uninhibited fruition. This, of course, is the desire of humanistic sociology, although it fell somewhat short of its intended goal. Certainly, humanistic sociology can learn something from these theories in terms of outlining the basic structure of its own views.

What each of these theories (Blumerian symbolic interactionism, Schutzean phenomenology, critical theory, and
Yugoslavian marxism) initially accomplishes (in opposition to humanistic sociology) is to ground all knowledge on human action. Blumerian symbolic interactionism does not view the phenomena in the social world to be by nature objective, but instead suggests that all social phenomena should be conceived as having social meaning. This meaning in engendered through the human use of symbols and language, or, in short, human action. So-called objective meaning is therefore an impossibility, in that all meaning is thought to embody the definitional abilities of the individuals who inhabit the social world.

Schutzean phenomenology, as with phenomenology in general, understands all knowledge to be intentional in character, in that all knowledge is believed to be substantiated by the intentional nature of human consciousness ... of something. It is human consciousness, therefore, which provides all so-called objects with their meaning, while the experience that is inherent to human consciousness is also thought to constitute or supply all social phenomena with their meaning. All formerly conceived objective knowledge must now be understood to be a product of the individuals Lebenswelt, or "life-world". This "life-world" is the world of conscious experience which is engendered by the conscious action of individuals endeavoring to construct their everyday world.
Critical theory follows a variety of theoretical tactics in order to ground social knowledge. One declares that all social meaning -- borrowing a term made famous by phenomenology -- is a product of the "life-world". Elsewhere, all types of social meaning are considered to be the result of a human "project" of action, to use a Sartrean term. In this sense, human definitions of reality are thought to provide all phenomena with their meaning as a result of the existential orientation (i.e., project) which such definitions are presumed to supply. Another tactic used by critical theory is to assert that all social meaning is a product of linguisticality. Stated simply the creative use of language by social actors is believed to supply all social phenomena with their meaning. Furthermore, some critical theorists also contend that all knowledge is the product of cognitive or knowledge constitutive interests. Each of these theories is a reaction (and objection) to the idea that knowledge can be grounded objectively.

Yugoslavian marxian employs a traditional marxism term to suggest exactly how knowledge is to be correctly understood to be grounded. The generic term used by these marxists do describe this knowledge generative process in praxis. Simply put, these authors are asserting that all knowledge is the product of sensuous, creative individual action. Through social action, or praxis, these Yugoslav
theorists believe that the individual can create social meaning, instead of merely reflecting some objective value in a passive manner.

In contrast to humanistic sociology, these theories make a systematic effort to ground all knowledge on human action. This endeavor is vital for two important reasons. First, knowledge is not thought to be objective, and the individual presumed to be subjective. Rather, all knowledge is believed to be worldly, in that the former distinctions of subjectivity and objectivity are merged into a new unity which allows knowledge to be general in character, while still grounded on human action. Consequently these theories can eventually advance a more human social ontology than mainstream or humanistic sociology. And second, any style of normative knowledge must likewise be considered a product of human action, and accordingly all normative knowledge must be treated as relative and not absolute in character. Accordingly, no absolutely conceived notions of what it means to be human can be advanced, in that social action cannot be thought to substantiate such claims. This argument will be important later in this chapter when the basic tenets of a humanistic sociological theory are more fully outlined.

Because each of these theories contends that all knowledge is grounded on human action (including knowledge about the meaning of human comportment), they all hold that
knowledge must be acquired in terms of the stipulations prescribed by human action. Like humanistic sociology, these four theories insist that an appropriate sociological methodology should not primarily concern itself with technological rigor and, thus, internal consistency. Rather, these theories assert that knowledge is validly collected only when it is interpreted in accordance with the meaning that has been attributed to it by human action, and therefore abstract schemes must not be used to explain the fundamental nature of knowledge and human behavior. Instead all knowledge must be understood relative to the knowledge constitutive interests (human action) which give it meaning.

Blumer believes that a proper social methodology should be sensitizing and not prescriptive in character -- it should merely suggest ways to look at social phenomena, and not determine what is seen. The type of research which Blumer wants sociologists to conduct is what he calls naturalistic, i.e., inquiry is to be directed to the empirical realm, particularly to the relevant social actors' definitions of that realm. Blumer explicitly warns that close spatial or emotional proximity is not sufficient to insure that valid data are extracted from a particular social setting. Rather, Blumer says that every investigation should consist of two components: exploration and inspection. Exploration is the stage in which the investigator aligns h/her methodological categories with those action...
categories used by the individual to define social life. It occurs as the investigator is aware that the constructs which h/she initially employs are not a priori but are merely probing in nature, and therefore should be altered as the situation dictates. The second stage of this process consists of the researcher supplying a general theoretical account of the situation just investigated. This theoretical model is not to be abstract or fanciful in nature, but instead is supposed to reflect the world as it is understood to operate according to the social actors.

Schutz contends that social actors do not orient their lives in terms of the social categories used by scientists to make sense of the world. The categories used by science are, in Schutz's view, merely secondary categories, in that they are abstractions made on the basis of the fundamental categories of conscious experience used by social actors to order social life. Building on the work of Weber, Schutz believes that social life can only be properly comprehended when it is analyzed in terms of the common-sense or direct experiential categories used by social actors, a type of understanding both refer to as Verstehen. What Schutz means by this term is that the researcher should attempt, through the epoché, to exclude all a priori conceptions about the nature of social life, and subsequently should try to grasp the meaning of social life as it is experienced by the social participants. This meaning is not derived
through empathy, but is fundamentally acquired by appraising social existence relative to the biographically determined or common-sense categories which are used by all social actors to provide some rationale for their lives.

Critical theory, in the traditional marxian sense, advances a dialectical methodology, but also stipulates that a hermeneutic methodology is appropriate for use by the social sciences. In the view of critical theory both of these approaches to methodology allow the social world to be more sensitively interpreted than is possible by positivism. Although these methodologies originate in entirely different traditions, they follow a somewhat similar procedure and assert that if the investigator is to capture the social world as it is experienced by social actors, h/she must not view methodological categories to be a priori in character. Instead, in both cases all initially used theoretical categories must be reflected upon and, thus, be seen as limiting constructs which merely serve to guide the initial stages of an investigation. When viewed in this manner, these constructs can be thoroughly altered in terms of the situation undergoing inquiry. Accordingly, both methodologies involve an essential dialogical interplay between the categories initially used to guide an investigation, and the social setting being studied. According to the adherents of critical theory both these methods differ radically from the a priori positivist methodological schemes which merely
coerce data to fit their explanatory categories.

The marxism of the "Praxis Group" employs a methodology which its adherents believe is more appropriate for social analyses than is positivism. These marxists also advance a dialectical methodology, although it is not viewed and used as it was by Stalin. To Stalin the dialectic merely represented an a priori methodology used to unearth the natural laws of economic, social, and historical development. These Yugoslav marxists did not view the dialectic in such a positivist way, or in any way closely associated with Verstehen. Whether conceived positivistically or as an adjunct to a subjectively conceived Verstehen methodology the dialectic entails reifications. Nevertheless, these Yugoslav marxists view the Erklären position associated with a positivistically conceived dialectic and the Verstehen notion to be two components of one (unified) dialectical movement. The Erklären position represents the first moment of the dialectic involving an unreflective methodological scheme. Through the second moment of the dialectic this initial Erklären scheme is subjected to reflection and its limitations are recognized; it becomes a limiting construct. The third or synthetic moment of the dialectic represents the reflective application of the initial Erklären methodological scheme, which now acquires a Verstehen character by virtue of it having an awareness of its limited applicative validity.
In light of this awareness, it becomes sensitive to the social setting to be investigated and understood.

It is important to emphasize at this juncture that all four of these theories assume that social life should not be understood in *a priori* or abstract terms, as is the case with positivism. To the contrary, social life is to be comprehended as it is experienced by the social actors that are investigated. These four theories all have the advantage over humanistic sociology, in that they do not simply state that this type of situationally insightful understanding can be achieved merely through empathy. Rather, each one attempts to deal systematically with the problem of how a researcher may overcome or set aside h/her own view of the world so that it can be interpreted as it is experienced by the social actors. These theories do not leave the generation of this type of self-reflective insight to such chance factors as "culture shock", but instead build into their respective methodologies procedures which are designed to engender such self-reflective insight. Each of these four theories recognizes that all knowledge is generated through social action, including the knowledge which is intrinsic to every methodological scheme, and accordingly have built into their respective methodologies a procedure for surmounting this obstacle and for understanding social actors in their own terms.
Because Blumerian symbolic interactionism, Schutzean phenomenology, critical theory, and Yugoslavian marxism all substantiate social knowledge on a ground that is neither subjective or objective, they do not have the problem which humanistic sociology has in formulating a coherent social ontology. Each of these theories grounds social knowledge on its own self-styled version of social action, which is neither subjective or objective, but which is a ground that actually subtends such a bifurcation. Therefore, none of these four theories has to vacillate between subjectivity and objectivity in order to provide a useful account of social order. Stated simply, because they recognize the importance of subjectivity in understanding the meaning of social life, they do not have to invoke some type of objective universal to insure the type of social order that is not traditionally associated with subjectivity. Instead, each of these theories grounds social order on inter-action, and thus neither in pure subjectivity nor objectivity, but human action, which is not conceived as solus ipse. Accordingly, it can become the base of social meaning which is not objective in character and, thus, is not ontologically repressive to subjectivity. Interestingly, humanistic sociology had this original goal which it did not, however, achieve.

Blumer, for example, notes that the analogies which sociologists commonly use to characterize the fundamental
nature of social life are too abstract and, thus, are inadequate. What is fundamental to social life for Blumer is that social actors view each other as subjects, and not as the embodiment of some abstract will or as actors living in isolation. Rather, social action is fundamentally symbolic in nature: each actor acts with reference to how h/she interprets the actions of other actors. Each actor, therefore, plans h/her actions with reference to how they will be interpreted by the other. After the actor has begun to grasp how other actors interpret h/her behavior, and vice versa, they each begin to formulate normative rules of action which reflect their mutually negotiated interests. This type of self and other oriented action is referred to by Blumer as "joint action". Joint action is, therefore, social action; social action is joint action which is recurrently enacted. In this sense, the social world for Blumer is ordered through joint action, for it serves as the ground for establishing general norms of behavioral expectations. These norms can be viewed as general in character, but never as ontologically divorced from the human action which initially established the parameters of those norms.

Schutz also asserts that social life does not consist of some collective will, à la Durkheim, or of a concatenated aggregate of isolated actors. In line with his belief that all knowledge is of the "life-world", the social world
likewise must be constructed to be grounded on human experience. Specifically, the social world for Schutz is always inter-individual or, to use a technical phenomenological term, inter-subjective. The individual always acts with reference to the world -- relative to other immediate actors, or actors conceived in a more general way, e.g., the "typical" postman or nurse. Nevertheless, (Schutz's) the actor always acts with reference to the other, and their reciprocally oriented actions must be synchronized if coherent action is to take place. Schutz does not believe that this synchronization occurs as a result of objective mechanisms, such as natural law. Rather, inter-action is synchronized when the actor is able to understand the motives of other actors, and vice versa. When this type of reciprocity is achieved, the individuals who are interacting are characterized as involved in a We-relationship. Schutz views this We-relationship as the ground of even the most abstract conception of social life, i.e., "society", and it serves to create the parameters within which appropriate behavior is thought to reside.

Throughout its history critical theory advanced a critique of domination, which perennially took the form of a rejection of any abstract conception of social life that might inadvertently stifle the self-development of its individual members. On the one hand, critical theory critiqued the realistic conceptions of social life advanced
by Gumplowicz, Ratzenhofer, and Vierkandt, and on the other insisted that social life should not be conceived as an anarchy of individual actors. In its early stages critical theory made statements to the effect that the individual is a social being, and thus attempted to subvert the usual distinction made between the individual and the social. Later on, however, critical theorists such as Habermas asserted that social life is fundamentally grounded on the Lebenswelt, and that a common social order is substantiated on communicative competence. Critical theory does not assume that this competence is to be measured against some normative scheme which is provided a sui generis status (as, for example, Chomsky does). For critical theory, communicative competence emerges as actors encounter each other in the "life-world". So Habermas grounds social life on interests which are shared because they are communicatively negotiated, and not abstractly universal. These negotiated norms link reciprocal behavioral expectations and, thus, suggest a possible general ground of social order. Again, social order is founded on a general base, though not one which is removed from the domain of human action.

Yugoslavian marxism continually objected both to the abstract or "statist" notion of social order advanced by Stalin, and to the idea that a totally decentralized social order represented the optimum in which the individual could
actualize h/herself. Instead, these marxists desired to promote what they refer to as an "integral" social order, i.e., one in which the image of human individual as _homo duplex_ is abandoned. Accordingly, the individual is not conceived to exist separately from what is social; the individual essence is thoroughly social. This realization of the individual as a social being comes to fruition through a self-managed production process, one in which the products of production directly reflect the labor which the worker embodies in them. Through this type of direct production the worker creates h/herself, and simultaneously creates for the other and not for some abstract market. As a result of this direct production, every individual creates h/herself, while also supplementing the existence of the other. Therefore, the products of production directly mediate the existence of the self and the other, and unites them into what these marxists refer to as a social "species-being". "Species-being" for these Yugoslavs refers to the individual's direct relationship to other individual producers -- a creative relationship which betokens the infinite range of human possibilities when the social order is viewed to be comprised of one creative producer complementing the other. The social order understood as a "species-being" is a concrete and not an abstract universal: social relationships are maintained, but not on some abstract ground.
As presented so far, the argument may seem to suggest that each of these theories has an identical aim. Undoubtedly, these theories did achieve a similar end, i.e. establishment of the ground of social life on human action, but they achieved this end through a variety of diverse means. A more balanced and accurate view of these theories requires also that their differences be acknowledged.

The four theories do exhibit considerable variation in their respective epistemological-methodological stances. In Blumerian symbolic interactionism, for example, the influence of pragmatism can be detected in Blumer's emphasis on social action as the ground of social knowledge. Blumer's methodology also exhibits a pragmatic conception of logic similar to that found in the work of Peirce. Schutz's phenomenology embodies Husserl's reaction against both empiricism and idealism and therefore contains a rendition of the conscious constitution of meaning that is absent from the other theories. Likewise, Schutz's methodology is somewhat neo-Kantian, and is thus unique among the four alternative positions. An heir to the German Enlightenment Tradition, critical theory has its epistemology-methodology underpinned by themes directly drawn from Hegel which are not present in the work of Blumer and Schutz, and are only indirectly reflected in the position of the Yugoslavs. The Yugoslavs are thoroughly marxian in their position, and therefore ground social knowledge on
praxis and their methodology on dialectics. Their notion of the dialectic is unique, however, in combining both Erklären and Verstehen methodologies in one movement of the dialectic. It thus differs from critical theory which seems to suggest that dialectics and hermeneutics represent two distinct methods.

Social ontologically, these four theories exhibit differences in placing the human actor at the center of social life. Again, Blumer's emphasis is pragmatic, in viewing joint action as embodying responsible social or moral action as the basis of social order. Schutz's ground of social order also reflects Husserl's influence. Here the focus is not on moral action, but action substantiated by human conscious experience. Social order is not, therefore, based overtly on the maintenance of individual integrity, but on the recognition that human experience must be synchronized if social life is to be possible at all. For critical theory, social life reflects -- in the Hegelian sense -- the self-movement of its constituents. Neither a concern for moral integrity nor the synchronization of conscious experience substantiates its view of social order, but instead the Hegelian desire to have the social order embody the movement of the social (individual) Spirit (Geist). Consistent with their epistemological-ontological position, the Yugoslav Marxists abjure the possibility of substantiating social life on anything abstract, such as
Stalin's notion of the state or Hegel's Spirit. In line with Marx's rejection of abstractions such as that promoted by Hegel, these Yugoslav's grounded social life on direct human production, or human "species-being".

A Summary of the Relationship of the Four Cognate Theories to Humanistic Sociology

Although these theories do exhibit a diverse intellectual ancestry, they do have similarities which can assist humanistic sociology in attaining its goal of creating a unified humanistic theory (in opposition to mainstream sociology). These similarities, stated simply, can serve as the cornerstone of a pervasively humanistic sociological theory, and represent the point at which these theories advance beyond humanistic sociology. Although these points have been implicit throughout this chapter, they will now be made explicit:

First, although humanistic sociology insists that the "human quotient" is the center of social life, it does not systematically ground knowledge on social action. The other four theories analyzed in this dissertation do ground all knowledge on social action and so prevent the erection of so-called objective knowledge. In this sense, the meaning of the social world for these four theories is the product of human action, and therefore the social world cannot determine social action. Because humanistic
sociology does not systematically address this issue of the ground of knowledge, it equivocates as to whether knowledge is subjective (socially constructed) or objective (deterministic) in character.

Second, these four theories resemble humanistic sociology in their concern that the methodology used by sociology be sensitive to social meanings. However, the methodology of humanistic sociology does not include a mechanism to insure that all a priori methodological schemes are excluded and that the social world is understood in terms of the experience of its inhabitants. Each of these four theories, in its own way, outlines a procedure which, if followed, can allow the social world to be grasped in its own terms.

And third, each of these four theories suggests ways in which social order can be secured without recourse to the use of objective universals. Although humanistic sociology certainly wanted to accomplish this task, it did not succeed because it failed to overcome the subject-object dichotomy which each of these four theories undercut. Having grounded knowledge of social action which is neither subjective or objective in nature, these theories could conceive of social knowledge as general knowledge which is not by nature objective. Therefore, social knowledge which serves as the ontological ground of the social world is a concrete and not an abstract universal.
In short, these four theories and humanistic sociology have similar aims. Yet, the lack of theoretical rigor on the part of humanistic sociology has prohibited it from formulating a fully developed sociological theory which places the "human quotient" at its center.

**Fundamental Themes of a Humanistic Sociology**

The overall aim of humanistic sociology is to create a non-normative humanism. It, therefore, rejects a basis of the social world which is established on a priori or abstract schemes which would by definition stipulate specific structures within which all social behavior must be enacted. If such a view were taken, for example, the norms presumed to be substantiating social life would be conceived to be objective, and the individual would be construed merely to be capable of responding to and, thus, of working within those norms. Any transgression of those norms is automatically considered to be indicative of deviance. Likewise, the presumed a priori norms can take on the form of a state apparatus or a conception of the social which resembles an all encompassing system, within the limits of which all behavior must be actualized. However, the sociologist who is consistently humanistic has an obligation to theorise in a manner such that the erection of such a priori schemes is precluded. The "human quotient" must be placed at the center of social life and, thus, be able to develop without
hinderances.

To avoid the rigidification of social life associated with mainstream sociology, humanistic sociologists must ground social life so that it is not conceived objectively, and cannot legitimately assume the form of an oppressive system. However, social life must not be grounded subjectively, which results in the need for some objective universal to supply the social order which subjectivity is usually incapable of providing. If either of these tactics is followed, the social individual will be construed to encounter an objective social world to which h/she must submit, and which can subsequently dominate individual desires.

If humanistically conceived, the ground of social existence must be substantiated by human action, and the meaning of social life is then a correlate of human experience. This grounding can be conceived intentionally or linguistically. Yet what is most important is that it be understood to be essentially or fundamentally related to human behavior -- i.e., that it is outlined in terms of its relationship to human action. In this sense, all the meaning of social phenomena must be regarded as "indeterminate" (to use a term of Heisenberg's), as a result of being thoroughly mediated (or constructed) by human action. Therefore, the world is not grounded subjectively or objectively, but rather has a ground which fundamentally sub-tends such a bifurcation. This type of ground might be
referred to as a world grounding: subjectivity and objectivity are essentially intertwined as the world of experience, or human action.

The implications of this type of grounding are numerous and, therefore, only the few most basic will be examined. First, every knowledge base is a social product and not a body conceived *sui generis*. Therefore, second, all normative knowledge bases must be the correlates of an existential orientation, which renders them normative only in a specific and not a general (*sui generis*) sense. What this means, third, is that individuals do not have to view themselves as automatically entrapped by those norms. By virtue of their fundamental existential status, they can always be brought into question and, therefore, transcended. Accordingly, fourth, the real limits to human growth are actually an outgrowth of the growth process itself and not some limit conceived *a priori*. In short, if the social world is understood to be grounded in this manner, the base used to legitimize any normative humanism is undermined. If social knowledge is an outgrowth of social action, it cannot have an ontological status antagonistic to that action, i.e., one which could legitimately stifle certain human options. All knowledge bases become, therefore, historical and are merely *presuppositions* for their own normative demands, in contrast to a universal, ahistorical categorical imperative which can dictate human action.
When the world is conceived to be intimately (or primordially) related to human action, the methodology used to investigate the social world must also be conceived to be neither subjective nor objective in nature. It must not be understood to be grounded on epistemological categories construed to be a priori in character, e.g., like the objective categories of formal logic or some abstract ideal type. Rather, any methodology which is humanistic in nature must be thoroughly mediated by human action. Therefore, a methodology is not only a mode of data collection, but is also simultaneously a procedure for data interpretation. So regarded, all methodologies are a way of constructing the social world and not merely studying the world.

When methodology is understood in this way, the goal of a researcher is not the collection of so-called objective data or the generation of so-called subjective sentiments which might serve adequately to supplement such objective information. If methodology is comprehended to be a mode of constituting the world, it cannot also rely on outside or environmental influences to provide clues to the effect that it is construing data incorrectly. Rather, a mediated methodology must provide its own vehicle for self-reflection and for momentarily suspending the presuppositions of the world-view which it advances. When this self-reflection is accomplished, it becomes at least theoretically possible for the limits of those presuppositions to be
If this type of transcendence is realized, the researcher can possibly begin to comprehend the world in terms of the presuppositions which the persons to be investigated use to construct the social world. When this knowledge is discovered, it cannot be treated as objective. But neither can it be viewed as purely subjective, for it may certainly effect more than one individual and is, therefore, social in character.

This way of viewing methodology does not imply that social laws are based solely on personal idiosyncrasies. Instead, all social laws are still social in character, but now they cannot be viewed as universal abstractions. The discovery of social regularities merely stipulates that under certain conditions particular events are more likely to occur than others. This statement differs from that advanced, for example, by probability theory or from a statistical theory of causality. Rather, a statement that under certain conditions certain events are more likely to happen than others, signifies that all events are disposed to occur relative to the assumptions that are made about the nature of the social world. This differs from probability theory which bases the probability of an event occurring on a set of assumptions which are believed to be universal su
generis. Accordingly, this notion of methodology conceives social laws, for example, to be concrete universals which become general and not abstract universals which are believed
to be operative in individual cases. In this sense, the
discovery of social laws is a possibility. However, it
must be conceived as a search for social regularities and
not for metaphysical universals.

This idea that social knowledge is grounded on human
action has the following major social ontological conse­
quences. That is, the fundamental nature of social life
must also be understood to be a product of social action,
and cannot be conceived objectively as an abstract "system"
or subjectively as the sum of individual actors. Instead,
social life must be comprehended -- to use Blumer's term --
as "joint action". In this sense, the synchronization of
inter-individual experience is the ground of social order;
social order and the individual are, therefore, co­
constituted. The social cannot be understood to dominate
the individual or the individual to possess pure or ideal
freedom. Rather, the individual must always conceive of
herself as operating inter-subjectively, i.e., as a
possibility of the world. The individual must always conduct
her affairs with reference to the other as an ontological
equal, so that an inter-actional situation of non­
domination might be created.

When this inter-subjective ground of social life is
understood, so-called institutional meanings can be com­
prehended in a non-repressive (humanistic) manner. Stated
simply, institutional meanings are merely those which actors
regularly use to adjudge their behavioral competence. These meanings are not a priori in character, but arise out of the inter-action process itself. In this sense, all social action is inter-subjective and behavioral routines may be held in common. These sets of common meanings are certainly thought to possess some type of general validity, but are not believed to be objective in character. That is, a specific or historically limited meaning might attain some general adherence, but it cannot acquire an ontologically objective status, separate from that of the social actors who originally created that meaning. By virtue of this creative grounding of social life, social existence itself must be viewed as a social possibility subject to routinization, to use Weber's term. This eventually can occur through the establishment of meanings which people agree not to question on a daily basis. Social or institutional meanings, therefore, merely represent a social possibility which can be subject to questioning any time and as such must be actively maintained.

Accordingly, a sociological theory which grounds itself on social action does not have to avoid notions such as social institutions or vacillate between subjectivity and objectivity in order to acknowledge the "human quotient" of social life, and to invoke objectivity to insure social order. Rather, the understanding that social life is sustained by human action also involves the grounding of
institutional meanings in such action. Accordingly, institutional meanings are essentially or fundamentally related to human action and still provide the type of generality necessary to serve as a basis for social order.

As suggested at the end of Chapter three, however, the humanistic sociologists did tend to vacillate between grounding social life objectively and subjectively, which resulted in their advancing a somewhat truncated rendition of human freedom. Traditionally, if this tack is followed when grounding social existence, primacy in this relationship is always given to objectivity. It is believed that objectivity is the only component in this relationship which is not fundamentally capricious, and can therefore provide the regularity that is necessary for the maintenance of social order. The usual result of this fundamental differentiation is that subjectivity has to work within the confines stipulated by objectivity. When this is the case, individual or social freedom comes to be equated with the necessity which is prescribed by objectivity. Accordingly, a very truncated rendition of social freedom is advanced.

Each of the four cognate theories just discussed obviate this problem. That is, they each tend to ground knowledge and, subsequently, social existence on a base which is neither subjective nor objective. Blumer grounds social existence on social action, while Schutz views it to be a correlate of human conscious intentionality. In
general, critical theory understands social life to be the product of cognitive interests, while for the Yugoslavs it is a product of praxis. Accordingly, each of these four theories understand the ground of social life to be something which is an extension of human action, and not an imperative structure which the social actor must encounter upon entering the social world. The "human quotient" therefore, is placed at the center of social life, in that its movement is thought to be that which outlines the parameters of social existence.

Therefore, the style of social freedom which each of these four theories proffers is far more radical and far reaching than that conveyed to humanistic sociology. Because they do not understand social action to be a force which merely encounters the social world, they likewise do not stipulate that social action must actualize itself within the structures elaborated or imposed by objectivity. Translated into more sociological terms, this means that the individual is not conceived as a mere subjective element which is cast into an objective world to which it must yield. Accordingly, freedom is not equated with the actualization of behavior which is deemed acceptable by the objective world, nor is it treated as a subjective reaction which the individual can have in the face of demands made by an imposing world. When the latter is the case, the individual is merely able to externalize freedom. What then is the
actual theory of freedom which can be distilled from these
four cognate theories?

These cognate theories suggest that freedom is the
essential element of the "human quotient". What this means
is that the "human quotient", because it is a correlate of
the social world, does not actualize itself within the
social world, but instead as the social world. Due to the
fact that these theories view the "human quotient" to be the
ground of social life, social life cannot theoretically
(metaphysically) oppose it. Therefore, the only real
limit of action which the "human quotient" encounters is that
which it imposes on itself. Subsequently, the "human
quotient" is fundamentally capable of actualizing or
formulating the social world in any number of ways. The
social world takes on the form provided by the self-
determination of the "human quotient", and the "human
quotient" has the capability to generate an unfettered
existence.

Two fundamental points should, however, be recognized
at this time. First, the individual may be born into a
world which existed before h/she arrived on the scene. This
social world may have a history which extends beyond the life
of any particular individual, but it does not have a status
which exceeds that allotted to it by the "human quotient".
Any world must be viewed to be a human creation (and is not
metaphysical in stature), and therefore can be changed or
altered at any time if enough power can be summoned. In short, an individual may encounter a world which h/she did not make, but not one which has a ground which was not provided by the "human quotient".

Second, the "human quotient" must not be thought to possess pure freedom. Pure freedom suggests that human action exists without bounds. The "human quotient", however, is thoroughly historical and therefore must always be actualized in situ. Even though the "human quotient" must realize itself in a historical situation, no situation can prescribe what action is possible for the "human quotient". Rather, the "human quotient" specifies the dimensions and, subsequently, the limits of any situation, simply because it can transcend the boundaries of any particular situation by taking on a new social form. What this means is that the "human quotient" can neither be treated as having a pure essence nor can it be viewed as abstractly (purely) free. Human freedom is only possible when the "human quotient" can actualize itself as a worldly phenomenon, and not merely as some pure or abstract form. Such worldly action, however, must be viewed as intersubjective or social, and not as some speculative fantasy of a solipsistic individual.

In fine, these four cognate theories place the "human quotient" at the center of world determination. Through its own self-determination the "human quotient" is capable of
shaping the social world in any direction. The "human quotient" is not merely allowed to react to so-called objective social options, which is inadvertently the case with humanistic sociology, but much more fundamentally is able to constitute or construct what is socially possible. This is certainly the case when Blumer says that the social world is only where social action takes place, and is not a structure which determines social conduct. When critical theory identifies social life as a "project", and when Schutz and the Yugoslavs respectively assert that social life embodies intentionality and praxis a similar idea is advanced. Nevertheless, each of these theories does not stipulate that freedom is a formal (a priori) social category, but instead that it is what the "human quotient" does, and therefore the "human quotient" has no determinate cause which stipulates how it shall develop. Rather, the "human quotient" is self-determined and provides itself with a self-imposed direction. The "human quotient", moreover, is fundamentally and not provisionally free; it has no ontologically prescribed limits, but only those which it sets.

Each of these themes (pertaining to a humanistic epistemology, methodology and ontology) can be found in the four related theories basically analyzed in Chapters IV, V, VI, and VII of this dissertation. These themes form a common thread which unites these diverse theoretical positions and can serve as the cornerstone of a more fully
developed humanistic sociological theory than currently exists. Hopefully, others will expand upon and develop these themes, so that this new epistemological-methodological and ontological position may be applied to the analysis of additional facets of social life.
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