# Pitirim A. Sorokin's Integralism and Public Sociology

VINCENT JEFFRIES

Major features of the thought of Pitirim A. Sorokin are related to Michael Burawoy's four forms of sociology. The article develops the theme that Sorokin's system of sociology makes major contributions to identifying standards of excellence for professional, critical, policy, and public sociology and for their interrelationships. Sorokin's integral ontology and epistemology are described and identified as sources of the distinctive characteristics of his system of thought.

The year 2004 was characterized by considerable interest in the idea of public sociology. Through the impetus provided by Michael Burawoy, it was the theme of the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association (2004), the subject of university and academic addresses and papers (Burawoy, 2003a; 2003b; 2004f; Burawoy and VanAntwerpen, 2001), of symposia (Zimmer et al., 2004; Burawoy et al., 2004; Acker, 2005; Aronowitz, 2005; Baiocchi, 2005; Brewer, 2005; Ghamari-Tabrizi, 2005; Katz-Fishman and Scott, 2005; Urry, 2005), book chapters (Burawoy, 2005a; 2005c), and of articles in professional journals (Burawoy, 2004a; 2004b; 2004c; 2004d; 2004e; 2005b; 2005d; 2005e). A formal "Task Force on Institutionalizing Public Sociologies" was established within the American Sociological Association in 2004 (Hossfeld and Nyden, 2005).

In a recent paper Burawoy and VanAntwerpen (2001) describe the nature of public sociology as follows:

> Public sociology is less a *vision of* than it is an *orientation toward* the practice of sociology. It is a sociology that is oriented toward major problems of the day, one that attempts to address them with the tools of social science, and in a manner often informed by historical and comparative perspectives. It is a sociology that seeks as its audience not just other sociologists, but wider communities of discourse, from policy makers to subaltern counter-publics. In its robustly reflexive mode, sociology manifests itself as a public sociology designed to promote public reflection on significant social issues (p. 2).

A comment on Burawoy's (2004c) proposal of public sociology by David Brady (2004) specifies its fundamental emphases:

> public sociology essentially involves two ideas: reaching a public audience and serving to improve the public's well-being.... The first matter ... involves gaining a broader and larger reception for sociological

**Vincent Jeffries** is professor of sociology at California State University, Northridge. His current work involves developing a theoretical tradition derived from Pitirim A. Sorokin's idea of integralism. He is also working on a study of the influence of the virtues in long-term marriages. He can be contacted at Vincent.Jeffries@csun.edu.

research and theories.... The second matter ... involves seeking to contribute to the betterment of society and the lives of its members (pp. 1629-1630).

In addition to public sociology, Burawoy (2004a, 2004c, 2005b) posits three other forms: professional, critical, and policy. Professional sociology provides theoretical and empirical knowledge, critical sociology formulates foundational value perspectives, and policy sociology applies concrete knowledge to problems in society. Each form has weaknesses, or "pathologies," that develop when it becomes too autonomous. These negative tendencies can be counteracted by positive features of the alternative forms.

These four ideal types of sociology represent a "division of labor" in which there is "reciprocal interdependence" between the forms such that "the flourishing of each depends on the flourishing of all" (Burawoy, 2004c: 1611). In this total system of sociology there is, ideally, "an organic solidarity in which each type of sociology derives energy, meaning, and imagination from its connection to the others" (Burawoy, 2005b: 15). Each form can thus be viewed as a component of the total scientific system of sociology.

This article addresses the question of how a creative public sociology that will make positive contributions to society can be developed. Pitirim A. Sorokin's system of sociology, including his idea of integralism, is taken as a starting point for the analysis. Sorokin is the most published and most translated scholar in the history of sociology (Martindale, 1975: 105-106). His thought is diverse and comprehensive, and has made major contributions in many areas of sociology (Jeffries, 2002a; Johnston, 1995).

Burawoy's (2005b) analysis of the forms of sociology can be regarded as initiating an extensive dialogue to evaluate the criteria of excellence for the science of sociology. His model dictates that each form must be considered separately, in terms of its most important characteristics, and systemically, in terms of its potential influence on the other interdependent forms, and on the overall level of excellence of sociology as a science.

This article is intended to demonstrate that Sorokin's ideas provide foundational contributions to the development of each form of sociology, and to a greater understanding of their role in the total system of sociology. Further, his ideas can provide counter tendencies to the potential pathologies of each form, and can neutralize some of the criticisms directed toward public sociology. His system of thought thus constitutes an exemplar for the scientific system of sociology, including public sociology.

## Professional Sociology

Professional sociology is the *sine qua non* of the other three forms (Burawoy, 2004c: 1611). This form furnishes the theoretical frameworks and research techniques that provide scientifically based knowledge and understanding. It is exemplified in the theoretical traditions and scientific research programs characteristic of the history of the discipline. Professional sociology is accountable to the academic audience of peers to which it is primarily addressed, and is legitimated by scientific norms. Pathologies of professional sociology include insularity, irrelevance, placing method ahead of substance, and unnecessary abstraction (Burawoy, 2004a; 2004c; 2005c).

The system of sociology contained in Sorokin's writings is based on a comprehensive program of professional sociology. His ideas make three particular contributions to this form: a basic orientation to the nature and organization of the discipline, a close correspondence of theoretical development and empirical research, and the ontology and epistemology of integralism.

*The Nature of Sociology*

Sorokin's sociology rests on the assumption that there are three "inseparable" components of the subject matter—personality, as thinking and acting individuals; society, the totality of interacting individuals and social relationships; and culture, composed of meanings, values, and norms and the vehicles through which they are manifested (Sorokin, 1947: 63-64; 1966: 635-649). Since "none of the members of this indivisible trinity (personality, society, culture) can exist without the other two" (Sorokin, 1947: 63-64), each must ultimately "be referred to the triadic manifold, or matrix in which it exists" (Sorokin, 1947: 47) to produce optimum knowledge and understanding. This basic conceptual and analytic frame of reference leads to a definition of sociology as "a generalizing science of sociocultural phenomena viewed in their generic forms, types, and manifold interconnections" (Sorokin, 1947: 16). General sociology includes the structural, which studies culture, society, and personality as systems, and the dynamic, which studies process and change in these systems. This same basic delineation of the subject matter is applicable to "special sociologies" that focus on a particular class of sociocultural phenomena, such as family, religion, economics, or crime (Sorokin, 1947: 16-17).

Sorokin's formulation of the frame of reference of sociology and its application in various special sociologies provides a foundation for professional sociology that is broad in its scope and powerful in its analytic potential. Unlike more restrictive perspectives that typically minimize one, or even two, of the culture, society, personality triumvirate, Sorokin's delineation of the nature of sociology fully encompasses the essential features of the objective reality that is its subject matter. This comprehensive view of the science of sociology is open to study and elaboration through a variety of theories, methodological techniques, and subject matters. The topics of public sociology that can be derived from this source can be addressed as a general orientation or in the universe of special sociologies, such as cultural sociology, sociology of education, criminology, or any other area. This orientation includes the study of civil society emphasized by Burawoy (2004b), while broadening the potential scope and focus of public sociology to a wide variety of sociocultural phenomena and substantive areas.

*Scientific Research Programs*

A second contribution of Sorokin's system of sociology is a strong emphasis on both theoretical development and empirical research. Particularly important and illustrative in this regard in Sorokin's professional sociology are the following: his comparative, historical, and statistical analysis of culture that underlies his theories of cultural types, integration, and change (Sorokin, 1937a; 1937b; 1941a; 1947; 1957a); his analysis and typology of social relationships (1937c); his theoretical and statistical analysis of the historical fluctuation of war and revolution (1925,

1937c, 1950d, [1941]1998a, [1942]1998b); his analysis of mobility and stratification (Sorokin, 1947; 1959), including the relation between power and morality (Sorokin and Lunden, 1959); his analysis of social theories (1928, 1950c, 1966) and of methodology (1956b); and his pioneering theoretical formulations and empirical work in the study of altruistic love (1950a, 1950b, 1954a, 1954b). In these areas Sorokin provides an exemplar for professional sociology with innovative theoretical and conceptual formulations systematically related to the analysis of various types of empirical data.

Sorokin's professional sociology illustrates a model of science in which theory and research are closely connected. The ultimate aim of scientific endeavor in this context is to explain basic structures and processes (Turner, 1998). Lakatos' (1978) exposition of the nature of scientific research programs exemplifies this emphasis on rigorous scientific development, and provides a model for building a firm foundation of scientific knowledge and understanding within professional sociology. In his analysis Burawoy (1989, 1990, 2004c: 1609, 2005b: 10) consistently maintains that developing vigorous scientific research programs in diverse areas is a necessary foundation for a creative and socially significant public sociology.

*Integralism*

A third contribution of Sorokin's system of sociology to public sociology is his idea of integralism. It is the basis of various aspects of Sorokin's thought (Ford, 1963; 1996; Johnston, 1995; 1996: 166-220; 1998), including his ontology and epistemology. The foundational idea of integralism is that the reality that is the subject matter of the social sciences contains empirical-sensory, rational-mindful, and superrational-supersensory components (Sorokin, 1941a: 741-746; 1956a; 1957b). This assumption opens the spiritual and transcendental realm to consideration and analysis. Since reality contains these three elements, this ontology necessitates a corresponding epistemology suitable for obtaining knowledge regarding all its aspects.

The system of truth and knowledge of a culture involves its scientific, philosophical, and religious thought. Sorokin's integral model is based on a system of truth and knowledge that has appeared in different societies and periods of history over the last 2,500 years (Sorokin, 1937b: 1-180; 1957a: 225-283). In this period of time in Western civilization some variety of integralism has occurred approximately as often as alternative epistemological systems that are based primarily on either empiricism or on faith (Sorokin, 1937b: 54-55). Integralism historically has been eclectic in terms of religious and philosophical orientation (Nichols, 2001). It is represented in the "idealistic rationalism" of particular branches of such diverse systems of thought as Taoism, Buddhism, Hinduism, classical Greek philosophy, and Christianity (Sorokin, 1963a: 373-374. See also 1937b: 57-69, 95-103).

The distinguishing characteristic of an integral epistemology is that it combines faith, reason, and the senses into a harmonious system. The truth of faith is regarded as including both intuition and the religious idea of revealed truth (Sorokin, 1964a: 227-229. See also 1956a, 1957b). Sorokin (1941a) describes an integral system of truth and knowledge as follows:

> the *integral truth is not identical with any of the three forms of truth, but embraces all of them*. In this three-dimensional aspect of the truth of faith, of reason, and of the senses, the integral truth is nearer to the

absolute truth than any one-sided truth of one of these three forms. Likewise, the reality given by the integral three-dimensional truth, with its source of intuition, reason, and the senses, is a nearer approach to the infinite metalogical reality of the *coincidentia oppositorum* than the purely sensory, or purely rational, or purely intuitional reality, given by one of the systems of truth and reality. The *empirico-sensory aspect of it is given by the truth of the senses; the rational aspect, by the truth of reason; the super-rational aspect by the truth of faith* (pp. 762-763).

An integral epistemology can produce significant advances in knowledge and understanding in the social sciences (Sorokin, 1961; 1963a: 372-400; [1944]1998c: 284). As stated by Sorokin (1963a):

> A systematic development of such an adequate integral system of cognition is an urgent need of our time. Such a system would include in it not only rational, sensory, and intuitive knowledge of rational-sensory realities but also the cognition of "suprasensory and suprarational" forms of reality-the knowledge called "no-knowledge" by the Taoist sages, *prajna* and *jnana* by the Hindu and the Buddhist thinkers, and *docta ignorantia* by Nicholas of Cusa. Development of such a genuine integral system of truth and cognition can greatly help mankind in enriching, deepening, and enlarging human knowledge of total reality, in eliminating the mutually conflicting claims of science, religion, philosophy, and ethics through reconciliation and unification of their real knowledge into one integral system of truth, in stimulating man's creativity in all fields of culture and social life, and in the ennoblement and transfiguration of man himself (p. 400).

Scientific endeavor within sociology is a continuum ranging from the metaphysical realm of presuppositions and ideological assumptions, to the middle level of theories and models, to the empirical realm of observation and data gathering (Alexander, 1982: 1-46). The comprehensive scope provided by the tripartite epistemology of integralism involves in its most basic sense the incorporation of ideas derived from religious traditions at all levels of this scientific continuum (Jeffries, 1998).

*The Practice of Science*

Two general criteria guide and provide impetus to scientific endeavor within professional sociology: scientific importance and value judgments. Both provide unique contributions to the advancement of knowledge and understanding, and to the assessment of the relative importance of past and future topics of study. Thus both contribute to the cumulation necessary for both policy and public sociology.

Determining scientific importance is an ongoing process of assessment emerging from theoretical development and cumulative research findings. In sociology, professional activity is focused on advancing knowledge and understanding regarding basic structures and processes within the frame of reference of culture, society, and personality (Sorokin, 1947: 16-17). This focus on the most fundamental aspects of the subject matter provides for considerable parallel between theories and research findings in general and special sociologies, thus maximizing scientific cumulation (Turner, 2005a).

The second criterion guiding the practice of science is value premises that are derived from conceptions of the good (Myrdal, 1958). The values that are formulated in the metaphysical environment of the scientific continuum influence scientific activity at less abstract levels. They guide problem selection and focus the evaluation of the significance of empirical results within professional sociology. They also contribute to cumulation and generalization by focusing theory and research on a limited range of problems. In these senses value premises guide the

ongoing practice of science. The nature of these values and the reasons for their importance can be formulated and considered within the sphere of critical sociology.

## Critical Sociology

Critical sociology raises questions and initiates dialogue within the academic community about basic assumptions and values, and about the moral foundations and concerns of sociology (Burawoy, 2004a; 2004c). It is the "conscience" of professional sociology (Burawoy, 2004c: 1609). It also disciplines policy sociology and initiates value commitments in public sociology. In executing these activities, critical sociology has on occasion drawn ideas from outside the discipline to formulate perspectives regarding these questions (Burawoy, 2004a: 105). The legitimacy of critical sociology is based on its ability to "supply moral visions" (Burawoy, 2005b: 16). These contributions of critical sociology will be lessened if it becomes overly sectarian or dogmatic.

Sorokin's critical sociology encompasses two areas. The first is his evaluation of the state of professional sociology, the second his formulation of the alternative of integralism, particularly with reference to its value premises.

### The State of Sociology

The scientific accomplishments of professional sociology and its level of contributions to the general society were regarded by Sorokin as minimal ([1941]1998a, 1956b). Because the sociology of the first part of the twentieth century focused on a natural science model, it "did not create referential principles adequate for a study of sociocultural phenomena nor develop methods fit for such a study" (Sorokin, [1941] 1998a: 94). Although a "vast" amount of information was collected, because of the neglect of reason and the rejection of intuition as sources of truth, these facts were not systematically gathered in a manner to produce knowledge. As a result, "only a few generalizations and correct formulas of uniformities in sociocultural processes were discovered" (Sorokin, [1941]1998a: 95). This failure of professional sociology led inevitably to failure in the policy and public realms, where "they were unable to eliminate any important social evils or to contribute to social welfare. They were incapable of offering any systematic plan of sociocultural reconstruction" (Sorokin, [1941]1998a: 98).

This lack of creativity in sociology can only be alleviated by a shift to an integral epistemology, referential principles that recognize the logical and meaningful nature of sociocultural phenomena, and resultant changes in the nature of the problems that are studied (Sorokin, [1941]1998a: 100-103). To a limited degree, these changes had begun to take place by the latter part of the twentieth century. One example is the general recognition of culture, society, and personality as the basic subject matter of sociology. Others are widespread agreement in sociological analysis on both the importance of the dimension of meaning and the concept of system. Despite these advances, an integral sociology had not been adequately or fully developed at Sorokin's (1965, 1966: 635-649) last evaluations, and still has not today.

*The Integral Model*

One function of critical sociology is to "dialogue about ends" as it "interrogates the value premises of society as well as our profession" (Burawoy, 2005b: 11). This assessment of values is fundamental in evaluating what problems should be studied in professional sociology and in justifying their relative importance. The content of an integral model of critical sociology at the highest level of value generalization is described by Sorokin as follows (1957b):

> Among all the meaningful values of the superorganic world there is the supreme integral value—the veritable *summum bonum*. It is the indivisible unity of Truth, Goodness, and Beauty. Though each member of this supreme Trinity has a distinct individuality, all three are inseparable from one another.... These greatest values are not only inseparable from one another, but they are transformable into one another.... Each newly discovered truth contributes also to the values of beauty and goodness. Each act of unselfish creative love (goodness) enriches the realms of truth and beauty; and each masterpiece of beauty morally enobles and mentally enlightens the members of the human universe.... For these reasons, the main historical mission of mankind consists in an unbounded creation, accumulation, refinement, and actualization of Truth, Beauty, and Goodness in the nature of man himself, in man's mind and behavior, in man's superorganic universe and beyond it, and in man's relationships to all human beings, to all living creatures, and to the total cosmos.... Any important achievement in this supreme mission represents a real progress of man and of the human universe (p.184).

These highly general values can be considered separately at a level of generalization below their transformability described above. Each needs to be specified and clarified to be incorporated in the system of ideas and practices that constitute the forms of sociology. Truth and goodness are the most important for shaping the discipline of sociology. The previous analysis has indicated that the ontology and epistemology of integralism can facilitate increased understanding of the truth regarding the nature, structure, and dynamics of sociocultural phenomena. The general value of goodness can also be expressed in concepts suitable for theoretical development and research application in professional and policy sociology.

*Studying Goodness*

An integral concept of goodness can be formulated from fundamental religious ideas which appear to be close to universal in the major world religions. The religious truth of faith provides the core values of critical sociology that discipline and guide professional sociology to the common focus of theory and research that is necessary for scientific cumulation. Sorokin (1948) notes

> religion enters into harmonious cooperation with science, logic, and philosophy without sacrificing any of its intuitive truth revealed through the superconscious of its seers, prophets, and charismatic leaders. On the other hand, in its turn it supplements science, logic, and philosophy through its system of ultimate reality—values. In this way religion, logic, science unite to form a single harmonious team dedicated to the discovery of the perennial values and to the proper shaping of man's mind and conduct (p.158).

In an integral model religious ideas can be used as value premises and concepts within the basic frame of reference delineated by Sorokin (1947: 63-65) of culture, society, and personality. They can be incorporated at various levels of the scientific continuum, ranging from the metaphysical level as value premises in critical sociology, to the theoretical level as basic concepts, to the empirical level as opera-

tional definitions applied to data of a particular nature within the practice of professional sociology (Jeffries, 1999).

Particularly important for sociological analysis are ideas from religious traditions pertaining to topics such as human nature, the characteristics of goodness and of perfection, the ends of human existence, and moral and ethical precepts. Ideas of this nature from religious traditions can be used to define goodness for study at two different levels of sociological analysis: the sociocultural and the individual personality.

*Goodness at the Sociocultural Level*

In regard to social interaction and intergroup relations, religious moral and ethical systems universally emphasize ideas such as doing good and avoiding evil, the Golden Rule of behaving toward others as one would have others behave toward oneself, and attitudes and behavior that are directed to benefiting the other in some manner. This orientation of doing good to the other has also frequently been referred to as love: benevolent or agape love in traditional terms, altruistic, compassionate, or unlimited love in more recent usage (Post, 2003). Concepts such as "solidarity" and "familistic" signify the manifestation of this love in terms of forms of interaction and social relationships, respectively (Sorokin, 1954a: 13). Though often differing in specifics, the world religions are similar in the essential nature of such ideas regarding the good in a context of interaction and intergroup relations (Hick, 1989; Hunt, Crotty, and Crotty, 1991; Post, 2003; Sorokin, 1948: 154-158; 1954a: 111-112; 1998c).

Sorokin's (1947: 93-144) theory of solidarity and antagonism provides a basis for scientific research programs in this area, ranging on the micro- macrocontinuum from interpersonal to international relations. The importance of the sociological problem of solidarity and antagonism to professional, policy, and public sociology is noted by Sorokin (1947):

> The paramount theoretical and practical importance of the factors of solidarity and antagonism is obvious. Had we known what caused either solidarity or antagonism, and with such knowledge been able to increase the familistic and eliminate the antagonistic from interpersonal and intergroup relationships, had we but known this, all the main social tragedies—war, bloody revolution, crime, coercion and compulsion, misery and unhappiness, the contrasts of poverty and luxury, domination and enslavement—would have been eliminated or reduced to a minimum (p. 119).

Solidary interaction is a situation in which "the aspirations (meanings, values) and overt actions of the interacting parties concur and are mutually helpful for the realization of their objectives" (Sorokin, 1947: 93). In contrast, in antagonistic interaction the meanings—values and actions "of the parties are opposite and mutually hinder one another" (Sorokin, 1947: 93). These forms of interaction also appear in more complex systems of social relationships, in which the "familistic" is predominately solidary and the "compulsory" is predominately antagonistic (Sorokin, 1947: 99-110. See also 1937c; 1941b: 167-240).

Internal solidarity has often been a factor in enabling some groups to establish compulsory relations of domination over others. Within an integral framework that derives concepts from religious traditions, such as the Golden Rule or the unconditional love of agape, the concept of solidarity must be formulated in terms of po-

tentially universal application. In this sense, the concept of solidarity is limited to interaction directed toward ends that are not known to violate the good of the human person, or basic rights of a personal, social, economic, or political nature. It thus includes the idea of justice, in which each receives his or her right or due (Pieper, 1966: 43-53).

Sorokin (1947: 119-131) explains solidarity and antagonism by cultural factors characteristic of the interacting parties: the nature of norms and values, whether they are concordant or discordant, and the degree to which they are expressed in behavior. Moral norms that are characteristic of religions, such as love and the Golden Rule, are a basic variable in Sorokin's (1947: 130-131) theory of the cultural sources of solidarity. Values and norms such as the aforementioned that are considered universal and are consistently practiced are primary factors in solidarity, particularly if this is true of each of the interacting parties. In contrast, sources of antagonism are values and norms that emphasize rivalry, egoism, or competition for limited resources, that are regularly practiced, and that are discordant among the interacting parties.

Extensions and elaborations of Sorokin's basic theory of solidarity and antagonism occur in his analysis of topics such as the problematics of sensate culture (Sorokin, 1937c: 161-180; 1941a: 737-779; 1941b), the relation between culture types and systems of social relationships (Sorokin, 1937c: 123-138), the relation between power and morality (Sorokin and Lunden, 1959), and war (Sorokin, 1937c: 370-380; [1942]1998b; [1944]1998c).

*Goodness in Individual Personality*

The desirability of individual development toward greater personal goodness is espoused by all major religions (Hick, 1989: 36-55). Such individual goodness is typically defined as a movement from self-centeredness to centeredness on God or the Ultimate Reality. This transformation entails a process of movement toward salvation/liberation involving progressively greater moral goodness on the part of the individual (pp. 299-315). This focus provides for studying goodness at the level of analysis of the individual personality. Two related concepts can be used to analyze the nature of goodness at this micro level: virtue and altruistic love.

The development in recent years in psychology of a major tradition called "positive psychology" has given a central theoretical and research focus to the concept of virtue (Vitz, 2005). Virtues are traditionally regarded as habits that are good, and thus that produce good works. They represent the perfection of the powers that move the individual toward what is good within human nature (Aquinas, 1981: 819-827; Pieper, 1966).

In a recent major work in the tradition of positive psychology, Peterson and Seligman (2004: 3-52) emphasize the historical and cultural universality of the concept of virtue. They maintain that six broad categories of virtues emerge as universally regarded personal manifestations of the good in the thinking of moral philosophers and religious thinkers representing the major world religions: wisdom, courage, humanity, justice, temperance, and transcendence. In this formulation, these universal virtues are manifested through character strengths, the psychological processes through which the virtues are activated. Character strengths in turn are linked to situational themes. These are habits linked to specific situa-

tions. For example, the virtue of humanity that involves "tending and befriending others" (Peterson and Seligman, 2004: 29) is expressed in character strengths such as love or kindness, which in turn can be expressed in situational themes such as empathy, inclusiveness, or positivity. The greatest cultural variation exists at the level of themes, is found less often for character traits, and is regarded as absent in the case of the universal virtues (Peterson and Seligman, 2004: 14).

More traditional formulations of the virtues, such as those of Aristotle (1941: 927-1112) and Aquinas (1981: 817-894, 1263-1879), parallel this list despite variations in terminology, emphasis, and organization (Peterson and Seligman, 2004: 46-48). The virtues can also be equated with the idea of benevolent or altruistic love since the virtues specify the attitudes and behavior necessary to benefit the other in a consistent manner (Jeffries, 1998).

Sorokin equated the idea of personal goodness with the manifestation of altruistic love (Sorokin, 1954a, 1964b: 160-208). This love is manifested in self-sacrifice, the giving of aid, the performance of duty, generosity, friendliness, unselfish service, and similar forms of behavior (Sorokin, 1954a: 47-79). Love of this nature is related to conceptions of the good in religious traditions. Sorokin (1954a: 79) notes: "There is no need to argue that *love is the heart and soul of ethical goodness itself and of all great religions*. Their central command has always been love of God and of neighbor."

Altruistic love has five dimensions (Sorokin, 1954a: 15-35): intensity, the degree of expenditure of energy and effort; extensity, the scope of others to whom love is given; duration, the amount of time during which love is expressed; purity, the degree to which the motivation to love is not self-centered; and adequacy, entailing both the degree to which the subjective intent of love is present and the degree to which the objective consequences of actions benefit the other. Lower levels of these dimensions of altruistic love are ego-centered, in that they are based primarily on enlightened self interest, while higher levels are ego-transcending, in that the end of love dominates the individual's motivation and actions (Sorokin, 1954a: 288-289). This range of attitudes and behavior manifested in altruistic love can be contrasted with behavior not related to altruism by its nature, and egoistic or anti-altruistic behavior, which may include hatred or enmity (Sorokin, 1948: 58-62). Recent writings indicate that Sorokin's formulation of the dimensions of love has potential applicability in scientific research programs on a variety of topics (Jeffries, 1998, 2002b; Post, 2003).

*The Power of Love*

On the personality level, evidence indicates that love is related to personal vitality and longevity, is a curative factor in some mental and physical disorders, and is a decisive factor in the over-all development and well-being of the individual (Sorokin, 1954a: 60-66). On the social level, the practice of altruistic love can transform social relationships, and the entire society and culture, in a positive manner (Sorokin, 1954a: 66-77). Love is a powerful creative force in the realization of ultimate values in all aspects of human life and experience (Sorokin, 1954a):

> the power of love generates, inspires, reinforces, and operates in all the individual and collective actions of the realization of truth and knowledge, of goodness and justice, of beauty and freedom, of the *summon bonum* and happiness, throughout the whole creative history of humanity (p. 79).

*Critical Impacts Professional*

The value perspective of critical integralism leads to two broad areas of theoretical development and empirical research in professional sociology. The first is the goodness of individuals, defined in terms of virtue and benevolent love. The second is social solidarity, the manifestation of goodness in interaction. It ranges from interpersonal, to intergroup, to international relations. This value perspective can be integrated with a variety of theoretical perspectives, research techniques, and substantive concerns, ranging from micro- to meso- to macro-levels of analysis, in both general and special sociologies. Two general theoretical and research problems emerge: how culture and society influence individual goodness, and how individual goodness influences culture and society (Jeffries, 1999).

By concentrating scientific practice through the investigation of the cultural, social, and personality sources of goodness in its various forms, an integral critical sociology adds greatly to the ability of professional sociology to establish the cumulation necessary for valid generalizations and the advance of knowledge and understanding. This strong professional foundation is crucial to a viable policy and public sociology.

## Policy Sociology

Policy sociology is the form that "focuses on solutions to specific problems" (Burawoy, 2004c: 1608). It provides instrumental knowledge regarding the means to reach a concrete goal. The legitimacy of policy sociology is based on its effectiveness. The problem is defined by a client or patron. A wide variety of organizations may contract for the services of sociologists. Policy sociology is thus directed primarily to an audience outside of the academic community. Potential pathologies are servility and the use of policy sociology by power holders in a manner in which scientific integrity is diminished (Burawoy, 2004a; 2004c; 2005b).

*The Promise of Integralism*

Sorokin ([1951]1998d) specifically advocated the development of a policy sociology directed toward realization of the values mandated by critical integralism:

> We seemingly know little about how to make friends and build a harmonious universe.

> The time has come when this knowledge must be obtained and fully developed. The historical moment has struck for building a new applied science or a new art of amitology—the science and art of cultivation of amity, unselfish love, and mutual help in interindividual and intergroup relationships. A mature amitology is now the paramount need of humanity. Its development tangibly determines the creative future of *Homo sapiens* (p. 302).

Because the integral model of professional sociology will yield "more valid and more accurate" knowledge and understanding "of the nature of sociocultural phenomena and of the uniformities that can be observed in its static and dynamic forms" (Sorokin, [1941]1998a: 103), it will provide a sound basis for policy sociology and have clear implications for the dialogue of public sociology. Sorokin ([1941]1998a) notes this contribution of the knowledge gathered by an integral professional sociology to these other forms:

The importance of such knowledge for applied social science is obvious. Some important future trends can be roughly predicted: efficient means of correcting social evils can be devised, the creative enrichment of human experience can be inspired; and in all fields of culture there can be created magnificent and lasting values (p. 103).

## *Integral Theoretical Foundations and Policy Implications*

A central element of policy sociology is to provide knowledge that is "practical" or "useful" about how something can be achieved (Burawoy, 2005b: 16). Such knowledge can range from broad theoretical orientations to specific solutions to particular problems. In Sorokin's integralism the most basic theoretical orientation for policy sociology is derived from the fact that culture, society, and personality phenomena "constitute an indivisible trinity bound together by the ties of causal and meaningful interdependence" (Sorokin, 1948: 94). Therefore, policy intervention directed toward positive change must involve all three of these aspects of reality. Thus in regard to establishing and maintaining peace and social solidarity, Sorokin (1948) observes:

> If we desire to eliminate war and to establish a harmonious world order, we must pay the fullest price for this value: we must transform in a creatively altruistic direction all human beings, all social institutions, and the entire culture of mankind in all its main compartments, including science, religion, law and ethics, the fine arts, economics, and politics. Otherwise all attempts are doomed to be abortive and to prove harmful rather than beneficial (pp. 95-96).

Sorokin's more specific agenda for policy formulation and intervention derives from the aforementioned principle that cultural, social, and personality factors must all be changed. However, there is a causal priority in generating reconstruction. Since "the total fabric of a given culture is woven of millions of trifling individual deeds" (Sorokin, 1948: 234), positive change rests on the necessary condition that "*every individual as such* can begin to work upon himself" (Sorokin, 1948: 233) in an effort to become more altruistic and creative. Thus individual deliberation and choice, and micro level initiatives beginning with individual behavior, become the necessary condition of effective social and cultural reconstruction. Sorokin (1948) describes the nature and importance of this effort at self-transformation toward greater personal goodness:

> one can carry on this self-education in thousands of specific actions, beginning with minor good deeds and ending with the acts of exceptional unselfishness. If most persons would even slightly improve themselves in this way, the sum total of social life would be ameliorated vastly more than through political campaigns, legislation, wars and revolutions, lockouts and strikes, and pressure reforms (pp. 233-234).

Sorokin's (1954a: 125-455) professional sociology devoted to the study of altruism includes an investigation of self-directed altruistic transformation. Various techniques that the individual can perform on his or her self, such as doing good deeds, individual creative activity, the development of altruistic self-identification, prayer, conscience examination, and rearrangement of group affiliations are analyzed and illustrated with case studies (Sorokin, 1954a: 323-355). Building on foundations from Sorokin, the study of various techniques of altru-

istic transformation is an important part of the recent movement to develop a scientific field devoted to research on "unlimited love" (Post, 2003: 159-202).

Resting on the necessary condition of individual transformation, Sorokin (1948) develops a general policy agenda for social and cultural reconstruction. This agenda moves from individual behavior to meso- then macro-levels. This continued advance of reconstruction is considered dependent on the contributions of scientific knowledge.

> *The second and third lines of attack consist in a well-planned modification of our culture and social institutions through the concerted actions of individuals united in groups, which, in turn, are merged in larger federations or associations.* At the present time the tasks are twofold: first, *to increase our knowledge and wisdom and to invent better, more efficient techniques for fructifying our culture and institutions and rendering human beings more noble and altruistic;* second, *through this increased knowledge and these perfected techniques to draw up more adequate plans for the total process of transformation, to diffuse and propogate them, and to convince ever-larger sections of humanity of the urgency, feasibility, and adequacy of the proposed reconstruction* (pp. 234-235).

### Integralism's Basic Policy Model: Individual Agency

Sociology has traditionally studied phenomena ranging from micro to macro levels, concretely, from the individual to the society or civilization. Work has been directed to developing theories of influence from either of these levels to the other: from micro to macro, and from macro to micro (Ritzer, 1981; Turner and Boyns, 2001). Much of Sorokin's sociological system pertains to the influence of macro factors such as general culture types and systems of social relationships upon more micro level phenomena and on individual personalities. However, his policy integralism places particular emphasis on movement from micro to macro. Therefore, the role of human choice at the most micro level of the individual, and its implications at increasingly macro levels, becomes a major focus of theory and research in professional and policy sociology, and a major criterion of relevance for public sociology.

The underlying theoretical logic of this model of policy sociology and its implications for professional sociology is similar to that developed by W.I. Thomas (1951: 35-38). While the mutual interdependence of personality and sociocultural factors is acknowledged, theoretical development and research on personality and the effect of individual attitudes and actions on transforming the sociocultural world of values in a positive direction is emphasized. In a statement that parallels Sorokin's model, Thomas (1951) notes:

> We must establish by scientific procedure the laws of behavior, and then the past will have its meaning and make its contribution. If we learn the laws of human behavior as we have learned the laws of mathematics, physics, and chemistry, if we establish what are the fundamental human attitudes, how they can be converted into other and more socially desirable attitudes, how the world of values is created and modified by the operation of these attitudes, then we can establish any attitudes and values whatever (pp. 37-38).

*Policy Sociology Initiated by the Sociologist*

Sorokin's comprehensive system of thought frequently contains policy formulations in the sense of presenting specific solutions to clearly identified problems. Sorokin began to move from his primarily professionally oriented writing to focus-

ing more on problems in his works on the crisis of contemporary culture and social relations (1941b), on war ([1944]1998c), and on behavior in situations of social calamity (1942: 296-319). In these writings he also proposed solutions to these problems. In his autobiography he notes that while completing the writing of his comprehensive system of sociology (Sorokin, 1947) he became increasingly pre-occupied with "the highly critical situation of mankind" (Sorokin, 1963b: 268). He decided that when this writing was finished "I would devote all my free time to the investigation of the means of preventing the imminent annihilation of the human race and of ways out of the deadly crisis" (Sorokin, 1963b: 268). Shortly after he made this decision, in the form of a commitment to scientifically study altruistic love, he was approached by Eli Lilly and offered financial support for his studies. Subsequent grants from Lilly made possible the establishment of the Harvard Research Center in Creative Altruism, with Sorokin as director (Sorokin, 1963b: 275-280).

Although Lilly provided valuable financial support, the direction of the Center for ten years of its existence, and all decisions regarding topics and methods of study, were left entirely in the hands of Sorokin (Johnston, 1995: 166-220; Sorokin, 1963b: 271-292). Thus Sorokin's policy sociology began before any contact with Lilly, and was completely free from control by a client or patron after Lilly became involved. It is therefore free from the pathologies of servility and loss of scientific integrity that can occur in this form (Burawoy, 2004c; 2005b). In his autobiographical statement Sorokin notes that "my independence and freedom of thought" were values that he was unwilling to compromise to obtain financial aid for his scientific work (Sorokin, 1963b: 274-275).

The nature of Sorokin's policy sociology can be more specifically understood in the context of the four forms of sociology. Burawoy (2005b: 11-13) notes that at a more descriptive and empirical level each ideal type form of sociology has within itself "moments" that reflect the dominant concerns of the other types. For example, critical sociology exists within professional sociology in the debates that take place both within and between research programs. This internal complexity can be seen in Sorokin's works. For example, his major work on altruistic love is clearly professional sociology in its content and intended audience, yet it contains a considerable section that deals with policy in terms of the techniques of altruistic transformation (Sorokin, 1954a: 125-489). Similarly, his analysis of power and morality is public sociology in terms of its intended general audience, while containing an extended policy analysis of how lack of morality in the exercise of power can be reduced and controlled (Sorokin and Lunden, 1959: 104-193).

Sorokin's (1948) analysis of reconstruction represents a detailed and comprehensive statement of policy sociology addressed to the general public. The policy intent and character of this work is clearly illustrated in the preface introducing the reader to the book:

> If this plan for personal, social, and cultural transformation is carried through, international and civil wars are likely to be eliminated, interpersonal and intergroup conflicts largely abolished, vast creative forces released, and an unprecedented renaissance of human values ushered in (Preface).

The entire work is a comprehensive statement of the various means necessary to reach more solidary and peaceful relations in this historical era. After a brief analysis of ineffective means to reach these ends, an increase in altruism is proposed as

the only effective solution to the problem of antagonistic and compulsory interpersonal, intergroup, and international relations. The rest of the work consists in a detailed exposition of the instrumental knowledge of how the goal of personal, social, and cultural reconstruction toward greater altruism can be effectively achieved. What must be changed, effective remedies, and the prospects of success are all considered in some detail.

The varied contexts of Sorokin's policy formulations, the fact they were of his own initiation, and their complete independence from the influence of client or patron suggest it is useful to distinguish a form of policy sociology that is initiated by the sociologist. Taking Sorokin's case as a model, sociological knowledge and understanding are applied to finding the solution to some problem. Focus is on the means to accomplish a particular goal, and thus on instrumental knowledge. However, the analysis is not initiated by, or responsible to, a client or patron. Rather, the problem and goal to be attained are formulated by the concerns of the sociologist himself or herself. A systematic program for reaching a goal is presented to an audience that can range from academic to varied publics. Confirmatory research is not required, as it typically is in policy research for a client, and, in some instances, a patron. In this sense the nature of this manifestation of policy sociology, "sociologist initiated," is a variation within the practical tradition of sociology described by Turner and Turner (1990). This policy sociology may be "moments" in writings primarily in another form, or, as in Sorokin's (1948) work on reconstruction, policy may be the central intent and pervade the entire work. Other examples of this manifestation of policy sociology can be seen in Yablonsky's analysis of effective gang interventions (1997: 125-222) and of therapeutic communities (1989), and in Jacobson's (2005) analysis of how to reduce crime and incarceration.

*Policy Integralism and Civil Society*

Burawoy stresses the link between sociology and civil society (2005b: 24-25), with multiple associations of a wide variety being viewed as necessary to further "the interests of humanity," and to insulate this social arena from possible threats from either the state or a market economy. However, these positive effects of civil society are not viewed as inevitable. A vigorous civil society can also contribute to political or economic domination (2005c: 324). Burawoy (2005c: 325) suggests two "real utopias" that emerge from the values of critical sociology and that can be the focus of the professional and policy forms of sociology: a civil society that facilitates participatory democracy, and a political system of democratic socialism. In relation to both, three basic research questions are posed: the conditions of genesis, of existence, and of long-term maintenance. These goals and questions are regarded as the basis for engagement with publics outside the academic community.

The theoretical and research agenda deriving from critical integralism is different from that proposed by Burawoy's analysis, but is complementary. Sorokin's (1948) policy model provides the assumption that a necessary condition of a civil society that produces positive effects is individual goodness that is then manifested in agency directed toward social and cultural reconstruction. A second focus deriving from Sorokin's (1963a: 482-492) professional sociology that has policy implications is provided by his detailed analysis maintaining the greater explanatory power of culture in comparison to social factors. Emerging from this analysis is the

research question of the nature of a culture that will provide for a civil society that furthers human welfare. The creation of this culture that is supportive of reconstruction needs to be understood from micro to macro sources of genesis, beginning with individual deliberation and choice. An understanding of how this can be done is a major focus of policy integralism.

Following the strategy suggested by Burawoy and Wright (2001: 480-484), the perspective of critical integralism can also serve as a basis for formulating utopian models. Sorokin's (1954a) analysis of individuals and communities that are exemplars of altruistic love provides insight regarding one of the varieties of case materials that can be used in this type of analysis. Such models of "real utopias" can serve as a reference for research into how goodness in individual and sociocultural forms can be more fully realized in civil society, and within the state and economic sectors of society as well.

*Providing Foundations for Public Sociology*

The integral theoretical and research agenda of professional and policy sociology provides a strong foundation for public sociology. It includes an emphasis on producing knowledge and understanding of the role of individuals in personal, social, and cultural reconstruction. This focus leads directly to the importance of the study of meso level organizations and social movements and their role in reconstruction. This agenda also focuses on how a culture that supports reconstruction is created through micro and meso activity. As a result of these directions of theory and research, some of the ideas that sociology will offer for dialogue with the public are applicable to individual decision-making and initiative, and to meso level organizational activity. The focus on goodness at the personal and societal level in integral critical sociology is complementary in providing a value framework that has the potential to interest significant numbers of individuals in various publics in the ideas offered by sociology.

## Public Sociology

Public sociology involves dialogue with audiences outside  the academic community regarding "matters of political and moral concern" (Burawoy, 2004c: 1607). This sociology can be of two different forms, "traditional" and "organic" (Burawoy, 2004c: 1607-1608). The former is typically directed to a general issue and large and diverse audiences, the latter to the particular interests of specific groups and communities. Public sociology "has no intrinsic normative valence, other than the commitment to dialogue around issues raised in and by sociology" (Burawoy, 2005b: 8), and can thus involve and support differing value orientations. However, the potential contribution of public sociology to the debate of significant problems and issues can be compromised when it becomes too influenced by the values and concerns of the public (2004c).

Sorokin's attempt to enlighten and engage a wider public outside of sociology began with his revolutionary speeches and writings in Russia, where he was active in expressing opposition first against the Czarist government, then later the Communists (Nichols, 1999; Sorokin, 1963b: 55-205). The focus of Sorokin's later efforts to write for the general public regarding the most fundamental and crucial

issues of this era derives from the basis of his professional sociology, including his historical and comparative analysis of culture types and sociocultural organization and change (Sorokin, 1937a; 1937b; 1937c; 1941a; 1957a), his analysis of social differentiation and stratification (1947, 1959) and his explorations of the nature, causes, and effects of altruism (1950b; 1954a; 1954b).

Sorokin's extensive analysis of various problematic aspects of this historical era and his vision of a creative response involving the increase of altruistic love provides a broad and comprehensive basis for his public sociology. His public sociology in this general context is expressed in writings on the cultural crisis of our era (1941a), basic trends in social change (1964b), the relation between power and morality (Sorokin and Lunden, 1959), the sexual revolution (1956), the nature and importance of altruism (1950a), and a program of personal, social, and cultural reconstruction (1948). All of these works are exemplars of public sociology in the sense that were directed toward the general reading public in an attempt to inform, heighten awareness, and inspire social action directed toward reconstruction.

In identifying significant books in public sociology Burawoy (2005b: 7) notes that their importance is indicated by the fact that they became "the vehicle of a public discussion about the nature of U.S. society—the nature of its values, the gap between its promise and its reality, its malaise, its tendencies." Sorokin's ideas are particularly illustrative of this type of portrayal, and its relationship to the potential goal-oriented activity of individuals and groups. Sorokin's public sociology is comprehensive. He describes the problematics of our contemporary era, outlines an alternative, and considers the means of realizing that alternative.

The significance of the current historical moment, and its problematic nature, is dramatically stated by Sorokin (1941b):

> We are living and acting at one of the epoch-making turning points of human history, when *one fundamental form of culture and society—sensate—is declining and a different form is emerging*. The crisis is also extraordinary in the sense that, like its predecessors, it is marked by an extraordinary explosion of wars, revolutions, anarchy, and bloodshed; by social, moral, economic, political, and intellectual chaos; by a resurgence of revolting cruelty and animality, and a temporary destruction of the great and small values of mankind; by misery and suffering on the part of millions.... (p. 22).

Sorokin posits that the emerging culture will be idealistic, or integral (These terms are synonymous. Sorokin, 1961: 95-96, 1963: 481; Ford, 1963: 53). The reasons why this type of culture will contribute to the betterment of the everyday lives of humankind are described by Sorokin (1948):

> The major premise of sensate culture must be replaced by the broader, deeper, richer, and more valid premise that the *true reality and value is an infinite manifold possessing not only sensory but also supersensory, rational, and superrational aspects, all harmoniously reflecting its infinity*.... such a premise is incomparably more adequate than the purely sensate premise of our present culture.
> A culture built upon such a premise effectively mitigates the ferocity of the struggle for a greater share of material values, because material values occupy in it only a limited place and not the highest one. A large proportion of human aspirations tend to be channeled in the direction of the rational or the superrational perennial values of the kingdom of God, of fuller truth, nobler goodness, and sublimer beauty. The very nature of these values is impersonal and universal, altruistic and ennobling. As these values are infinite and inexhaustible, the quest for them does not lead to egoistic conflicts (p. 107).

The change to this type of culture follows general principles of cultural integration and change derived from Sorokin's professional sociology: the premise per-

taining to the nature of reality is foundational (1937a: 3-152; 1957a: 2-52). As a result of this ordering of cultural integration "the replacement of the major premise of sensate culture by the fundamentally different one which I designate as the idealistic premise, is the most fundamental step toward the establishment of a creative, harmonious order" (Sorokin, 1948: 107-108).

This fundamental cultural change is influenced by social science knowledge, and is both cause and effect of a movement toward greater altruistic love (Sorokin and Lunden, 1959):

> This new socio-political order aims to be built upon the up-to-date scientific knowledge and accumulated wisdom of humanity; it is animated ... by the spirit of universal friendship, sympathy, and unselfish love with ensuing mutual aid of everyone to everybody (p. 147).

Sorokin (1941b) notes the difficulty of the transition to a different culture and system of social relationships, emphasizing his model of policy sociology that gives first priority to self-directed individual change. A call to action on the part of each member of the public is issued:

> Our remedy demands a complete change of the contemporary mentality, a fundamental transformation of our system of values, and the profoundest modification of our conduct ... All this cannot be achieved without the incessant, strenuous, active efforts on the part of every individual in that direction (p. 321).

### Relevance Is Foundational

Public sociology is legitimated by its relevance (Burawoy, 2005b: 16). Sorokin presents a potentially engaging and powerful public sociology in this regard. Because it is closely linked to his professional, critical, and policy sociology, it rests on a strong foundation. It defines the nature of current problems in a broad scope that can be readily understood by a general audience if presented appropriately. It points to the solution of these problems in a manner that can involve both organic and traditional publics in participation in personal, social, and cultural reconstruction.

Sorokin and Lunden (1959) note the potentially comprehensive and unifying force of a public sociology focused on the study of goodness in the following statement:

> The wonderful radiation of creative love by its living incarnations is acceptable to scientists and philosophers, to religious and moral leaders of different denominations, even to atheists and agnostics. It is the common ground and the common value for scientists, philosophers, religious leaders, irreligious sceptics, and for all, except perhaps the few partisans of hate, enmity, and evil who are still polluting the creative course of human history (p. 178).

## Conclusion

In the conclusion of his Presidential Address to the American Sociological Association Burawoy (2005b) maintains:

> if we are going to acknowledge and reward public sociology then we must develop criteria to distinguish good from bad public sociology.... We must encourage the very best of public sociology whatever that may mean. Public sociology cannot be second-rate sociology (p. 25).

Sorokin's system of sociology provides a potentially significant contribution to recognizing the criteria of "good" public sociology. Because his integral sociology is systemic and comprehensive it makes major contributions to each of the interdependent forms of sociology delineated by Burawoy (2004a, 2004b, 2004c, 2005b). His public sociology can be viewed as an outcome of the other three forms.

Sorokin's professional model contributes a broad and inclusive conceptual frame of reference and an exemplary display of original theoretical development linked to empirical research. It also contains an innovative ontology and epistemology that incorporates the knowledge and understanding of philosophy and religion in the scientific continuum of a professional sociology based on the idea of integralism. The critical perspective deriving from this integral base in turn provides a focus of theoretical development and empirical investigation for scientific research programs in diverse areas of sociological analysis and practice. This concentration can greatly advance the cumulation of scientific knowledge in professional sociology. The strong program of professional sociology that emerges from Sorokin's model provides a corrective to Tittle's (2004) criticisms that center around the lack of reliable and valid scientific knowledge, and mitigates Nielsen's (2004) concern that advocacy can undermine scientific objectivity. The close relation between theory and research also insulates to some degree against the professional pathologies of irrelevance, unnecessary abstraction, and placing method ahead of substance.

Sorokin's critical sociology contributes the idea of goodness as a core value. It provides ideas of altruistic love, virtue, and solidarity as basic formulations of the good at the individual and sociocultural levels of analysis. It is important to recognize that this general value core of an integral model of critical sociology, that of goodness in its personal and sociocultural manifestations, is essentially apolitical and potentially universally available. The linking of these values to particularistic group interests or political agendas, especially at the personal level, is difficult. Goodness in terms of altruistic love, virtue, and social solidarity is probably as close as possible to a statement of universal values. Thus Sorokin's critical sociology provides at least partial correctives to concerns about how choices of values are to be made (Tittle, 2004), narrowness of values (Nielsen, 2004), unduly close association of Marxism and public sociology (Boyns and Fletcher, 2005), and the political nature and incompatibility of the values of public sociology with a significant portion of the general public (Turner, 2005). The critical sociology pathologies of dogmatism and sectarianism are lessened because of the inclusive nature of the values themselves and their universality as conceptions of the good.

These contributions of Sorokin's integral model of professional and critical sociology in turn greatly enhance the development of a vigorous policy sociology. This policy sociology is explicitly directed towards the means of realizing personal, social, and cultural reconstruction in terms of increased personal goodness and greater social solidarity. Brady (2004) has questioned whether there is a clear program in public sociology that can be practiced by sociologists with diverse interests. Sorokin's model provides for multiple activities of a specific nature that are unified around the development of knowledge and understanding regarding how the core multidimensional value of goodness can be realized. It provides diverse theoretical and research activities for professional and policy sociologists, a multidimensional value core for critical sociologists to explicate, and should yield a series of topics that can be presented to publics with reasonable hope for a re-

sponse of interest. The universal and engaging nature of the end values of integral policy sociology, combined with the specific goal direction of reconstruction, should provide some insulation against the policy pathologies of servility and manipulation by power holders.

The base provided by these three forms creates a public sociology that can engage both organic and traditional public audiences in dialogue regarding the nature of the good, the means by which it can be realized, and the part each and every individual can play in the enterprise of reconstruction. The clearly defined goals of integral sociology and their comprehensive nature provide an inherently interesting and innovative field of dialogue while providing sufficient foundational ideas and direction to insulate against the pathologies of faddishness and pandering to public concerns. Sorokin's system of integral sociology thus appears as a powerful base for a public sociology that is aptly suited in "conveying sociology to a wide lay audience through sociological interventions that set a new agenda for the discussion of public issues" (Burawoy, 2005e: 4).

## References

Acker, J. 2005. "Comments on Burawoy on Public Sociology." *Critical Sociology* 31: 327-331.

Alexander, J.C. 1982. *Theoretical Logic in Sociology: Positivism, Presuppositions, and Current Controversies*. Berkeley, CA: University of California.

American Sociological Association. 2004. *An Invitation to Public Sociology* Washington, D.C.: American Sociological Association.

Aquinas, T. 1981. *Summa Theologica*. Volumes 1-5.Westminister, MD: Christian Classics.

Aristotle. 1941. *The Basic Works of Aristotle*. New York: Random House.

Aronowitz, S. 2005. "Comments on Michael Burawoy's "The Critical Turn to Public Sociology." *Critical Sociology* 31: 333-338.

Baiocchi, G. 2005. "Interrogating Connections: From Public Criticism's to Critical Public's in Burawoy's Public Sociology." *Critical Sociology* 31: 339-351.

Brady, D. 2004. "Why Public Sociology May Fail." *Social Forces* 82(4): 1629-1638.

Brewer, R.M. 2005. "Response to Michael Burawoy's Commentary: "The Critical Turn to Public Sociology." *Critical Sociology* 31: 353-359.

Burawoy, M. 1989. "Two Methods in Search of Science: Skocpol versus Trotsky." *Theory and Society* 18: 759-805.

_____. 1990. "Marxism as Science: Historical Challenges and Theoretical Growth." *American Sociological Review* 55: 775-793.

_____. 2003a. "Public Sociologies in a Global Context" Polson Memorial Lecture. *Third Annual Workshop of the Polson Institute for Global Development*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University.

_____. 2003b. "South Africanizing U.S. Sociology."*From the Left* 24(3): 1, 12-13.

_____. 2004a. "Introduction." *Social Problems* 51: 103-106.

_____. 2004b. "Manifesto for Public Sociologies." *Social Problems* 51(1): 124-130.

_____. 2004c. "Public Sociologies: Contradictions, Dilemmas, and Possibilities." *Social Forces* 82(4): 1603-1618.

_____. 2004d. "The World Needs Public Sociology." *Sosiologisk tidsskrift* (Journal of Sociology, Norway) No. 3.

_____. 2004e. "Public Sociology: South African Dilemmas in a Global Context." *Society in Transition* 35(1): 11-26.

_____. 2004f. "To Advance, Sociology Must Not Retreat." *Chronicle of Higher Education* August 13.

_____. 2005a. "Provincializing the Social Sciences." Pp. 508-525 in *The Politics of Method in the Human Sciences*, edited by George Steinmetz. Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press.

_____. 2005b. "For Public Sociology." *American Sociological Review* 70: 4-28.

_____. 2005c. "The Critical Turn to Public Sociology." Pp. 309-322 in *Enriching the Sociological Imagination: How Radical Sociology Changed the Discipline*, edited by Rhonda Levine. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.

_____. 2005d. "Rejoinder: Toward a Critical Public Sociology." *Critical Sociology* 31: 379-390.

_____. 2005e. "The Return of the Repressed: Recovering the Public Face of U.S. Sociology, One Hundred Years On." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 600 (July): 1-18.

Burawoy, M., Gamson, W., Ryan, C., Pfohl, S., Vaughn, D., Derber, C. and Schor, J. 2004. "Public Sociologies: A Symposium from Boston College." *Social Problems* 51: 102-130.

Burawoy, M., and Van Antwerpen, J. 2001. "Public Sociology at Berkeley: Past, Present and Future." Unpublished paper.

Burawoy, M., and Wright, E.O. 2001. "Sociological Marxism." Pp. 459-486 in *Handbook of Sociological Theory*, Edited by J.H. Turner. New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.

Ford, J.B. 1963. "Sorokin as Philosopher." Pp. 39-66 in *Pitirim A. Sorokin in Review*, edited by Philip J. Allen. Durham, NC: Duke University.

_____. 1996. "Sorokin's Methodology: Integralism as the Key." Pp. 83-92 in *Sorokin and Civilization: A Centennial Assessment*, edited by J.B. Ford, M.P. Richard, and P.C. Talbutt. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Ghamari-Tabrizi, B. 2005. "Can Burawoy Make Everybody Happy? Comments on Public Sociology." *Critical Sociology* 31: 361-369.

Hick, J. 1989. *An Interpretation of Religion*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Hossfeld, L., and Nyden, P. 2005. "Institutionalizing Public Sociologies." *Footnotes* 33(1): 3.

Hunt, A.B., Crotty, M.E., and Crotty, R.B. 1991. *Ethics of the World Religions*. San Diego, CA: Greenhaven Press.

Jacobson, M. 2005. *Downsizing Prisons*. New York: New York University Press.

Jeffries, V. 1998. "Virtue and the Altruistic Personality." *Sociological Perspectives* 41(1): 151-166.

_____. 1999. "The Integral Paradigm: The Truth of Faith and the Social Sciences." *The American Sociologist* 30(4): 36-55.

_____. 2002a. "Integralism: The Promising Legacy of Pitirim A. Sorokin." Pp. 99-135 in *Lost Sociologists Rediscovered*, edited by M.A. Romano. Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellon Press.

_____. 2002b. "Virtue and Marital Conflict: A Theoretical Formulation and Research Agenda." *Sociological Perspectives* 43(2): 231-246.

Johnston, B.V. 1995. *Pitirim A. Sorokin: An Intellectual Biography*. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas.

_____. 1996. "Sorokin's Life and Work." Pp. 3-14 in *Sorokin and Civilization: A Centennial Assessment*, edited by J.B. Ford, M.P. Richard, and P.C. Talbutt. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

_____. 1998. "Pitirim Sorokin's Science of Sociology and Social Reconstruction." Pp. 1-55 in *Pitirim A. Sorokin on the Practice of Sociology*, edited by B.V. Johnston. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Katz-Fishman, W., and Scott, J. 2005. "Comments on Burawoy: A View from the Bottom-Up." *Critical Sociology* 31: 371-374.

Lakatos, I. 1978. *The Methodology of Scientific Research Programs* edited by J. Worral and G. Currie. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Martindale, D. 1975. *Prominent Sociologists since World War II*. Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill.

Myrdal, G. 1958. *Value in Social Theory*. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Nichols, L.T. 1999. "Science, Politics, and Moral Activism: Sorokin's Integralism Reconsidered." *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* 35(2): 139-155.

_____. 2001. "Sorokin's Integralism and Catholic Social Science: Concordance and Ambivalence." *The Catholic Social Science Review* 6: 11-24.

Nielsen, F. 2004. "The Vacant 'We': Remarks on Public Sociology." *Social Forces* 82(4): 1619-1627.

Peterson, C., and Seligman, M.E.P. 2004. *Character Strengths and Virtues*. New York: Oxford.

Pieper, J. 1966. *The Four Cardinal Virtues*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.

Post, S.G. 2003. *Unlimited Love: Altruism, Compassion, and Service*. Philadelphia, PA: Templeton Foundation Press.

Ritzer, George. 1981. *Toward an Integrated Sociological Paradigm*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Sorokin, P.A. 1925. *The Sociology of Revolution*. Philadelphia, PA: J.B. Lippincott.

_____. 1928. *Contemporary Sociological Theories*. New York: Harper and Brothers.

_____. 1937a. *Social and Cultural Dynamics*. Volume 1. New York: American Book Company.

_____. 1937b. *Social and Cultural Dynamics*. Volume 2. New York: American Book Company.

_____. 1937c. *Social and Cultural Dynamics*. Volume 3. New York: American Book Company.

_____. 1941a. *Social and Cultural Dynamics*. Volume 4. New York: American Book Company.

_____. 1941b. *The Crisis of Our Age*. New York: E.P. Dutton.

_____. 1942. *Man and Society in Clamity*. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co.

_____. 1947. *Society, Culture, and Personality*. New York: Harper & Brothers.

_____. 1948. *The Reconstruction of Humanity*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

_____. 1950a. *Altruistic Love*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

_____. ed. 1950b. *Explorations in Altruistic Love and Behavior*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

_____. 1950c. *Social Philosophies of an Age of Crisis*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

_____. 1950d. *Leaves from a Russian Diary*. Enlarged Edition. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

_____. 1954a. *The Ways and Power of Love*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

_____. ed. 1954b. *Forms and Techniques of Altruistic and Spiritual Growth.* Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

_____. 1956a. "This is My Faith." Pp. 212-227 in *This Is My Faith.* edited by S.G. Cole. New York: Harper & Brothers.

_____. 1956b. *Fads and Foibles in Modern Sociology and Related Sciences*. Chicago, IL: Henry Regnery.

_____. 1956c. *The American Sex Revolution*. Boston, MA: Porter Sargent.

_____. 1957a. *Social and Cultural Dynamics*. One Volume Edition. Boston, MA: Porter Sargent.

_____. 1957b. "Integralism is My Philosophy." Pp. 179189 in *This is My Philosophy*, edited by Whit Burnett. New York: Harper and Brothers.

_____. 1959. *Social and Cultural Mobility*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.

_____. 1961. "A Quest for an Integral System of Sociology." Pp 71-108 in *Memoire du XIX Congres International de Sociologie*. Volume 3. Mexico: Comite Organisateur du XIX Congres Intertnational de Sociologie.

_____. 1963a. "Reply To My Critics." Pp. 371-496 in *Pitirim A. Sorokin in Review*, edited by P.J. Allen. Durham, NC: Duke University.

_____. 1963b. *A Long Journey*. New Haven, CT: College and University Press.

_____. 1964a. *Sociocultural Causality, Space, Time.* New York: Russell and Russell.

_____. 1964b. *The Basic Trends of Our Times*. New Haven, CT: College and University Press.

_____ 1965. "Sociology of Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow." *American Sociological Review* 30(6): 833843.

_____ 1966. *Sociological Theories of Today*. New York: Harper & Row.

_____. [1941]1998a. "Declaration of Independence of the Social Sciences." Pp. 93-103 *Pitirim A. Sorokin: On the Practice of Sociology*, edited by B.V. Johnston. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

_____. [1942]1998b. "The Cause and Factors of War and Peace." Pp. 265-278 in *Pitirim A. Sorokin: On the Practice of Sociology*, edited by B.V. Johnston. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

_____. [1944]1998c. "The Conditions and Prospects for a World without War." Pp. 279-291 in *Pitirim A. Sorokin: On the Practice of Sociology*, edited by B.V. Johnston. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

_____. [1951]1998d. "Amitology as an Applied Science of Amity and Unselfish Love." Pp. 302-304 in *Pitirim A. Sorokin: On the Practice of Sociology*, edited by B.V. Johnston. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Sorokin, P.A. and Lunden, W.A. 1959. *Power and Morality*. Boston, MA: Porter Sargent.

Thomas, W.I. 1951. "The Need for a Social Science." Pp. 35-38 in *Social Behavior and Personality: Contributions of W.I. Thomas to Theory and Social Research*, edited by E.H. Volkart. New York: Social Science Research Council.

Tittle, C.R. 2004. "The Arrogance of Public Sociology." *Social Forces* 82(4): 1639-1643.

Turner, J.H. 1998. "Must Sociological Theory and Sociological Practice Be So Far Apart?: A Polemical Answer." *Sociological Perspectives* 41: 243-258.

_____. 2005a. "Is a Scientific Theory of the Family Desirable?" Pp. 26-29 in *Sourcebook of Family Theory & Research*, edited by V.L. Bengtson, A.C. Acock, K.R. Allen, P. Dilworth-Anderson, and D.M. Klein. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

_____. 2005b. "Is Public Sociology Such a Good Idea?" *The American Sociologist* 36: forthcoming.

Turner, J.H., and Boyns, D. 2001. "The Return of Grand Theory." Pp. 353-378 in, *Handbook of Sociological Theory* edited by J.H. Turner. New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.

Turner, S.P., and Turner, J.H. 1990. *The Impossible Science* Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Urry, J. "The Good News and the Bad News." *Critical Sociology* 31: 375-378.

Vitz, P.C. 2005. "Psychology in Recovery." *First Things* 151 (March):17-21.

Yablonsky, L. 1989. *The Therapeutic Community*. New York: Gardner Press, Inc.

_____. 1997. *Gangsters*. New York: New York University Press.

Zimmer, C., Burawoy, M., Nielsen, F., Brady, D., and Tittle, C. 2004 "Commentary and Debate: Introduction to a Debate on Public Sociologies." *Social Forces* 82(4):1601-1643.