

discussions in these pages), in order that an educated and authentic consensus be reached. I suggest, for instance, that many members who would oppose ASA guidelines for ethics at this stage would favor them if more examples of unethical conduct were brought to their attention. Authentic consensus requires as uninhibited a participation of the membership in formulating resolutions as in discussing them—and not merely voting. At the moment, I am not yet certain of the extent to which the new ASA constitution fully answers this need. In any event, I would favor a specific constitutional provision for polling the members on macroscopic societal issues.

(d) Now, if the constitution does not provide for taking public stands at all, and if the macroscopic effects of an issue are of such magnitude that a *crisis* is reached in the sense that basic needs or values of the society are undermined, the sociological ethic, as I see it, makes a public comment not simply important but mandatory. Many constitutions and normative systems, all those I would consider as worthy of one's commitment on other grounds, include an explicit or implicit right to rebel which in effect means the suspension of prevailing procedures and norms when ultimate values are violated. This was quite well established at the international trials at Nuremberg. The fundamental similarity of universalistic norms in bureaucracy and science

(as well as economics) has often been pointed out. The refusal to suspend a universalistic norm when a "unique" case calls for it is the ideological essence of the evil that comes from moral responsibility which is a basis of "Eichmannism." (Not the acts involved, which are highly particularistic, but the ideology—"I just follow orders, all orders, no matter what they are.") While constitutions and taboos should not be wantonly or regularly suspended, if they are never obeyed, extreme and rigid ritualization may well result. Many have countered that this was the argument used by the Nazis. This, it seems to us, is the kind of blind formalism that has characterized some of the recent liberal writings: a value is a value is a value and one suspension is as good as another. You are either for war, or against war; for arms on the campus, or against them; you cannot be for arms in opposition to fascism but against the war in Vietnam. The "process" must prevail, whatever the outcome.

It is obvious that when universalistic rules are suspended it is the *content* of the value in whose name the suspension takes place that is significant; the suspension is evil if the value is an evil one, and tolerable if the value is worthy. The mechanisms of educated and authentic consensus should be used to determine the values held by the members of the ASA, including those which allow (indeed, on some occasions, however rarely, prescribe) public action.

THE PRESENT STATUS OF SOCIOLOGY IN GREECE

CONSTANTINA SAFILIOS-ROTHSCHILD

The Merrill-Palmer Institute and The Harvard Center for Population Studies

The real development of sociology in Greece did not begin until the early 1960's. Before that time, some sporadic attempts were made but it is questionable whether or not it can be claimed that sociology existed. In 1909, the first sociological society was founded by A. Papanastassiou, a liberal political thinker, aiming to secure modern labor legislation and to organize trade unions. The society published a journal called *The Journal of Social and Legal Sciences* but the content of the articles was hardly sociological even from a theoretical point of view.¹ This society and the journal lived only for a year and were followed by another similar society founded by the same person in 1916, publishing a journal called *Review of Social and Political Sciences*. In 1926 another journal was published under the editorship of Professor Kalitsounakis, an economist, occasionally (especially in recent years) publishing some theoretical sociological discussions.

Before the Second World War the history of sociology was taught at the Law Faculty of the University of Athens be-

tween 1933-1935 by P. Kanellopoulos (who in recent years was the party leader of the right wing).

The years that followed were quite eventful for Greece. The Greek-Italian War, the German occupation and the Second World War followed each other and ravaged the country until the late 1940's. After the Second World War Sakellariou taught sociology for a few years at the Faculty of Philosophy and wrote a book entitled *Koinoniologia* (Sociology), which was a history of social thought dealing primarily with the theories of the nineteenth century. In the past ten years, however, sociology has not been taught at any of the Faculties of The University of Athens. In 1948 *The Sociological Review* appeared (edited by Lembesis, a sociologist trained in Germany) and was again short-lived. In 1950 the sociological society of the Greek Center for Social Studies was founded by a group of lawyers, economists, and political scientists, and a journal called *Sociological Research* was issued by the society in 1957. Despite the fact that all the articles published in the three issues which appeared were completely theoretical, and no sociological research was conducted by the authors, who were not trained sociologists.

Up to this time, that is, the 1950's, most Greek "sociologists" were usually economists, political scientists, or lawyers, occasionally with some training in sociology or philosophy and history of sociology at a European university. They were classified sociology in the theoretical sciences. They were therefore, trained to be either objective observers or theoretical scientists but only intelligent theoretical discussants of the social, economic, and political scene in Greece, and their training and orientation were reflected in their writing and activities. Their opinions were often clearly biased.

The author wishes to acknowledge the help of Mrs. Mary Kakaviatou-Gutenschwager, a Greek social anthropologist intimately familiar with sociological activities in Greece, who read the manuscript and suggested some very helpful revisions. Also, Dr. Ioanna Lambiri-Dimaki informed me of the recent sociological developments in Greece, and Dr. C. D. Spinellis, and Dr. Anna Potamianou gave me very helpful suggestions and information.

¹ Information about the history of the development of sociology in Greece prior to the second world war as well as later on, the dates during which different chairs of sociology were held and the subjects taught have been taken from: Mary Gutenschwager, "An Introduction to the History and Development of Sociology in Greece," unpublished manuscript, Athens, 1966.

ON PUBLIC AFFAIRS STATEMENTS OF PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS

AMITAI ETZIONI
Columbia University

The basic premise I would like to take as my starting point is that, as a general rule, a professional association should not comment on public affairs. Its members did not form the association for such a purpose and probably prefer to use other organizations, which specialize in public affairs, to express their views. Also, as the basis of membership in a professional association is not ideological consensus on public affairs may be hard to reach, and, as a result, public statements would frequently be divisive. Talcott Parsons pointed out another reason: professional associations are dependent upon public support and tolerance; participation in controversial public affairs is likely to undermine these bases of our work.)

The question, hence, is not—"Should professional associations issue statements on public affairs?"—but "Are there circumstances under which the general rule against public statements may be suspended?" It seems that there is at least one kind of situation in which an "exemption" is already well accepted: I shall argue for an additional kind. At the present time, it is widely held that there is a place for public action when public events adversely affect the membership's professional work. For instance, during the McCarthy era, the ASA issued a statement censoring the University of California for its introduction of a loyalty oath. On another occasion, the ASA threatened to cancel its annual meeting in St. Louis unless the hotel housing the meeting integrated its swimming pool. To what degree the uninhibited use of a public statement is really a prerequisite for the professional work of sociologists, even during conventions, or the association's public action at best marginal effect as a pretext to act on a matter for which there was a strong normative commitment and a wide consensus of the members, i.e. desegregation, is a question which need not concern us here. In either case a public statement for public action exists, although it seems not strong enough to allow for all the necessary action.

The second kind of situation in which public action is warranted depends upon whether or not the following criteria are met:

- 1. *The matter clearly concerns sociological expertise.* We would not expect the ASA to comment on the fluoridation of tooth decay, a proper subject for the AMA. (Public statements by other disciplinary associations are rather common. Recently the AMA issued an anti-marijuana statement; the American Association for the Advancement of Science one re chemical warfare in Vietnam.) On the other hand, the question of the feasibility of "unequal but equal" public education is in part a matter of sociological expertise.

Since the ASA obviously could not comment upon matters in the rather catholic sociological domain, an qualification must be added: *the issue concerned must have wide sociotropic social effects.* That is, the more consequen-

tial the event is for the society—the ultimate client of sociologists—the more it deserves the association's attention. Thus, a law passed by the U.S. Congress which, for example, prohibited all cigarette smoking would not be as deserving of comment by American sociologists as, let us say, the Indian government's consideration of a law making sterilization mandatory for males who have fathered two children would be for Indian sociologists. To speak up in the latter case is to alert the society—both decision-makers and public—to the far-reaching consequences their acts may be expected to have according to the best sociological knowledge available; it represents neither a condemnation nor an approval of the act on abstract ethical grounds, but a professional judgment. The determination of which matters are sufficiently consequential for the society to warrant public stands and what these stands ought to be is a matter for collective judgment, for the educated and authentic consensus of sociologists, the third criterion.

(c) A vote open to all qualified members of the association should be taken to establish when the ASA ought to make public statements and what kinds of positions should be taken. Such a vote would illustrate only what positions the membership holds; adequate provisions should be made for disagreements about facts, their interpretation, and the methods for verification. Although the majority may, of course, be mistaken, there is no other way of reaching *professional consensus*, no other basis for determining the collective judgment of the association. At the same time, it is especially important that the minority's views be made public along with those of the majority; a typical statement might indicate that for reasons *x, y, and z* a named percentage of the ASA's *active* members hold that the war in Vietnam is significantly distorting American society, while the other members hold for reasons *a, b, and c*, that it is not. (A colleague raised the following query: "Is every sociologist assumed to have 'expertise' on all major social concerns, whether he has himself investigated the matter or is thoroughly conversant with investigation of it, that form the basis of an informed judgment?" My answer is: on matters which require *specialized* sociological knowledge, a committee of specialists should be appointed by the ASA—similar to the AMA committee on marijuana—and the findings be circulated among the members before a vote is taken. The assumption is that the membership at large has enough competence to evaluate such a report.) If this procedure is followed, it could not be said that the ASA was in fact speaking only for some members, while giving the impression that all members concurred. Furthermore, it should be noted that on many issues the membership seems not as divided as may at first be assumed; e.g., there is a great deal of consensus on such basic matters as the effect of segregation or war.

The vote, however, should be taken only after the membership has had a chance to inform itself on the issue (via mechanisms such as conventions, circulation of reports and

Submitted for comments to William J. Goode, Alvin Gouldner, K. Hopkins, Irving L. Horowitz, Charles P. Loomis, Robert Merton, and Louis Weinstein.