SOCIOLOGY, POLITICS, AND SOCIETY IN POSTWAR ITALY 1950–1980

DIANA PINTO

Italy in the postwar period has experienced a tormented social and political development spanning the entire gamut of western hopes and disillusions vis à vis economic growth, social harmony, and political representations. Several phases have marked the way from a static, backward postwar setting to a rapid Reconstruction; from the spectacular "economic miracle" to the planning hopes of the Center Left years; from the social upheavals of the late 1960s to the complex and contradictory setting of the 1970s in which advanced and traditional sectors of society, finally in open clash with each other, produced a truly national problematic. Perched on top of the international North-South divide, Italy has become the ideal metaphor for the major problems and "solutions" which have beset not only the western industrialized world but also the "underdeveloped" world as a whole.

Postwar Italian sociology, by following closely the political and social vicissitudes of the Italian setting, also provides a running metaphor of changing western assumptions and hopes with respect to society and its industrial transformations. Indeed sociology's very consolidation as a discipline, the themes it treated, the intellectual stances it took, the models it espoused, merit closer analysis because they shed light on the following key issues of vital concern for international social science as a whole: the perpetual dilemma between "ideology" and "sociology"; the conflict between social action and critical intellectual engagement on the one hand and professionalism on the other; the link between social analysis, the left in general and marxism in particular; the ambiguous relationship to power as well as the problem of "relevant" analysis. From a purely "professional" perspective, Italian sociology today is a flourishing discipline with nearly one hundred chairs in different universities, several periodicals, special collections in the principal publishing houses, and the makings of a nationwide organization, not to mention interna-

Institut d'Histoire du Temps Présent, C.N.R.S., Paris

tional exchanges and contacts. All of this is a far cry from sociology's postwar beginnings as a marginal intellectual movement ostracized both by the cultural and university environment in a political setting which accorded no legitimacy to the very notion of "society". I have treated elsewhere Italian sociology's institutional development and professional consolidation, which hagiographers of disciplines could well term a "from rags to riches story".[1] What I wish to stress in this article are the political and social factors, intellectual tensions, and cultural openings which are responsible for Italian sociology's postwar development and its internal debates. Italian sociology's vitality and corrosiveness are the product of an engagé social and political context which will be examined at length. If anything, sociology's current professional institutionalization carries with it the danger of closing it off to those vital external pressures which generated its past vibrancy. Professional organization and intellectual incisiveness do not always coexist.

Postwar Italian sociology can best be analyzed in terms of five major political-intellectual phases, each carrying its own specific sociological approaches and themes, but all closely linked to the wider political and social context. The five phases are best described as follows. 1) *Sociology's postwar origins:* sociology as intellectual rebellion in a postwar context of political, cultural and institutional marginality. Emphasis on industrial sociology as a way of seizing a changing working class reality behind the static category of the "proletariat" (1950–1955). 2) *Sociology's cultural centrality:* as an antidote to marxist orthodoxy and ideology during the crisis of marxism and as the provider of a social dimension for liberal or non-marxist currents. Emphasis on technological innovation as the liberating catalyst for new social configurations in the changing social and political setting of the "economic miracle" (1956–1960). 3) *Sociology's professional consolidation:* in the context of Center Left planning hopes, emphasis is placed on the political, cultural, and economic aspirations of "society" as a whole (as opposed to industrial development and the working class), in the context of American inspired models of industrial society (1960–1965). 4) *Sociology's crisis between reformism and radical change:* a new emphasis on technology as alienation, on industrial sociology and on political voluntarism against technocratic planning. Society is redefined from "below" as its own actor (1966–1972). 5) *Sociology's national consolidation:* as crossroads for Italy's principal social and political debates in the 1970s centering on the complex interpenetration of Italy's North and South both in social, economic, and political terms (1972–1980). Italian sociology's postwar development can only be understood fully as a counterpoint to Italy's political and cultural left.

Sociology's Postwar Origins (1950–1955)

Italian sociology developed in a cultural and political context which was fundamentally hostile to its tenets and very existence. Dominated by historicism and idealism, Italian culture had always had a highly ambivalent attitude toward the social sciences, both on the Left and on the Right. There were many sources for this ambivalence and even refusal. Italian marxism, incarnated at the end of the century in the thought of Antonio Labriola, was anti-positivist and considered history as the only "human science". Crocean liberalism considered all social sciences as "false" because they did not take into account individual action and freedom, thus classifying social facts without "understanding" them. Fascism, as formulated in the thought of its principal ideologue, Giovanni Gentile, stressed the role of collective voluntarism in the creation of a highly idealized and equally strong State; society, perceived as the realm of chaos, had to be transcended, its multiple components brought into order from above. Italy's Resistance Left, imbued in political voluntarism, accorded validity to the social sphere only if it was defined in marxist terms. Through Gramsci, it continued to privilege the Crocean emphasis on the primacy of spiritual and political elements in history as opposed to purely social and economic considerations.[2]

This negative cultural baggage vis à vis the social sciences was further complemented in the postwar period by the Italian political setting which accorded no particular weight to society as an independent or vital actor. The Communist and Socialist Left, loyal to orthodox marxism, refused to see in the term "society" (when not used in the "sacred texts") anything more than an ideological catchword designed to hide static class divisions, thus dissimulating the struggle between capitalists and proletariat. Christian Democrats wedded the notion of society as a neo-Thomist corporatist and transcendental community to immediate political considerations. The result was just as impermeable to critical social analysis as marxist orthodoxy. The Liberal strain privileged the individual as opposed to the social dimension in its essentially economic vision of political life.[3] The study of society could only be highly marginal in a socially static and war-torn setting which gave top priority to political stability and economic reconstruction. In this context, any interest for the concrete study of society implied an intellectual rebellion against nearly all the established reference points of Italian (but not only Italian) culture.[4] Above all it implied: a desire to go beyond the often hollow social characterizations of a Crocean humanistic philosophy shared by marxists and non-marxists alike in the belief that workers, peasants, and bourgeois were more complex social actors than static categories could account for; a perception that reconstruction was a dynamic process which would yield a markedly different social

and economic setting bearing no similarity to the prewar years; the belief that Italy was embarked on a process of change which could not be understood with any national historical interpretation but needed instead references to international patterns of development and sociological analysis.

Two vastly different intellectual environments offered the seeding ground for such a cultural rebellion in the early 1950s: the Catholic University of Milan and the University of Turin. The former would play a truly important role in the 1960s when Catholic currents fused with their lay counterparts, while the latter provided to all effects and purposes the founding environment for postwar Italian sociology. Suffice it to say here that the Catholic University of Milan, created in the 1920s, acted as an intellectual counterpoint to the fascist dominated public universities and provided a haven of sorts for social science research during their weak years. Armed with its own neo-Thomist vision, this Catholic milieu was immune both to Crocean idealism and to fascist neo-Hegelianism. Interested in the role of individual choice and fulfillment inside the Catholic community as well as in man's productivity, this milieu was particularly open to social psychological analyses, all the more so that it sought to combat marxism with all of its force.[5] Under the guidance of Padre Gemelli, the founder of the University, and himself a psychologist, extensive researches were carried out on Catholic workers, their social conditions and psychological outlook. These researches remained, however, in an intellectual Catholic "ghetto" with little or no spillover into Italian society.

It is in the city of Turin that postwar sociology found a cultural and practical haven. Former capital of the liberal state, open to French and English currents of thought, Turin was above all by the end of the war the center of Italy's most advanced industrial sectors. The University of Turin had remained throughout fascism the repository of Italy's weak empirical and neo-positivist tradition in a faculty of philosophy which was staunchly anti-Crocean. It is in this intellectual context, under philosophers and jurists such as Norberto Bobbio and Nicola Abbagnano that Italy's first generation of postwar sociologists was trained, not in sociology, for there were no courses offered, but in philosophy with particular emphasis on French and Anglo-Saxon currents. Alessandro Pizzorno and Franco Ferrarotti are the products of this intellectual context, best defined by a desire to transcend the narrow confines of Italian culture than by the explicit will to resume Italy's positivist tradition going back to Cesare Lombroso and Enrico Ferri, not to mention the anti-ideological work of a Mosca or a Pareto.[6] In the early 1950s, the need for sociology's existence was defended by philosophers more as a matter of intellectual principle than as a concrete professional issue, for there was no "sociological" research to speak of in progress. Politically, the intellectual environment of

Turin would be determinative for Italian sociology. The city is squarely on the left, having been a bastion of antifascist resistance where Communists, Socialists, and left-wing liberals intermingled on friendly terms and in close contact with the marxist lynchpin, the industrial working class present in the vast orbit of the FIAT industries. The political divisions of the Cold War fit poorly in Turin's intellectual climate where Vittorini's *Il Politecnico*, Italy's leading cultural review (a close equivalent of Sartre's *Les Temps Modernes*) appears as an organ of the PCI while still remaining very open to foreign and even American currents. This anti-sectarian character of Turin's left would provide the ideal substrate for sociology's postwar beginnings, as literati, professors, trade unionists, economists, technicians, and political figures participated in the same cultural environment. As we shall see this political and cultural osmosis would resume in full vigor in the wake of Stalin's death, particularly after the crisis of marxism in 1956.

Besides the university, Turin also offered a concrete environment for sociologists to be trained in the "field": the Olivetti industries in the nearby town of Ivrea. Directed by Adriano Olivetti, an industrialist with a long Resistance past, member of the left-wing Turinese circles, and particularly open to Scandinavian models of social organization and to Emmanuel Mounier's personalism (as embodied in the French review *Esprit*), the Olivetti industries were in the 1950s the avant-garde of industrial organization, technological innovation and social planning for their employees. In brief they were a showcase for modernism in Italy's industrial landscape, albeit a paternalistic modernism. In Olivetti's Bureau of Social Research Italy's first generation of sociologists in effect constituted around the task of producing the regulatory town plan for the city of Ivrea. One should add to the names of Pizzorno and Ferrarotti those of Luciano Gallino and Franco Momigliano. Preparing the town plan of Ivrea meant in effect understanding the social changes which were taking place in Turin's hinterland during the years of Reconstruction: the changing composition of the working class with the arrival of new recruits from the countryside; the impact of industrialization and technological innovation on an entire territorial area (the Cavanese); the collective social needs of a new industrial population for which the town of Ivrea had to plan social services and housing. In a sense the questions addressed in microcosm at Ivrea were those which would determine Italian sociological work for the ensuing decade. Indeed Italy's first sociological review of the postwar period, *Quaderni di Sociologie*, edited by Abbagnano and Ferrarotti starting in 1951, would serve as a platform for the researches coming out of Ivrea and also present the most interesting sociological works produced abroad, mainly from America.

The first phase of Italian sociology is characterized by a nearly exclusive interest in industrial sociology. Defined by a marxist intellectual matrix, this research eschews any new formulation of a theory of society and gives primary attention to a close analysis of the working class in concrete work settings. Hinged on the belief that industrial settings have common structural characteristics whether in America, in Italy, or in the Soviet Union, this sociological research seeks to discover the working class behind the "proletariat". Hence its interest for American industrial relations (including Human Relations), for the impact of technological innovation, for alternative modes of trade unionism. Sociology seeks to demolish ideological blinders while also participating in the social planning of innovation. Italian sociology's postwar origins condition its priorities and perspectives throughout the 1950s and most of the 1960s. *Institutionally:* the first generation of sociologists have no university connections and develop in an industrial context closely linked to municipal planning bodies of which Ivrea is perhaps the first Italian example. *Thematically:* Italian sociology focuses on the most advanced social industrial settings, displaying little interest for the other classes of society (whether peasants, bourgeois, or tertiary workers), beyond the working class. *Geographically:* Italian sociology is wedded to the most advanced sectors of the North. The Italian South remains the territory of literary and anthropological work focused on peasant life and the psychology of traditional societies.[7] These two currents of analysis do not meet. It is really only in the 1970s that Italian sociology will fully begin to analyze the weight of traditional sectors in the structuring of Italian society. As we shall see, throughout the 1950s and 1960s, its emphasis will be on the most advanced forces of society, those responsible for its modernization.

The Turinese environment which we have described was not only important for understanding the origins of Italian sociology but would play a determining role in the renewal of leftist militance in the late 1960s and in the redefinition of sociology that ensued from it. The interest in industrial studies and in the working class that would reemerge with the "Hot Autumn" of 1969 would in effect mark a return to Italian sociology's original concerns. These concerns were to be relegated to a secondary position as sociology branched out toward new themes with the advent of the "economic miracle" and the political opening to the Center Left.

Sociology's Cultural Centrality (1956–1960)

Italian sociology attains cultural centrality in the late 1950s when the assumptions which underlay its postwar stance – i.e., that Reconstruction was a dynamic process which would bring about major changes in Italian society

and that the working class had to be studied concretely beyond ideological characterizations – gain wide credibility among the intellectual and political elites of Northern Italy. Two major factors or events are responsible for this collective breakdown of postwar ideological divides: the crisis of marxism brought about by the Hungarian uprising and the XX Party Congress, and the increasing visibility of Italian economic dynamism soon to be known as the "economic miracle". The suppressing of workers' councils in Hungary and the revelation of Stalin's crimes alienate from the PCI all those party militants and intellectuals who chafed under the Party line and its sectarian orthodoxy, and its seeming inability to seize the changing profile of Italy's economy and society.[5] Confronted with an impressive economic recovery, a strong industrial and commercial activity, these elites search for new models of explanation. Concrete sociological knowledge appears as the ideal antidote to ideology, a breath of fresh air against the weight of political categories, the only manner of finally understanding exactly what was going on in society. This change in the "mood" of the Northern left more than anything else is responsible for the cultural centrality of sociology in these years. Two reviews play a crucial role in this "awakening" from the Cold War: *Ragionamenti* and *Passato e Presente,* run by members of the Northern intelligentsia of Milan and Turin, both non-Communists and ex-Communists. They seek to discover empiricism and neo-positivism, the social sciences as a whole, and the structure of industrial society. Politically committed to a radical restructuring of Italian society, this post-1956 left advocates change through structural reforms based on planning and therefore on a detailed knowledge of society's needs, rather than on the older static appeals for change through the revolutionary myth.

This moving away of the Northern left from revolutionary certitudes toward a search for new solutions is matched on the other side of the ideological divide by an equally strong desire to understand the changes wrought in Italian society by the "economic miracle". Liberal interpretations of economic growth and Catholic analyses of a static society proved as incapable as marxism to seize Italy's process of modernization and its subsequent social transformations. Inside Christian Democracy a new younger anti-Communist left-wing, interested in social planning, emerges against the politically oriented conservative older generation. Significantly, this younger generation is largely trained at the Catholic University of Milan with its intellectual opening to social science techniques if not to neo-positivism per se. Another important change in the Catholic milieu is the opening to the social sciences of the review *Il Mulino,* which had always represented the current of lay Catholicism closest to Italian liberalism, and which had thus shared Italian culture's anti-positivist humanism. The review *Il Mulino,* and the publishing house of the same name which would follow, would play a vital role in the consolidation and intellec-

tual legitimation of sociology in all Italian intellectual life. The opening of the Italian left and the Catholic world to the social sciences would in effect be the prologue to the Center Left political alliance of the early 1960s.

The researches carried out by sociologists such as Pizzorno and Ferrarotti at the Olivetti Bureau of Studies on the working class come to fruition in this changed intellectual and political climate which gives top priority to a clear understanding of the transformations of Italian society. The reformers, planners, trade unionists, etc. called upon by local political councils and planning bodies to help map out community responses to social change, become sociology's new public and, more important for the discipline's development, its sponsors. Social science and planning centers such as the National Center for Social Defence and Prevention (CNPDS) in Milan and the Institute for Economic and Social Research (IRES) in Turin would not only finance sociological research but would also provide an intellectual setting for the sociologists themselves. Indeed, Pizzorno's, Gallino's, and Ferrarotti's first monographs are brought out under IRES and CNPDS sponsorship.[9] In 1960, the CNPDS organizes an international conference on the theme of "Technological Progress in Italian Society," a sign that Italy's northern political elites are defining their society in full "economic miracle" in terms of industrial models coming from more technologically advanced societies. The theme of technological innovation marks a perfect transition from sociology's working class concerns of the early 1950s to the wider interests it would take on in the 1960s. Originally studied in terms of its impact in the factory setting, technological innovation rapidly became a means of understanding the social dislocations produced by industrialization on an entire territorial unit. Artisans, shopkeepers, peasants, and middle classes all became the subject of study as they reacted to the modernization process. In affecting society as a whole, technology was changing even the working class' position toward other social classes. To speak of the working class' integration in a new industrial society was less than utopian in the post-1956 cultural and political setting. Technology indeed was seen as a potentially liberating factor.[10]

As Turinese sociology widened its interests beyond the working class, the Catholic current of social psychology also opened to new more clearly sociological themes under the impulse of a former doctor turned social psychologist, Francesco Alberoni. The most important of the themes studied by the Catholic current in the late 1950s was probably immigration. The first massive wave of Southern immigration to the North took place in 1957–1958, after Northern industries had attracted all the available workforce away from their own agrarian hinterland. The thousands of migrants arriving daily at railroad stations in Turin and Milan were tangible proof of Italian society's qualitative

transformation. The Catholic current first emphasized the social psychological adaptation of the Southern migrants to a changed environment.[11] The more clearly sociological implications of their presence in the North (in terms of social change, housing needs, relation with the Northern population) became, however, predominant, especially when the research was sponsored by municipal planning bodies. Since immigration was in a sense the consequence of technological innovation, the two different strands of sociological research in Italy could work together on common themes and problems, even if without fusing. This collaboration was helped along by the fact that the CNPDS in the late 1950s played a key role in giving sociology professional credibility. In 1957 it fostered the creation of an Italian Association of Social Sciences (AISS) with the help of the International Sociological Association (ISA). The AISS was run along interdisciplinary lines because there were too few Italian social scientists to warrant specialized association. In 1958, the newly created AISS sponsored a conference on the theme of "City and Countryside," a theme which enveloped all social science research and stood at the crossroads of Italy's modernization. In 1959, as a way of "legitimizing" Italian sociology, ISA held its IV World Congress in Milan and Stresa on the theme of "Sociology in its Social Context". It is the occasion for Italy's sociologists to meet the international "pantheon" and to come into contact with foreign researchers at what would be a turning point for international social science as a whole (the use of models of advanced industrial societies as the common leaven for international sociological discourse).

In the late 1950s, Italian sociology is still entirely defined outside of an academic context. Its field of action and public lies in social and economic planning institutes set up to promote social services in Northern Italy. Its political orientation is toward left-wing planning. Its perceptions of Italian society are uniquely Northern; immigration is studied as a phenomenon affecting the North without worrying about what it was doing at the same time to the social structures of the South. Sociology's central theme is modernization, and its intellectual mission is to provide concrete knowledge with which to undo the preconceptions of static ideological categories both on the left and on the right. Sociology is the new tool of structural social reforms, a way of privileging an ebullient and productive society over a traditional and weak State and political setting; economic growth over anticapitalist pessimism; changing social formations over rigid class conflict. Politically and intellectually, sociology is the very language of innovation.

Sociology's Professional Consolidation (1960–1965)

The breaking down of the ideological divide after 1956 and the opening of

Socialists and Christian Democrats to new themes and problems comes to fruition in 1960 with the first Center Left political alliance at the local level in cities like Turin and Milan, to be followed in 1962 with the national alliance. The interest which local elites had shown for the social sciences as an aid in local planning is thus transferred to the national level, where the Center Left government is precisely invested with the task of carrying out major structural reforms and of better distributing Italy's economic growth through a national social and economic plan. The first priorities as major reforms: the opening up of the educational system; housing and urban planning; and at a grandiose scale, the modernization of the Italian South, by setting up zones of industrial development, "poles" of attraction for industrial and commerical activity, in the belief that what the "economic miracle" had done for the North could be also carried out in the South with the help of judicious planning. In this reformist context, economics and sociology appear as the ideal handmaidens for a new Prince.

This link to a national reformist ambience is the key to sociology's scientific consolidation, which can be accounted for by three reasons. First, the social sciences effectively become the new *lingua franca* of the Center Left, capable of bridging the historical and cultural gaps which separate the Christian Democratic tradition from that of lay Socialism. Ahistorical and international in scope, the social sciences smooth out any major conflicts between the two political traditions, primarily by treating Italy's problems as the product of qualitatively new social and economic transformations, for which past solutions (and therefore conflicts) would be of little use. The "economic miracle" provided the ideal framework for this obliteration of past tensions. Second, sociology in particular gained ground because "society" itself became a central conceptual category of the Center Left, designed to cover all those phenomena which could not be explained by purely economic and political considerations. The emphasis placed on society is the result of the crisis of marxism, the increased awareness that modernization had produced new social configurations, especially with respect to the tertiary sector, and the realization that henceforth economic growth would depend on society's own consumption rather than on political decisions and the laws of an abstract market. This new interest for "society" is best reflected in reviews such as *Passato e Presente* and *Il Mulino* which reach a widespread public of intellectuals, policymakers, political figures, and professional groups, i.e., the main audience for social science research in the early 1960s. One must realize that the notion of "society" debated in this period is restrictive when compared to the concept which will emerge in the late 1960s, when the definition will come from below. In the early 1960s society is less an actor in its own right than a force to be molded and regulated by planners and technicians from above.

Third, Italian sociology consolidates because its Catholic and lay currents (not unlike the Center Left itself) meet on the common ground of Italy's modernization, i.e., its entrance into the ranks of advanced industrial societies. This interest in modernization translates itself into a very explicit interest for American social science, for American political, economic, and social models. Several intellectual and political assumptions underlie this turning to America. 1) The North's economic miracle could act as a powerful locomotive which would pull the South out of its traditional backwardness, and launch all of Italy into a pattern of development similar in scope if not on the same level with America's. The priority given to economics diminished the profound differences in the two national experiences at a time when America itself was more than willing to export its own models. 2) The crisis of marxism and the withdrawal of the PCI into a ghetto of sorts, combined with the Center Left opening, convinced the reformist elites that Italy had come closer to the American political model of liberal democracy, at a time when Kennedy's "New Frontier" was in itself a beacon for new social and economic experiments. Politics was increasingly perceived as an issue-oriented search for practical consensus, as the meeting ground for varied interest groups in industrial society. 3) Modernization was assumed to entail a blurring of class divisions in the creation of a mass society where citizens and consumers were supposed to replace "workers" and "bourgeois". America's popular culture thus became relevant in a setting which until previously had known only culture (with a capital "C") in its elitist forms. 4) American social theory (whether Weberian or functional) aroused interest in an intellectual context where the crisis of marxism had swept away many of the theoretical certitudes of the intellectual left. A new social theory had to take into account the profound transformations of society and explain them beyond the old conflictual models of class analysis, based on the weight of historical tradition.

These assumptions are all reflected in the sociological work of the early 1960s and in the professional consolidation of the discipline. The social impact of the "economic miracle," the role of the immigrants in Northern cities, the change in professional status and qualification, are all studied at the Lombard Institute for Social and Economic Studies (ILSES), a newly created research institute which reflected all the links between the social sciences and the planning hopes of the Center Left alliance. Centered in Milan, the city with the most impressive economic "take off," and the new center of Northern culture (in finance, the arts, etc.), the ILSES rapidly became a crucial training ground for a second generation of sociologists and economists, hired to carry out research on the Lombard region. Sociologists such as Massimo Paci, Laura Balbo, Vittorio Capecchi, and economists such as Michele Salvati were all trained on the spot at ILSES, where the older generation of Pizzorno, Alberoni,

and economists such as Giorgio Fuà worked. One could say that this center acted as an informal graduate school where lectures and seminars were often offered even by visiting foreign sociologists. The common theme was industrial society's development.

Political sociology flourishes mainly under the auspices of the Il Mulino publishing house and its newly created Carlo Cattaneo Institute for research. More than any other group, Il Mulino incarnates the Center Left pro-American model of pragmatic politics. In this context important studies on party activists both inside the PCI and the DC, as well as the PSI are launched, to obtain more knowledge on the social and political values and demands these parties incarnated. At a more theoretical level in the early 1960s studies are begun on the essence of bipartisan government and the notion of political alternance.[12] Italy is examined as a case of "imperfect bipartisanship," but in a context that presupposes her belonging to a quasi Anglo-Saxon model of reference. Ideological divisions seem definitely on the wane. Mass society, mass culture, changing national mores and expectations are studied instead by the Catholic current under Francesco Alberoni at the Catholic University of Milan. Mass communications, stardom, and other popular culture manifestations are new topics of study in the newly founded Institute of Sociology of the university.[13] Perhaps the most significant of intellectual symbols, social theory penetrates Italian social thought. The great sociological classics such as Weber and Durkheim are translated along with the more recent works by Talcott Parsons and Robert Merton. These ambitious translation projects are carried out under the auspices of Il Mulino and the Comunità Editions which are one of the offshoots of the Olivetti movement, later regrouped as the Olivetti Foundation.

The separate institutions of research we have just mentioned are in reality interlinked through personal collaboration as well as through the common research activities of their members. The sociology institute of the Catholic University, the ILSES, and Il Mulino, form an ad hoc professional sociological network. Alberoni is responsible for Il Mulino's research on PCI and DC party activists, Pizzorno works on the PSI in the Milan area; Catholic university researches often complement those of the ILSES. Under the sign of industrial society, one professional environment emerges. As proof of sociology's consolidation, new sociological reviews arise: *Studi di Sociologia* directed by Alberoni; *La Rassegna Italiana di Sociologia,* regrouping the old Turinese group plus the Milanese sociology of ILSES; a new edition of the *Quaderni di Sociologia* appears less linked to the Turinese environment. *Il Mulino* itself is an important platform for sociological research. At an institutional level sociology makes a small entrance into the university setting when Ferrarotti

wins a chair of sociology at the Education Faculty of the University of Rome, while Pizzorno wins one in the Economics Faculty of the University of Urbino. In the early 1960s, one cannot speak of sociology outside of the planning institutes; the bulk of research is performed in such a context. Yet the prospect of a university institutionalization looms on the horizon since the creation of faculties of social sciences inside the universities is part of the Center Left reforms for higher education. Such faculties would automatically need sociological teachings and research activities. The Center Left seeks to establish such faculties so that they can provide trained cadres to meet the needs of an advanced industrial society.

In the early 1960s sociology consolidates in what can be called a "golden years" ambience, because political, intellectual, and economic elites all react favorably to social science research, welcoming at least in theory its contributions to the modernization of Italian society. Accordingly, the sociology which developed in the early 1960s was essentially one of the "Enlightenment". It sought to advise a reformist Prince and to train his policymakers. Sociologists cultivated an image as scientific experts capable of isolating the necessary social changes without which no proper economic and social decisions could be made. Traditional or ideological tensions are minimized as empirical analyses of society settle in the forefront. Social openness, economic growth, the potentially harmonious consequences of modernization are all stressed. This new will toward change is perhaps best embodied in the V World Congress of the ISA held in Washington in 1962 on the topic of "Sociology and the Policymakers". The scientific vocation of sociology in the Italian context will prove to be, however, very much of an intellectual and political statement, limited to a few avant-gardes of a true reformist and modernist bent.

Sociology's Crisis Between Reformism and Radical Change (1966–1972)

The late 1960s in Italy as in other western industrialized countries are characterized by an important political, intellectual, and institutional disarray, largely due to the rapid economic and social transformations these societies had experienced and the even more rapid revolution of expectations. In Italy, this disarray takes on deeper and more extreme characteristics because it marks the end of the social and economic climate of the "economic miracle" as well as of the Center Left planning hopes. In reality the Center Left had come to power precisely at the moment when the favorable *conjoncture* which had made the economic miracle possible (low wages, the opening of international markets through the creation of the EEC, the inevitable rise in consumerism after years of postwar austerity) ceased to exist. Reforms were

charted when the economic growth on which they were hinged began to decline. As a consequence the Left begins to resign intellectual and social importance precisely at the time the first Center Left reforms were slowly being implemented. Reformers and "revolutionaries" thus oppose each other on a ground still dominated by traditional political and economic interest. Of all intellectual disciplines, sociology is the one most caught in the cross-fire. Its internal tensions, changing themes of interest, and social references are perfect indicators of Italy's political and social turmoil.

Sociology's professional vicissitudes are a case in point. Consolidated originally in the regional planning centers of the North, and deeply intertwined with the reformist hopes of the Center Left, sociology in effect had no independent guarantees or scientific status. This uneasy alliance between political research sponsors and sociologists falls apart around 1966–1967 and is a symbol of the wider Center Left tensions. Political sponsors wanted rapid answers to short term questions which were often purely political in scope, thus leaving sociologists with little possibility of carrying out more long term and detached analyses of society. More important, the reformist "Prince," under whose aegis the sociologists had been willing to work, never materializes. No sooner enacted, then the Center Left alliance proves incapable of pushing through the needed reforms, as the Christian Democratic majority seeks to pander to its more traditional vested interests' constituency for fear of losing it to the right. In reality the Center Left in not enacting Italy's badly needed structural reforms produces little more than palliative measures in which scientific knowledge of society played no measurable role (as opposed to political imperatives). The "golden years" entente between science and politics breaks down, precisely on the issue of "research for whom?, and with what purposes?" In 1967, the ILSES falls apart as sociologists are dismissed and also choose to leave this planning body.

New institutional structures take the place of the regional planning centers in which the sociologists seek an independent professional niche. They are the direct result of the Center Left dreams and of the closer ties to American social science. In reality these institutions, Committes for Political and Social Sciences (COSPOS), financed in part by the Social Science Research Council and by the Olivetti Foundation, are temporary measures designed to place the social sciences in a para-university setting while waiting for the Center Left reform of university structures with its creation of Social Science Faculties. Their purpose is to train social scientists in a graduate school atmosphere. Several of these centers are constituted: for political science in Turin, sociology in Milan, economics in Ancona, and the economics of development in Naples. Inside the university world itself, some sociology courses are taught

in the faculties of economics and humanities for students who still cannot "major" in sociology. In terms of undergraduate education, the major novelty is the creation of the Istituto Superiore di Sociologia at Trento, designed to provide a three year diploma in sociology for lycee graduates. In reality all of these centers are the product of the Center Left ambience which sought to train professional social scientists to become the future managers of the consensus produced by harmonious economic growth. The creation of this applied professional social science is the dream of the reformist Christian Democratic elites (whose pet project is precisely the faculty at Trento) as well as of the Socialist reformers who see in such a university environment the guarantee against political pressures on research.

These institutional measures, however, take place in a political and social setting which is no longer that of the early 1960s, and which thus gives them an entirely different intellectual meaning. Italy's economic miracle and modernization have in themselves generated expectations for social welfare and economic benefits which the Center Left cannot implement. Society, unable to be regulated from "above" through enlightened planning, produces its own voices of dissent in the form of different collective movements, each demanding social services and a greater participatory role. Students, workers, teachers, and employees in the late 1960s protest against social inequalities, poor planning, technocratic politics. In their attempts to define their rights and needs, they not only constitute a new public avid for sociological knowledge, but also an alternative subject for social action. Their existence profoundly modifies sociology's professional vocation and themes of research, because sociology is closely present in the three main spheres of Italian society which are central to the crisis of the late 1960s. These spheres are: 1) The Catholic Left which breaks off from the traditional Catholic world; 2) the Northern factory setting; 3) the university-political milieu throughout Italy.

1) The Catholoc Left which the Center Left ambience had brought into contact with its lay socialist counterparts in what was a reformist stance, undergoes an important secularization and radicalization in the late 1960s. The main reason for this transformation is its growing disaccord with the conservative politics and technocratic decisions of the Christian Democrats in power. One of the key moments of the resurgence of a Left in Italy occurs when the Italian Catholic Workers Associations (ACLI) dissolve in 1967 over an unbridgeable gap between left and right wing currents which are no longer united by a common allegiance to Christian Democracy and against the "specter" of the lay socialist or communist left. The left of the ACLI effectiveiy joins the lay trade unions and thus reinforces their clout in protesting against the failures of the Center Left government. The preliminaries are

already set for the joint trade union policy which would follow the "hot autumn" of 1969. The Catholic working class movement proves to be just as opposed to industrial mass consumer society, its inequalities, and lack of "transcendence" as its marxist counterparts. Catholic and marxist intellectuals thus find common themes in the renewed interest for critical theories of society, especially those formulated by the Frankfurt School, and in the major issue of man's "alienation" from his industrial work. The younger generation of sociologists trained at the Catholic University of Milan under Alberoni become increasingly interested in social protest and in counter models of society of an anti-repressive nature.[14] Ironically, in terms of its original purpose, the Institute of Sociology of Trento becomes the center of this counter-sociology, drawing students nationwide, and providing the setting for a student movement whose ideas and tactics would spread to the rest of Italy (not unlike the role which Nanterre would play in May 1968). In a sense Catholic and marxist "idealism" would fuse in a violent protest against the flatness of industrial society and its failed promises.

2) There is a resurgence of working class militants in the Northern industrial bastions of Turin and Milan, which would culminate in the "hot autumn" of 1969. A new working class base, the product of changed technological qualifications, heavy Southern migration, and a changed international context of competition rebels against the prevailing hierarchical barriers inside the factory, increased work tempos, and an excessive division of labor. It formulates its critiques of industrial society in the renewed language of class conflict with heavy emphasis on neo-capitalism's misdeeds, not just in the realm of industrial life but also in that of collective services and social benefits. A new industrial sociology develops in Turin as a non-professional current whose exponents are political activists belonging to the extreme left of the Socialist Party, and who had always been opposed to the Center Left coalition. They are in close contact with the changing technological and social realities of Italy's principal firms, such as FIAT and Olivetti, and they use the conceptual categories of Marx's *Das Kapital* to criticize the contradictions of industrial society. This current of analysis is expressed in reviews such as *Quaderni Rossi* and *Quaderni Piacentini* which fight on behalf of industrial democracy and give priority to the working class as the only social actor capable of fostering the truly major reforms of society which Italy needs. In the late 1950s the first generation of postwar sociologists had seen technological innovation and its social consequences of modernization and higher productivity as factors which would push all of society "upwards" and away from the traditional class divisions toward a more open society. In the late 1960s, the social impact of new technological changes was instead construed by the new left as a "downgrading" factor. Not only had society failed in

blurring class divisions, but increasing quantities of workers, whether blue collar, employees, or even students, were living victims of capitalism's restructurings. Combined with the wider marxian critique of industrial society's "alienation," this quasi-Trotskyist emphasis on the primacy of the working class restored the language of class conflict in Italian political and intellectual life. The extraparliamentary left would base its struggles on *social* analyses which were opposed to the official interpretations of industrial society.[15]

3) The third major change in Italian society takes place on a nationwide basis and can be called a "crisis of modernization". Its first centers of crisis were the universities where increasingly larger numbers of youths gather to be trained for jobs and futures which are less and less clear. It is especially in the large universities outside Italy's Northern industrial regions that the clash between aspirations and reality is most visible (e.g., the University of Rome and the University of Naples). Surrounded by entire areas of underdevelopment, where industrial society is merely a mirage of consumerism and pop culture, these universities provide the ideal forum in which the very models of Italy's postwar growth are reconsidered. The universities are themselves symbols of these contradictions, enormous dinosaurs where students are little more than alienated cogs in a non-productive machine. It is in such settings that a current emerges to examine Italy's lagging sectors, forgotten during the economic miracle, but which reappear ominously for their explosive social and economic potential. In Rome, Ferrarotti, around his newly created review *La Critica Sociologica,* studies Rome's shantytowns and the mechanism of underdevelopment which the city has managed to perpetuate despite all the Center Left's planning [16] In Naples, at the agrarian institute of Portici, young sociologists such as Enrico Pugliese begin working on the consequences of the Mezzogiorno's modernization in the aftermath of the Center Left's reform measures and implantation of "poles of development". Both of these currents stress the degree to which modernization itself has led to social marginalization, and to dysfunctional results with respect to its original intentions. Politically, these critiques of industrial society yield inside the extraparliamentary left positions which are either Trotskyist, as in the case of the Northern industrial milieus, or Maoist, as is the case for many younger intellectuals in Southern Italy. In both cases, the model of rational reformist politics along liberal lines is not only discarded but violently rebuked. This is the political and social context in which Italy's third generation of sociologists develops. They will conceive of sociological analyses as a function of the working class and of the student movements before their very eyes. Industrial alienation, the need for a social purpose, and the awareness of underdevelopment will play a central role in their definition of sociology's vocation.

What are the effective links between the new political and intellectual contexts described above, the application of Center Left reforms, and the crisis of sociology? The answer is complex. Institutional contexts linked to the dreams of the Center Left planners are in reality used for other purposes, but used nevertheless, because, despite what amounts to an important methodological and political rebellion in the younger ranks of sociologists, there are no institutional alternatives available. Still only marginally integrated in the universities, Italian sociologists of the younger generations are in effect trained inside the COSPOS centers and even profit from fellowships to the United States (originally set up in the context of the "golden years" assumptions). What changes is the intellectual and political orientation of the research undertaken. At the sociology COSPOS in Milan, where most of the third generation of sociologists is trained, students choose to study in an engagé manner the industrial struggles before them in the late 1960s. They also study the student movement, often as borderline participants. In both cases priority is given to on-the-spot study in an engagé manner, as opposed to the detached scientific monographs their elders had produced in the late 1950s. The sociologists of the late 1960s are keenly aware of the presence of social actors in the Italian political setting, actors with whom they choose to collaborate. Indeed, most of them perform studies for the trade unions, especially for the avant-garde metal workers' union which is strong both in Turin and in Milan. Sociological work in brief is perceived as work done in order to better understand society so as to change it politically.

The Weberian distinction between "politics" and "science" had never really taken root in Italian sociology in the postwar period. As we saw, even sociology's anti-ideological role in the late 1950s could be construed as a political stance. Furthermore, the lack of institutional security in a university setting made sociology's scientific independence all the more tenuous. In the late 1960s, therefore, the return to a more marxist formulation of social knowledge, while constituting a break with an "American" model of professional work, did not in reality represent an alien tradition for sociologists such as Pizzorno and Ferrarotti. They were therefore able to adapt to the new themes and to guide the researchers of the third generation in their work. The first generation in this case was as profoundly touched by the political convulsions and social transformations of the late 1960s as the third. They too were dismayed with the outcome of the Center Left planning efforts and their incapacity to wield any influence in reformist circles. Furthermore, the renaissance of the trade union world and of a socialist militance was fundamentally in harmony with their original social visions of the early 1950s. The only difference between generations was probably to be found in the weight accorded to the importance of a scientific and professional consolidation. The first generation

saw its benefits as a guarantee against the power of political pressures, while the young sociologists saw in professional organization the greatest threat to politically relevant research. Nevertheless, Italian sociology does not experience the Anglo-Saxon clash between sociological generations, because the "fathers" are just as intellectually politicized as the "sons".

In the sociological crisis of the late 1960s, what comes under fire are the sociological assumptions of the "golden years". The younger sociologists attack the optimism of the modernization models of the early 1960s. They stress the degree to which American derived models do not fit Italian reality. They see the sociological work of the 1960s as having provided little more than a reformist ideology to what was really conservatism in disguise. For the younger sociologists, sociology should furnish social knowledge for social struggles in which they participate not as scientists but as engagé intellectuals. To this effect, the third generation of sociologists, as well as the second – whose reaction is even stronger since they had entered the discipline during the "golden years" and saw many of their implicit assumptions dwindle in front of the militance of the late 1960s – is more inspired by the alternative political reviews such as *Quaderni Piacentini* and *Quaderni Rossi* or *Problemi del Sociolismo* than by the professional production to be found in the sociological reviews created in the early 1960s. Their real points of reference are the social actors themselves and not any professional network.

Symbolic of this professional crisis is the meeting held in Turin in 1971 on the topic "Sociological Research and Role of the Sociologist," in which members of the first and second generation (the third, being students, were not invited) discussed the degree to which Italian sociology had found a professional content and valid methods. In reality the discussion bore on the validity of using American derived models for the Italian setting. One sociologist, Vittorio Capecchi, whose work up to then had been on elaborate mathematical models of social mobility, makes a public autocritique and argues for sociological research based on "inquests" and social engagement.[17] He would play a determinant role in the 1970s by editing a review, *Inchiesta,* which would try to bridge the gap between scientific research and social engagement. In its pages, some of the key sociological production of the 1970s would appear. As a result of this meeting, the AISS created in 1957 would disband, and Italian sociology would enter the 1970s without any systematic professional organization. Its reference points and concerns would be entirely turned to the outside world and its social and political actors.

Italian sociology undergoes in the late 1960s important changes in theme away from the modernization models and emphases on industrial society of

the early 1960s. The working class, its grass roots organization, and changing relation to the trade union structures become the new themes of concern along with the nascent collective movements. The tone is anti-capitalist; the affiliation is predominantly with the extra-parliamentary left and against established political parties, the PCI included. Society itself is seen as its own principal actor, and the sociologists as its "prophets". Unlike the early 1960s there is no political Prince to advise; the trade unions become the closest equivalent of such a Prince, but precisely because they are a *social* and not a political force. Yet, despite its professional crisis and thematic transformation, Italian sociology in the late 1960s retains much of the original optimism of the "golden years". It merely shifts its hopes away from Center Left planning toward trade union action on behalf of reforms. In reality one Northern locomotive is substituted for the other, but the principle that Italy's key sectors and future lies squarely in the North remains unchallenged in the late 1960s. It is this principle of Northern "supremacy" which would be undermined in the 1970s. Reconsideration of the North's position with respect to the rest of Italy would open the way to a truly *national* sociology. Italian sociology would consolidate intellectually in the 1970s by taking traditional non-industrial, and non-Northern sectors of society into account, no longer as backward relics which the forces of modernization would slowly make disappear but as sociological presence in their own right, vital components of Italy's complex national setting. The impetus for such a change of orientation in Italian sociology would once again come from the social and political context.

Italian Sociology Consolidates (1972–1980)

Unlike France or America, Italy continued to experience throughout the 1970s the consequences of the social unrest of the late 1960s, its politicization, social activism, and grass roots militants. The intense industrial struggles of 1969, in which the working class won major economic, organizational, and political concessions, while changing in the process both the structure and social vocation of the trade unions, marked only the beginning of the Italian left's "renaissance". Reinforced by these industrial victories, the left in the trade unions, in the collective movements, as well as in the PCI began its long march toward the conquest of power in Italian society as a whole. The left would gain its strongest victories in the years 1972–1976; on the social front with the reforms on behalf of divorce, a renewed family code, as well as abortion; on the individual front with the change in social and family mores and the acceptance of greater sexual, feminist, and personal freedom; and on the political front with the steady ascendancy at the local and national level of the PCI during the administrative elections of 1975 and the national

elections of 1976. The combined power of the trade unions, the PCI, and the collective movements on the left made it in effect impossible to run Italy without the left's tacit or positive consent.

The 1970s, however, would also be the decade in which the "reaction" against the left would raise its head, thus dashing some of the more optimistic hopes of the late 1960s, when social revolutionaries, having upset the Center Left reformists, assumed that they had won the battle against conservatism. Indeed, it was during the "hot autumn" of 1969 that the right began manifesting its opposition to the social victories of the left. On December 12, 1969 a bomb was deposited in a major Milanese bank which killed several persons and injured many. Attributed to leftist extremists, the act was in reality the work of neo-fascist groups eager to inaugurate a "strategy of tension" which hopefully would have terrorized the middle classes into accepting a right wing regime. In 1970, a prominent general, Borghese, attempted a coup against the State as a way of stopping the perilous move to the left. In 1971, riots broke out in the Southern city of Reggio Calabria, where the populace, composed mainly of unemployed and youths (dislocated by the modernization taking place in the countryside), rebelled against the State and demanded jobs and social services. These social claims were not picked up by the left, whose presence in the South was very weak. The neo-fascists channelled these protests into a cohesive protest against Christian Democracy and its system of clientary power. The result: in the 1972 administrative elections the Christian Democrats lost an important number of votes to the neo-fascist party (MSI) in the South. It was enough to convince the DC to form a Center Right government, the first since 1962, as an answer to the frustations of traditional groups who felt dislocated and unprotected in a society increasingly organized in a corporativist manner. The DC did not wish to see these traditional groups, its key constituency, move to the right. Italian political life in the 1970s would have as a backdrop the tensions resulting from the fears of the right and the growing demands of the left for a share of power. More than anything else, it was the formation of a Center Right government which galvanized the trade unions into a united and comprehensive action for planned social change, and the PCI into seeking national power through the strategy of the "historic compromise".

In terms of our interests for sociology, this clash between the political left and right awakened left-wing Northern intellectuals (among whom the sociologists were to be found) to the existence of *other* "Italys" beyond the industrialized reformist society of the North, that had held their attention throughout the postwar years. Conservative middle classes, traditional shopkeepers and artisans, clientary interests, and marginal masses, both in the

South's backward cities as well as in the North suddenly appeared to exert pressure on society's development, in ways which modernization models had not anticipated. Italy's political left had to take the existence of these groups into account if it wanted to win an increasingly larger portion of society to its camp. Both in political and social terms it became imperative to determine exactly *who was what* in Italian society, with what social demands, class affiliations, and political inclinations. Sociological analyses therefore came to play a predominant role in the 1970s in a social setting where the rebellion against technocratic planning fused with more traditional issues such as the problems of the South, the absence of a strong State, severe territorial and economic imbalances, and the slowing down of the Northern locomotive in the context of a major international economic crisis. Sociology became in effect the intellectual handmaiden of a consolidated left seeking to transform not only society, but the very apparatus of the State. The 1970s therefore mark the triumph of the sociologist as engagé intellectual in a politically decisive context, where for the first time in the postwar period, both Italy's North and South had to be taken into account in a truly national problematic of interpenetration. The old metaphor of the North's "locomotive" and the South's "caboose" would lose meaning in a setting where the North would be just as plagued by problems of backwardness and inefficiency as the South.

One cannot fully understand the themes of Italian sociology in the 1970s without realizing that they were closely connected with the Italian left's search for a collective social actor capable of carrying out at a national level the necessary structural reforms on which the Center Left had foundered. The identity of this actor changed throughout the decade to fit Italy's evolving political situation. In the late 1960s the industrial working class and the collective movements which sprung up in the university, schools, hospitals, barracks, and prisons seemed to be the privileged actors for social change, precisely because of their opposition to pre-existing bureaucratic structures. In the early 1970s the trade unions became the institutional force judged as capable of carrying out national reforms through the planning of jobs, investments, and social services; this vision of the trade unions saw them as global interlocutors on behalf of a social change beyond the narrow interests of their traditional constituency. When the trade unions proved unable to encompass all of Italian society with their social clout, because in the context of a growing economic crisis they had to take care of their own, hopes shifted to the PCI and to the notion once more of political change as the only one capable of reaching all areas, whether Northern or Southern, industrialized or traditional. The PCI's electoral victories marked the peak of leftist euphorias, but a peak which would not last as the PCI slid into purely political choices and the historic compromise

with Christian Democracy. Society as a privileged entity seemed to be losing ground. In the late 1970s, the Italian left seemed to be running out of voluntarist actors capable of producing major structural change. Its attention turned to the enduring weights of society's political and economic structures, to all the elements which made significant social innovation impossible. The consequence has been a reflection on the seeming contradictions of a country which experienced at the same time: the rise of the left and a seeming political paralysis; the consolidation of a strong civil society and the spread of terrorism; a massive economic crisis linked to the international situation and the appearance of a vibrant "parallel" economy; the crisis of the State (both Hobbesian and Welfare) and an apparent survival of a strong democratic fiber in a society that can "make do" when the State fails to respond.

The principal themes Italian sociology addressed in the 1970s can be schematically listed as follows in relation to the left-wing hopes of the decade: 1) the study of the working class and of collective movements in the early 1970s matching the hopes for these actors in transforming society; 2) the analysis of the labor market and of economic dualism in the light of the national planning potential of the united trade unions; 3) the study of social classes and their link to the State in the search for the "objective" allies of the working class in the political sphere. In light of the current decline in left-wing political voluntarism, these three themes have given way to other considerations linked to the analysis of social marginality, the parallel economy, the crisis of legitimacy of the State, and terrorism.

1) *The industrial working class:* The third generation of Italian sociologists, influenced by the industrial struggles of 1968–1969 and by the critiques against neo-capitalism of *Quaderni Rossi* and *Quaderni Piacentini,* turn to a renewed industrial sociology (placing more emphasis on worker action than on technological innovation) in the late 1960s. In Milan, the students of the sociology COSPOS around Pizzorno embark on a long collective research on the working class and its links to the trade unions in ten different industrial factories of the Milan region. This research, covering the years 1968–1972, seeks to analyze the social origins of the new working class militancy, its technological implications and political repercussions in the creation of a more democratic, decentralized, and issue-oriented trade union movement.[18] Throughout most of the 1970s, the trade unions' role in drafting global reforms for Italian society will be at the core of national debates on the Italian working class' "revolutionary" or "social democratic" potential. Intellectuals and sociologists will hold different positions on the topic: some arguing that the renewed militancy of the working class in Italy was the result of a "catching up" with respect to the trade union traditions of more advanced industrial

countries, and therefore could only lead to a social democratic setting; others arguing instead that Italy in the late 1960s was at the beginning of a truly revolutionary process, because the working class could find echoes in the rest of society for a major social upheaval.[19] In both cases, sociologists and trade union militants and cadres collaborate in research which is of utmost importance to the trade unions themselves as they seek to draft new programs of action which will interpret correctly the essence of the new working class militancy. The apex of sociological work in tandem with trade unions is probably visible at the 1973 meeting of the major unions, when a national plan of reforms is drafted, which seeks to take into account not just the interests of the working class but also those of the unemployed, the students looking for jobs, in a comprehensive overview of the structural problems of Italian society. The trade unions seem to be taking on the role of a non-political Prince.

2) *Collective movements:* parallel to the industrial struggles are the struggles on behalf of greater individual and collective rights against what is perceived as stringent and backward social legislation. These struggles are waged on behalf of divorce, abortion, housing, social services, and grass roots democracy in society's specialized "compounds," i.e., the family, schools, hospitals, barracks, and prisons. These collective struggles are studied intently by sociologists who believe that these issue-oriented movements will guarantee society's renewal precisely because they are devoid of strict class connotations. Furthermore, unlike trade union linked actions, collective movements can arise anywhere, in small Southern villages as well as in heavily industrial settings. In reality trade union and collective struggles are closely intertwined. The former, in trying to implement a plan of national renewal, need to attract the contestetory movements which are present in society's "cells," for students, teachers, and employees are badly needed leaven for advocating social reforms. The latter need the constituency of the trade unions and their social "clout" to win support for issue-oriented demands, which were won through national referendums. The Catholic trained sociologists of the University of Trento are particularly strong in their analyses of collective movements, especially with regard to changing social mores and the family. Ferrarotti's group in Rome is most interested in the housing issue as the rallying point for social action in a non-industrial setting. Capecchi's review *Inchiesta* has as an avowed purpose to act as a go-between for sociologists and collective movements in the hope that resources can be pooled and analyses turned to concrete use by groups with different problems.[20]

3) *Labor market and economic dualism:* perhaps more than any other, this theme is responsible for the national scope of sociology's consolidation in the

1970s. Research on the labor market had already begun under the auspices of ILSES in the early 1960s with the purpose of analyzing the impact of the massive Southern migration on Lombard society. At that time the assumption was that this migration could only have positive economic and social consequences both for Italy's North and South (by providing needed labor for the former and by emptying overpopulated countrysides for the latter). By the late 1960s the result of this research and the changed intellectual and political environment were pointing to a completely different interpretation of Italy's postwar development. Massimo Paci's work showed to what degree Southern migration did not just fill new jobs but in reality produced "substitution mechanisms" in the labor force, whereby the weaker sectors of the economy (women and older men) merely dropped out of the labor market and became added loads on family budgets. Modernization in reality had produced pockets of underdevelopment in the North itself.[21] As for the South, the Center Left's ambitious plans of creating industrial poles of development to foster a modern society along the Northern model wrought havoc with delicate social balances. Southern modernization threw entire peasant populations off the land without providing them with jobs elsewhere in the cities, since most of the industries implanted in the South were capital intensive and required a very small and highly skilled work force. Furthermore, Southern cities lacked the commercial thrust and industrial infrastructures of the North to "create" new jobs, in what was at any rate a period of economic stagnation. The result: uprisings like those of Reggio Calabria, and the creation of a mass of marginal workers, in what was a qualitatively different social setting when compared to the traditional problems of the "Southern Question".[22] Research on the labor market showed the degree to which the interpenetration of North and South had taken place in a highly dysfunctional manner for both halves of the country, in what was an about face with respect to the assumptions of the economic miracle.

The labor market theme proved equally valuable in analyzing other related social phenomena such as Italy's educational system and family structure. Marzio Barbagli's research showed the degree to which education and economic opportunities were not functional correlates, and that internal migrations in effect distorted all benefits of reform originally intended for the South. Laura Balbo used the theme of the labor market to analyze the composition and economic role of different family members both in Italy's North and South.[23] In better understanding the role of the Southern "industrial reserve army" with respect to the North, sociologists-economists were able to single out the specificity of Italy's central regions in the labor market structure. The Center's agrarian and small industrial activities would stand out as a highly flexible mixture of economic productivity when compared to the

North's exclusively industrial orientation and the South's hybrid mixture of super advanced industries (the "cathedrals in the desert") and very backward agrarian concerns.[24] Indeed, Italy's central regions would become the key area of sociological analysis with respect to the growing interest for the "parallel economy". Analysis of Italy's labor market also provided a far clearer understanding of the phenomenon of Southern migration with respect to the South itself, and the weight of immigrant remittances on the Southern economy.[25] Each of these topics provided further knowledge of Italy's *national* social setting in ways which were never addressed by the sociological production of the 1950s and 1960s.

4) *Social classes and their link to the State:* halfway between economics and political sociology, the debate on the actual weight of different social classes in Italian society was clearly linked to a specific political setting: that of the search for "objective" allies for a working class movement that seemed unable single-handedly to carry out Italy's needed reforms. Interest in industrial sociology and in collective movements, and in the labor market went hand-in-hand with the belief that the most advanced social and economic sectors played the determinant role in shaping Italian society. The debate on social classes instead was the product of an increasing awareness of Italy's lagging and traditional sectors in the shaping of Italy's social and political imbalances. Reflection on traditional sectors had been neglected almost entirely during the economic voluntarism of the "miracle" and Center Left planning years, as well as during the political voluntarism of the late 1960s. From the start the debate on social classes centered on the South because it was the South, with outbreaks such as those of Reggio Calabria, that opened Northern eyes to the complexities of Italian society. Class analysis of Southern modernization showed the degree to which it had in effect fostered a new middle class who lived off of its access to the State's lucrative funding of economic and social projects. This class handed out these benefits to the marginal unemployed whose political weight it thus controlled. Similar clientary arrangements could also be found in Italy's North. The conclusions drawn from such a realization: class formation was not necessarily the product of economic development (as marxists and liberals had assumed) but could also be the result of political choices and party mediations.[26] The blurring of political and economic lines could also be seen in the growing number of protests and strikes carried out by employees in public and private sectors on behalf of better salaries and working conditions, protests and strikes which were, however, of a corporatist character, and not immediately to be linked with the wider trade union actions.

Two separate intellectual-political interpretations developed out of these

findings on social classes. The first stressed the vast degree of social dissatisfaction present throughout Italian society, both in the North and in the South, and advocated the merging of disparate social demands into a truly revolutionary "front". This front would include the industrial working class, employees, and the "productive" middle classes in a broad reformist coalition. This line was best incarnated in the strategy of the PCI in the mid-1970s as it sought to enter into the "historic compromise" with the DC. A more left-wing version of this united front advocated instead the revolutionary character of a working class alliance with the marginal masses of the South, in what would have been a modern version of Gramsci's worker-peasant alliance.[27] The other current of analysis stressed instead the profound structural incompatibility which separated a truly reformist front from what were essentially conservative or corporatist interests in disguise. This current of analysis showed the degree to which the objective interests of the marginal masses working in transient jobs in the parallel economy or of the middle classes were in reality antithetical to the interests of the trade unionized working class.[28] The first current stressed political voluntarism; the second instead performed anti-ideological critiques of political platforms. In both cases, sociological analyses were at the heart of intellectual political debates centering on the role which the PCI should assume in Italian society.

Italian sociology's greatest originality in the 1970s came from the fusion of the labor market and social classes themes. The entire gamut of social classes was analyzed as a function of two key variables: economic structures on the one hand and political considerations of social stability on the other. The result has been sociological production which has clearly reoriented social analysis beyond the facile modernization models of the 1960s (whether marxist or anti-marxist). The State (both in its welfare and clientary structures) has emerged as a key actor in the formation of social classes and as a determinant element in Italy's economic organization and its class divisions. Originally tied to the hopes of spurring national reforms through trade union action and the PCI, this research on the labor market and on social classes has in effect underscored the immense differences which separate Italy's subordinate classes from each other. The structural incompatibility between Northern industrial workers with their trade union benefits, guaranteed pensions and collective rights, and their Southern counterparts, often employed in marginal pursuits with no social guarantees or pensions, helps explain the inability of Italy's left to form a truly national program for social change. Turin and Reggio Calabria cannot be brought together after all, even by the most optimistic political voluntarism. Sociology, closely tied to this spirit of voluntarism, has ended up exposing the unrealistic bases of many political stands of the 1970s in what would be a major anti-ideological function for Italy's national social and political debates.

Postwar Italian sociology in effect thrived best when social as opposed to political actors seemed to be playing the central role in national development. This occurred twice in the postwar phase: during the early years of the Center Left when social planners seemed to hold the keys to Italy's modernization, and politics was assumed to be merely the pragmatic putting in place of social and economic reforms; and during the years of trade union activism of the late 1960s and early 1970s when grass roots organizations inside the factory and in other social organizations seemed to play a determinative role in national policy. Sociology and politics were instead always engaged in an unsteady liaison. The Center Left alliance with the Reformist Prince fell apart precisely when sociologists realized that the social reformers carried little weight in what was really a conservative mixture of subtle political give and take, not really determined to carry out national reforms. In a similar vein, sociologists looked to the Communist Party with what could be called a sympathetic diffidence, because its primary interests would continue to be political. It is not a coincidence that sociology would provide powerful anti-ideological analyses of Italy's class situation precisely at the time the PCI sought to encompass through the language of political voluntarism and historic compromise the widest possible coalition of social forces. Italian sociology in reality would be the ideal handmaiden of a *social* left which defined itself in non-political categories – hence its greatest interest for the working class and the collective movements of society. In effect Italian sociologists rejected the Gramscian notion of being "organic intellectuals" of a given party. Italian sociology after all had molded itself in opposition to orthodox *political* marxist stands; it accepted and used economic and social marxian analyses, but its top priority was always to society, never to a party.[29]

The four themes around which Italian sociology consolidated in the 1970s – industrial sociology, social classes, labor market, and collective movements – were originally all themes of dissent vis à vis the sociological assumptions of the "golden years". They rapidly became, however, in the 1970s professional fields in their own right. Three factors are responsible for this change in radical sociology's intellectual status: its institutional integration, the creation of a network of scientific publications, and the very consolidation and institutionalization of what had been the extra-parliamentary left. At an institutional level, Italian sociology was able to consolidate professionally inside the university, when in the 1970s Italy's faculties of political and social science were finally created. In practical terms this means that the sociological community, previously scattered in various planning institutes, is awarded academic positions. For the first time it can carry out extensive researches without political pressures and with few career pressures at first, since in the early 1970s sociology was still too crisis-ridden to generate institutional

demands of its members. In this manner, even the third generation of sociologists is integrated into an academic structure. At first these institutional positions "nourish" the sociologists without directing their work performed in the context of the political and social engagement described above. Indeed, most sociological production of the early 1970s appears in engagé political reviews such as *Quaderni Piacentini, Inchiesta,* or *Problemi del Socialismo,* or in the trade union's *Quaderni di Rassegna sindacale,* never in the old professional sociological journals created in the early 1960s. But a university setting has its own constraints. The presence of students, the creation of sociology curricula, leads to the formation of professional specializations, as theses get written. The themes we have described above, particularly that of the labor market, become bona fide areas of specialization, complete with impressive bibliographies, unquestioned areas of formal knowledge. Research feeds further research and in the mid-1970s new structures are set up to provide financing for the researches carried out inside the universities. Italy's National Research Center (CNR) becomes an important sponsor along with the newly created Italian Social Science Council (CISS) established with the help of the Olivetti Foundation, and whose purpose it is to act as a professional forum for common research projects between Italy's different universities and also as a liaison with foreign research institutions. As the themes of the late 1960s consolidate and carry greater weight in the universities, these professional institutions increasingly reflect their concerns.[30]

Institutional consolidation gathers significance only when it is accompanied by a "scientific" network of production. As we mentioned earlier, Italy's sociologists in the late 1960s and early 1970s had mainly written in engagé political and social reviews. The transformation of this engagé production into scientific publications is largely the work of publishing houses, foremost among which stands Il Mulino, which reprinted in book form many of the articles which the sociologists had written in journals such as *Inchiesta* and the *Quaderni Piacentini.*[31] Along with other publishers such as Etas Kompass and Liguori, Il Mulino has become the privileged vehicle for the new sociological monographs which have been steadily appearing ever since the sociologists have acquired university status (and therefore the time, but also the career need to publish). Sociology's institutionalization and scientific production would have been meaningless without the creation of a new public to read its production. In reality the marginal sociology of the late 1960s could become a consolidated professional discipline because the marginal social forces beside which it had fought have also become key fixtures of Italy's social and political horizon. The trade unions, the Communist Party, not to mention social institutions such as schools and hospitals, where social workers abound, have all become major "consumers" of sociological knowledge, sponsors of

research projects, and the new public for this scientific production.[32] What could be more institutionalized than a sociology professor at a university carrying out research under contract from a trade union center seeking to train its cadres in the problems of the labor market? Seen from this angle sociology's consolidation in the 1970s has been an absolute success. In a sense the sociologist has returned to his old role as adviser to the policy-makers, no longer defined as technocratic reformers (although these too have resurfaced in the face of Italy's political quagmire), but as major social institutional actors. This professional consolidation is most visible in the current moves to create an Italian Sociological Association, moves which are led by the same Capecchi who had played such an instrumental role in eliciting the abandonment of the old Italian Social Science Association.[33]

At a wider cultural level, Italian sociology in the 1970s has succeeded in making Italy's political and social debates less abstract, more based on a concrete study of sociological data, and less prey to ideological exaggerations. All sides of the political spectrum will agree on the data that must be consulted in order to tackle a given problem. This in itself is no minor step when one looks back to the intellectual ambience of the postwar period and its powerful ideological division. Italian sociology has in effect conquered its institutional, scientific, and intellectual place in Italian society. Scientific production will increase as the national sociological network becomes more homogeneous. The discipline has clearly become an ongoing pursuit. But what are its wider prospects for the 1980s?

I should like to end this analysis of postwar Italian sociology on a more quixotic note and point out all the risks the discipline will face in the coming years. First, institutionally, Italian sociology may lose its vitality as increasingly fewer younger persons enter its ranks. The creation of social science faculties in the early 1970s meant that all of a sudden there were an enormous number of teaching slots to be filled in the social sciences. In effect the entire sociological community of the time obtained teaching positions, including the third generation of sociologists. The result has been the freezing of any new positions for a long time to come, and this implies that a fourth and fifth "generation" of sociologists is less likely to emerge as a distinct intellectual entity in the field, since there are practically no career possibilities. Students are trained to become employees and little else. Second, intellectually, as the social actors who had stimulated the renewal of sociology in the late 1960s "recede," Italian sociology runs the danger of remaining wedded to dated radical categories which had given its *raison d'être* during the apotheosis of the early 1970s. The labor market theme, while very fruitful and highly original, can become excessively technical if it is not wedded to wider social

and political concerns. Third, and most important, it is precisely the changing social and political context which may radically alter sociology's cultural role in the coming decade as the primacy of society itself in the study of collective life is losing ground. What I say for Italian sociology is in reality applicable to other national contexts as well. Professional consolidation and institutionalization cannot guarantee the vitality of a discipline. The best postwar sociology was produced in a setting of social mobility, economic dynamism, political transformation, and of constant tension between innovation and conservatism. All of these factors are no longer predominant.

The economic crises, declining demographic structures of advanced industrial societies, the political swamp in which they find themselves, coupled with the new priority given to international tensions and the latent fear of war, have combined to place the interest for "society" in a secondary position among current concerns. Furthermore, topics which had inspired sociological analysis in the postwar period are now lending themselves best to other types of analysis, whether of an economic, psychological, or philosophical-political nature. This is particularly true in the Italian case for three distinct themes whose importance we have stressed throughout these pages: the economic miracle, collective movements, and political voluntarism. In the late 1970s they have turned into disenchanted and negative caricatures of themselves. The parallel economy and "moonlighting" are now getting the political and intellectual attention once reserved for the economic miracle. The social marginality, political passivity, and drug addiction of today's youth make the headlines where their collective demands for a more open and democratic society had dominated in the late 1960s. Terrorism stands as the last nihilistic vestige of the political voluntarism of the 1970s. In this "decadence," the missing component is precisely the social dynamism which underlay postwar development.

Current interest in Italy for the "parallel" economy as the invisible force which has kept the country going despite what seemed impossible economic and social tensions, is a far cry from the earlier interest in the highly visible and vibrant economic miracle. At best the parallel economy is a way of structuring economic survival in the interstices of an economic crisis. Even if it procures truly productive jobs for thousands or millions of workers, it can play no comparable role to the locomotive of the earlier miracle, because it does not generate social transformations, technological innovations, new jobs or market needs. One cannot build national hopes on it. It is a static productivity whose impact on Italian society is best studied in terms of its consequences on the G.N.P. As such, the parallel economy is the privileged territory of analysis for economists. Having won the most important social battles in civil society, collective movements have taken on a different implication since the anti-political autono-

mous protests of 1977 in Bologna. Criticizing all parties, and the Communists in particular, jobless disillusioned youths and students marched in protest lumping together as "establishment" both the traditional parties as well as the newly consolidated left, because none had managed to solve their social problems. Basking in a climate of pessimism, indifference, and political nihilism, these new movements have turned to drugs and personal private concerns. Some sociologists have tried to show the political consequences of this new marginality, particularly in a setting where the left has been excluding the demands of these movements from its political calculuses.[34] In reality, however, these protests lend themselves more to social psychological analyses than to sociological reflections, for this new moroseness crosses class lines and carries little social hope or weight. It is a collective state of mind.

As for political voluntarism, its only vestige is terrorism, which with its nihilistic hatred of the State, holds no room for social considerations. It is no coincidence that the majority of Italian sociologists have been reticent to study this phenomenon. Its clandestinness is not the real stumbling block. Child of the explosive union of Catholic and marxist lefts, which was so instrumental in the reorientation of Italian society in the late 1960s (as well as sociology's), terrorism is less the product of social and economic structures than of a political stalemate, frustrated illusions of a complete revolutionary change, grafted onto a weak State whose political elites wallow in byzantine games. Terrorism so far has been studied by the Catholic current of social psychology which has won new ground in the late 1970s in reaction to the excessively economic and left-wing oriented "lay" sociology we have described in the preceding pages.[35] It has also been studied in a journalistic vein where sociologists spoke more as concerned citizens. Most recently its ties with the autonomous disenchanted collective movements are being underlined.[36] In reality sociology has been unable to broach the problem of terrorism because it represents an attack against the State in its classic Hobbesian nature. The labor market current of sociology could address itself to the weaknesses of the Welfare State, its inability to oversee society's economic and social organization, and to reconcile society's "guaranteed" and "non-guaranteed" sectors. But terrorism raises other types of fundamental questions, linked to the very existence of a *polis*, to the nature and limits of democracy's ability to defend itself against outside attacks, to the role of the State vis-à-vis its citizens, to the nature of justice, etc. These problems are all in the purview of political theory, philosophy, jurisprudence. The social composition of terrorism, while interesting, is off the mark with respect to these "classic" questions of political survival.

At a more general level, sociology's capacity to analyze contemporary society may be in part jeopardized by the slow return to *historical* perceptions of

what has now become a very long and complex postwar period. Social science models thrived on an ahistorical and international "golden years" context, which seemed to be the wave of the future in the early 1960s, but which is increasingly relativized as "exceptional" today. Historical analyses, based in part on sociological work, may dominate a decade bereaved of dynamic social, economic, and political actors, and where economic and political issues of survival may become primordial.

NOTES

1. Cf. Diana Pinto, "La Sociologie dans l'Italie de l'après-guerre," *Revue Française de Sociologie*, 2, 1980.
2. Antonio Labriola, Neapolitan marxist philosopher, heir of Hegelianism and prime thinker of the Italian Socialist Party at the turn of the century. His critiques of positivism and the privileged role he accorded to history can be found in *La concezione materialistica della storia* (Bari, 1971). Benedetto Croce was against positivism all of his life. His critiques against the social sciences can be found at the beginning as well as at the end of his writings: *Materialismo storico ed economia marxista* (Bari, 1968), 253–293; *Terze pagine sparse* (Bari, 1955), 133–136. Giovanni Gentile, minister of education under fascism and Crocean ideologue of the regime. For a survey of social thought under fascism, see O. Lentini, *L'analisi sociale sotto al fascismo* (Naples, 1975). The critiques which Gramsci addresses against sociology are scattered throughout his writings, but a good point of reference are his reactions to Bucharin's works, to be found in A. Gramsci, *Il materialismo storico e la filosofia di Benedetto Croce* (Turin, 1966), 117–165.
3. PCI reflections are best found in the party review, *Rinascita*; Catholic perceptions of society in the Catholic University review, *Vita e Pensiero;* while the liberals expressed themselves best in *Il Mondo.*
4. For a Franco-Italian comparison of cultural climates with respect to sociology, see Diana Pinto, "Sociology as a Cultural Phenomenon in France and Italy: 1950–1972," Ph.D. dissertation (Harvard University, 1977).
5. The Church accepted social science research in its empirical form because it could be integrated in a theological cadre, something which marxist social analysis instead could not achieve, since it drew its premises from fundamentally different social philosophies. For an overview of Catholic thought, see Eugenio Garin, *Cronache di filosofia italiana*, 2 vols. (Bari, 1975), 455–473.
6. Neither the criminologists nor the neo-Machiavellians had much of a following in this century, either under fascism or in the postwar years. The detached critiques of Italian politics and of socialism did not find a fertile terrain, except perhaps in the thought of Norberto Bobbio who has stressed their role as critics of ideology. N. Bobbio, *Saggi sulla scienza politica in Italia* (Bari, 1977).
7. The South is best known through books such as Carlo Levi's *Cristo si è fermato a Eboli*, a novel written by a Northern Jewish intellectual exiled in a small Southern village under fascism, in which the author describes the ahistoric rhythms of life in villages which are still pre-Christian in their deepest beliefs. The South is also known through Danilo Dolci's social work at Partinico in Sicily, or through foreign analyses such as Edward Banfield's *The Moral Bases of a Backward Society* (New York, 1958). Southern society's transformations are studied mainly by economists, intent on modernizing the South, such as Manlio Rossi-Doria at the Portici center which he directed for many years. See his *Riforma agraria e azione meridionalista* (Bologna, 1956).
8. In 1954 the PCI representatives lose heavily in the FIAT internal shop stewards elections. This defeat is construed at the time as proof that the working class was no longer interested in the sectarian orthodox revolutionary messages of the Party.
9. The positive and inevitable aspects of this modernization are stressed. The phenomenon is not evaluated. The purpose of these works is to understand the mechanisms which will allow Italy to become "modern". F. Ferrarotti, *Sindacalismo autonomo* (Milan, 1958); L. Gallino, *Progresso tecnologico ed evoluzione organizzativa negli stabilimenti Olivetti* (Milan, 1960); A. Pizzorno, *Comunità e razionalizzazione* (Turin, 1960).
10. The debate on the "new working class" which appeared in 1958–1959 in the

French review *Arguments,* was closely followed in Italy by the *Ragionamenti* group. The two reviews were in very close contact and often exchanged articles. Indeed *Arguments* was set up under the inspiration of *Ragionamenti.*

11. For instance, Francesco Alberoni, *Contributo allo studio dell'integrazione sociale dell'immigrato* (Milan, 1960). For an overview of the literature on immigration see M. Liguori, "Fenomeni migratori e sociologia," *Rassegna Italiana di Sociologia* (Jan–March 1979), 109–146.
12. The key sociological books for this rethinking of Italian political life are: F. Alberoni, *L'attivista del partito: una indagine sui militanti di base nel Pc e nella DC* (Bologna, 1967); Giorgio Galli, *Il bipartitismo imperfetto* (Bologna, 1967).
13. F. Alberoni, *L'elite senza potere: ricerca sociologica sul divismo* (Milan, 1963); or his *Consumi e Società* (Bologna, 1961). It is in the early 1960s that Umberto Eco's work on popular culture becomes known and fashionable. Eco would become Italy's leading semiologist.
14. The work of G. E. Rusconi on the Frankfurt School is highly indicative: *La Teoria crtitica della società* (Bologna, 1968). Alberoni's analysis of the new collective state of protest is a seminal work in Italian sociology: *Statu Nascenti: studi sui processi collettivi* (Bologna, 1968).
15. The third generation of sociologists would partake of this intellectual slant in its own engagé work carried out inside the COSPOS centers. Emilio Reyneri, "L'organizzazione del lavoro nella fabbrica IBM," in *Per la critica dell'organizzazione del lavoro* (Bologna, 1971); Mario Regini and Emilio Reyneri, *Lotte operaie e organizzazione del lavoro* (Padova, 1971).
16. The research on Rome comes out as a book: Franco Ferrarotti, *Roma da capitale a periferia* (Bari, 1971).
17. V. Capecchi, "Struttura e tecniche della ricerca," in P. Rossi, ed., *Ricerca sociologica e ruolo del sociologo* (Bologna, 1972), 23–120.
18. It will culminate in a six volume study: A. Pizzorno, ed., *Lotte operaie e sindacato in Italia (1960–1972).* The sixth volume is an analytical conclusion of the results; A. Pizzorno, E. Reyneri, M. Regini, I. Regalia, *Lotte operaie e sindacato: il ciclol: 1968–1972 in Italia* (Bologna, 1979). An English summary is also available in C. Crouch and A. Pizzorno, *The Resurgence of Class Conflicts in Western Europe since 1968* (London, 1978).
19. These debates are best summarized in A. Accornero, A. Pizzorno, B. Trentin, M. Tronti, *Movimento sindacale e società italiana* (Milan, 1977); and in Guido Baglioni, *Il sindacato dell'autonomia* (Bari, 1975).
20. *Inchiesta* and *La Critica Sociologica* are the primary vehicles for analyses of these collective movements. Two significant books on the topic are F. Alberoni, *Classi e generazioni* (Bologna, 1968); A. Melucci, *Lotte sociali e mutamento* (Milan, 1974).
21. Massimo Paci, *Mercato del lavoro e classi sociali in Italia* (Bologna, 1973).
22. G. Mottura and E. Pugliese, *Agricoltura, Mezzogiorno, e mercato del lavoro* (Bologna, 1978).
23. M. Barbagli, *Disoccupazione intellettuale e sistema scolastico in Italia* (Bologna, 1975). L. Balbo, *Stato di famiglia* (Milan, 1977).
24. L. Meldolesi, *Disoccupazione ed esercito industriale di riserva in Italia* (Bari, 1972). A. Bagnasco, *Tre Italie: la problematica territoriale dello sviluppo italiano* (Bologna, 1977).
25. E. Reyneri, *La catena migratoria: il ruolo dell'emigrazione nel mercato di lavoro di arrivo e di esodo* (Bologna, 1979).
26. A. Pizzorno, "I ceti medi nei meccanismi di consenso," in F. L. Cavazza and S. R. Graubard, *Il caso italiano,* 2 vols. (Milan, 1974), 315–337.
27. C. Donolo, "Sviluppo ineguale e disgregazione sociale nel Mezzogiorno," *Quaderni Piacentini,* n. 47 (July 1972), 101–129. Both the Donolo and Pizzorno texts (footnote 26) are reproduced in M. Paci, ed., *Capitalismo e classi sociali in Italia* (Bologna, 1978). An English translation of these two texts is forthcoming in D. Pinto, ed., *Contemporary Italian Sociology: A Reader* (Cambridge University Press).
28. Paolo Sylos Labini, *Saggio sulle classi sociali* (Bari, 1975).
29. Symptomatic of this new economic sociology is Massimo Paci's work; Paolo Calza Bini, *Economia periferica e classi sociali* (Naples, 1976).
30. The CISS is currently sponsoring a major multi-city research on the "second job" (moonlighting) and its impact on Italian society and economics. The project headed by L. Gallino covers Italy's Northern, Central, as well as Southern areas.
31. M. Paci's *Mercato del lavoro,* G. Mottura and E. Pugliese's *Agricoltura,* and L. Balbo's *Stato di famiglia* are books all composed out of a series of articles which at first appeared in left-wing para-sociological reviews.
32. In 1979, the PCI undertook a major sociological study of its party militants, complete with questionnaires and statistical compilations. This acceptance of sociology

was a far cry from its postwar ideological critiques and also a step forward with respect to the diffidence of the 1960s.

33. A. Cavalli, "Il convegno di Milano," *Rassegna italiana di sociologia,* n. 3 (July–September 1979), 355–357.
34. A. Melucci, "Dieci ipotesi per l'analisi dei nuovi movimenti," *Quaderni Piacentini,* 65–66 (1978); translated into English in D. Pinto ed., *Contemporary Italian Sociology;* Francesco Alberoni, *Movimenti e Istituzione* (Bologna, 1977).
35. The Catholic current of sociology which did not move to the "left" in the late 1960s and which maintained its social psychological orientation, is regaining ground. It has regrouped around the review *Studi di Sociologia,* which Alberoni had directed until 1968. The main sociologist of this group is, among the elders, Sabino Acquaviva, a sociologist of religious phenomena and most recently terrorism, who has written among other things, *Mutamento sociale e contraddizioni culturali* (Bresci, 1976), and *Guerriglia e guerra rivoluzionaria in Italia* (Milan, 1979). The other prominent sociologist in this group is Achille Ardigo, who has written along with Pier Paolo Donati, *Famiglia e industrializzazione* (Milan, 1976).
36. Franco Ferrarotti, *Alle radici della violenza* (Milan, 1976). A. Melucci is currently working on the links between the autonomous movements of disaffected youths and terrorism.

Theory and Society 10 (1981) 671–705
0304-2421/81/0000-0000/$02.50