

# POLITICAL SOCIOLOGY IN EASTERN EUROPE

by

JERZY J. WIATR

*Institute of Philosophy and Sociology, Polish Academy of Sciences*

When Reinhard Bendix and Seymour Martin Lipset published in *Current Sociology* Vol. VI, 1957, No. 2 their essay on political sociology and the bibliography on the subject, they were mainly concerned with the development of research in the United States and Western Europe, and made no reference whatever to the socialist countries in Eastern Europe. This was the result not only of insufficient contact and inadequate exchange of information between the two groups of countries at that time; it was also due to the lag in sociological research, including political sociology, in the socialist countries.

Things have changed since then. The revival of theoretical discussion and the renaissance of empirical research in the socialist countries have had repercussions in the studies of politics. Granting that the subject is delicate and very much exposed to the pressure of ideology and political tactics, political sciences are of exceptionally great value for every political system, perhaps even more so for a socialist system than for the others.

Research in political sociology, in the socialist countries, whose social structure, power structure, ideological orientation and intellectual tradition differ a great deal from those in Western Europe and North America, involves several new problems which I shall try to present in this paper. This is a report on new developments in political sociology in the socialist countries and not in political sociology in general. But I believe that the development of political sociology in the socialist countries breeds some more general theoretical problems which might enrich the field of political sociology in other countries as well. Indeed, the very difference in orientation and research trends may generate scientific controversy and encourage the general development of the science.

In presenting the situation in political sociology in the socialist countries I shall try to point out the peculiar features which make it different from other trends in political sociology. In virtually no other field of sociology is the difference in methodological approach and ideological orientation so striking as it is in political sociology. Hence, it is in this field, more than in any other, that the existing differences must be mutually recognized to facilitate effective international co-operation. Since science, despite all the differences in trends and orientations, constitutes one whole, the peculiar features of political sociology in Eastern Europe should not be a barrier to comparative international studies on an increasing scale or to intellectual co-operation in various forms between scientists under different socio-political systems.

The term *sociology* is a newcomer in the official nomenclature of social sciences in most East European countries. If sociology had been left out from the programmes of social studies, it was not because of any real scientific reasons, but because its name was objected to. The present renaissance of sociology in these countries is related to the political changes which have taken place during the last decade; in fact, it is evidence of new political tendencies. Hence the importance of following the changing approach to political phenomena in the theoretical sociological publications in socialist countries. The period between 1957 and 1963, covered by the appended bibliography and referred to in the present paper, provides ample material on the subject.

### POLITICAL SOCIOLOGY: DEFINITION OF SUBJECT

Owing to the rapid development of various branches of sociology in our age it is increasingly difficult to speak about sociology in general; more and more often do we speak about a concrete branch of sociology. Specialization, partly related to progress in empirical research and partly caused by the fading away of theoretical interests, divides sociology into several disciplines which have less and less in common. At the same time we are facing a growing difficulty in fixing exactly the limits and subjects of each sociological discipline.

Political sociology, usually—and, I believe, quite wrongly—regarded as one of these detailed sociological disciplines, is in a particularly awkward situation in this respect. One might ask, indeed, what is the proper subject of its investigation? What is needed is a definition of its relationship to general sociological theory. Finally, we must define relationship to the other political sciences.

These topics have long been the subject of scientific literature. The consensus seems to be that political sociology is mainly concerned with the sphere of power, including the functioning of institutions within which power is exercised and the behaviour of persons who are fighting for power or exercising power. If this is the subject of political sociology, then it is relatively easy to distinguish it from other branches of sociology, assuming of course that the remaining sociological disciplines are not concerned with power relations and leave them to political sociology. This is probably an oversimplification, since the political aspect, the aspect of power, appears in many sociological studies dealing with a great variety of subjects. Hence, it would perhaps be more accurate to say that political sociology differs from other detailed sociological disciplines in that in analysing various social phenomena it concentrates on the *aspect of power* inherent in them. This aspect can be discovered in various fields of social life, although it is not equally important in each of them. Political sociology begins when we pay particular attention to the political aspect of social reality and turn it into the pivot of our analysis.

In this sense, the place of political sociology among sociological disciplines is essentially different from that of other branches of detailed sociology. The latter are concerned with some isolated fields of social life (the village, the city, the family, industry, etc.), while political sociology investigates social phenomena from the angle of their political aspect, the aspect of power. Hence, if there is any justification for regarding political sociology as a separate discipline, it is on the grounds of the difference in theoretical approach rather than the difference in the subject of study. Consequently, political sociology differs from the other sociological sciences in that it allows for a diversity of points of view and a variety of angles of analysis of social relations. Looking at it from this standpoint, political sociology is an orientation or perhaps a school within general sociology rather than a specialized discipline.

Such a standpoint is usually adopted when one accepts the theory of Marxist historical materialism, which is the theoretical and methodological basis of political sociology in East European countries. According to this theory, politics is the superstructure of economic relations; at the same time, by crystallizing the socio-economic relations, it plays an important part in the whole historical process. The study of politics becomes, therefore, the central point in the analysis of social relations; any scientific analysis of society is inconceivable without it. In the article which marked the beginning of the Polish school of political sociology Julian Hochfeld wrote: "The Marxist political science introduces the sociological point of view and, in fact, initiates the sociology of political relations: it localizes political phenomena, studies them functionally, and seeks the sources of these phenomena in social relations. As a result, the

Marxist interpretation of social phenomena, the Marxist sociology becomes above all the sociology of political relations. The role played by the Marxist doctrine in the development of sociology of political relations can be best illustrated by the fact that this doctrine introduced the sociological point of view into the study of politics, thus laying the foundations for an integrating political science—the sociology of political relations.”<sup>1</sup>

It is because of this political orientation of Marxism that in the Marxist social sciences politics is the supreme and essential aspect of social life. In the light of these theoretical tenets general sociology can hardly be regarded as a science dealing with politics only *ad hoc*, nor can the relationship between political sociology and general sociology be considered to be the same as, for example, in the case of rural sociology or family sociology. In the Marxist sociological syntheses the major place is taken up by an analysis of political relations; this is borne out by the contents of the recent manuals of sociology and historical materialism, some of which are listed in the first part of the appended bibliography.

This aspect of social reality, the aspect of political relations, has crucial significance for a theory which is obviously political in nature. In other words, in the Marxist social sciences it is hard to draw a demarcation line between political sociology and general sociology, inasmuch as general sociology is bound to be a theory of politics, which was described by Lenin as the concentrated expression of economics and which is regarded as the main mechanism of social changes. This interrelation of political sociology and general sociology is one of the main features of political sociology in Eastern Europe.

The relationship between political sociology and other political sciences also has its peculiar features in this part of the world. Again, the problem is not confined to the socialist countries alone, but is the object of controversy among scientists the world over.

The very nomenclature of the subject is equivocal and varies from country to country. The Anglo-Saxons use the term political science; the French prefer to speak of political sciences, i.e. a group of sciences dealing with political problems from various points of view. This is perhaps a matter of convention, not affecting the problem of merit; it may have some practical meaning for the organization of scientific life rather than for scientific research itself. Nevertheless, the matter is not indifferent for the development of science, and we shall try to examine it a little more closely.

Politics is, of course, the subject of a variety of sciences, including history, political economy, sociology, the theory of international relations, several legal sciences, etc. It is impossible to precisely demarcate the boundaries between one science and another; the scope of each science is again a matter of convention. Any controversy on the internal structure of political sciences can thus be reduced to the question of existence of a central science which integrates the various political sciences.

Some sociologists believe that this is the function of political sociology as the most general, integrating political science. This view is represented by Julian Hochfeld in the essay quoted above, in which he refers to Otto Stammer and others. Similarly, in Maurice Duverger's view political sociology and political science are synonymous. These authors believe that political sociology, or sociological political science, is the central, theoretical, integrating political science.

Other authors try to find a special, unique scope for political science, a scope which would distinguish it from the other political sciences, particularly from political sociology. Jean Meynaud says, for example, that “le passage des ‘sciences politiques’ à

<sup>1</sup> Julian Hochfeld, “Marksizm a socjologia stosunków politycznych” “Marxism and the Sociology of Political Relations”, in *Studia Socjologiczno-Polityczne*, Warsaw 1958, No. 1, p. 16.

la 'science politique' constitue un réel progrès dans l'analyse des sociétés humaines"; further on, he insists on the creation and expansion of "une discipline dont la tâche est de prendre globalement en charge l'analyse de la vie publique."<sup>1</sup>

Thus in Meynaud's view political science differs from the other political sciences in that it is the only one to take care of studies in political life as a whole, in all its aspects. It would be rather hard to put this programme into effect; nor could it be easily reconciled with the ambitions of representatives of other political sciences, which in Meynaud's version are to be subordinated to *la science politique*. For example, the reduction of political sociology merely to studies in political behaviour or bureaucracy, without which Meynaud could hardly defend his contention that sociological research is insufficient for the understanding of politics, simply does not correspond to the scope of subjects taken up by political sociology in many countries.

Hardly more convincing is the differentiation between political science and political sociology made by Bendix and Lipset. They say: "Like political science, political sociology is concerned with the distribution and the exercise of power in society. Unlike political science, it is not concerned with the institutional provisions for that distribution and exercise, but takes these as given. Thus, political science starts with the state and examines how it affects society, while political sociology starts with society and examines how it affects the state, i.e. the formal institutions for the distribution and exercise of power."<sup>2</sup> They add, however, that the division of interest between the two fields was much clearer during the nineteenth century than it is today. In fact, one could hardly say today that the institutional approach prevails in modern political science. The remarkable expansion of the behaviourist trend in the studies of political life seems to have put an end to the monopoly of the institutional approach in political science. When Bauman, in examining the main types of the definition of power used by scientists in the West, points out that in most cases power is considered in the categories of behaviour, he has in mind not only sociologists but political scientists as well.<sup>3</sup> Several publications sponsored by the International Political Science Association<sup>4</sup> seem to prove that Dahl was right in seeing in the behavioural approach a successful and predominant protest to the former prevalence of the institutional approach in political science.<sup>5</sup>

Opinions may differ as to the value of this protest. The Marxist tradition shows distinct preference for considering the sphere of politics first of all from the angle of class structure, i.e. "starting with society", but with a strong touch of the institutional approach. The reduction of sociological and political problems to issues which can be presented in the categories of individual behaviour, so characteristic of neopositivism, runs counter to this tradition and represents the opposite methodological and theoretical standpoint. The conclusion is not, however, that the behavioural approach to politics is quite useless and all wrong, but that within Marxist political science it can serve as a subsidiary approach only, and that its effects will depend on the ability of coupling it with the institutional approach. But the acceptance of this methodological standpoint destroys the distinction upon which Bendix and Lipset base their division of the study of politics into political sociology and political science.

<sup>1</sup> Jean Meynaud, "Sciences politiques et science politique" *Res Publica, Revue de l'Institut Belge de Science Politique*, vol. II, No. 1, 1960, pp. 6, 9.

<sup>2</sup> R. Bendix, S. M. Lipset, *Current Sociology*, *op. cit.*, p. 87.

<sup>3</sup> Z. Bauman, "O pojęciu władzy" ("On the Notion of Power"), *Studia Socjologiczno-Polityczne*, No. 12, 1962.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. *Essays on the Behavioral Study of Politics*, Austin Ranney ed., Urbana, 1962, especially the chapter on "The Impact of the Behavioral Approach on Traditional Science," by E. M. Kirkpatrick.

<sup>5</sup> Robert A. Dahl, *The Behavioral Approach in Political Science Epitaph for a Monument to a Successful Protest*, report at 5th Congress of Political Science, Paris 1961.

In the Marxist political sciences the boundary line between political sociology and other political sciences becomes vague and intangible. Marxism introduces the sociological approach into political sciences in their entirety, thus turning them into a projection of political sociology. The resulting integration of political sciences might in the future undermine the distinction—still existing, although mostly by force of tradition—between political sociology and the other political sciences. Political sociology would thus turn into a part or an aspect of political science, if such a science did emerge by integrating the various political sciences which exist independently today.

#### THE IMPACT OF MARXISM

The peculiar properties of Marxism as a theoretical orientation in world sociology are less marked today than they were a hundred years ago. Many elements of Marxist thought have been appropriated by other scientific trends. This is particularly evident in the case of political sociology, since it owes its very existence mainly to the Marxist studies of politics. Politics interpreted as the conflicting interests of social classes and strata, power regarded as the superstructure of economic and social relations, ideology interpreted as “rationalization” of interests and spontaneous behaviour—these are all methodological approaches introduced long ago by Marxism and almost universally accepted today.

This does not mean, however, that the dominating impact of Marxism upon political sociology in East European countries has ceased to be the feature which distinguishes this sociology and determines its difference from political sociology in the West. The impact of Marxism is expressed above all in (1) the choice of basic values accepted by the researcher and influencing in turn the whole process of research; (2) the characteristic notion of the connection between theory and practice; (3) the emphasis laid on the study of large social structures and institutions; and (4) the link between development prospects of political sociology and the realities of political systems in the socialist countries. These are the four reasons why political sociology in the socialist countries is developing along largely different lines than political sociology in the West.

Let us start with the choice of basic values which predetermines the ideological orientation of scientific study. In the social sciences, in spite of the repeated insistence on creating a science ethically neutral and free from valuation, the choice of these values is of immense importance. Contrary to the common neopositivistic opinion, the desire to free science from valuations belongs to the realm of utopian dreams. As Gunnar Myrdal puts it, “. . . value premises are necessary to research and . . . no study and no book can be wertfrei, free from valuations”.<sup>1</sup> If this view is accepted it is easy to agree that the difference between the great ideological orientations in whose orbit political sociology is developing, has an indirect bearing on the choice of subjects for research and on the criteria for determining the importance of various phenomena and the significance of various arguments.

This is a problem of what might be called the researcher's inner experience, which is largely independent of his research procedures and is formed in the course of his whole life. But the experience collected by the individual scientist is the product not only of his life record but also, or rather most of all, the product of the environment and the ideological climate in which the scientist was brought up and in which he is acting as a citizen. In this sense there is nothing extraordinary in the fact that the predominance of the Marxist ideology in socialist countries determines the ideological perspective of political sociology in those countries.

<sup>1</sup> Gunnar Myrdal, *Value in Social Theory*, New York, 1958, p. 261.

There is a difference between the ideological perspective of political sociology in Eastern Europe and the ideological perspective of political sociology in the West. Describing political sociology in the West, Bendix and Lipset wrote: "Though shorthand characterizations necessarily oversimplify, it appears to us that the common denominator of studies in political sociology consists in a refined 'interest-theory' of political behaviour and in a political commitment to the values of democratic institutions."<sup>1</sup>

"The values of democratic institutions" can be interpreted in various ways; their interpretation in the socialist countries of Eastern Europe differs from the interpretation given in the West. It is worthwhile, therefore, to examine the type of values which determine the ideological commitment of political sociology in this part of the world.

Studies in political sociology in Eastern Europe are based on a different set of values than the one used in western countries. It is above all a socialist sociology, i.e. its set of values is based on the prospect that society will develop towards an increasing implementation of the principles of egalitarianism. It regards class struggle not only as the key to the understanding of political relations but also as the way to overcoming social inequalities by means of abolishing the class rule of the privileged classes and finally by eliminating the privileges as well. The realization of an egalitarian society of social justice constitutes the basic ideological value which determines research prospects for political sociology in Eastern Europe. This ideological orientation also leads to a peculiar interpretation of democracy as a value accepted and approved by political sociologists. In accordance with the ancient tradition, Marxist sociologists are inclined to regard democracy as government by the people in the interest of the people. Hence, more emphasis is laid on analysing the social *content* than the *form* of power. This choice of values, as I shall try to prove, has a bearing on the selection of research subjects in political sociology.

Such a choice of basic values implies approval of these political institutions associated with proletarian dictatorship. Political sociology in East European countries resembles in this respect its partner in the West: both of them accept the political system within which they operate. But since the two systems are different different are also the problems under sociological study. For example, the problem of elections and voting behaviour, extremely important in the West, plays a marginal role in socio-political studies of the socialist State. The selection of subjects and the emphasis accorded to each within studies in political sociology reflect the differences in the actual importance of the various components of the political system.

In Marxist political sociology in East European countries the acceptance of the political system of the socialist State is related to a characteristic concept, different than in many other trends and schools of political sociology, of the connection between theory and practice. The need for coupling scientific studies with the requirements of social practice is, of course, recognized in the social sciences everywhere; however, its interpretation under the Marxist system has its own original features.

In *The Modern Prince* Antonio Gramsci wrote: "The success of sociology is related to the decadence of the concept of political science and political art which appeared in the nineteenth-century (more exactly in the second half, with the success of evolutionary and positivistic doctrines). . . . If political science means science of the State and the State is the whole complex of practical and theoretical activities with which the ruling class not only justifies and maintains its rule but manages to win the active consent of the governed, it is obvious that all the essential questions of sociology are nothing but questions of political science. . . . The problem should be posed

<sup>1</sup> R. Bendix and S. M. Lipset, *op. cit.*, p. 81.

of what is 'science' itself. Is not science itself 'political activity' and political thought, inasmuch as it transforms men, makes them different from what they were before?"<sup>1</sup>

These sentences, so characteristic for Gramsci's "philosophy of practice", contain an idea which is by no means a novelty in Marxism. Its origins are in Karl Marx's introduction to *Zur Kritik der Hegelschen Rechtsphilosophie* (1844) which presented for the first time the concept of revolutionary process as the outcome of unity between theoretical thought and practical action, between philosophy and the struggle of the proletariat. According to this concept, and according to what Lenin later wrote in *What is to be done?*, and other works, but contrary to the belief of many "orthodox" Marxists of a still later era, the revolution is not an automatic product of spontaneous development; nor can the knowledge of politics be reduced to the discovery of historically inevitable events (it is not by coincidence that the quotation from Gramsci's writings is related to his critique of Bukharin's *Theory of Historical Materialism*; Gramsci regarded Bukharin as the representative of positivistic influence in Marxism).

The concept of political knowledge considered as self-consciousness of political movement and social class and based on the knowledge of reality, i.e. a type of science very much committed to politics, has accompanied Marxism at every stage of its development. As admitted even by those writers who, like George Lichtheim,<sup>2</sup> are quite far from Marxism, there is a certain connection between the political standpoint of the Social-Democrats and the rejection by Second Internationale's leading theoreticians of the dialectic "young Marxist" views on the relationship between philosophy and action. Similarly, there is a connection between the dialectic concepts of Lenin, Gramsci and Lukàcs (e.g. Lukàcs' interesting concept of the "boundary consciousness" of the proletariat) and the political climate of the radical Communist wing in the workers' movement.

These problems are important not only for the historian of social theory. Actually, the confrontation of the dialectic and the neopositivistic standpoints is particularly meaningful today, if only because of the growing influence of the neopositivistic attitude in contemporary science. Nowhere else does it come to the fore so strongly as in the theory of politics. The dialectic concept of the relationship between theory and action, typical for the revolutionary tradition of Marxism, seems to lead to at least two conclusions concerning the character of political sciences. The first conclusion is that they have a practical importance and, far from being a purely academic domain, can play—and actually do play—an important practical role. The second conclusion is that their prospects are organically linked with political commitment to political issues. Indeed, in no other social science is political commitment of the theory so obvious and unquestionable as in political sciences. This also determines the place of political sciences in the Marxist theory as a whole; it is an important place, since Marxism as a whole is a theory of politics, or, to be more precise, the theory of socialist politics.

In view of the close relationship between political theory, including political sociology, and action, and also in view of the fact that the theory itself is regarded as an organic component of political action, in the political sociology of East European countries it is quite hard to draw a distinct limit between the descriptive and analytical social science on one hand and the postulating socio-political thought on the other. A distinction can be made in respect to some papers which obviously belong either to the postulating or to the descriptive type. Many other works, however, including

<sup>1</sup> A. Gramsci, "Notes on Machiavelli's Politics," in *The Modern Prince and other writings*, London 1957, pp. 181–182.

<sup>2</sup> George Lichtheim, *Marxism. An Historical and Critical Study*, New York, 1962, pp. 59–60, etc.

several books listed in the appended bibliography, couple some elements of the postulating political thought with a scientific study of various aspects of socio-political life. Again, the vagueness of the boundary line between theoretical writings of a postulating type and scientific analysis *sensu stricto* is not a matter of coincidence but is due to the character of East European political sociology. Because of this characteristic feature, which in my belief deserves to be emphasized, publications of a postulating type have not been excluded from the appended bibliography.

The impact of Marxism upon political sociology in the socialist countries can also be seen in the methodology of research. According to the nineteenth-century tradition, Marxism lays special stress on the study of large social structures and institutions paying much less heed to the behavioural aspect of political life. Although empirical research into various aspects of political behaviour (membership in political parties, voting behaviour, readership of political press, etc.) has recently been initiated in some socialist countries, it continues to be the fringe rather than the main current of political sociology in Eastern Europe. Presumably the proportions will change, and in the future the less popular fields of study will get more attention from researchers. For the moment, however, the predominance of the institutional and macro-sociological approach is characteristic for political sociology in the socialist countries.

This, of course, is followed by a corresponding choice of methods and techniques of research. Most papers concentrate on a comparative analysis of historical material, while only a few are based on a study of statistics or data obtained from sociological questionnaires and interviews. Field research, applied more and more frequently by sociologists in the socialist countries, is regarded by many as an additional procedure to complement historical and comparative studies. It seems safe to assume that the prevalence of the historical and comparative approach, which has always been typical of Marxist sociology, will continue for a long time to be a characteristic feature of the political sociology we are concerned with. However, it is increasingly becoming a platform for the confrontation of various approaches and research methods. For when Marxism is interpreted freely, undogmatically and without ossified rigidity, it excludes blind compliance with a single methodological approach and eliminates the monopoly of a single method of study.

#### THE PROBLEMS UNDER STUDY

It was mentioned before that the subjects under research in the socialist countries reflect on the one hand the hierarchy of values adopted by Marxism and, on the other, the proper features of the political system within which political sociology operates in those countries. Accordingly, the main interests of political sociology in East European countries can be categorized as follows:

##### (1) *Social classes and strata*

In accordance with the Marxist tradition, the problems of social classes, class struggle and its political effects keep a leading place in East European political sociology. The Marxist theory of classes is discussed, systematized and commented on in a large number of works; many authors concentrate on class relations before the socialist revolution or in the first years of socialist construction; a great many papers are devoted to class relations in the capitalist society. But besides these traditional topics some new trends have begun to appear in sociological discussions and studies. Thus the Marxist theory of classes is given a broader interpretation by including such conceptions as the theory of social stratification and the theory of pressure groups. These two groups, and the developments they are concerned with,

make the Marxist political sociology face some phenomena which either came into being after the birth of the Marxist theory or had not been studied until recently. The knowledge has been collected and the theories have been given a mature shape; now they are being confronted with the traditional Marxist tenets, helping in many cases to broaden or modify them. This, of course, gives rise to lively discussions and polemics, since some authors believe that these additions—e.g. studies in social stratification—to the traditional scope of the Marxist sociology are completely superfluous. As if in reply to these objections Stanisław Ehrlich writes: “The division of society into classes and strata, recognized not only by Marxism but by bourgeois economy and sociology as well, is a fundamental division. However, it must not lead to minimizing the importance of the division into organized interest groups... The conflicts between group interests, caused by the general class structure of society, are no less important for the understanding of socio-political processes than is the awareness of the existence of basic class conflicts.”<sup>1</sup>

Ehrlich's work illustrates the new wave of interest in the class theory in confrontation with the theories of stratification and pressure groups, the latter being regarded as complementary concepts in relation to the concept of social classes and class struggle.

Along with the broadening of the traditional problems of classes and class structure a new element has appeared in social studies. Research has been started on an increasing scale, although not in every country, on the new social structure resulting from the socialist transformation of the socio-political system. The fact that the new society is not fully egalitarian but reveals differences in stratification, arouses theoretical interest in the character of these differences; also it makes it necessary to recognize the political importance of divergent or conflicting interests of various strata or groups. Discussions of and empirical studies in the stratification of socialist societies are confined for the time being to sample research and initial hypotheses. However, the very fact that this problem, regarded until recently with great misgivings, has now been taken up, and that the number and scale of pertinent studies—including comparative analyses embracing several socialist countries—are growing at a rapid rate, leads us to believe that in a not too distant future we shall arrive at an outline of a general theory of the social structure of socialist societies. At any rate, discussions on the subject of differences in stratification and their evolution constitute one of the more lively and interesting trends in today's political sociology in the socialist countries.

## (2) *Political parties and movements*

Next to the study of social classes and strata, the second place in political sociology in the socialist countries belongs to subjects related to political parties and movements, especially the workers' movement as the leading political force of the system. Most papers on this subject contain descriptive studies, rarely reaching for laurels in the realm of theory. But here, too, the situation has begun to change. Some publications on the subject of the workers' movement (e.g. by Z. Bauman) enlarge and modify the existing views on the origins of the adaptation of the Social-Democratic movement to the socio-political structure of modern capitalism. Also, there is a marked rise of interest in comparative studies of party systems, also the party systems in the socialist countries which, along with countries with a monoparty structure include countries where several political parties exist. Another new field of research still in its initial stage and introduced only in a few countries, is the sociological

<sup>1</sup> Stanisław Ehrlich, “‘Grupy nacisku’ w strukturze politycznej kapitalizmu” “‘Pressure Groups’ in the Political Structure of Capitalism”, *PiWN*, Warsaw 1962, p. 17.

study of the ruling party, its inner structure, its composition, membership, etc. These studies, linked to the political practice of the Communist party, might prove particularly helpful in the future.

(3) *Public administration, bureaucracy and self-government problems*

The next group of theoretical subjects focusing the attention of political sociologists in the socialist countries includes problems related to the State, the apparatus of power, bureaucracy, and social self-government. According to an old Marxist forecast, socialist revolution will lead in the long run to the withering away of the bureaucratic apparatus of power which will be replaced by social self-government in various forms. As we all know, that forecast has not come true; the problems of large bureaucratic structure, which preoccupy modern political sociology everywhere, exist also in the socialist countries.

Following the 22nd Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, which discussed the ways of replacing bureaucratic organs by social self-government seeing in it an important task facing the Soviet society, the role of bureaucracy and the prospects of social self-government have become the object of keen interest among sociologists. The sociological deliberations that are now under way have their own field of experimental research, if I may use the term, in the activities of workers' self-government in Yugoslavia and, partly, also in Poland. Empirical studies and theoretical discussions relating to elected organs of local administration, their competences far exceeding the traditional functions of local self-government, can be regarded as one more element of these deliberations.

(4) *National relations*

Since the majority of socialist countries in Europe have a polyethnic structure, nationality problems are regarded as another valuable research subject for political sociologists. While comprehensive theoretical or comparative studies on the subject are quite rare and most papers are of a descriptive character, national relations must be considered as an important component in the wide range of problems with which political sociology in this part of the world is concerned.

(5) *Ideologies*

A marked revival of discussions in the sociological literature of some socialist countries on the role of ideology was noted in 1957 and has continued in many cases to this day. Although most publications dealing with this subject contain deliberations on the border of political sociology and sociology of knowledge (for example, the impact of ideological commitment upon scientific cognition is often examined), some studies concentrate on modern political ideologies and are a form of critique of these ideologies. Those are mainly papers discussing the ideology of Social-Democratic parties in the West as well as the ideologies of other political groups and movements. A separate place in this category belongs to publications discussing and commenting on the programmes and other documents of Communist parties; several of these, since they add a relatively large contribution to theoretical knowledge, must be classified under political sociology.

(6) *Other interests*

The remaining, rather poorly represented fields of research include papers dealing with the problems of war and the armed forces, a few studies in voting behaviour, public opinion and propaganda (e.g. A. Uledov's works), some comparative studies of parliamentary systems, and discussions and comparative analyses of the sociological

aspect of international relations (most of the latter are concerned with the chances of peaceful co-existence). Each of these should be regarded as an illustration of the prospects of further development of sociological interests rather than a field of advanced research.

In characterizing the range of political sociology in the socialist countries it is important to note that new problems are being constantly added to it. This is an evidence of the revival of sociological research, which refuses to be circumscribed by the traditional scope of problems. The traditional problems, i.e. those which have strong roots in the Marxist tradition, continue to predominate, but their role is no longer exclusive. Considering the relatively short period of expansion of sociological research in the socialist countries, it is safe to expect that this tendency will result in the future in a growing convergence, though hardly in identity, of the scope of political sociology under the socialist system and under other systems.

Political sociology in East European countries has now reached the stage in which many concepts are revised and research methods are reshaped. As a field of theoretical interest it has an old tradition of Marxist studies in political life, but as a field of empirical sociological research it is still very young and consequently suffers from many weaknesses. Work on the integration of the modern methods of empirical sociology with the theoretical heritage of Marxist historical materialism has been started but not yet completed. In the course of this integrating process political sociology in the socialist countries will probably be enriched and developed. If this development continues to reveal—and there is every reason to believe that it will—the characteristic features derived from the Marxist spirit and ideological commitment to socialism, a separate school of political sociology will emerge and its importance in world sociology will grow continually. But it is only fair to note that there is much to be done before this task can be accomplished.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

The present bibliography was compiled on the basis of the bibliography of political sociology in the socialist countries collected by the Political Sociology Section of the Institute of Philosophy and Sociology in the Polish Academy of Sciences. It includes 890 titles published between 1957 and 1963 in Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Poland, Rumania, the Soviet Union, and Yugoslavia. Depending on the degree of development of political sociology in each country, they are represented by a proportionate number of titles both in the original bibliography and in the present selection. In selecting the items listed in this bibliography our intention was to present as fully as possible the works published in book form and to give priority to empirical studies containing new factual material. But we did not fail to enumerate such theoretical works which, although deprived of empirical documentation, are important enough to constitute an achievement in political sociology (e.g. articles published in the theoretical magazines of Communist parties).

The bibliography was prepared by a team of researchers. I take this opportunity to gratefully acknowledge their efforts. I owe special gratitude to Krzysztof Ostrowski and Adam Przeworski for their valuable contribution and initiative. The Hungarian part of the bibliography was compiled by Ivan Varga (Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Sociology Section).

\* \* \*

The trend report and the bibliography have been prepared in connection with the activities of the International Sociological Association Sub-Committee on Political Sociology as a part of the efforts to facilitate comparative studies of politics.