

Managing the Differences
Sociology of Stratification in Czechoslovakia
and in Poland (1956-1970)

By

Bartosz Matyja

Submitted to
Central European University
Department of History

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts

Supervisor: Professor Viktor Karády
Second Reader: Balázs Trencsényi

Budapest, Hungary
2019

Copyright Statement

Copyright in the text of this thesis rests with the Author. Copies by any process, either in full or part, may be made only in accordance with the instructions given by the Author and lodged in the Central European Library. Details may be obtained from the librarian. This page must form a part of any such copies made. Further copies made in accordance with such instructions may not be made without the written permission of the Author.

Abstract

The thesis discusses the emergence of sociology of stratification in Czechoslovakia and in Poland between 1956 and 1970. It argues that for the development of the research in the area the context of international cooperation and rivalry was crucial. Czechoslovak and Polish sociologists developed their idea within frames of selective (sometimes critical) reception of the Western theoretical and methodological currents in sociology and social thought.

Equally important was the context of the changing political situation in each of those countries. Different strategies of de-Stalinization of those countries resulted in divergent development of the discipline in Czechoslovakia and in Poland. The need for some reconstruction of the society after the death of Stalin, and in a new economic reality connected with the completion of the process of industrialization resulted in the works of sociologists moving towards social engineering. The main objective of the thesis is to investigate the premises of such social engineering present in some main currents of sociological approaches to stratification, including the interpretation of the current state of socialist construction as well as a vision of well-organized society.

Acknowledgments

This thesis would not be written without generous support of Visegrad Fund, whose Master's Scholarship allowed me to focus on the studies.

Tables of contents

Introduction.....	1
Ideology, science, violence: preliminary considerations	2
Sociologists under socialism: continuations	5
1. Revival of Sociology in Poland and in Czechoslovakia	8
1.1 Beyond the national contexts	10
1.2 Poland: the avant-garde of socialist sociology.....	18
1.3 Czechoslovakia	22
2. „Scientifying” socialist self-knowledge.....	27
2.1 Are there classes under socialism?	29
2.3 Vertical differentiation of socialism	35
2.2 Contradictions of socialism.....	40
3. Managing the contradictions: towards well-organized society.....	44
3.1 In quest for differentiated equilibrium.....	46
3.2 Strive for status consistency.....	49
3.3 <i>La lotta continua!</i>	51
Conclusions and continuations	52
Bibliography	57
Primary Sources	57
Secondary Literature	59

Introduction

The thesis discusses the emergence of social structure research in Czechoslovak¹ and in Polish sociology and its development in the late 1950s and the 1960s. It concentrates on two approaches to social structure, namely on stratification theory and on theory of classes. The existence of the social differentiation, particularly conceived in form of class structure was one of the most sensitive aspects of legitimization of socialist regimes across the Soviet Bloc. The period in question (1956-1970) was marked by partial disillusionment with Stalinist agenda of social change, that was recognized as erroneous and detrimental by the party leaderships and described as such in numerous sociological studies. Therefore, what is characteristic of sociology of that time are the attempts to overcome “dogmatic” variants of class theory. It would be, however, a mistake to concentrate solely on the theoretical aspect. Theorizing was to high extent secondary to the empirical undertakings, which were closer to the idea of engaged sociology, that still faced the challenge of securing already achieved goals and pushing the construction of socialism forward. This kind of engagement resulted in sociological works of the period in question containing visions of well-organized society. The main objective of this thesis is to unveil those visions and investigate their premises.

One of the most important aspects of the social structure research in those countries of that time is the retreat from class analysis. The move away from the orthodox understanding of class divisions, and consequently of class struggle occurred in numerous variants, ranging from denial of existence of classes in socialist societies to more sophisticated attempts to nuance the importance and nature of class divisions in such societies. Those latter could be, again divided into some main currents of which two seem particularly important. Firstly,

¹ Following M. Voříšek, I decided to refer to Czechoslovak sociology and sociologists, instead of Czech and Slovak, as there was no distinctively Slovak sociology at that time, and the most important sociological research took place in Prague, within the central scientific institutions. See M. Voříšek, *The Reform Generation: 1960s Czechoslovak Sociology from Comparative Perspective*, Prague: Kalich, 2012, 31-33.

socialist sociologists would argue for multi-dimensional analysis of social structure with a number of possible approaches based on diverse criteria (for instance simultaneous investigation of both class structure and stratification). Secondly, sometimes they would disguise this retreat by re-interpreting the very concept of class, moving away from its essential economic foundations towards more stratum-like definition.

This kind of revision could occur due to increasing need for scientific studies of socialism as an industrial society, which to high extent served as legitimization for sociological research. Pointing to the process of industrialization allowed for the application of Western theory of industrialization and theory of conflict to investigations of socialist societies. Following that, one more task appeared in front of sociologists from the Eastern bloc, namely that of distinguishing between capitalist and socialist variant of industrial society in a way that would accentuate the progressive and socially just nature of the latter. This already brings the issue of different entanglements of academic undertakings. Therefore it is useful to begin with some remarks on how such topic should be approached.

Ideology, science, violence: preliminary considerations

This is not a study in sociology of knowledge or sociology of science. Nevertheless, certain assumptions from those two disciplines are present implicitly or explicitly in every study of knowledge production. The question of the status of knowledge, scientific knowledge in particular, is of high importance here not least because of the historical context of the 1950s and the 1960s which was marked by ideological struggle between the capitalist and the socialist camps. Besides, since the thesis concentrate on some approaches to social structure, including stratification and class theory, it touches core aspects of knowledge-conditioning, namely its class-based determination. Thus distinguishing between science and ideology or propaganda requires increased cautiousness and probably cannot be fully achieved.

In the thesis I follow the achievements of the main line of the non-classical sociology of knowledge constituted by so-called Strong Programme, and some currents that more or less accurately referred to this project, especially Jeffrey Alexander's cultural sociology². As opposed to the classical sociology of knowledge stemming from Marx and Mannheim, non-classical sociology of knowledge accentuates the complexity of relations between social structure and knowledge. Focusing on the two-sidedness of this relation, it allows the possibility "that at least under certain circumstances the determination of social structure by the systems of knowledge is stronger than in the opposite direction"³. From such a point of view society and knowledge can never be separated. Starting from that point, Andrzej Zybertowicz stresses the threefold role that violence plays in cognition. The first aspect is the categorizing nature of every knowledge. The second one is that knowledge, determines the society in a similar way as power does. Lastly, and most importantly here, "determinants of knowledge belong to the social world, not outside of it, and therefore violence is one of the most fundamental of those determinants"⁴.

Thus there emerges a question of how to approach the notion of "ideology" which will appear throughout the whole thesis and constitutes one of its key problems. Classifying the language of socialist social sciences as ideological in a pejorative sense all too often serves to discrediting of the whole project, while at the same time overlooks the ideological entanglements of the Western sociologist. Thus covers the fact that no cognitive undertaking is completely free from a kind of ideological conditioning, and naturalizes some of the aspects of the capitalists society. However, the concept can be also used with either neutral or even positive connotations. In both cases it recognizes some kind of distortion of consciousness,

² M. Bucholc, „Pamiętacie mocny program? Współczesne losy mocnego programu socjologii wiedzy”, in *Oprogramowanie rzeczywistości społecznej*, eds. M. Gdula, L. M. Nijakowski (Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Krytyki Politycznej, 2014), 209-215.

³ A. Zybertowicz, *Przemoc i poznanie: studium z nieklasycznej socjologii wiedzy* (Toruń: Uniwersytet Mikołaja Kopernika, 1995), 22.

⁴ Ibid., 27-57.

but treats it as a phenomenon immanent to every kind of cognition. Neutral understanding of “ideology” implies that every cognition is biased by structural factors such as belonging to a certain social group or class. Classic example of such an approach stems from Marx and his continuators, most importantly Karl Mannheim⁵. Yet, the word “ideology” was (and still is) used in a positive sense in expressions such as “ideological front” as well as “successes of socialist ideology”. This is usually followed by the positive evaluation of propaganda. Many of the academicians who subscribed to socialist agenda and thus saw their scholarship as a political vocation were proponents of intensified ideological work and would openly admit their ideological goals.

Such conceived knowledge and scholarship is entangled in both local and international official politics, as well as all different kinds of formal and informal hierarchies, including the academic hierarchies. The period in question was marked by a certain relaxation that decreased the level of officially exercised violence due to nearly parallel retreat of both Stalinism and McCarthyism in the mid-1950s.⁶ Understandably, the relaxation was much more awaited in the Eastern bloc, where the outcomes of political intervention into scholarship were much more detrimental.

The association of knowledge production with class consciousness resulted in an anti-pluralist turn, initially in the Soviet social thought, and in the late 1940s in the newly subjugated countries of the Eastern Bloc. Institutionally, universities in Central Europe followed to some extent the soviet patterns. It would be, however, erroneous to see the changes in the academia solely as the outcome of coercive policy. The reforms of higher education, argues Agata Zysiak, were primarily a response to on-going radical social changes: “the transition from the elite towards the mass university was not a result of Stalinization of

⁵ Mannheim, K. 1936. *Ideology and Utopia*. London: Routledge.

⁶ J. Bockman, *Markets in the Name of Socialism: The Left-Wing Origins of Neoliberalism* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2011), 55.

Polish academia, but of a global process impacting higher education systems from Kamchatka to Porto”.⁷ According to her, historical narratives of “captive universities” are reactions of the elites to the changes in class composition of the universities, an act of resistance of the intelligentsia defending their symbolic trenches. Similar is true for the general evaluation of the socialist rule: “The arguments about ‘feudal socialism’, nepotistic nomenclature and the primacy of the political capital [...] are also a part of the struggle to maintain one’s own cultural arbitrariness as dominant. Those concepts are the discursive tools of opposition groups combating for recognition of their own cultural arbitrariness as a culture proper, of intelligentsia confronting the party authorities and working classes”⁸.

Sociologists under socialism: continuations

In the USSR from the late 1920s till the late 1950s sociology was banned as a “bourgeois pseudoscience”. More precisely, bourgeois sociology was declared pseudoscience, historical materialism being considered a proper proletarian sociology⁹. In the original Bukharin’s formulation social sciences were considered as class-determined. Bourgeois sociology occupied inferior position as it was denied the ability to understand the changes, precisely because it was preoccupied with capitalism and its preservation. Therefore, only proletarian sociology, as essentially progressive, is capable of deeper insight into on-going social processes. However, this stance was challenged (for being too lenient), among others by Lenin. Consequently, a more militant approach to sociology on the whole was applied later¹⁰. In the late 1920s the discipline was successfully removed from the academia, and the word “sociology” disappeared from the public sphere. Similar changes followed the seizure of power by the communist parties in Czechoslovakia and in Poland.

⁷ A. Zysiak, *Punkty za pochodzenie: powojenna modernizacja i uniwersytet w robotniczym mieście* (Kraków: Zakład Wydawniczy „Nomos”, 2016), 184.

⁸ Ibid., 301.

⁹ M. Voříšek, op. cit., 15.

¹⁰ G. Batygin, *Preemstvennost' rossijskoj sociologicheskoi tradicii*, in *Sociologija v Rossii*, ed. V.A. Jadov (Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Instituta sociologii RAN, 1998), 24-25.

Sociologists had an important role to play in the after-war period, many of them joining the efforts to rebuild destroyed countries, and many of them engaging in the process of socialist reconstruction. In both Czechoslovakia and in Poland some key figures of sociology seek to provide legitimization for the newly-established regime and took part in the revival of the higher education system. In the Polish context Joanna Bielecka-Prus attempted to investigate the “social roles of the sociologists”. Those attempts, however, resulted in a peculiar categorization of those roles, characteristic of anti-communist discourse. The choices available for the scholars, ranged from the dissident-like form of resistance to the opportunist strategy of complying to the official discourse.¹¹ Presented thesis tries to avoid such clear-cut divisions. Biographies of the protagonist of the thesis are too complex to fit any three-categories divisions. Sociologist in both Czechoslovakia and Poland were engaged on several layers, different circuits¹², different diction. Different loyalties that cannot be easily split into dichotomies such as communist and anti-communist, Marxist and non-Marxist, heroic and opportunist. Most importantly, for many sociologists it was time of negotiation of the autonomy of the academy, but also of the character of the discipline. Their research based on self-learned theories and methods quite often, at least in the early stage of the re-institutionalization of sociology. Therefore the re-establishment of the discipline can be considered a generational experience.

The rebirth of sociology meant not only the mushrooming of sociological institutions, but also the attempts to “catch up” with the Western theoretical and methodological standards, that were broadly recognized, even if still considered as ideologically biased. It was also part of a broader struggle to renew ossified Marxism by renegotiating some of its key concepts, often with reference to other theoretical currents. Thus the knowledge production of Czechoslovak and Polish sociologists cannot be studied solely in the national contexts, but

¹¹ J. Bielecka-Prus, “Społeczne role socjologów w PRL”, *Przegląd Socjologiczny*, no. 2/58 (2009), 71-103.

¹² Z. Nešpor et al., *Dějiny české sociologie* (Praha: Academia, 2014), 307.

rather “at the point of intersection between the realities of the geopolitical and ideological East-West divide; Eastern bloc opportunities and obligations for cooperation; and the local exigencies of the party line and the system of planned science.”¹³ Furthermore, Włodzimierz Winclawski argued for a kind of history of sociological thought that treats its development „not as objective, ever more advanced knowledge, but rather as a process of formation of self-knowledge of certain social groups”¹⁴ and Michael Voříšek convincingly advocated for historical understating of sociology as practice¹⁵. Therefore I approach the topic differently than Kochan, who argued for: “existence of an autonomous theoretical practice” which is supposed to mean also “an autonomous history of theory that is not simply a kind of instrumental indoctrination, manipulation, hoax or lie. It has its own history and specificity, even though this history, its rhythm, temporalities and tempo are co-determined by universal and regional history”¹⁶. Contextualization should not be considered as an addition to understanding of history of sociology but rather as its core.

It is important to take into consideration the political constraints of science of that time. Nonetheless, equally important is the international context. Inquiring into “strategies developed by socialist sociologists in response to uneven distribution of power and resources across the East-West divide and within the Eastern bloc”¹⁷, for which strives Adela Hincu, should help to historicize the distinctions between science and ideology and avoid some awaiting traps of oversimplifications. This is, however, important not only because of the ideological struggle of that time, but also given the prevailing semi-peripheral status of

¹³ A. Hincu, “‘A Common Front?’: Social Structure Research in 1970s Socialist Romania”, in *Social sciences in the "other Europe" since 1945*, eds. A. Hincu and V. Karády (Budapest: Central European University, 2018), 210. See also: M. Voříšek, op. cit., 20.

¹⁴ W. Winclawski, *Lud, naród, socjologia. Studium o genezie socjologii słowackiej* (Toruń: Uniwersytet Mikołaja Kopernika, 1991), 5.

¹⁵ M. Voříšek, op. cit., 15-20.

¹⁶ J. Kochan, *Studia z teorii klas społecznych* (Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe „Scholar”, 2011), 7.

¹⁷ A. Hincu, op. cit., 210.

Central European social sciences, which encourages for seeking legitimization and sense of belonging to the international community of sociologists in the Western scholarship.¹⁸

1. Revival of Sociology in Poland and in Czechoslovakia

In both Czechoslovakia and in Poland the year of 1948 was marked by the seizure of power by the communist party. This allowed more radical reforms that in early post-war period were postponed due to accentuation of moderately socialist and, primarily, democratic agenda. One of most pressing issue was rebuilding of education system, including reforms of higher education – a process often referred to as “Stalinization” or “Sovietization” of science. Both terms direct the attention to the foreign origins of newly introduced policies, implying the existence of a pattern that could have been adopted by the satellite countries of the Soviet Union.

As John Connely argued, such patterns should not be conceived as ready-made solutions that could be instilled into the higher education systems in Soviet-dominated sphere. Nor were the Soviets particularly eager to introduce those patterns themselves.¹⁹ Nevertheless, socialist countries at the earliest stage of the reforms apparently followed certain examples or introduced certain solutions independently, basing on the premises of Marxism-Leninism and its core in social sciences – historical materialism. In Czechoslovakia and in Poland even before 1948 some fierce debates over desirable system of higher education and visions of proper sciences took place within the academia and in the press. The most

¹⁸ T. Warczok and T. Zarycki, *Gra peryferyjna: polska politologia w globalnym polu nauk społecznych*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe Scholar, Kraków 2016. A. Hincu, „Introduction: ‘Peripheral Observations’ and Their Observers,” in *Social Sciences in the “Other Europe”*, op. cit.; V. Sommer, “Towards the Expert Governance: Social Scientific Expertise and the Socialist State in Czechoslovakia”, p. 145.

¹⁹ J. Connely, *Captive University. The Sovietization of East German, Czech, and Polish Higher Education, 1945-1956*, (Chapel Hill - London: The University of North Carolina Press, 2000), 19-21.

important outcome of those debates along with the change of regime in 1948 was sociology being replaced at the universities with historical materialism.²⁰

Voříšek convincingly demonstrated that problems of sociology in the Eastern bloc cannot be reduced to the politically oppressive system of planned science, even though the political factor in the academia was of high importance. Only in two European countries the process of institutionalization of sociology had been completed significantly earlier than in Czechoslovakia and in Poland: in the Netherlands and in the Federal Republic of Germany. Czechoslovakia and Poland achieved that stage at approximately the same time as the Scandinavian countries, France and Great Britain. The main factors hindering the development of the discipline were, according to Voříšek, threefold: 1) political and ideological motivations (not only in the socialist camp, but also in the right-wing dictatorship of Greece and Spain); 2) conservatism of the academia; and 3) the situation on the job market²¹. Understandably, the influence of political impact on the development of sociology varied greatly both in the degree of intervention and in its character, in the Eastern Bloc being the main factor impeding the development of the discipline.

Institutional changes in the socialist states led to a nearly complete isolation of the academic life of each of them. Notably, the isolation existed not only along the West-East divide, but also within the Eastern bloc. Due to centralized and bureaucratized academic policies, contacts among socialist scholars were very rare²². The story of re-establishing of sociology in Czechoslovakia and in Poland is, from that perspective, also a story of overcoming this isolation. It should not, however, be considered one-sidedly, but rather as multi-directional process of network building and coping with the limitations of intensified

²⁰ N. Kraško, *Instytucjonalizacja socjologii w Polsce 1920–1970* (Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, 1996). M. Voříšek, op. cit., 128-145, 181-185.

²¹ M. Voříšek, p. 21-27.

²² J. Kilias, *Goście ze Wschodu: socjologia polska lat sześćdziesiątych XX wieku a nauka światowa* (Kraków: Zakład Wydawniczy „Nomos”, 2017), 49.

ideological struggle. Therefore in the first sub-chapter I analyze the supranational context of the development of sociology in Czechoslovakia and in Poland, and after that I focus on the institutional and intellectual changes in each of those two countries, including the relations between Polish and Czechoslovak scholars.

1.1 Beyond the national contexts

In order to overcome the abovementioned underdevelopment of sociology numerous international initiatives were designed starting in the late 1940s, most importantly by the UNESCO. Substantial role was played by the International Sociological Association established in 1949 at the initiative of the Social Sciences Department of the UNESCO. Initially it aimed at bringing together sociologists from around the world for cooperation in diagnosing contemporary social problems. Additionally, its goal was to prompt the development and convergence of social research around the world, as in the 1940s and 1950s the status of sociology as a scientific discipline was still quite vague²³.

At first, socialist countries did not send their official delegations. The Constituent Congress in 1949 gathered representatives from 21 countries. Poland was the only socialist country represented there. Stanisław Ossowski became a member of Provisional Executive Committee in 1949 and was later reelected in 1950, even though no Polish institution was affiliated with the ISA at that time (generally the ISA did not allow individual membership)²⁴. His participation in the Association, as well as other contacts between the Western and the Eastern scholars, were of private, not institutionalized, nature and thus very limited. Only after the death of Stalin in 1953 did the situation change. Khrushchev's "new course" allowed some new perspectives for West-East scientific cooperation, particularly after the Geneva summit of the "Big Four" held in July 1955, where Soviet leader called for renewal of

²³ J. Platt, *A brief history of the ISA 1948-1997* (Quebec: International Sociological Association, 1998), 13-15.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 17.

academic contacts in the polarized world. The importance of his new stance was reflected in the standpoint of Polish Academy of Science, which in its internal document commenting the Khrushchev's speech accentuated the need for institutional preparations for such a cooperation²⁵. It is worth noting, that this kind of relative relaxation was enabled not only by "the Thaw" in the Eastern bloc, but also by the shift in the policy of the United States. The period in question was marked there by the retreat of McCarthyism and the development of the US cultural diplomacy agenda²⁶.

Under such circumstances the development of social sciences in line with the ideas of peaceful coexistence and cooperation made way for intensification of scientific contacts. Throughout the next two decades world congresses of sociology organized by the ISA every third year (later every fourth) became important occasions for sociologists to present their findings and look for cooperation with their foreign counterparts. Yet, they were also areas of propaganda struggles, which is not easily separated from the scientific aspects, and as such constituted a sensitive issue. A turning point in this cooperation was the Third World Congress of Sociology held in Amsterdam from 22nd to 29th August 1956. Given its importance for the development of sociology in Poland (and in some other countries of the Soviet sphere), its occurrences deserve more detailed coverage. This should also help to demonstrate the context of ideological rivalry within which Polish and Czechoslovak sociologists developed their research.

The Third World Congress of Sociology attracted much more attention, welcoming significantly bigger number of sociologists from many more countries than the previous two. Equally important was that for the first time it hosted official delegations from the Eastern Bloc²⁷. Additionally, it was only after (and in relation with) the Third Congress, when

²⁵ D. Olšáková, „Pugwash in Eastern Europe: The Limits of International Cooperation Under Soviet Control in the 1950s and 1960s”, *Journal of Cold War Studies*, Vol. 20, No. 1 (2018), 218.

²⁶ J. Bockman, op. cit., 50-56.

²⁷ J. Platt, op. cit., 28.

numerous national sociological associations were established, most importantly in the Soviet sphere of influence, where the meeting prompted the re-institutionalization of sociology.

What is particularly interesting about the course of the conference are the different strategies developed by delegations from different socialist countries and different evaluation of the event. At the third congress the Soviet team consisted of a dozen of “orthodox Marxists, ideological fighters vehemently proving to everybody all the advantages of Marxism-Leninism”²⁸. This would continue till the mid-1960s when the younger generation of scholars had taken over the highest positions in the Soviet Sociological Association (established in 1958)²⁹. As one of those younger scholars stressed, the sociological (philosophical) leadership of that time was subordinate to a sort of internalized “party discipline”³⁰ and in their academic activities they would stick to the logics of East-West conflict. Czechoslovakia did not send an official delegation, which is also telling of the academic climate there. At the following congresses they would, however, follow the Soviet pattern of sending “dummy delegations” consisting of a mixture of party functionaries and genuine scholars³¹.

Poland, conversely, would always send a delegation of its most influential sociologists. In Amsterdam the country was represented by, among others, Stanisław Ossowski, Julian Hochfeld and Adam Schaff, but also by 24-years-old Jerzy J. Wiatr, who on his return provided an insightful report.³² The attitude of the Polish sociologists differed greatly from that of their Soviet counterparts, which is reflected in the reports written by the latter to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

²⁸ V.N. Shubkin, *Vozrozhdayushhajasja sociologija i oficioznaja ideologia*, in: *Rossijskaja sociologija...*, op. cit., 78.

²⁹ S. Novinkova, *Sociologija: istorija, osnovy, institucionalizacija v Rossii*, (Moscow – Voronezh 2000), 140

³⁰ V.S. Semenov, “*Nauka - vyshe politiki*”, in: *Rossijskaja sociologija...*, op. cit., p. 434.

³¹ J. Kilias, “An Older Brother: Polish and Czechoslovak Sociology in the 1960s,” in *Social sciences in the “other Europe”*... op. cit., 199.

³² J.J. Wiatr, „Trzeci Światowy Kongres Socjologii”, *Myśl Filozoficzna*, no. 6 (1956), 215-233.

Petr Fedoseev and Mikhail Kammarin wrote that “the presentation by the Polish professor Stanisław Ossowski stood apart, as some disagreement with Marxist-Leninist theory of classes was expressed there”³³. Fedoseev and Alexey Rumjanceva reported also that the paper was well-received by the bourgeois scholars, and praised as “Western-style”. According to the report representatives of Poland and Yugoslavia were more eager to cooperate with bourgeois sociologists, Poles having more contacts with the French than with the Soviets. Therefore, Rumjancev and Fedoseev suggested inviting more socialist scholars to the USSR for joint research³⁴. The lack of ties with other socialist scholars, they reported, “affects the ideological work in people's democracies and reduces the role of the Soviet scientists in spreading of Marxism-Leninism in these countries”.³⁵

Soviet scholars were highly interested in maintaining clear division between capitalist and socialist types of society, not least because of numerous suggestion from the Western scholars that stressed the blurring of those distinctions. They mentioned hostile attitude of rightist sociologist and “reactionaries” such as Raymond Aron, as well as some “Trotskyists”. During one session, wrote Fedoseev and Kammarin, most militant anti-communists left the room to express their discontent³⁶.

Those tensions were particularly visible during one of the most heated discussions that circled around the issue of education in the context of social mobility which lead to “a somewhat aggressive exchange of imperfect information” about the subject between Soviet delegate Fedoseev and his Western adversaries³⁷. Soviet unyielding stance on that was again mirrored in the report: “The main outcome of the discussion of educational issues – along

³³ “Zapiska AN SSSR o Tret'em Vsemirnom sociologicheskom kongresse v Amsterdame, 12 dekabnja 1956 g.,” in: *Rossijskaja sociologija...*, op. cit., 577.

³⁴ “Zapiska A. M. Rumjanceva i P. N. Fedoseeva na imja Pervogo sekretarja CK KPSS N. S. Khrushcheva o mezhdunarodnom sotrudnichestve sociologov [ne ranee sentjabnja 1956 g.],” in *Rossijskaja sociologija...*, op. cit., 586.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 587.

³⁶ “Zapiska AN SSSR o Tret'em Vsemirnom...,” op. cit., p. 577-578.

³⁷ J. Floud, “Third World Congress of Sociology, Amsterdam, 22nd to 29th August 1956”, *International Review of Education*, Vol. 3, No. 2, (1957), 240.

with the coverage of the achievements of the Soviet Union – should be considered the exposure of the class nature of the education system in Western countries”³⁸.

Internal messages of Soviet sociologists did not really change after the congress. Evaluating the results of the Congress, the report concludes that the Soviet scholars successfully informed the world community on the situation in the Soviet Union and “prevented the spread of defamatory information regarding the USSR, which had taken place at previous congresses”³⁹. It is not, however, to be overlooked, that this sort of statements was also meant to serve as an incentive for the authorities to provide institutional support for the development of sociology in the country. The report is followed by suggestions for establishing a sociological association that would issue its own academic journal with large part of the circulation being in English and distributed across the West. This “would help to expose the slanderous fabrications of the reactionary press against the socialist camp”⁴⁰.

Quite different was the report published by Jerzy Wiatr in „Philosophical Thought” („Myśli Filozoficzna”), the most important Polish academic journal of that time. The author noted that „the participation of the delegations from socialist countries was met with particular interest and extremely friendly welcome”⁴¹ because of the dominance of liberal-democratic outlook of the Western sociologists. Among them there were numerous leftists with truly anti-capitalist orientation. Wiatr was positively surprised with their progressive attitudes and their disregard for a Cold-War mindset. He even diagnosed prevailing communist sympathies of the French sociologists. All that encouraged him to reject the idea of non-Marxist sociology being simply a reflection of power-relations on the “political and ideological map of the capitalist world”. From this point of view he noticed that there is an unreasonable tendency

³⁸ „Zapiska AN SSSR o Tret'em...” op. cit., 579.

³⁹ „Pis'mo AN SSSR v CK KPSS ob organizacii Sovetskoj sociologicheskoi associacii, 26 dekabnja 1957 g.,” in: *Rossijskaja sociologija...*, op. cit., p. 599.

⁴⁰ Ibid., p. 600.

⁴¹ J.J. Wiatr, „Trzeci Światowy...”, 215.

among socialist scholars to exaggerate or even to artificially construct the “reactionary current in the contemporary sociology”⁴². He would rather link anti-socialist rhetoric with disregard for Stalinism, but not with the progressive socialist tendencies on the whole⁴³.

Contrary to his expectations, Wiatr recognized numerous potential allies for Marxist scholars, for instance on the ground of challenging subjective sociology. According to him, the works of the Western sociologists provided an interesting critique of one-sidedness of Marxism. The young sociologist agreed that when it comes to explaining the social conditioning, socialist science overestimates the economic factors, which overshadows all the rest⁴⁴.

Essentially different from the Soviet one was Wiatr’s account of aforementioned discussion on education. He appreciated the addressing of the question of social stratification in socialist countries. According to him the question of potential existence of social classes in socialist societies, and more importantly their nature, is one of the most pressuring issues for sociology. The changing social reality could require revision of some key Marxist concepts: „Solution to this issue can, by no means, be popularization of the concepts that were recently challenged (even if wrongly) as inadequate for the new situation”⁴⁵. Those concepts, argued Wiatr, called for some rethinking based on research, not on preconceived assumptions.

For Polish sociologists the results of participation in the Congress were, again, quite different. Not only were they able to make use of it on the national level, but also they succeeded in reestablishing fruitful connections with the Western scholarship. They also managed to improve their institutional position within the international social sciences, and continued to occupy high functions in the ISA, as the only (till 1962) representatives of people’s democracy.

⁴² Ibid., 217.

⁴³ Ibid., 217-218.

⁴⁴ Ibid., 220-221.

⁴⁵ Ibid., 225.

Wiatr argued for more universalist approach to sociology, rejecting the division between capitalist and proletariat science: It would not be beneficial to accept *a priori* the assumption of essential dissimilarity of all the social processes in countries of different social systems⁴⁶. Given potential convergence of social systems, socialist scholars can benefit from the contributions of the Western ones, who already faced some of newly emerging social phenomena. Summing up the outcomes of the Congress Wiatr pointed to the opportunity to overcome the idea that contacts with foreign scholars are “a battle with an ideological enemy” and enhance international cooperation.

The course of the Congress, its evaluations and outcomes provide some valuable insight into condition of academic research in the Eastern Bloc and its dependence on the political context. They reveal quite wide range of possible paths for the socialist scholars. The conference opened up entirely new perspectives for the sociologists from the Eastern Bloc. It connected them to the scholars from the rest of the world. Not only did that provide them with personal links to those scholars, but also inspired revision of current perspectives, or at least encouraged more research, especially on the topics discussed during the congress. Scholars from Poland used new opportunities to retake their position from the late 1940s, placing Polish sociology relatively close to the Western center⁴⁷ and becoming an avant-garde of the discipline in the Eastern Bloc. Czechoslovaks were left behind.

Following congresses were also areas of different struggles, including internal disagreement between scholars from the same country. At the fourth congress in Milan and Stressa in 1959, Chałasiński presented a paper Sociology and Social Mythology in Post-War Poland which was slightly changed version of his 1957 article published in “Kultura i Społeczeństwo”. According to Wiatr, the authoritative and one-sided presentation did not attract much attention. Even though after printing the original text in Poland no consequences,

⁴⁶ Ibid., 229.

⁴⁷ J. Kiliński, “An Older Brother...,” op. cit., 199.

having presented it at the congress he was dismissed from the University of Łódź and from the Polish Academy of Science. It could also had an impact on more restrictive passport policy for the next congress in 1962.

International cooperation should not be, however, reduced to such events. In literature on institutionalization of sociology in the Eastern bloc high importance is ascribed to the visits of Western sociologist to Czechoslovakia, to the USSR and to Poland⁴⁸. Notably, starting from the late 1950s a crucial role was played by exchange programs, particularly those organized by the USA. The most impactful was by far the Ford Foundation that since 1955 started to work on bilateral cooperation with the countries of the Eastern bloc. Soon an exceptionally vivid cooperation with the Polish government was established, Poland becoming the main recipient of the Foundation's "intellectual Marshal Plan"⁴⁹ and sending majority of its most important sociologist for exchange programs to the USA. The relaxation of relations with the Soviet Union encouraged the authorities to allow to participation of communist party scholars, as long as it was in line with American "national interest"⁵⁰, earlier very much hesitant to let communists into the country.

Paragraphs above presented the context of international competition and cooperation mainly from perspective of the development of Polish sociology, with Czechoslovakia generally left aside. This is mostly because of scarcity of international contacts at this early stage of institutionalization of the discipline. Czech scholars had trouble obtaining the Western books, which changed only in the mid-1960s⁵¹. Modest tradition on one hand, and more rigid political control over science in Czechoslovakia seem to be to key factors of this state of affairs. In such a situation Polish academicians played an important role as a mediator

⁴⁸ J. Kiliński, *Goście ze Wschodu...*, op. cit.,

⁴⁹ Expression by Michael Pollak, 'Paul F. Lazarsfeld: A Sociointellectual Biography', in *Knowledge: Creation, Diffusion, Innovation*, no 2 (1980), cited after I. Czernecki. "An intellectual offensive: The Ford Foundation and the destalinization of the Polish social sciences", *Cold War History* Vol. 13, No. 3, 291.

⁵⁰ I. Czernecki, op. cit., 295.

⁵¹ „Česká sociologie v letech 1965-1989 (diskuse u kulatého stolu)", *Sociologický časopis* No. 40 (2004), 716.

between the East and the West, as well as in the development of Marxist sociology⁵² The links between those two countries will be addressed in chapter 1.3.

1.2 Poland: the avant-garde of socialist sociology

The comeback of sociology to the Polish academia, unlike in the majority of countries of the socialist camp, cannot be treated simply as an outcome of political liberalization. The events of 1956 were preceded by an increased intellectual excitation parallel to a power struggle within the Polska Zjednoczona Partia Robotnicza (Polish United Workers Party', PZPR)⁵³. From this point of view the broadening of the intellectual autonomy should be considered a part of the process of liberalization, not its result. Notably, as of 1955 an influential weekly "Po prostu" ("Quite Simply") became a platform of constructive criticism of the official politics, and as such it functioned also as a weapon in the conflicts within the party. Also in 1955 Klub Krzywego Koła (the Crooked Circle Club) was established and from the very beginning played an important role as a meeting point of reformist intellectuals⁵⁴.

Already in 1955 sociology courses were reintroduced to the universities' curricula. In the next year a decision was taken to bring back the sociology programs to the university, which happened in 1957, as soon as it was possible. In the same year "Przegląd Socjologiczny" ("Sociological Review") was reactivated and the first issue of a new academic journal "Kultura i Społeczeństwo" ("Culture and Society") was published. Editor-in-Chief of both of them was named Józef Chałasiński. The mid-1950s also witnessed the birth of the Polish Sociological Association (Polskie Towarzystwo Socjologiczne, PTS), which evolved from the Sociological Section of the Polish Philosophical Association. The PTS quickly became the most important link between Polish sociology and the world scholarship⁵⁵.

⁵² J. Kiliński, "An Older Brother...", op. cit.

⁵³ J. Kochanowski, *Rewolucja międzypaździernikowa: Polska 1956-1957* (Kraków: Znak, 2017).

⁵⁴ W. Jedlicki, *Klub Krzywego Koła*, (Warszawa 1989).

⁵⁵ N. Kraśko, op. cit., 170-173.

As a result of internal development of the academic sociology and the contacts with the Western scholars (whether Marxist or not) there emerged a strong revisionist current usually referred to as “humanist Marxism” or “open Marxism”. It was an attempt to recycle core ideas of the Marxist tradition while questioning the ossified and ritualized use of the official variant of the doctrine. Sociologists in Poland set out to incorporate the Western scholarship to historical materialism, gradually moving away from the latter. The attempts to apply Marxist analysis to socialist societies made the reformist sociologists realize the need for reconceptualization of key concepts of class theory. Notably, Marxist sociologists in Poland would engage in vivid dialog with parallel existing local non-Marxist sociology, also heavily influenced by the Western currents. After the Fourth World Congress of Sociology (1959) Wiatr noted: “the fundamental question of sociology today is the confrontation of Marxism and other sociological currents, which in no other country is as vivid as it is in Poland”⁵⁶.

Three sociological circles played the most important role in the renaissance of sociology in Poland, representing different traditions of sociological thought. The most vivid one was initially that of Stanisław Ossowski. Although he was deprived of the possibility to teach, he continued working at the university, conducting his own research. Its outcomes were published in *Class Structure in the Social Consciousness* (1957), a book representing non-Marxist approach to theory of classes. The fact that he was able to publish such a book is telling of the intellectual climate of that time, as well as of his exceptional position. It is hardly imaginable that this kind of study could be published freely in Czechoslovakia⁵⁷ and, presumably, even in Poland not every sociologist would be able to that.

Another group of sociologists concentrated around Józef Chałasiński (and later around Jan Szczepański, his disciple). The leader managed to build a strong sociological center in

⁵⁶ J. J. Wiatr, „Z problematyki IV Światowego Kongresu Socjologicznego”, *Studia Sociologiczno-Polityczne*, no. 6 (1960): 181-184.

⁵⁷ „Česká sociologie v letech...”, op. cit., 712.

Łódź even before the reforms of higher education of 1948-1950. Chałasiński, being a disciple of Florian Znaniecki occupied an exceptional position among Polish sociologists, and played an important role in maintaining the continuity of tradition of local sociology. He also contributed much to organizational aspect of the revival of sociology, initiating studies on intelligentsia that were later in the 1960s continued by Szczepański.

Another influential group was circled around Julian Hochfeld, with young scholars such as Włodzimierz Wesołowski, Jerzy J. Wiatr and Zygmunt Bauman. Following the Third Congress Wiatr and Bauman published a paper entitled “Marxism and the Contemporary Sociology”, a sort of manifesto for the development of sociological research in the country. This was a continuation of the line presented by Wiatr in his report from the Third Congress. The authors argued, that the emancipatory potential of Marxism as critique of ideology, had suffered itself from intensified ritualization of the official language. Following Ossowski’s criticism from the late 1940s, they pointed to religious aspects of Marxism in its integrative function of the workers’ movement ideology. Thus they moved away from the critique of sociology as a bourgeois science, and the concept of historical materialism as the only possible Marxist (proletarian) sociology. No science, they claimed, could be ascribed to a particular class, since “science – socio-historical process of coming on to the truth – is an expression of socially common, not class-particular level of knowledge of the world and is subject to verification and falsification by the criteria of truth, not utility”.⁵⁸

Allegedly proletarian historical materialism all too often was used as an “ideological muzzle” restraining the development of social sciences⁵⁹. Manichean vision of the struggle between capitalist world and the countries emancipated from capitalism lead to immediate rejection of everything alien. Even today there is a prevailing mindset denying any

⁵⁸ Z. Bauman and J.J. Wiatr, “Marksizm a socjologia współczesna”, *Myśl Filozoficzna*, no. 1 (1957), 3-23.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 7.

contribution of the social research on capitalism. Equivalents. Useful for the studies on socialist countries. To turn away from research on capitalism, authors are convinced, is to “resign from the studies on the contemporary socialist countries”. Urbanization, technological advance and changes in education. Research on social stratification in socialism that „cannot be replaced by an exegesis of scientifically primitive Stalin’s thesis about the division into two non-antagonist classes [...]”⁶⁰, the thesis itself being in need of verification or at least specification. They also encouraged not only posing problems derived from contemporary sociology, but also applying solutions. Even if ideologically biased, worth trying.

In 1958 those ideas were developed more consequently by Julian Hochfeld in his program of social research manifested in a paper “Marxism and sociology of political relations” in newly established journal “*Studia Socjologiczno-Polityczne*” (“Sociological and Political Studies”)⁶¹. He stated that “[...] the Marxist interpretation of social phenomena, the Marxist sociology, becomes most of all a sociology of political relations” and “systematic textbook of Marxist theory could be written as a presentation of basic problems of sociology of political relations, preceded by philosophical and methodological introduction”⁶².

The disputes over the role of Marxism and sociology were not only a matter of the academia. Some of those controversies took place in periodicals such as “*Polityka*”, an influential weekly. Marxism and revisionism in the process of negotiation. For instance, the division of sociologists into three camps presented by Joanna Bielecka-Prus: Marxist (against survey research) revisionist Marxist (accepting survey research, but warning against Americanization of Polish sociology), and independent scholars is a terrible oversimplification. “Heterogeneous character of the positions of the Marxists allowed the

⁶⁰ Ibid., 13.

⁶¹ J.J. Wiatr, „Otwarty marksizm i odrodzenie socjologii: rola Juliana Hochfelda i Zygmunta Bauman’a”, *Studia Socjologiczno-Polityczne*, no. 1 (2017), pp. 13-26.

⁶² J. Hochfeld, „Marksizm a socjologia stosunków politycznych”, *Studia Socjologiczno-Polityczne*, No. 1 (1958) Reprinted in: idem, *Marksizm, socjologia...*, 283.

opposition to successfully negotiate a certain margin of autonomy, that the party could not take back. Marxist sociologists eventually had to come to terms with the flourishing of survey research in Polish sociology”.⁶³ Such statements ignore the complexity of negotiations between different standpoints at the intersection of science, politics and ideology.

Andrzej Werblan, the head of department of science and education of KC PZPR, argued in 1963 that ... “sociology is a particularly ideological and politically engaged science” and that in a long run, there is no space for non-Marxist social sciences, as the successful construction and securing of socialist society is highly dependent on those ideological fundamentals. “All the attempts to separate ‘ideological’ and ‘cognitive’ element in social sciences are either utopias, or intentional falsehoods”⁶⁴. Thus Werblan reasserted the status of sociology as a weapon on the “ideological front”. Paradoxically, he adds, the ideological struggle intensifies with the ever further-going attempts to ensure peaceful coexistence. The elimination of war does not mean the elimination of contradictions between the two camps. He encouraged sociologists to resist the increasing pressure of American science, stressing that the will of overcoming the ideological barriers is only on the side of socialist scholars. Therefore, the openness of the latter towards the Western scholarship means the capitulation of the socialist science, rather than cooperation of the equal⁶⁵.

1.3 Czechoslovakia

In Czechoslovakia political situation in the mid-1950s was much less favorable, the highest leadership being hesitant to take course on “the Thaw”. Thus Michal Kopeček writes about a kind of arrhythmia of the changes in 1956. For instance, unlike in Poland or in Hungary, the Communist Party was hesitant to rehabilitate the victims of political trials of the Stalinist era. In 1954 once again, one of most important issues in Czechoslovak politics

⁶³ J. Bielecka-Prus, op. cit., 86.

⁶⁴ A. Werblan, op. cit., 97.

⁶⁵ Ibid., 102-109.

became the trial of so-called Slovak bourgeois nationalists. The threat of anti-communism and revisionism. In 1956 the Hungarian Revolution and the Polish October convinced Czechoslovak communist to react in order to avoid a similar turmoil in their country, which resulted in fastening the grip on political affairs with only some personal consequences of the internal party struggle at the top of party leadership. The discussion within Komunistická strana Československa (the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, KSČ) about the 20th Congress ended up with the decision to neutralize the de-Stalinization moods with coercion and propaganda.⁶⁶

Yet, also in Czechoslovakia some liberation of culture occurred. One of most important events was the Second Congress of Czechoslovak Writers where party's cultural policy was highly criticized. The congress was followed by a discussion in *Literární noviny* ("Literary News") in which relation of ideology and science was addressed. Two new journals devoted to the cultural and political issues were established: "Tvorba" ("Creativity" or "Creative Output") and "Kultura" ("Culture"). Those new titles were supposed to constitute some kind of counterweight to more orthodox *Literární noviny*. In those and in other journals some critical articles were published and the reformist discourse developed⁶⁷.

Another turning point was the beginning of an anti-revisionist campaign in 1958. In the pages of *Filosofický Časopis* ("Philosophical Journal"), "Nová mysl" ("New Thought"), *Tvorba* and *Rudé Právo* ("Red Justice") a struggle for the "purity of Marxist thought" started in order to pacify the reformist discourse⁶⁸. In Prague a special seminar devoted to counter revisionism took place. Vladimír Kocuký, its leading speaker, argued for firm resistance against detachment of Marxist science from ideology. In his report he condemned the attempts to defend bourgeois democracy or rejecting the dictatorship of the proletariat as well as some

⁶⁶ J. Rychlík, *Češi a Slováci ve 20. století: Spolupráce a konflikty 1914-1992* (Praha: Vyšehrad, 2015), 412-416.

⁶⁷ M. Kopeček, *Hledání ztraceného smyslu revoluce: zrod a počátky marxistického revizionismu ve střední Evropě 1953-1960* (Praha: Argo, 2009), 294-297.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 302.

erroneous analyzes of international situation a theory of peaceful coexistence. In March 1959 the Central Committee of the KSČ published a document *Zpráva o současně situaci ve filosofii* (“Information on the Current Situation in Philosophy” evaluating the struggle against revisionism in a similar spirit⁶⁹. The campaign echoed in the 1960s, but more often as rhetorical device of confirming one’s loyalty to the party and the principles of Marxism-Leninism⁷⁰.

In such political context Czechoslovak sociology was slow to be re-established, and when it became possible, it happened only gradually and in a peculiar way. In 1958 an innovation was introduced in the higher education under the name of “scientific communism” (*vědecký komunismus*). Some sociologists associated this term with another set of constraints enforced on social sciences, and ironically the only original contribution of Czech sociologist to social sciences in the Eastern bloc. This one-sidedly critical evaluation of the role played by scientific communism was, however, recently questioned. Markéta Devátá argues, that in the situation of lack of appropriate political climate and general weakness of reformist currents in Czechoslovakia the introduction of this term allowed for latent and gradual move away from the⁷¹. The sudden emergence of “scientific” communism would imply that there existed a non-scientific variant of communism – a “first step towards a heresy”.⁷² cleverly developed. (Kaláb, Machonin). program of scientific communism prepared elaborated in the Institute of Marxism-Leninism at the Charles University in Prague (Miloš Kaláb). The need to analyze communism scientifically, sociologically, which meant rehabilitation of sociology⁷³. Ambivalent character: scientific communism as a unity of theory and tactics of the international workers’ movement, ideology of working class. instructions for revolutionary

⁶⁹ Ibid.

⁷⁰ Ibid., 304.

⁷¹ M. Devátá, *Marxismus jako projekt nové společnosti. Dvě studie ke společenským vědám (1945-1969)*, (Praha: Ústav pro soudobé dějiny, 2014).

⁷² Kulatý stůl, p. 716.

⁷³ M. Devátá, op. cit., 23.

practice – important weapon against revisionist tendencies of objectivistic bourgeois sociology disguised in Marxist terminology, ignoring fundamental contradiction between bourgeois and socialist societies.⁷⁴ against national communisms. “In fact, scientific communism [...] had two levels: official, taught to students, combating against contemporary revisionism, and unofficial, serving for the teachers of Marxism-Leninism to develop theoretical (revisionist) concepts [...]”⁷⁵. The unofficial gradually disseminating into the official. “In practice, scientific communism became an ideological tool that was supposed to overcome the crisis of the project of political education at the universities caused by the 20th Congress of the CPSU”⁷⁶.

To some extent this process of liberalization through scientific communism benefited from the change of the political situation. Growing tolerance towards criticism was partially conditioned by the economic crisis that became apparent around 1959. At that point the detrimental results of rapid restructuring of the society (collectivization of the agriculture including) manifested themselves clearly. Repeated “class political screening” in bureaucracy and management deprived the country of specialists need for running the industry⁷⁷. Already in 1960 serious trouble with fulfilling the third Five-Year Plan were noticed.⁷⁸ At the same time Czechoslovakia was supposed to enter the path towards building some kind of socialist welfare state which required cadres for the running of economy. The country also lacked the professionals who could provide expertise for the governance. This was about to change. Also in 1960 a new constitution was introduced opening new stage of socialist construction⁷⁹.

⁷⁴ Ibid., 24-25.

⁷⁵ Ibid., 24.

⁷⁶ Ibid., 25.

⁷⁷ L. Kalinová, “A Contribution to the Social History of Czechoslovakia 1945-1989”, *Czech Sociological Review*, Vol. 4 No. 2 (1996), 229.

⁷⁸ V. Kural, *Československo roku 1968. 1. díl, Obrodný proces*, Praha 1993.

⁷⁹ V. Sommer, op. cit., 140-144.

As for sociology, new currents from Poland, Hungary and Yugoslavia along with advances of “scientific communism” started to gradually undermine the ossified core of Marxist-Leninist social sciences.⁸⁰ Sociology, at first not institutionalized, became a part of the climate of “the golden 1960s” – a decade-long cultural revival in Czechoslovakia. In 1959 Jaroslav Klofáč and Vojtěch Tlustý published a book on empirical sociology which was still characterized by some Marxist orthodoxy but at the same it constituted the first attempt to look beyond the official language (as an open confrontation was not possible).⁸¹ In 1963 Karel Kosík published his *Dialectics of the Concrete* in which he attempted to combine Marxist thought with phenomenological influence and Irena Dubská published her book about the social thought of August Comte. One year later the newly-established magazine Tvář (“Face”) became a center of revival of intellectual debate.

Also in 1964 an international conference devoted to social structure of socialist society was organized in Hrazany by Institut of Marxism-Leninism for Higher Education and Philosophy Institut of the Československá Akademie Věd (Czechoslovak Academy of Science). Scholars from Poland, Yugoslavia, Hungary and the USSR took part in the event, which boosted the development in Czechoslovakia, not least because it gave an impulse for the integration of social research by means of establishing scientific teams to overcome institutional divisions⁸².

Official rehabilitation of sociology occurred only in March 1965⁸³ and was a part of general revival of social sciences in Czechoslovakia. One of most important aspect of this revival was establishing of several scientific teams that were supposed to bring together scholars from different disciplines for cooperation on gathering knowledge on the

⁸⁰ M. Devátá, op. cit., 6-7.

⁸¹ M. Petrusek, “Výuka sociologie v čase tání a v časech normalizace (1964–1989)”, *Sociologický časopis*, no. 5 (2004): 599-600.

⁸² M. Devátá, op. cit., 35-37; Z. Nešpor et al., op. cit. 317, 352-353.

⁸³ M. Devátá, op. cit., 35.

Czechoslovak society. The most important of them was led by Pavel Machonin, and was assigned the task of constructing a research on the social structure in the country⁸⁴. This team together with the one led by Radovan Richta (research on scientific and technical revolution) were supposed to prepare reform plans that should help avert the economic crisis and boost the development of the country. That was a vital step towards expert governance⁸⁵, and an attempt to improve “scientific management” of the society.⁸⁶ It had, however, also a certain symbolic meaning, as it legitimized the reformist forces within the party against its conservative fraction that impeded the taking of the course on de-Stalinization for quite a long time.

The activities of those team were quite successful. The party approved the works of the Richta’s team and decided to distribute its finding as a form of preparations for the 13th Party Congress. The project was supposed to be completed by the 14th Congress planned in 1970, but the work was interrupted by the invasion of the armies of the Warsaw Pact.

2. „Scientifying” socialist self-knowledge

The attempts to scientifically understand socialism and, consequently to act consciously in favor of its securing and further development were entangled in the temporalities of tradition, current struggles, and the visions of future⁸⁷. In the previous chapter I presented key moments of reinventing the tradition of socialist thought, focusing primarily on overcoming the outcomes of Stalinization of social sciences. The renegotiation of core elements of Marxists social thought was marked by critique of errors of the Stalinist era: “dogmatism”, “sectarianism”, “extreme leftism” (pol. *lewactwo*, cz. *lewičactví*). Even though in some

⁸⁴ Z. Nešpor, op. cit., 352-353.

⁸⁵ V. Sommer, “Towards the Expert Governance: Social Scientific Expertise and the Socialist State in Czechoslovakia”, p. 142-143.

⁸⁶ M. Devátá, op. cit., 6-7, 36-41.

⁸⁷ J. Beckert, *Imagined Futures: Fictional Expectations and Capitalist Dynamics* (Cambridge, London: Harvard University Press, 2016).

questions the continuators of this tradition went far away from the original Marxism or Marxism-Leninism, the critical potential of the socialist thought remained an important horizon for the scholars in both Czechoslovakia and in Poland. Yet, those principles of egalitarianism were confronted with the reality of the socialist state and the socio-economic necessities of organization of society, or in other words with the problems of an industrialized society. The analyzing of socialist society as also, or even primarily, an industrial society turned the attention of the Eastern sociologists towards the Western theory that could offer some ready sociological questions, if not answers.

The combination of Marxism with Western theories brings back the question of ideological struggle and the confrontation of Marxist and non-Marxist sociological traditions. Bronisław Minc reported that at the Fifth World Congress of Sociology in Washington (1962), socialist sociologist had been asked again, whether they are able to use Marxism for an analysis of socialist countries, and the answer was affirmative. For Minc this could be only valid as long as “the division of socialist society into social classes and strata is acknowledged, and the socio-economic and political processes are researched from the perspective of the interests of those classes and strata”.⁸⁸

The second, at least equally important, factor to this strive for self-understanding were the structural changes that already demonstrated themselves in both Czechoslovakia and Poland, most importantly nationalization and socialization of the means of production. It is important to note, that both countries followed different paths and presented different level of economic development. In Poland the collectivization of agriculture stopped at the very initial level, while in Czechoslovakia, the majority of the employed in the agriculture were members of agricultural cooperatives. Also the dynamics of those changes were different. The first phase of the changes, nationalization and socialization of the means of production, was a

⁸⁸ B. Gałęski, „Niektóre problemy struktury społecznej w świetle badań wiejskich”, *Studia Socjologiczno-Polityczne*, no. 1 (1963), 35.

starting point of the reflection on the lessening of the importance of class division. Later, starting in the late 1950s, there was a visible increase in the private initiative. This second phase, however, seems not to be taken into account by the sociologist of the 1960s⁸⁹.

In the following sections I discuss the move away from the class analysis and following turn in the direction of diversely conceived social stratification research. In the last section I point to the outcomes of those multi-dimensional analyses of social structure, with a focus on the approaches to the emergent contradictions of socialist society and on the social conflicts revealed.

2.1 Are there classes under socialism?

Although no consensus was reached in the 1960s as to the relevance of class divisions in socialist society, quite early there emerged a mainstream sociological perspective. As was mentioned before, Polish reformist Marxists tended to balance economic bias of Marxist tradition of that time with the help of some new currents in social thought. As a result, they ended up far from the original Marxist approach to the class question. Nevertheless, they still insisted on at least relative validity of this approach, which for many reasons continued to be an important point of reference. This is also true for Czechoslovak scholars, probably even to a larger extent, as the revisionist current there was much slower to find its own language of social analysis. Crucial divisions remained between proponents of economic and sociological understanding of class, based on accordingly different concepts of ownership (or control) of the means of production. Those disputes were, however, still set within the framework common to all socialist scholars and consisted of the core of Marxist class theory. Therefore it seems important to recall here some of key features of this theory. Since Marx have never proposed any fixed definition of a class, foundational for this tradition was Lenin's formulation of the concept of classes. In the *Great beginning* he characterized them as

⁸⁹ J. Kochan, op. cit., 100-101.

large groups of people differing from each other by the place they occupy in a historically determined system of social production, by their relation (in most cases fixed and formulated in law) to the means of production, by their role in the social organization of labor, and, consequently, by the dimensions of the share of social wealth of which they dispose and the mode of acquiring it.⁹⁰

Right after this definition Lenin accentuated the exploitation present in the capitalist class relations, adding that what is characteristic of class is that one of them “can appropriate the labor of another owing to the different places they occupy in a definite system of social economy”⁹¹. He also described the conditions required for the abolishment of classes. He resisted the idea that class division can be overcome simply by nationalization of the means of production and overthrowing of the exploiting classes. Eliminating the divisions between town and country, as well as between manual workers and brain workers was another *sine qua non*. This lengthy task required also overcoming the passive resistance of some social groups such as “survivals of small scale production”, and “the enormous force of habit and conservatism” connected to them. Thus communism could be built only slowly, by gradually achieving those goals⁹².

Those short passages from Lenin’s *Great Beginning* along with Marx’s works were the main point of reference for the theoretical undertakings of Czechoslovak and Polish scholars, and for the discourse around classes in general. Karel Kosík in 1958 distinguished four kinds of such a discourse, four kinds of approaches to and uses of Marxist class theory. The first one, “descriptive academism” or “academic socialism”, treats class theory as a teaching of defining and classifying social classes and strata. Thus cognitive potential of this approach is very much limited. Nonetheless it has some critical power, as, unlike bourgeois sociology, it does not reduce the question of classes to the issue of distribution, but accentuates “the fundamental aspect of classes – their ownership relation to the means of production”.⁹³ It

⁹⁰ V. Lenin, *A Great Beginning: Heroism of the Workers in the Rear “Communist Subbotniks”*, Collected Works, Volume 29, Progress Publishers, access on-line [no pagination]: <https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1919/jun/19.htm>

⁹¹ Ibid.

⁹² Ibid.

⁹³ K. Kosík, „Třídy a reálná struktura společnosti”, *Filosofický časopis*, no. 5 (1958), 721.

seems that this perspective was predominant in Czechoslovak social sciences, most importantly as a part of “scientific communism”. This state of affairs would continue at least until the mid-1960s, when the first series of empirical research was launched. Next two approaches were also present in Czechoslovakia: the one that approached class theory as a set of principles of class struggle and another whose focus was to reveal the disguised class interests. All these three types could be found also in Poland, although – as Kosík rightly suggested – there is a fourth type, characteristic of Polish sociology after 1956: “an empirical, sociological interpretation of class theory”⁹⁴.

Those preliminary remarks allow to move towards the issue of existence of classes in socialist societies. It could be argued, that most of approaches emerging in socialist sociology were different variants of the official Soviet narrative of “non-antagonistic classes”. The early phase of the development of this kind of interpretation (later reconsidered in much more sophisticated way) was summarized by Stanisław Ossowski in his 1957 book *Class Structure in the Social Consciousness*⁹⁵. To demonstrate the impact of the Ossowski’s work it is useful to invoke two comments on this book. In retrospect, Jiří Musil comparing Czechoslovak and Polish sociology claimed, that the existence of a book that openly confronted Marxist class theory (and historical materialism in general) was a decisive advantage of the latter. The importance of Ossowski’s work was recognized also by Andrzej Werblan, though in a much different manner. He pointed to this very book as an example of how the Marxist scholars had given in to the pressure of non-Marxist perspectives, as the book had not been welcomed with enough criticism⁹⁶.

Yet, as Kochan argues, Ossowski’s book was not so different from the rest of the 1950s-1960s literature on theory of classes, at least when it comes to the “folkloristic” understanding

⁹⁴ Ibid., p. 722-723.

⁹⁵ S. Ossowski, *Struktura w świadomości klasowej* (Łódź, Wrocław: Łódzkie Towarzystwo Naukowe, Ossolineum, 1957), 100-101.

⁹⁶ A. Werblan, op. cit. 103-104.

of class antagonism: „Marx and Engels”, wrote Ossowski, “are above all the inheritors of the dichotomist conceptions found in folklore and of the militant ideology of popular revolutions”.⁹⁷ Those imaginations encompassed primarily the fundamental division of the society between two basic antagonistic groups: exploiters and exploited. „Seen from the viewpoint of Marx and Lenin, ‘non-antagonistic classes’ constitute a *contradiction in adiecto*. The authors of ‘Historical Materialism’ appear to realize this; after citing Lenin’s definition of class they write: ‘in this sense one can no longer call our society a class-society’”⁹⁸

In Poland throughout the whole period in question those fundamentals of class theory were subject of vivid debates. Main source of disagreement was already mentioned: the controversy over the role of the relation to the means of production. There were two lines core to those disputes. The first one referred to general processes reshaping industrial societies, primarily in context of changing the relation between ownership, control, and management. This line would reduce the importance of the ownership of the means of production, stressing the changing nature of the control over production and its relations to property. Most famously those ideas were expressed by James Burnham⁹⁹, and the majority of the polemics referred to his work, and the approach he suggested. The second line developed specifically with regard to socialist society. Most of Polish sociologists agreed, that the construction of socialist society did not fully put an end to class divisions. Rather, by virtue of nationalization and socialization of the means of production, and therefore by annihilation of the capitalist class, it abolished the antagonist aspect of class structure – the contradiction between two basic classes of capitalist society, between the capitalists and the workers. Wesołowski claimed, that in socialist society, the working class, was freed from its “Siamese brother” – the capitalist class – and thus should be considered a former-class rather than an actual class.

⁹⁷ S. Ossowski, op. cit., 74.

⁹⁸ Ibid., 101.

⁹⁹ J. Burnham, *The managerial revolution* (Bloomington : Indiana University Press, 1960).

Those interpretations, however, did not pass unquestioned. There was an impactful current closely related to the orthodox variant of Marxism-Leninism. Among others Jarosław Ładosz challenged the revisionist accusing them of exploiting the simplified edition of Marxist class theory for their own benefits. Most importantly, he criticized them for equalizing the class struggle in capitalism and socialism.¹⁰⁰ He argued, that it is necessary to stand firmly against (pol. *dawać odpór*, from rus. *davat' otpor*) such deformations of Marxism-Leninism. He argued that the relations of ownership should be approached primarily from the perspective of the economic institutions not from the legal or social point of view.¹⁰¹ Ładosz criticized the approaches to class that focus on broadly conceived „style of life”. Arguing for the economic understanding of class, i.e. determined by the relation to means of production, he stresses that although class differences influence styles of life, this influence is of different nature. It is determined mainly by the amount of income, but it is to certain extent autonomous from the relation to means of production: in better situated groups of the working class there he diagnoses a tendency to follow habits of exploiting classes.¹⁰²

Finally, some authors decided to conveniently, though not very convincingly, ignore the theoretical complexity of the issue of classes. For instance, Jan Malanowski in his study *Class relations and social differences in a town* set out to investigate social differentiation by measuring “the sense of social distance, class interrelations, investigation of the processes of the blurring of the social differences. He argued that “classes do not exist in socialist Poland, if conceived from the perspective of the ownership of means of production, since in Poland the society on the whole is the subject of the ownership of means of production”.¹⁰³ However, there was yet another reason to think of disappearance of classes. Following Wesołowski (al

¹⁰⁰ J. Ładosz, *Marxistowska teoria walki klas* (Warszawa: Książka i Wiedza, 1969), 5.

¹⁰¹ Ibid., 8-9.

¹⁰² Ibid., 58-59.

¹⁰³ J. Malanowski, *Stosunki klasowe i różnice społeczne w mieście* (Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1967), 8-12.

in not very reliable way), he argued that in Poland processes of decomposition of class features had come to a very advance stage and thus the blurring of the social barriers can be diagnosed.¹⁰⁴ Eventually, the author reduced the importance of the Marxist concept of classes to two aspects: 1) the explanation of the social antagonisms, and 2) the political use in terms of Lenin's idea of realignment of social forces. He distanced himself from theoretical disputes, suggesting that large social groups can be called classes or strata more or less interchangeably.

In Czechoslovakia, due to central planning of science, there was far going division of scientific labor. Therefore the investigation of social structure was entrusted to a scientific team gathered by Pavel Machonin. It's research program was sketched in the article "The Social Differentiation of Socialist Society and the Differentiation in the Nature of Labor" published in "Sociologický Časopis" by the leader of the team together with Bohumil Jungmann. The authors put the initiative in the context of overcoming dogmatism and sectarianism of the Stalinist period. In this sense, they saw their undertaking as a kind of continuation of some attempts initiated by scientific communism, that turned against orthodox theoretical bias in favor of empirical research.¹⁰⁵ They criticize the mechanistic reduction of all social relations to class relations. Instead, they postulated considering of the issue of social structure in the multidimensional context, primarily with reference to the changes ongoing in the sphere of labor. They accentuated theory of classes and the concept of class struggle as a starting point of their theoretical considerations, but their aim was the "historical overcoming" of those concepts in such a way, that would adjust this intellectual tradition to the emergent socialist society of Czechoslovakia. Core to this adjustment was the suggestion to investigate relations between social differentiation of socialist society and differentiation

¹⁰⁴ Ibid.

¹⁰⁵ P. Machonin and B. Jungmann, "Sociální diferenciace socialistické společnosti a diferenciace v charakteru práce (Náčrt teoretické koncepce výzkumného programu)", *Sociologický Časopis*, no. 6 (1965): 657-658.

in the character of labor, determined primarily by the processes affecting the productive forces.¹⁰⁶

Glezerman in the book edited by Pavel Machonin described the transitional phase of the way towards communism. Characteristic of the first phase of this process is the disappearance of the antagonist class, but not of the class divisions that are heritage of the capitalist system. The elimination of the exploitation of human by human also does not fully allow to consider the existing socialist society as classless. In fact the only way to approach such a society is to capture the process of transition. From such a perspective the classes of socialist society should be conceived as „disappearing classes”.¹⁰⁷ What is still left of the class structure, are two different forms of ownership of the means of production: nationalized (state owned, or – as Glezerman would stress – owned by the whole society) and collectivized, owned by groups (cooperatives)¹⁰⁸.

2.2 Vertical differentiation of socialism

Social stratification is much more difficult to define than class structure. While choosing place in a historically determined system of social production as a criterion of class belonging results in a small (and usually relatively easy to determine) number of possible categories, defining different strata requires much more conceptual effort and the outcomes are usually quite ambiguous. Thus the turn towards the stratification theory and away from class theory has been recently criticized in the Polish context, as resulting in arbitral classification based on equally arbitral choosing of criteria¹⁰⁹. The situation was complicated by quite frequent linking of social stratification with different aspect of social structure, such as occupational divisions (socio-occupational structure). Many of the authors pointed to multi-dimensional

¹⁰⁶ Ibid.

¹⁰⁷ G. Glezerman, “Historický materialismus a analýza sociální struktury socialistické společnosti”, in *Sociální struktura socialistické společnosti*, op. cit., 169-170.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid.

¹⁰⁹ J. Kochan, op. cit., 100.

characteristic of classes in Marx, Engels and Lenin, where the consciousness aspects together with political aspect of class structure were dominant.¹¹⁰

Some of most absorbing questions was how stratification is related to class structure, what are the possible criteria for distinguishing a stratum, and how the division into strata intertwine with the occupational structure. One of the commonly recognized stance was that of Bogusław Gałęski who made the criteria of stratification dependent on the direct cognitive goals. In his analysis of social structure of Polish village he followed the Lenin's approach that had focused on the question of realignment of social forces.¹¹¹ This is however, only one instance of the thinking in terms of social engineering, based on recomposing the social actors in terms of different alliances of social groups.

Hochfeld tried to avoid "psychology of classes". Yet, he claimed, that dependence of all essential kinds of social stratification on the relations of production is no longer as obvious as it had been for Marx and Engels, and today it would require a detailed investigation. He suggested that from the perspective of structure of personality, the influence of stratification may be more important than that of class structure. (84-85).¹¹² This idea was later developed in the Hochfeld's circle by sociologist such as Adam Sarapata and Włodzimierz Wesołowski. Sarapata claimed that "for a theorist occupation is the basic aspect of social structure and indicator of social processes. It is where the mechanism of selection, of formation of personality, mechanisms of career and of professional culture can be observed".¹¹³ The research conducted by Sarapata together with Wesołowski demonstrated some similarity between capitalist and socialist hierarchy of occupations, yet the dissimilarities discovered were of high importance and allowed later some creative interpretations (see chapter 3.1). The most important difference was revealed in the position of qualified workers, whose prestige

¹¹⁰ See e.g. Widerszpil, op. cit., 17-20.

¹¹¹ B. Gałęski, op. cit., p. 35-40.

¹¹² J. Hochfeld, „Marksowska teoria klas:...", op. cit.

¹¹³ A. Sarapata, "Z Badań nad przemianami w hierarchii zawodów", *Studia Socjologiczne*, no. 2 (1962), 93.

was broadly recognized in Polish society: “This undermines commonly held opinion that links every form of manual labor with lower prestige than that of intellectual work”.¹¹⁴ The authors were convinced about the influences of socialist value system and successes of socialist ideology. What is puzzling in the authors is radically low position of unqualified workers, which directs their attention to the other, more universal values. The way they interpreted those findings stresses that socialist ideology can be successful only if combined with more universal values such as knowledge and qualifications. Also: level of income, though it seemed for them more complex question.¹¹⁵

Sarapata followed Zygmunt Bauman in disagreement with the prevailing American approach to strata that treats stratification as more or less synonym (or an equivalent) of class structure and uses those two interchangeably.¹¹⁶ Sarapata suggested two possible context of references to stratification: 1) stratification as hierarchization (valuation) of the individuals from the perspective certain attributes of these individuals; 2) similarity of certain groups determined by certain attributes of their members.

Bronisław Minc agreed that while classes are determined by only one criterion – the relationship to the means of production – stratification can be considered multi-dimensionally, from the perspective of numerous criteria. For instance, such a criterion can be the place occupied in the process of social organization of production, with divisions between managers and workers is one of the most crucial. In fact, he paid much attention to the managing stratum, that in socialist society is characterized by “strict hierarchy and division into two large categories: economic management and administration on one side, and the party leadership and bureaucracy on the other”¹¹⁷. It is important here to distinguish this approach

¹¹⁴ W. Wesołowski and A. Sarapata, Hierarchia zawodów i stanowisk, *Studia Socjologiczne*, no. 2 (1961), 120.

¹¹⁵ Ibid.

¹¹⁶ A. Sarapata, *Studia nad uwarstwieniem i ruchliwością społeczną w Polsce* (Warszawa: Książka i Wiedza), 1965, 6-7. See also: Z. Bauman, *Zarys socjologii...*, op. cit., p. 339.

¹¹⁷ Bronisław Minc, „O rozwarstwieniu społeczeństwa socjalistycznego”, *Kultura i Społeczeństwo*, no 3 (1963), 53.

from that of Milovan Đilas. Both in Minc and in Ładosz, there is a resolute opposition against claims about allegedly emergent new class of power, due to their economic understanding of classes. Minc additionally stress the importance of relationship between the state and strata, suggesting, that the existence of the state is not only class determined and, unlike in original Marxist theory of the state, the state does not disappear with the abolishment of classes. Its existence is also condition by the differentiation of society into strata.¹¹⁸

At this stage, the stratification conceptions developed more or less similarly in Czechoslovakia. As Machonin stated in the conceptual introduction to *Československá společnost* (Czechoslovak society), the team had been preoccupied with the dynamics of social structure, and consequently with the vertical aspects of social differentiation and social mobility. Social structure was conceived as a multi-dimensional complex of different systems, out of which two were considered most important, as they encompass essential roles of a human being: system of labor and occupations, and system of styles of life. Within those systems, systems such as that of education or that of distribution of values and norms. It is important, as – according to Machonin – practically every kind of social differentiation can on a certain level be conceived with regard to differentiation of values, and therefore placed on a certain scale of values an somehow measured¹¹⁹. This resulted in the conception of hierarchy of statuses.

Since there are numerous aspects of social differentiation, there are also diverse criteria that determine status. In fact, it would be advisable to talk about multitude of statuses, as those statuses they are to certain extend autonomous from each other, similarly as there exist the multitude of values. Machonin's team distinguished following determinants of statuses, or general types adequately to the aspects of social differentiation: 1) complexity of performed job, 2) style of life outside the workplace, 3) education and qualifications, 4)

¹¹⁸ Ibid., 53-54.

¹¹⁹ P. Machonin, "Konceptuální rámec...", op. cit., 21-25.

quality of life (respectively level of income), and 5) participation in governing and management¹²⁰. Machonin considers only the last aspect as strictly hierarchical, the rest of them belonging rather to the sphere of culture or being related to styles of life, though he allows the possibility for them to form hierarchies under certain circumstances¹²¹.

This multi-dimensional perspective allowed the sociologists to construct a concept of “synthetic status” that helps to generalize all different partial differentiations. Not only did that enable abstract comparisons of complexity of statuses of different individuals (“the axis of vertical differentiation”), but also opened the possibility of analysis of the composition of the status of individuals with regard to the psychological structures of their motivations. This aspect plays a certain role in the integration of society. In the integrated society particular aspects of status usually tend to high level of congruency of its elements. This means that the components of synthetic status are more or less consistent: high partial status in one aspects of differentiation is mirrored in an adequate level in other aspects. Such a status can be considered as “crystalized”¹²². Some level of status consistency was recognized by Machonin as a condition for defining a strata: “Along with the current state of Marxist conception of class, we consider as strata only those groups, that are characterized by a certain degree of status consistency”. This means that those groups are constituted by “a certain coordinated intertwining of productive and attributive systems”, most importantly by the two fundamental ones: the occupational system and the system of styles of life.

If, however, certain partial statuses diverge, there is a risk of “decomposition of status”. The concept of decomposition of status taken over from Wesołowski¹²³ is one of the most crucial in the analysis of Czechoslovak society by Machonin’s team. It points to the

¹²⁰ P. Machonin, “Konceptuální rámec...”, op. cit., 29.

¹²¹ Ibid., p. 30.

¹²² Ibid., p. 30.

¹²³ Ibid. See also: W. Wesołowski, Włodzimierz, *Classes, Strata, Power*, transl. G. Kolankiewicz (London : Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1979 [1965]).

“subjective” manifestations of the “objective” structure. According to the research group, the Marxist interpretation that they subscribed to, suggests that phenomena manifested in, for instance, styles of life, are determined by the social stratum, but over time they in a way “objectify” themselves and are capable of influencing other social phenomena, within the intertwined relations of different factors of differentiation¹²⁴.

Those considerations turned Machonin against overestimating political dimension and the role of power in social stratification. Nevertheless he allowed the possibility that under certain circumstances political aspects can be crucial (for instance when the social structure is particularly rigid and dichotomistic). However, He postponed this problem claiming that it should not be, however, the matter of theoretical assumptions, but of empirical research¹²⁵.

2.3 Contradictions of socialism

As it was demonstrated above, socialist sociologists were aware of vertical differentiation of their societies and of tensions and conflicts of interests dividing it. For each of three different currents distinguished in the thesis those contradictions of socialism were approached differently, though they also shared some similarities. The most important is that in all of those approaches the contradictions in question were considered as non-antagonistic. This allowed to conceive them in some of the variants as “driving forces” of the development.

Yet, some of the authors tended to associate them with the current economic situation of their society characterized by a certain backwardness compared to the more wealthy Western countries. This relative underdevelopment could help explaining some of the shortcomings of the socialist system, while at the same time legitimize new measures that could prompt the catching up with the West. Finally, diagnosing the conflicts and social problems were connected to the first phase of socialist construction with several possible ways

¹²⁴ Machonin, “Konceptuální rámec...”, op. cit., 29. P. Machonin, “K celkové charakteristice...”, op. cit., 134-135.

¹²⁵ P. Machonin, “Konceptuální rámec...”, op. cit., 29.

of approaching it. From one side they could be approached as the results of intensified industrialization accompanied by the radical and anomic changes in the social structure, caused by the shortcomings of bureaucratic and sectarian management of the Stalinist period. Increased sense of relative deprivation. With the beginning new phase of socialist construction, which is still a transitional phase but more conscious of the limitations, there was noticed a development of “scientific dialectical thinking”¹²⁶

Machonin and his team followed two different though sometimes overlapping paths. Firstly, they concentrated on polemics with critics of Marxism, bourgeois sociologists, but also with “pseudo-Marxist” currents that “blame the socialist society for the fact that there exists some conflicts and contradictions there”.¹²⁷ The current state of affairs, claimed Machonin, was conditioned by the regime preceding socialism and those determinants cannot be eradicated at immediately. The social structure of Czechoslovakia is constrained by the remaining of capitalism, as well as by the relative underdevelopment of the country. Socialism belongs to the communist type of society, rather than to capitalist one, but the quality of life may still be at best similar to that of the most developed capitalist countries. Most importantly, the limitations are the consequences of the specific physical and technical character of labor of a socialist industrialized society.¹²⁸

The success of socialism lies somewhere else. It is primarily in that socialist society “achieved a certain non-antagonistic unity of economic, political and ideological aspects of its structure and in that basic interest of the society as a whole, of groups and of the individuals”. Its, however, a relative, immanently contradictory unity, simply another stage on the way to non-antagonistic society.¹²⁹ This contradictory nature of sociality should be

¹²⁶ Z. Strmiska, „Pojetí sociální struktury v současné nemarxistické sociologii“, 75-77. See also: M. Hirszowicz, *Konfrontacje socjologiczne* (Warszawa: Książka i Wiedza, 1964).

¹²⁷ P. Machonin, “K celkové charakteristice...,” op. cit., 111-112.

¹²⁸ Ibid., 115-118.

¹²⁹ Ibid., 110.

treated as a result of dialectic motion of society. Conflicts are treated here as a signal of malfunctioning and a “driving force” of the development. The popularity of conflict theory was high in both Czechoslovakia and Poland. Conflicts were sometimes the topic of discussions in journals. However, reports on the current state of the theories took precedence over creative attempts to engage with them critically from the Marxist perspective. Usually they reports were limited to the enumeration of perspectives characterized by summary of their main premises.¹³⁰ Both in Czechoslovakia and in Poland mostly reported the Western conflict theories and attempts to draw conclusions valid for the non-antagonistic society, primarily within peculiar form of dialectic of its development.

For Polish context more important seem, however, divisions related to the social organization of labor, including division of labor. As was already mentioned, one of the most important of its aspect was the existence of managerial group visible more or less on every level of hierarchies. This was usually conceived as the most fundamental imperative of the organization of differentiated society. There was no consensus as to what is actually determined by the necessities of social organization. It is possible to argue, however, that the functionalist theory of stratification that accentuated functional necessity to fill the important position in society, was not received as well as it was in Czechoslovakia. Those kinds of considerations were treated as very abstract and speculative divagations, and, besides, politically uncertain. More attention was devoted to the issues related to the process of production, as well as to the essential division between town and village.¹³¹

For Wesołowski who was preoccupied with questions of power and status, one of the most important issue were the predicting the results of both increasing and leveling of social inequalities. Since he set out to counter theory of functional stratification for its quasi-universal approach to human nature, especially with regard to social motivations of action.

¹³⁰ F. Valek, „Hýbne síly vývoje sociální struktury”, in *Sociální struktura socialistické společnosti*, op. cit, 156.

¹³¹ J.J. Wiatr, “Materializm historyczny a socjalizm”, *Studia Sociologiczne*, no. 1 (1961), 56-57.

Therefore he focused on potential psychological tensions aroused by all divergences in social position, especially the inconsistency of status. The outcome would be than the filling of dissatisfaction with the social structure, and the feeling of relative deprivation, “because people have become accustomed to seeing social differentiation as somehow synchronized”.¹³² Those negative outcomes are, however, not inevitable:

High prestige can be treated as a specific way of levelling-out the global sum of ‘rewards’ for input into the functioning of the whole social mechanism, then it need not foster discontent. On the contrary, it may be the means for assuaging the feelings of being wronged which arise out of ‘partial’ deprivation.¹³³

Thus the feeling of “partial” or “relative” deprivation could be compensated by “partial privileges”. The next chapter presents the development of those ideas in the context of potential social engineering.

It is important to point here to the external aspect of those considerations. Sociologist from Czechoslovakia and Poland were faced with the challenge of explaining, if not justifying the contradictions of socialism to the Western scholars. Usually they would stress the difference in character of those contradictions in comparison with capitalist societies. Wiatr, for instance, pointed out that Marx did not investigate the symptoms of contradictions but, the basic contradictions of capitalism. No such an undertaking has been done in context of socialism, as the Western scholars were preoccupied with superficial level of ideological struggle: „Anti-communist literature with delight notes all the facts pointing to the internal contradictions in socialism, but has never scientifically proved that the opposition of group interests in such a society is an inevitable consequence of its economic organization”¹³⁴.

Nevertheless, transformations of social structure in the eyes of many reformist Marxists rendered historical materialism less useful perspective for analysis of socialism, especially

¹³² W. Wesołowski, *Klasy, warstwy, władza* (Warszawa: PWN, 1965). All references here to the English edition: *Classes, Strata, Power*, transl. G. Kolankiewicz, (London : Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1979), 118-119.

¹³³ Ibid., 119.

¹³⁴ J.J. Wiatr, “Materializm historyczny a socjalizm”, op. cit., 58.

when it comes to explaining the socialist state. Marxist theory of state cannot very well fit here. One of key aspect of Marxist theory of state, namely the identification of the state with a tool of class oppression was no longer valid. Nor was the state a guardian of private property. On the contrary, one of its function is the protection of socialized property. This role was also extrapolated to the sphere of international relations in a form of an international class struggle, not least because of the division of world into two large systems.¹³⁵

Concluding, the considerations of the contradictions of socialist societies were characterized by a turn towards dialectics of social development, recognition of the importance of conflict in such a development and distinction between constructive and harmful conflicts. The last chapter focuses on the premises of some visions that were supposed to alleviate the potential harmful outcomes of those contradictions.

3. Managing the contradictions: towards well-organized society

The previous chapter demonstrated a variety of approaches to vertical differentiation of socialist society. Even though certain disagreements arose between the scholars, there emerged a visible mainstream of social stratification research. In following sections I concentrate on two of those main currents of sociological thought. Those currents can be briefly characterized by their recognition of the primacy of the non-class aspects of vertical stratification. From that point, I analyze the conceptions for reducing the negative results of vertical differentiation of socialist society. In other words, I focus on the ideas of influencing the social structure that were supposed to ensure (relatively) unimpeded development of such society and more or less compensate for hierarchical differentiation related. Since such an approach would create completely one-sided image of sociology of stratification, it is

¹³⁵ Ibid.,. 60.

balanced by a third perspective that accentuated the importance of class analyses also with regard to socialist society.

Given the diversity of proposed solutions (or, for some cases, rather general orientations), a certain degree of simplification is needed for such an analysis. Therefore I decided to group those ideas into three categories basing on the normative premises they presuppose. The first approach presupposed the possibility of balancing different types of differentiation by redistributing other values in a way that could compensate for the lack of certain other goods. Focusing on the multi-dimensional character of social stratification, it strived to reorganize the elements of the structure in a way, that would flatten the hierarchies, turning vertical differentiations into more and more horizontal ones. Therefore, as in works of Włodzimierz Wesołowski or Adam Sarapata, it gravitated towards reflections concerning human nature and the possibility of shift in values systems that would allow such a realignment. The second orientation is represented here by Pavel Machonin and his scientific team. This group of scholars elaborated a vision of socialist society that claimed to be a realistic and pragmatic way of organizing society. Most briefly characterized, its starting point was the conviction about the need to secure socio-economic development, which should allow the increase of material and cultural production, and consequently improve quality of life. The main problem of this approach with regard to social structure was the need to justify inequalities created and reproduced by the conditions of such development. The last vision that could be distinguished from the approaches discussed in the thesis differed more from the previous two, as it put the accents on different aspects of social structure. It is represented here by scholars such as Bronisław Minc, Jarosław Ładosz and Stanisław Widerszpil.

As with every attempt to categorize, this classification brings certain risk of over-interpretation, of reading additional content into analyzed texts. The threat is even more serious, while comparing those approaches. Although all of them have some Marxist-

Leninsist foundations, and refer to more or less the same social phenomena, they do so on different levels. The status of each of those proposals differs, for instance, when it comes to the degree of its “utopism”, or, to use less normative expression, to the degree of its applicability. While the Machonin’s team treated their work as an expertise advocating for certain political solutions, other scholars remained within more hypothetical frames of solely academic practice.

3.1 In quest for differentiated equilibrium

In their critical reception of the Western scholarship, scholars from the Hochfeld’s circle intended to challenge the ostensible universality of those currents, which suggested that in all types of societies stratification is conditioned by the more or less same mechanism. This kind of universalism would leave no alternative possibilities of the organization of society, and consequently naturalize the social structure, especially when followed by functionalist explanation of differentiation. Therefore both Adam Sarapata and Włodzimierz Wesółowski, argued for such a characteristic of socialist society that would point to its specificity, also with regard to its stratification. Core to their undertakings were the conviction that social process can be influenced by the proper policies of the state. Therefore the starting point for their considerations was the realization that some current social problems were the outcomes of “incorrect managing of social mobility and processes of selection.”¹³⁶

Following Pitrim Sorokin, who in his book *Social and Cultural Mobility* claimed that social mobility does not necessary mean mobility of people but also of things and values, Sarapata advocated for more complex concept of mobility. This was a starting point for Sarapata to challenge the ostensibly universalist vision of status hierarchies, such as hierarchies of occupations. What he argued for was that those kinds of hierarchies are not

¹³⁶ A. Sarapata, „Uwagi o przedmiocie problematyce i metodzie socjologii ruchliwości społecznej”, no. 1 (1963), 33-34.

constant in time and prone to ideological influences¹³⁷. Realization that certain valuation can be susceptible to upward and downward mobility helped to achieve two goals. First, it allowed to de-naturalize the American patterns. Secondly, and probably more importantly, it opened some perspectives for consideration of stratification from the ideological point of view.

From a slightly different perspective the concept of lessening the social tensions by an ideological shift was suggested by Włodzimierz Wesołowski, primarily in his critical reading of functionalist theory of stratification. In his polemics with Kingsley Davis and Wilbert E. Moore he challenged the illegitimate assumptions regarding human nature. Their perspective, he argued, universalizes the features of capitalist industrial society. Human nature in their work equals the characteristics of the American middle class¹³⁸. Thus one more feature of their theory becomes apparent - it is primarily a theory of psychological motivation. This standpoint is acceptable for Wesołowski, as long as this characteristic of the theory is clearly stated. Otherwise, it serves as an allegedly objective and universal justification of inequalities, Disguised as a “functional necessity” it does not allow any criticism.

Davis and Moore treated education and power merely as values-means, that allow individuals to achieve other values: material benefits and prestige. Wesołowski, conversely, supposed that those values can be considered self-sufficient, and as such can become the main determinants of human action. He already noticed some signs of such an orientation in some Western works on American society (such as David Riesman’s *The Lonely Crowd*, or William H. White’s *The Organization Man*). Yet, even more important is the example of the socialist society, which demonstrated that alternative “models” of industrial society are possible: “The practice of socialist construction had already created the model of society that in many aspects differs greatly from the one presupposed by Davies and Moore”.¹³⁹

¹³⁷ A. Sarapata, *Studia nad uwarstwieniem...*, 18-21.

¹³⁸ Wesołowski, „Funkcjonalna teoria stratyfikacji”, *Studia Socjologiczne*, no. 4 (1962), 107-108.

¹³⁹ Ibid., 107-110.

Wesołowski argued, that many of the initial requirements for such a rebuilding of social consciousness were already met. Along with the levelling of income came the ideological successes, as the propaganda managed to advertise some of desirable attitudes. Most importantly, the education as a value-goal occupies very high position in the current value systems recognized by the society. Another aspect of this value shift is the change of approach to inequalities. Egalitarianism, according to Wesołowski, started to become a dominant outlook, not only when it comes to postulates, but also in the everyday life¹⁴⁰.

Not all of those findings were confirmed by Adam Sarapata. He established, that the acceptance for social inequalities is still high in the society. Yet, he pointed out that there are certain regularities in the way people justify this kind of acceptance. He claimed that many of those justifications are not necessarily directly connected to the particular sort of income (to a particular occupation) but rather to the social meaning of the occupation, that is always conditioned by many factors, including the political and ideological situation of the society. This allowed him to predict that those attitudes could be easily influenced¹⁴¹.

The hope for the alleviation of some social tensions was primarily based on the conviction that shortage of some values can be compensated by the distribution of other values:

One type of equalization process consists in the levelling of certain, but not all, attributes between two classes. The second type of equalization is represented by the 'overtaking' of one class by another along one or two dimensions, the others remaining relatively constant. Most skilled workers earn as much as teachers and some more than medical doctors. Certain skilled manual jobs carry higher prestige than many routine white-collar jobs¹⁴²

Most importantly, it seemed possible to Wesołowski, that with support of ideology, a peculiar state distribution of prestige, it is imaginable to influence the social valuation of certain profession that in a long run could result in an axiological shift, that would overcome the

¹⁴⁰ Ibid., 111-113.

¹⁴¹ A. Sarapata, *Studia nad uwarstwieniem...*, op. cit., 320-321.

¹⁴² W. Wesołowski, „Funkcjonalna teoria stratyfikacji”, op. cit. 115.

ostensible requirements of far-going differentiation of income advocated by functionalist approach.

Arguing against an alleged functional necessity of income inequalities, Wesołowski came to the conclusion that if there actually is a necessity for any kind of stratification it is rather by the criterion of power, not of material benefits or prestige. The hierarchical structures emerge not because of the need to provide incentives for the individuals to gain education, and consequently to occupy important positions in the society, but due to the imperatives of social organization, because of the social character of human life¹⁴³.

3.2 Strive for status consistency

The starting point for Machonin and his team resembles that of Sarapata. The research on social structure in Czechoslovakia was declared as a turn against erroneous policies of the period of Stalinization characterized, among others by vulgar leveling (cz. vulgární rovnostářství).¹⁴⁴ According to them this resulted in the elimination of qualified people from the socially important positions, including the state administration and the management on different levels of production. The detrimental policies were reshuffling society, for instance in process of aforementioned class screenings, moving the educated and skilled workers (mostly white-collar) to the jobs below their qualifications and unsatisfactory with regard to prestige, income and the tasks performed. This was, according to the sociologists, one of the factors impeding the economic development and contributing to the disintegration of the society.

Yet, the most worrisome aspect of this disintegration was the tampering with socially acknowledged norms and values. This is the point where Machonin and his team went closest

¹⁴³ W. Wesołowski, „Funkcjonalna teoria stratyfikacji”, op. cit., 116.

¹⁴⁴ Machonin, „Konceptuální ramec...”, op. cit., 34.

to the Polish sociologist discussed above, at least with regard to the diagnoses. In his introductory chapter to *Československá společnost* the leader of the Czechoslovak researchers presented a framework in which the conception of status decomposition presented by Wesołowski played an important role. It is, however, also the very moment when the two approaches diverge with regard to the conclusions drawn from the similar diagnoses. While the author of *Classes, Strata, Power* saw in the possibility of decomposition of status the opportunity to play with the hierarchies, Machonin conceived it as one of the main threats to the fundamentals of social organization. Therefore it is worthwhile to zoom in on the concept of status in Machonin's work, as well as on the context of the research led by him.

Beginning with the latter, it is important to remind here that the process of restructuring of society proceeded differently in Czechoslovakia than in Poland. As Lenka Kalinová pointed out: "Not only did Czechoslovakia have a greater level of earnings' levelling, but the general attitude towards the intelligentsia was also worse than elsewhere in the Soviet bloc".¹⁴⁵ She also quotes a Soviet delegation that visited Czechoslovakia, who noted that they "had not met such sectarianism with relation to the intelligentsia in any other country" of the Soviet sphere¹⁴⁶.

Now it is time to look closer at the way Machonin and his collaborators conceived the social differentiation under such circumstances. The key term in their analyses is that of status or rather the multitude of statuses, as they link different kinds of status depending on the particular type of differentiation. What is most important is the interrelation between those different kinds of status and the criteria, or in other words, the need for their congruence.

¹⁴⁵ L. Kalinová, op. cit., 229.

¹⁴⁶ Ibid.

3.3 *La lotta continua!*

The last approach presented here is by far the most militant one. Preoccupied with the analysis of class structure of society, scholars of that current (Ładosz, Minc, Widerszpil) remained suspicious of alternative approaches to social structure. That does not mean that they would deny other aspects of social differentiation. Rather, they tended to see them as a secondary phenomenon, sometimes relatively autonomous from the class divisions. What is characteristic of this standpoint is the conviction that the attempts to explain the results of class divisions by the divisions different than those of class nature in the eventually ends up in apologetic, or at best neutral understanding of all social relations¹⁴⁷. From the perspective of historical materialism, to which orthodox variant those authors subscribed, production relations take precedence over all the other: social, political, cultural and others, being the core determinant of the social dynamics¹⁴⁸. Given this determination, the main task of all critical social analyses of socialist society becomes unmasking of conflicts within non-antagonistic classes. This brings the considerations to a lower level of analysis, an analysis of divisions within working class (respectively, within the class of workers of the nationalized or socialized sectors)¹⁴⁹ or to, so to speak higher level of international class struggle.¹⁵⁰

The recognition of the precedence of class determination over all other relations resulted also in the more or less fixed vision of possible social reshuffling. Given the very abstract level of analysis to which those scholars subscribed, this approach remained blind to smaller-scale undertakings. In the reality of already existing socialism the Leninist concept of realigning social forces had also lesser potential than in the “pre-revolutionary” situation, especially that, according to Widerszpil, “class divisions crystalize only in the moments of

¹⁴⁷ J. Kochan, op. cit., 146.

¹⁴⁸ S. Widerszpil, op. cit., 54.

¹⁴⁹ J. Ładosz, op. cit., 99-101.

¹⁵⁰ S. Widerszpil, op. cit., 121-127.

intensified social tensions, they emerge from the cover of different kinds of social relations”¹⁵¹.

Consequently, those scholars presented, so to speak, more passive attitude towards the imagined features. Not being able to influence directly the social development in a way that Sarapata or Wesołowski on one side, and Machonin’s team on the other, they directed their attention towards the most general problems of social dynamics. It is important to stress here that towards such orientations pushed them the very nature of the core premises of historical materialism.

Conclusions and continuations

The first two of the presented visions could be characterized as optimistic. Even though each of them points to some unsurmountable tensions, they both presuppose certain level of agency in managing the contradictions and conflicts in socialist society. In that sense, both of them subscribe to the vision of the possibility of existence of non-antagonist organization of the society that is not yet communist, even though a certain unity of the society that emerges from those visions is always considered “dialectically” It seems that this kind of optimism was possible due to, so to speak, soft concepts of power, that each of presented approaches implied. Main adversaries of authors the authors in question would argue against those conceptions by stressing irremovable and “objective” relations of domination based on the relations of production. In Poland, where the academic disputes were more vivid, those concepts were in constant process of negotiations, within the mainstream currents of Marxist and non-Marxist sociology.

Sociologists from Czechoslovakia and Poland developed their ideas in the process of coming out of the isolation of the Stalinist Period. Jerzy Kochan argued that precisely because

¹⁵¹ Ibid., 27.

of this earlier isolation and underdevelopment of sociological research in Poland the older concepts of the Western sociology could have been recycled and presented as new, especially when clothed in Marxist language.¹⁵² Moreover, inability to determine the essential social contradictions and overlooking of the importance of ownership relations led to the acknowledgment of “dominance of social harmony over conflict, cooperation over contradictions” in Polish society¹⁵³. Consequently, the sources of any shortcomings of the socialist system were believed to be found in erroneous political decisions, poor management, and consciousness¹⁵⁴.

It can be agreed that certain optimism was characteristic of some sociologist at that time. However, a relative nature of this optimism should not be overlooked. The progressive accomplishments of socialism were praised primarily in comparison with the capitalist societies. Quite often they were also considered as a certain potentiality, rather than actual condition of society. Sociologists in both Czechoslovakia and Poland differed among each other as to the evaluation of current social situation. Especially Czechoslovak scholars tended to put ongoing changes into a somewhat historiosophical scheme of revolutionary way towards communism, describing the current phase as “transitional”, sometimes overestimating the advances of socialist ideology and of the economic development.

Yet, when considered from the perspective of Winławski mentioned in the introduction, from the perspective of self-knowledge there is possible a different evaluation, the one that historicize the sociological knowledge production of that time. This is not a justification of resignation from theorizing or an attempt to undermine criteria of scientific validity. Rather, it is a reminder that all scientific undertakings are entangled in different dimensions of social life, of aforementioned intersections of tradition, current struggles, and

¹⁵² J. Kochan, op. cit., 102.

¹⁵³ J. Kochan, op. cit., 103.

¹⁵⁴ Ibid.

the visions of future, and that perspective of theoretical purity and academic consistency, as in Kochan's, is not always the most beneficial one.

All the protagonists of the thesis subscribed more or less to the idea of engaged social sciences. Many of them put a lot of effort into proving that sociology is never able to avoid choosing sides. If it pretends to do so, it is either a hoax, or an intentional mystification. In both cases it serves the preservation of current social relations, which for many of those scholars. Therefore it seems appropriate to attempt to evaluate the traditions discussed in the thesis in context of their actual and possible continuations.

As I demonstrated above, one of the stimuli for the renewal of scientific approaches to studies of socialism was considering it as a variant of industrialized society, and thus in a way similar to capitalism. Even though approaches such as theory of convergence were more or less rejected, this opened up new perspectives not only for a critique of socialism, but also, in retrospect, of capitalism and its further development. For many of the historical revisionist such comparisons became a fundament for renewed critique of the liberal societies. So-called anti-anti-communism was meant not so much to rehabilitate communism, as to challenge prevailing capitalist mindset, especially in its contemporary neo-liberal version.

Sociological analysis from the socialist period constitute a vital inspiration for such revisionist currents. They also, contribute to the understanding of current debates. The good example of that is already mentioned book by Agata Zysiak that analyzed the reforms of the Polish university under socialism, basing predominantly on sociological research of that time. Zysiak concludes her considerations pointing out that "the suggestions of contemporary reforms sometimes sound as a distant echo of Stalinist postulates". The current reforms of higher education, she claims, reflected the same logics of efficacy and utility, as those initiated in 1948.

There is another aspect of this perspective. Recently, however, numerous scholars argued for different periodization, putting emphasis on structural changes. Essentially, they would underline the importance of modernization leap taken in the early 1970s and the subsequent emergence of the consumer society¹⁵⁵. Those authors, like Zysiak, would usually point to the convergence of capitalist and socialist societies, stressing for instance the shift from Fordist to post-Fordist mode of their organization¹⁵⁶. Analyzing the emergence of the consumer society is important for yet another reason. According to numerous works, it was precisely the failure to satisfy the needs characteristic of such a society, that contributed highly to the fall of socialism in Central Europe¹⁵⁷. This is another incentive for the development of cooperation on the intersections of historical sociology and history of social thought. Promising as it helps to avoid reductions and oversimplifications.

Finally, since one of the axes of the thesis was the interplay of traditions, current struggles and imagined futures, the last remark will be devoted to this very issue. The analyses that attempt to place the national experience beyond its local context should contribute to the understanding of some global challenges and allow to look for some inspirations in local answers to them. The de-Stalinization of intellectual life in Central Europe meant the attempts to renegotiate some core aspects of ossified Marxism. Again, it is beneficial to look at such intellectual transformations not only in their local context, but also to search for some comparable developments elsewhere. As to the revisionist attempts to review Marxism, similar struggles could be traced in the Western scholarship, where at the same time the strive for antropologization or humanization of Marxism, strive for “Marxism with a soul” (Marshal

¹⁵⁵ M. Gdula and M. Sutowski, *Przed „Solidarnością” był „Czterdziestolatek”*, in: *Rok dobrej zmiany*, M. Sutowski (ed.), Wydawnictwo „Krytyki Politycznej”, Warszawa 2017. M. Szcześniak, (2016). *Normy widzialności: tożsamość w czasach transformacji*, Fundacja Nowej Kultury Bęc Zmiana : Instytut Kultury Polskiej, Warszawa 2016.

¹⁵⁶ E. Dunn, *Privatizing Poland: Baby Food, Big Business, and the Remaking of Labor*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca 2004. P. Saudra, *Państwo, szkoła, klasy*, Wydawnictwo “Krytyki Politycznej”, Warszawa 2017. See also: J. Bockman, op. cit.

¹⁵⁷ M. Pullmann, *Úpadek a pád komunistických diktatur ve východní Evropě*, w: P. Kolář, M. Pullmann, *Co byla normalizace?* dz. cyt., s. 169-172.

Berman) started to change the identity of the left¹⁵⁸. Such inquiries are essential for the maintaining of the critical potential of social and human sciences.

¹⁵⁸ M. Berman, *The politics of authenticity : radical individualism and the emergence of modern society* (New York: Atheneum, 1970).

Bibliography

Primary Sources

- Bauman, Zygmunt and Jerzy J. Wiatr. 1957. "Marksizm a socjologia współczesna" (Marxism and the contemporary sociology), *Myśl Filozoficzna*, no. 1 (1957): 3-23.
- Bauman, Zygmunt, *Zarys socjologii: zagadnienia i pojęcia* (Outline of sociology: questions and concepts), Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1962
- Doktorov, B., *Sovremennaja rossijskaja sociologija: Istoriko-biograficheskie poiski*, Moscow 2012.
- Doktorov, Boris, *Sovremennaja rossijskaja sociologija: Istoriko-biograficheskie poiski* (Contemporary Russian sociology: historical and biographical searches) , Moscow 2012.
- Floud, J. "Third World Congress of Sociology, Amsterdam, 22nd to 29th August 1956", *International Review of Education*, Vol. 3, No. 2, (1957), pp. 240-242.
- Gałęski, Bogusław. „Niektóre problemy struktury społecznej w świetle badań wiejskich”, *Studia Socjologiczno-Polityczne*, no. 1 (1963).
- Gałęski, Bogusław, „Z badań nad przemianami społeczno-ekonomicznej struktury wsi w Polsce Ludowej (cz. I)”, 3-25., MF, 1956, no. 5.
- Glezerman, G., "Historický materialismus a analýza sociální struktury socialistické společnosti", in *Sociální struktura socialistické společnosti*.
- Hochfeld, Julian, „Marksowska ogólna teoria klas społecznych”, in: idem, *Studia o marksowskiej teorii społeczeństwa*, Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1982.
- Hochfeld, Julian, *Marksizm, socjologia, socjalizm: wybór pism* (Marxism, sociology, socialism: selected works), Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1982.
- Kosík, Karel, „Třídy a reálná struktura společnosti”, *Filosofický časopis*, no. 5 (1958), 721.
- Ładosz, Jarosław, *Marksistowska teoria walki klas* (Warszawa: Książka i Wiedza, 1969), 5.
- Machonin, Pavel and Bohumil Jungmann, "Sociální diferenciace socialistické společnosti a diferenciace v charakteru práce (Náčrt teoretické koncepce výzkumného programu)", *Sociologický Časopis*, no. 6 (1965): 657-658.
- Machonin, Pavel, "K celkové charakteristice sociální struktury socialistické společnosti", in *Sociální struktura socialistické společnosti*, Pavel Machonin (ed.), Praha: Svoboda, 1966: 108-151.
- Machonin, Pavel, "Konceptuální rámec a základní teoretické předpoklady výzkumu sociální stratifikace," in *Československá společnost: sociologická analýza sociální stratifikace*, Pavel Machonin, (ed.), Bratislava, 1969.
- Machonin, Pavel. ed., *Československá společnost: sociologická analýza sociální stratifikace* (Czechoslovak society: sociological analysis of social stratification), Bratislava, 1969.

- Machonin, Pavel. ed., *Sociální struktura socialistické společnosti* (Social structure of the socialist societies), Praha: Svoboda, 1966.
- Malanowski, Jan, *Stosunki klasowe i różnice społeczne w mieście* (Class relations and social differences in a town), Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1967.
- Ossowski, Stanisław. 1957. *Struktura klasowa w społecznej świadomości*. Łódź-Wrocław: Łódzkie Towarzystwo Naukowe, Ossolineum.
- Richta, Radovan, et al. 1966. *Civilizace na rozcestí*. Praha: Svoboda, 1966.
- Rossijskaja sociologija 60-h godov v vospominanijah i dokumentah*, G. Batygin, M. G. Pugacheva, S. Jarmoljuk (eds.), Saint Petersburg 1999.
- Sarapata, Adam, "Z badań nad przemianami w hierarchii zawodów" (Research on Changes in the Occupational Hierarchy), *Studia Socjologiczne* 2 (1966). . .
- Sarapata, Adam, *Studia nad uwarstwieniem i ruchliwością społeczną w Polsce* (Studies on stratification and social mobility in Poland). Warszawa: Książka i Wiedza, 1965.
- Strmiska, Zdeněk, „Pojetí sociální struktury v současné nemarxistické sociologii”, in *Sociální struktura socialistické společnosti*, ed. P. Machonin, Praha: Svoboda, 1966: 44-78.
- Szczepański, Jan, ed. *Z Badań Klasy Robotniczej i Inteligencji* (From studies on the working class and intelligentsia). Łódź: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1958.
- Velek, F., „Hýbne síly vývoje sociální struktury”, in *Sociální struktura socialistické společnosti*, ed. P. Machonin, Praha: Svoboda, 1966: 152-167.
- Werblan, Andrzej, „O sociologii krytycznie: niektóre problemy ideologiczne współczesnej sociologii polskiej” (On sociology critically: some ideological problems of contemporary Polish sociology) in: idem, *Szkice i polemiki* (Essays and polemics), Warszawa: Książka i Wiedza, 1970, 89–113.
- Wesołowski, Funkcjonalna teoria stratyfikacji, *Studia Socjologiczne*, no. 4 (1962).
- Wesołowski, Włodzimierz and Adam Sarapata, „Hierarchia zawodów i stanowisk”, *Studia Socjologiczne*, no. 2 (1961): 91-124.
- Wesołowski, Włodzimierz, *Classes, Strata, Power*, transl. G. Kolankiewicz, London : Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1979 [1965].
- Wesołowski, Włodzimierz, *Klasy, warstwy i władza* (Classes, strata, and power), Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1965.
- Wiatr, Jerzy J., „Trzeci Światowy Kongres Socjologii”, *Myśl Filozoficzna*, no. 6 (1956), pp. 215-233.
- Wiatr, Jerzy J., „Materializm historyczny a socjalizm” (Historical materialism and socialism), *Studia Socjologiczne* no. 1 (1961): 48-62.
- Wiatr, Jerzy J., „Otwarty marksizm i odrodzenie socjologii: rola Juliana Hochfelda i Zygmunta Baumana”, *Studia Socjologiczno-Polityczne*, no. 1 (2017), pp. 13-26.

Wiatr, Jerzy J., „Z problematyki IV Światowego Kongresu Socjoologicznego”, *Studia Sociologiczno-Polityczne*, no. 6 (1960): 181-184.

Włodzimierz Wesołowski, Z problematyki uwarstwienia społecznego, 226-237, MF 1957, no. 1

Secondary Literature

Beckert, Jens, *Imagined Futures: Fictional Expectations and Capitalist Dynamics*, Cambridge, London: Harvard University Press, 2016.

Bielecka-Prus, Joanna “Społeczne role socjologów w PRL”, *Przegląd Socjologiczny*, no. 2/58 (2009): pp.71-103

Bockman, Johanna, *Markets in the Name of Socialism: The Left-Wing Origins of Neoliberalism*, Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2011.

Česká sociologie v letech 1965-1989. [diskuse u kulatého stolu. *Sociologický časopis / Czech Sociological Review* 40, 2004: 695-744.

Connelly, John. 2000. *Captive University. The Sovietization of East German, Czech, and Polish Higher Education, 1945-1956*, Chapel Hill - London: The University of North Carolina Press.

Czernecki, Igor, “An intellectual offensive: The Ford Foundation and the destalinization of the Polish social sciences”, *Cold War History Vol. 13, No. 3*: 289-310.

Devátá, Markéta, *Marxismus jako projekt nové společnosti. Dvě studie ke společenským vědám (1945-1969)* (Marxism as a project of a new society), Praha: Ústav pro soudobé dějiny, 2014.

Gdula, Maciej and Przemysław Sadura. 2012. „Style życia jako rywalizujące uniwersalności” in: M. Gdula and P. Sadura (eds.) *Style życia i porządek klasowy w Polsce*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe „Scholar”.

Hîncu, Adela. 2018. “‘A Common Front?’: Social Structure Research in 1970s Socialist Romania”, pp. 209-223, in A. Hîncu and V. Karády (eds) *Social sciences in the "other Europe" since 1945*. Budapest: Central European University.

Hîncu, Adela. 2018. „Introduction: ‘Peripheral Observations’ and Their Observers”, pp. 1-28, in A. Hîncu and V. Karády (eds) *Social sciences in the "other Europe" since 1945*. Budapest: Central European University.

Jedlicki, Witold, *Klub Krzywego Koła*, (Warszawa 1989).

Kalinová, Lenka. 1996. „A Contribution to the Social History of Czechoslovakia 1945-1989“, *Czech Sociological Review*, 1996, Vol. 4 No. 2: 223-236.

Kilias, Jarosław, *Goście ze Wschodu : socjologia polska lat sześćdziesiątych XX wieku a nauka światowa* (The guest from the East: Polish sociology in the 1960s and the world science), Kraków: Zakład Wydawniczy „Nomos”, 2017.

- Kilias, Jarosław. 2018. *An Older Brother: Polish and Czechoslovak Sociology in the 1960s*, in A. Hincú and V. Karády (eds) *Social sciences in the "other Europe" since 1945*. Budapest: Central European University.
- Kochan, Jerzy, *Studia z teorii klas społecznych* (Studies in class theory), Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe „Scholar”, 2011, 2011.
- Kochanowski, Jerzy, *Rewolucja międzypaździernikowa: Polska 1956-1957* (Kraków: Znak, 2017).
- Kopeček, Michal. 2009. *Hledání ztraceného smyslu revoluce: zrod a počátky marxistického revizionismu ve střední Evropě 1953-1960*, Praha: Argo.
- Kraško N. 1996. *Instytucjonalizacja socjologii w Polsce 1920–1970*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warszawa.
- Kural, Václav, *Československo roku 1968. 1. díl, Obrodný proces*, Praha 1993.
- Mannheim, Karl. *Ideology and Utopia*. London: Routledge, 1936.
- Nešpor, Zdeněk R, et al. 2014. *Dějiny české sociologie*, Prague: Academia.
- Novinkova, S. *Sociologija: istorija, osnovy, institucionalizacija v Rossii*, Moscow – Voronezh 2000.
- Olšáková, Doubravka, „Pugwash in Eastern Europe: The Limits of International Cooperation Under Soviet Control in the 1950s and 1960s”, *Journal of Cold War Studies*, Vol. 20, No. 1 (2018): 210-240.
- Petrusek, Miloslav. “Výuka sociologie v čase tání a v časech normalizace (1964–1989)” [Teaching sociology in the periods before and during normalization (1964–1989)]. *Sociologický časopis* 40, no. 5 (2004): 597–607.
- Petrusek, Miloslav. 2000. „Co bylo, když sociologie nebyla. Osudy zakázané a zhanobené vědy 1948–1963” in Barvíková, H. (ed.), *Věda v Československu v letech 1953–1963. Sborník z konference..* Praha: Archiv AV ČR.
- Platt, Jennifer, *A brief history of the ISA 1948-1997*, Quebec: International Sociological Association, 1998.
- Rychlík, Jan. 2015. *Češi a Slováci ve 20. století: spolupráce a konflikty 1914-1992*. Praha: Vyšehrad.
- Sadura, Przemysław. 2017. *Państwo szkoła klasy*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Krytyki Politycznej.
- Semenov, V.S. “*Nauka - vyshe politiki*”, in: *Rossijskaja sociologija...*, op. cit., p. 434.
- Shubkin, V.N. *Vozrozhdaajushhajasja sociologija i oficioznaja ideologia*, in: *Rossijskaja sociologija...*, op. cit.,
- Sommer, Vitezlav, “Towards the Expert Governance: Social Scientific Expertise and the Socialist State in Czechoslovakia”.

- Sulek, Antoni, „'Do Ameryki!': Polscy socjologowie w Stanach Zjednoczonych po 1956 roku i rozwój socjologii empirycznej w Polsce”, in *Obrazy z życia socjologii w Polsce*, Oficyna Naukowa, Warszawa 2011, 96-141.
- Trencsényi, Balázs, et al. 2018. *A history of modern political thought in East Central Europe, Volume II, Negotiating modernity in the 'short twentieth century' and beyond. Part I, 1918-1968*. Budapest: Oxford University Press.
- Voříšek, Michael. 2012. *The Reform Generation: 1960s Czechoslovak Sociology from Comparative Perspective*. Prague: Kalich.
- Warczuk, Tomasz and Tomasz Zarycki, *Gra peryferyjna: polska politologia w globalnym polu nauk społecznych*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe Scholar, Kraków 2016.
- Winclawski, Włodzimierz. 1991 . *Lud, naród, socjologia. Studium o genezie socjologii słowackiej* [People, nation, sociology: A study of the origins of Slovak sociology]. Toruń: Uniwersytet Mikołaja Kopernika.
- Zybertowicz, Andrzej, *Przemoc i poznanie: studium z nieklasycznej socjologii wiedzy*. (Violence and cognition: a study in the non-classical sociology of knowledge), Toruń: Uniwersytet Mikołaja Kopernika, 1995.
- Zysiak, Agata, *Punkty za pochodzenie: powojenna modernizacja i uniwersytet w robotniczym mieście*. Kraków: Zakład Wydawniczy „Nomos”, 2016.