Druck gefördert vom Fonds zur Förderung der wissenschaftlichen Forschung
n Österreich.

CIP-Kurztitelaufnahme der Deutschen Bibliothek

Geschichte der österreichischen Soziologie: Konstituierung,
Entwicklung u. europ. Bezüge / Josef Langer (Hg.). - Wien
SBN 3-900351-97-X
NE: Langer, Josef (Hrsg.)

SBN 3-900351-97-X

Umschlagentwurf: Andrea Zeitlhuber
Druck: rema print, Neulerchenfelder Straße 35, A-1160 Wien

Josef Langer (Hg.)

GESCHICHTE DER ÖSTERREICHISCHEN SOZIOLOGIE
Konstituierung, Entwicklung und europäische Bezüge

Verlag für Gesellschaftskritik

INHALT

GRUNDLEGUNG

EUROPÄISCHE BEZÜGE

Raimondo Strassoldo (Udine)

THE AUSTRIAN INFLUENCE ON ITALIAN SOCIOLOGY

Introduction

There are not many connections between Italian and Austrian sociologies, if by Austria we mean the tiny Alpine country born in 1918, and by sociology the narrow discipline, distinct from other social and human sciences, which has spread in European universities largely since the late fifties.

So understood, Italian and Austrian sociologies have so far displayed a typical 'feudal' (in Johan Galtung's meaning of the term) relationship with regard to the dominant world-sociology. They have both cultivated their 'vertical' relationships, striven to catch up and keep abreast with developments in the world sociological centre(s), and have been quite oblivious of each other; little time has been left for the cultivation of horizontal, neighbourly relations.

A scan of Italian sociological literature of the last twenty years fails to yield more than extremely sparse papers dealing with Austrian authors and problems.[1] That there are practically no contacts between the two sociological communities is also the impression of some of the most respected experts in the history of Italian sociology.[2]

Things are far different if we relax the definition of time, space and content. In time, so as to include the years when Austria, and Vienna in particular, was the centre of a large multinational complex, so that by Austrian we meant any citizen of the Austrian Empire writing in German. This would entail, of course, an extension in space, because we could label as Austrian also authors from different Central European regions and nations. But it would automatically mean also an extension in substance, because at those times sociology had not yet been clearly differentiated from other social sciences, philosophy and the humanities in general.

Thus defined, the influence of Austrian social thought upon its Italian counterpart - as well as upon world culture - becomes indeed most relevant.[3] The Austrian school of economics (Carl Menger, Böhm-Bawerk, von Mises) looms large on the intellectual horizon of Italian, as of any other, economists. In addition there are the expatriates (the question will be taken up later), Josef Schumpeter and Friedrich von Hayek, whose contribution largely crosses both disciplinary and national boundaries. Then there is - not unconnected, because there does seem to exist a peculiar Austrian *forma mentis*[4] - the Austrian school of philosophy of science - Mach, Schlick, Wittgenstein, the Vienna Circle, Popper; these are also first class figures for the Italian philosophers. The same can be said of the Austrian school of the philosophy of law,

and of political science, as represented by Hans Kelsen (who, however, became universally known here only in the late fifties). And of course, perhaps the most famous Austrian contribution to world culture and human sciences, Freud's psychoanalysis, which penetrated rather early into Italy via the door of Trieste - a classic case of the 'bridge' function between cultures being performed by a frontier minority.[5]

The affinity between these fields of knowledge and sociology are obvious; and more could perhaps be cited. We harbour the suspicion that Wilhelm Schmidt's anthropology was not without influence on certain strands of Italian studies in this field (see contribution by *Demarchi* in this volume), and we feel certain that Austrian experimental psychology has become important in Italy, again through the Trieste door (the school of Gaetano Kanitza).[6] More generally still, it can be stated that 'Austrian' culture has enjoyed wide admiration in Italian intellectual circles, especially over the last fifteen or twenty years.

This admiration is certainly not a peculiarly Italian phenomenon. As is well known, Anglo-American culture has also shown many signs of interest in the 'Austrian mind', 'great Vienna', 'Mitteleuropa'; and a spate of studies, some of them book-length, have appeared on these subjects. Some of them have been read and even translated in Italy (*Janik/Toulmin* 1975); thus Italian interest in these topics is, to some extent, another example of subservience to Anglo-American culture. More recently, even France staged a great exhibition at the Beaubourg in honour of the Viennese spirit in its golden age. There are, however, also more local causes for the renewed (or totally new) Italian interest in Austrian culture.

The Seventies were dark, 'leaden' years for Italy; economic stagflation, social unrest, political instability (fear of 'sorpasso', the gaining by the Communist Party of a relative majority), spread of drug addiction and of organized crime (mafia, camorra, the 'kidnapping industry') and on top of all this, political terrorism escalating to the highest target (the Moro murder).

One of the reactions to this state of affairs was, at least in some northern regions and in some social classes, a nostalgia for the good old days when these parts of Italy were securely attached to a well-ordered civilized Central Europe; when there was no danger of lapsing back, as now seemed the case, into Mediterranean, Levantine, Latin-American, Third-World barbarism. In regions such as Lombardy, in Parma, even in Florence, but especially in Veneto and most notably in the Trieste area, there arose a new demand for 'revisionist' information on the time when Austria ruled; a minor cultural industry flourished (books, congresses, exhibitions) appealing to high and middle-brow groups, but there were also more popular mass events (political movements, festivals) (*Strassoldo/Kufahl* 1981; *Strassoldo* 1987).

The upshot of all this is that Austrian culture in general - arts, sciences, way of life - are held in high respect and admiration by Italian intellectuals[7] and this holds true for sociologists as well. Things may still be different among the populace, where a long 'risorgimentale' tradition in school history teaching still lingers, in which Austria and Germany are thrown together as

Italy's hereditary enemies, as barbarians and oppressors, in a single line from the Goths to Barbarossa, to the 'henchman' Franz Josef and to the Nazis.

Finally, in a study of the relationship between Italian and Austrian sociologies, a decision must be made about the Jewish expatriates. It is well-known that a large part of what is characteristically 'Austrian', 'Viennese' or 'Mitteleuropean' in the arts and sciences, is really Jewish[8], and that perhaps the most productive contribution made by 'Austrian' culture to world culture has been through the ordeal of emigration in the face of Nazi madness. This is true also of the social sciences. The list of 'Austrian' expatriates who became world authorities in sociology is impressive. They almost monopolized the field of epistemology and methodology; with Karl Mannheim[9] they founded whole new fields of sociology in Great Britain (sociology of knowledge, sociology of planning); with Paul Lazarsfeld they dominated the quantitative field, with Schütz and Luckmann the interpretative-qualitative one; with Karl Deutsch they revolutionized political sociology and introduced cybernetic and communication theory to the social sciences; with Morgenstern they opened up new fields in the study of econmic behaviour; the list could go on for a long time. But to what extent is it legitimate to claim these men as Austrians? True, they were mostly born as citizens of the Austrian Empire, had studied there, and at least in their early works often wrote in German. But they belonged to a minority group whose relations with the groups around them had always been difficult and complex, and never one of complete identification. Most of all, they had to flee when vulgar prejudices against them became state policies; and had to suffer, in exile, the destruction of their kind at the hands, or by the inaction, of the people they had left. In most cases, they understandably cut off any ties with the countries of origin and identified themselves with their new homes. When their fame returned to Europe from across the Atlantic, they proudly presented themselves as American, or British, and were thus accepted. Only in a few cases, and only most recently, have some started to look back with some sympathy to their 'old' countries, and have even started to work in and for them.[10]

All this has been recalled here only to stress the difficulties in considering as 'Austrian' influences on Italian sociology, those issuing from the above-mentioned authors. There is a delicate ethical-political problem here, but also a more practical problem of manageability. To discuss as 'Austrian' the influences of such writers as Mannheim, Carnap, Wittgenstein, Lazarsfeld, Schütz and many others of this calibre would be tantamount to writing a large part of the history of contemporary Italian sociology, i.e. the history of the relations between the Italian sociological province and the world metropolis on which it depends.[11] As an operational decision, we would exclude such influences on the ground that they came via the Atlantic detour, not directly across the Alpine borders between the two countries.

On this basis, the main direct connection between Italian and Austrian sociologies seems to be the Gumplowicz-Savorgnan case; and to this we shall dedicate the main part of the present paper. This case study will be preceded,

for obvious reasons of contextualization, by a short outline of the history of Italian sociology. The Gumplowicz-Savorgnan case-study will then emerge, hopefully, not as a mere piece of historiographic erudition, but as representative of important aspects of the evolution of Italian sociology.

The two comings of Italian sociology

It can almost be maintained that there have been two sociologies in Italy. The present one, perhaps a thousand members strong, of whom about half are academics and enrolled in the 'Italian Sociological Association'[12], is a distinctly post-war phenomenon; it can be considered as an aspect of the general 'modernization', i.e. Americanization, of Italian culture and society. The first chair in sociology was instituted by the Allied Authorities in Florence directly after the liberation; the founding fathers of contemporary sociology, such as Franco Ferrarotti, had had extensive experience in the USA. The fifties were marked by an enthusiastic and wholesale translation of American classics, through which also the European - French, German and even Italian - classics were re-discovered, re-legitimated and re-interpreted. Research programmes were supported and research institutes founded with American money, the motive being the need to gain better, more scientific knowledge of the country, and to contribute to its modernization. A certain demand for sociological services - research, counselling - began to develop in private and especially public institutions (planning bodies, local administration, etc.). Scholars from different backgrounds - philosophy, law, economics etc. - developed interest in this 'new' exotic discipline, and began to participate at international sociological meetings. By the end of the fifties, a couple of national sociological congresses had been held, at which scores of scholars and practitioners participated. By the early sixties, there was enough potential demand and enough academic manpower to set up a whole faculty in social sciences (Trento, 1963).

The Trento faculty was meant to supply planning and administrative institutions with a corps of 'social technicians' and 'social engineers'. In the course of the Sixties, however, the mood of the younger generation underwent the set of changes better known as the '68, and students in sociology, in Trento and elsewhere, led the revolt. All over Italy, as all over advanced societies, the students' demands for social studies, especially of a critical, 'revolutionary' sort, grew enormously. The Italian system, rather surprisingly, responded quickly: universities across the country expanded sociological programmes and set up a score of Political Science faculties in which sociology had a prominent role; hundreds of posts for young researchers, assistants and professors were opened, also in an attempt to co-opt and 'buy out' the intellectual leaders of the revolt. Italian sociology veritably exploded, and the consequences of this sudden manifold expansion are still being felt in many ways.[13]

One aspect that may be noted in this context is that although American policies, culture and social sciences were among the main targets of the polemics, the ideological framework within which 'critical sociology' was acted out was essentially a mixture of Parsonian structural-functionalism and young-marxian 'romantic' socialism. In other words, 'established', i.e. bourgeois, capitalist, American sociology was fought with conceptual weapons borrowed mainly from American sociology (and from other intellectual traditions from other parts of the world, of course). To this day, there is little awareness, in Italian sociology, of the importance of other sociological traditions; European, and also Italian. And there is little interest in the history of European and Italian sociological thought. The Metropolis, though attacked, still draws most of the attention of the provinces.

Thus it is not widely known to Italian sociologists that there was a time when Italian sociology was one of the main national schools, whose production was frequently and respectfully cited abroad; a time when the most prominent figures in world sociology sought collaboration with and publication in Italian sociological journals, and Italian social scientists were likewise solicited for conferences and courses abroad.

Of course, the overall dimension of the sociological enterprise was by some magnitude smaller than the present one. There were far fewer workers in the field, with a much smaller output; it was still possible to keep abreast of the total production not only of sociology proper, but of the related fields as well. There were also, consequently, much fewer schools of thought, theories and specializations. But the fact remains that, in that much smaller sociological world, Italy counted for much more than its present share (which, by some indicators, is estimated at about 2%)[14].

This first Italian sociology flourished roughly between 1880 and 1925. It was part of a more general social-reform attitude, heir of the Enlightenment and scientificness; it was motivated by the belief that rational thought and the 'experimental' analysis of social facts would supply the right answers to social problems. It recognized Comte and Spencer as founding fathers, and generally shared a faith in social evolution and progress. It had no inferiority complex towards second-generation sociologists of other nations: the theories of Durkheim, Schäffle, Tönnies, Simmel, Small and all the rest of what is established today as the sociological Pantheon, were freely acknowledged, discussed and criticized. There were also attempts at historical typologies of sociological schools which left their marks on subsequent works of this sort (e.g. F. Squillace's history of sociology, 1902, seems to have been of great help to Sorokin's in 1928). Politically, most sociologists ranged themselves between the liberal and the radical wing; in the parlance of the time they were often 'democrats'. They usually could not accept Marxist socialism, as contradictory to their evolutionary position; some of them accepted social-darwinism's conservative undertones, and indeed this stance marked what survived as the most famous early Italian sociological school - the 'Elitist' trio, Mosca, Pareto and Michels[15]. They were also often anti-clerical, as they felt they were

iests of another religion; some were Jewish, and many free-masons. They ared a strong sense of mission and were very active and productive. Their mes - A. Loria, J. Luzzatto, N. Colajanni, A. Niceforo, G. Sergi, M. A. ccaro, E. Ferri, E. Morselli etc. - were well-known and highly respected in ir times. They formed a rather tightly-knit group, formalized from 1910 in (first) Italian Sociological Association.

They are almost unknown nowadays. The second Italian sociology disclaimed y direct hereditary link with them, save perhaps with the Elitists, and this ly because they happened to remain famous abroad. And even this caused me embarassment. Post-World-War-Two sociology wrote pre-World-War-One ciology into non-existence, mainly in order to present itself as an Immacu- e Conception.

There are many theories on the causes of this alleged thirty-year hiatus in history of Italian sociology. The most current one is that sociology was uffed out by the convergent attacks from fascist authoritarianism and nedetto Croce's authority. Both seem inadequate. Fascism had no overall ilosophy to speak of; there was little in the official doctrines that could in inciple motivate hostility against sociology. On the contrary, many sociolo- cal theories could be - and in fact were - marshalled in support of Fascism ocial Darwinism, elitism, theory of oligarchies, social organicism etc.)[16]. As r Croce, it is true that his idealism and historicism were squarely opposed to sitivistic sociology and to the very idea of a 'science' of society, and the rly sociologists reciprocated with sharp critiques of idealistic philosophies. ut it is hard to maintain that Croce, and even his former colleague Gentile, uld suppress sociology on theoretical grounds alone; their 'dictatorship' over alian culture was not so totalitarian.

Two other theories can be advanced. The first is that early Italian socio- gy was not killed by anyone, it died of internal exhaustion.[17] It had an- unced an era of "salvation through science" that refused to arrive; it was sically a faith in a God, progress, that failed; it had promised a new ap- oach to life and politics that soon ended up in repetitious preachings. After e Great War, the spirit of the times shifted away from the scientific towards more pragmatic, active, decisionist, even revolutionary approach; sociologists st their audience, and often their own faith and stamina.

Another, complementary theory puts the blame on the workings of the ademic system. Early sociology died out because it failed to secure access to d become established in the universities (which in Italy are a most centra- ed system). Early sociologists were either professors of related sciences nostly economics, law, philosophy, but also anthropology, statistics and story) or private scholars (this was especially the case with the strong cilian group). They pressured for the establishment of regular courses and airs in the universities, but in vain. Now, the dynamics of the academic stem are certainly not unrelated to events in the general social, political and ltural context, but they have their own peculiarities, and it may well be that

academic and ministerial contingencies. Sociologists had to keep or accept chairs in other disciplines, and their production was inevitably moulded by that fact. In other words, to survive and progress academically, sociologists had to transform into something else. A frequent destiny was to become statisticians and demographers, the case with some of the most distinguished contributors to the 'Rivista Italiana di Sociologia': after the demise of the journal we find Corrado Gini, Lanfranco Maroi, and Franco Savorgnan as professors in the newly-founded Faculty of Statistics and Demography at the University of Rome. And here we also find a haven in which early sociology in fact survived in uninterrupted if latent tradition, as we shall see later.

Austrian sociology in the 'Rivista Italiana di Sociologia', 1897 - 1923

Early Italian sociologists published in a variety of sources; since 1897 by far the most important one has been the 'Rivista Italiana di Sociologia', published bimonthly in Turin. It is a thick (over 200 pp.), well-organized and handsomely produced journal. It carries two or three major essays, often by prominent foreign scholars, a number of lesser articles, and a wide array of rubrics, reviews of various lengths, summaries, topical bibliographies, and chronicles of various events in the international sociological community (congresses, schools, courses, etc.). One is impressed by the cosmopolitan spirit (in the issues before 1915!), the elevated style, the care for detail, the orderliness and the timeliness. Books and articles are announced and commented on within month of their appearance anywhere in the world. Indeed, great dedication and professional competence must have gone into this enterprise year after year.

The contents are rather ecumenical, both in substance and in space. Most of what appears would nowadays be classified as social philosophy, social history, social administration, social anthropology, philosophy of law, political science. The geographical field of reference covers impartially the whole of Europe and North America; Japan also enjoys a surprising amount of attention. Less civilised areas, of course, are treated in anthropological articles. Some substantial emphases look quaint to the modern reader, but the overall impression is that most topics dear to modern sociology were already being vigorously discussed about a century ago, including for instance the Negro problem in the USA and women's emancipation.

We could not carry out a quantitative content analysis of the magazine, but using the citations and bibliographical references as an indicator, our guess is that French sociology dominates, with German-speaking and English-speaking following, probably equally. Spanish sociology would be fourth, at some distance, but also the Slavic-language sociologies are not overlooked.

Judging by the place of publication, Germany proper dominates the German-language literature, by at least 80%, we estimate. The rest appears to be rather equally distributed between Swiss and Austrian publications. The ap-

that Austrian scholars routinely published in German sources. In passing, it may be noted that the German authors most respected seem to be Simmel and Tönnies, while the 'organicists' (Schäffle etc.; Schäffle of course can also be considered as an Austrian sociologist, see contribution by *Fürstenberg* in this volume) are amiably criticised. What is most curious is the almost total neglect of Max Weber; we have come across only two references to him, one, as a researcher in psycho-physics,[18] and the other as the rather ridiculous maniac of 'Wertfreiheit' at the first congress of the newly-founded German Sociological Association.

In general, and with the large exception of which we shall speak in the next paragraph, Austria does not seem to loom large in the intellectual horizon of the 'Rivista'. We find some reports on the condition of women and child workers, on migration from the Danube areas to the Americas, on ethnic problems, on electoral reforms, on medical care for the working classes, etc. Authors cited in the bibliographies are mostly meaningless to the present writer; the more familar ones include Wilhelm Schmidt, Otto Bauer and Othmar Spann.

References to Austria (Habsburg Empire) grow more frequent in the war years, but in an altogether different spirit. Discussions on the conditions of the national and ethnic minorities - including the Italian one - within the empire had already appeared, predicting that the 'Jailhouse of peoples' was bound for destruction.[19] In 1913 the RIS paid great respect upon his death to the noted Lombrosian social psychologist and criminologist Scipio Sighele, an ardent irredentist prosecuted by the Austrian authorities. The RIS then joined the war effort; Italian sociology, like all other European sociologies, became nationalized.[20]

Gumplowicz in Italian sociology

The one 'Austrian' author to figure prominently in early Italian sociology is Ludwig Gumplowicz. We have no idea why this is so. Perhaps it was his 'realistic' approach, emphasizing power and violence, conquest, domination and conflict that appealed to the heirs of Machiavelli, in contrast to the optimistic rhetoric of organismic and evolutionary sociologies then in fashion. Some reasons for the Italian sympathy for Gumplowicz are summarized in the obituary published by RIS on his death in 1909: "Because he loved liberty, he had great esteem for Italy and felt the Italian question always close to his heart." But this smacks of reconstructed, a-posteriori rationalization; what is hinted at here is that the old fighter for Polish freedom was a supporter of Italy's claims over the 'terre irredente'. Maybe there are other more cogent reasons; the fact remains that his 'Rassenkampf' got a favourable review as early as 1883 in the Neapolitan philosophical journal 'Rassegna critica'; Icilio *Vanni*, one of the driving forces of early Italian sociology, discussed it approvingly in his 'Prime linee di un programma critico di sociologia' (1883); A. Roncali wrote

a 12-page review of Gumplowicz's text, 'Grundriss der Soziologie' (1885) in the 'Giornale degli economisti' in 1886; so did Napoleone Colajanni in an article entitled 'Un sociologo pessimista' published the 'Rivista di filosofia scientifica'.

The extent of these writers' enthusiasm for Gumplowicz can be appreciated by the fact that he was given the honour of opening the first issue of the 'Rivista Italiana di Sociologia' (January 1897) with his essay 'L'origine delle societa umany'; essays by Durkheim and Nowichow were given only second and third place.

Gumplowicz remained a regular contributor to the journal in subsequent years: 'La suggestione sociale' (RIS, Sept. 1900); 'Una legge sociologica della storia' (RIS, Jul-Aug. 1901); 'Le origini storiche dei Serbi e dei Croati' (RIS, Jul.-Aug. 1902); 'La sociologia di Gustav Ratzenhofer' (RIS, May-Aug. 1905); 'La concezione naturalistica dell'universo e la sociologia' (RIS, Jan.-Feb. 1907); 'La sociologia e il suo compito' (RIS, May-June 1908). In the May-June volume of 1913 an article of his appeared posthumously: 'Per la psicologia della storiografia'. Almost unfailingly, his articles were granted the opening position.

Upon his retirement in 1907 the editors of RIS dedicated a warm note to him, as to "one of the first collaborators" where "first" seems to denote both a descriptive-temporal and an appreciative meaning. On his death, the journal dedicated to him, as already stated, a two-page obituary, stressing his scientific achievements, his moral character and his love and interest for Italy.

A perusal of RIS, as well as of other sociological works of the period, easily confirms Gumplowicz's exceptional position. In the journal, all his books and papers are promptly announced, reviewed and discussed; the French translation of his 'Soziologie und Politik', prefaced by Rene Worms (Giard and Briere, Paris 1898) was presented to RIS readers the very same year; his article 'Los von Rom!' was summarized in RIS Jan.-Feb. 1901 (with the title curiously translated as 'Il trionfo di Roma'), and so on. His theories were often and widely discussed by several RIS contributors - in Nov. 1897 by A. Vaccaro in a critical but admiring essay, and in the following years by G. Sergi, G. Mondaini, V. Tangorra and others. Gumplowicz was also frequently cited by other Italian sociologists, such as Gaetano Mosca, not however by Pareto, who preferred to acknowledge the authority of the other Austrian 'conflict' theorist, G. Ratzenhofer.[21] *Gumplowicz* appreciated the Italian interest in his theories and in his 'Geschichte der Staatstheorie' (1905) he reciprocated with admiring remarks on Italian sociology.

Gumplowicz's Italian disciple: Franco Savorgnan

Clearly Gumplowicz had many readers and supporters in Italy, but he also had a disciple in the full sense of the word, someone who studied with him, received his imprint[22] and proceeded to spread the master's word for the rest of his own life. His name was Franco Savorgnan.

It seems useful to dwell a little on this figure, for he seems emblematic of the role of 'marginal men', of 'men of two worlds', of border minorities, in establishing links between neighbouring cultures, in functioning as 'bridges' and 'mediators'[23]. In turn, this supports the theory of the enduring importance of place, space and location in human affairs, even at the more abstract intellectual level, and the theory of 'ecological destiny'[24], in this case, of Trieste, which, as we have seen, had already fulfilled this role in other instances (e.g. psychoanalysis). Savorgnan is also interesting because his career seems typical of many early sociologists, and of the fate of Italian sociology altogether. Finally, it seems just and appropriate to seize this opportunity to take stock of an eminent scholar whom Italian sociologists have completely disowned and forgotten.

Savorgnan was born in Trieste in 1879 of an originally Venetian family grafted onto one of the most powerful seigneurial houses of Friuli, but his was a middle-class, professional branch. As was customary for young men of his class in Trieste, he went to study law at Graz, the nearest university in the Austrian Empire, where he became fascinated by Gumplowicz and sociology. At the age of 23 he translated into Italian the master's 'Die Soziologische Staatsidee' and had it accepted for publication by the RIS publishing house ('Il concetto sociologico dello stato', Torino, 1904). Thus began his career as a regular contributor to the journal. He seems to have been the author of numerous anonymous reviews of (mostly German-language) works, and had at least a score of extended reviews and review articles and a number of original articles and essays published, such as 'Carlo Cattaneo e la sociologia' (Sept.-Dec. 1904), and 'Intorno alla costituzione politica e sociale dei popoli oceanici' (Mar.-Apr. 1907), which was the first of a number of studies in political anthropology, aimed at the corroboration of Gumplowicz's theory on the essential role of conquest in the emergence of the State. He contributed to an important symposium on the theme of social progress (1911). More significant, in the light of the further evolution of his scientific interests and career, are a handful of empirical-quantitative studies on demographic and economic problems in Austria-Hungary, the only major works on the neighbouring country appearing in the Italian sociological journal. Thus in RIS, May-June 1910, he published 'Religione e nazionalita nella scelta matrimoniale', a comparative study of the main cities of the Empire, including Trieste; in Jan.-Feb. 1915, Marcello Boldrini wrote a summary of Savorgnan's 'Il risparmio postale in Austria dal 1882 al 1912', originally published in Trieste in the series of the local Scuola Superiore di Commercio (1914). In the same series Savorgnan had, in 1912, published a major statistical-economic analysis, 'La distribuzione dei redditi nelle provincie e nella grandi citta dell'Austria'. But alongside such studies, which later became dominant in his output, he also cultivated other interests such as ethnic and language problems.

Like many Triestini of his class, he was an Italian patriot (national-liberal, they were called). He started a certain 'irredentist' political activity[25] as early as 1906, and his professional career progressed hand in hand with his civic

'cursus honorum'. He was appointed professor and then director of the Scuol Superiore di Commercio and became a city councillor. On the outbreak of wa (1915), he fled to Italy, becoming active in refugee committees and, after th war, in governmental committees for the settling of Italy's war credits (wit Austria and Germany) and debts (with the U.S.). Professionally he started 'clericus vagans' life in several Italian universities, as professor of statistic mostly in law faculties: Padua 1915, Cagliari 1915-20 (where he acquire tenure), Messina 1921-2, Modena 1922-27, Pisa 1927-9. In 1929 he was final called to the prestigious chair of demography at the university of Rome, an within a few years he rose further to the all-important post of President o the Istituto Centrale di Statistica, Italy's highest authority in statistic matters.

During and immediately after the war he published a number of studies o demographic and economic aspects of the war, and also contributed to th burgeoning literature on Italy's claims to Istria and Dalmatia, in opposition t the Yugoslav claims.[26] In 1925-27 he published, at the university of Moden two collections of his earlier sociological papers, together with some new one under the title 'Studi critici di sociologia'. From then on the word sociolog tends to disappear from his titles. He still refers often to German-languag sources and authorities, but no longer to Gumplowicz. His first love final resurfaced after the Second World War, towards the end of his career, in short article on 'I primi elementi della sociologia gumplowicziana', in one o the first issues of the newly-founded 'Rivista Italiana di demografia e stat stica' (II, 1-2, 1948)[27]. It looks like a ban on the study of sociology had bee lifted, and Savorgnan wished the new cycle to begin in the name of Gumplo wicz. However, things developed a little differently.

As already hinted, the Faculty of Statistics and Demography in Rome wa one of the few refuges of the survivors of the early positivist Italian socio logy. But the driving force here seems to have been Corrado Gini, author o some of the most impressive studies to appear in the RIS, a world authorit on statistics, and heir to Rene Worms at the Secretariat of the Institut Inter national de Sociologie. Gini also had competent and energetic followers, lik Vittorio Castellano, who in the fifties and sixties revitalized sociologica interests and put new life into the institute, culminating with the impressiv XXII. Congress in Rome in 1969. The latest cycle in in the history of Italia sociology had begun.

But it was too late for Savorgnan, who had retired in 1954, almost 50 yea after his master, and died in 1963, the same year when his former junio colleague and commentator at the RIS, Marcello Boldrini, helped to found th Faculty of Sociology in Trento. He did not leave intellectual heirs, at least i the sociological realm, and could not be present at the crucial moments of th Second Coming of Italian sociology; and so he disappeared from the historica memory of Italian sociology.

It is hard to assess the extent to which Savorgnan can be taken as a link a mediator between Italian and Austrian sociologies. Certainly he was instru

mental in strengthening the interest of the RIS in Austrian and German-language literature and problems in general; the impression is that references to this world - by no means unimportant previously - grew quite preceptibly after Savorgnan started his collaboration.

His main merit could have been the penetration of Gumplowicz into Italian sociology, were it not for the hard fact that the latter had already been well-known, read, discussed and admired in Italy almost twenty years before Savorgnan met him and translated his book.

Savorgnan's mediating function in the sociological realm, like that of other Triestino intellectuals in other realms, was effectively destroyed by the nationalist passions that brought about the Great War. Savorgnan sided squarely with his Italian cultural fatherland, and throughout his life after 1915 showed no regrets, afterthoughts or sympathy for the political system to which his home town had belonged in his youth. He does not seem to have done anything after 1918 for the re-establishment of cultural ties between Italian and Austrian scholars, although he retained a certain cosmopolitan outlook that led him to the post of vice-president of the International Statistical Association from 1934 to 1947.

In fact his admiration for Gumplowicz had little if anything to do with his feelings towards Austria; as we have seen, Gumplowicz had been a Polish nationalist and a Jewish nobleman (see *Szacki* in this volume), and many of his theories could be interpreted in an anti-Austrian (i.e. anti-Habsburg, anti-germanic) key. Savorgnan's familiarity with German-language literature, culture and society in general did not produce, apparently, particular feelings of belonging and love; or, if they had in his youth, they were quickly suppressed and superceded by Italian patriotism. This might have been a completely spontaneous process, or it may have been aided, after the war, by the pressures of the new environment. There was little chance in nationalistic and fascist Italy for someone who could be liable to charges of 'austriacantismo'.

Final Remarks

What precedes are merely a few preliminary notes on the subject. A serious study of the influence of Austrian upon Italian sociology would entail a much more systematics analysis of the sources, and perhaps a questionnaire-based survey of contemporary Italian sociologists. Nevertheless this exploratory perusal of a few of the sources, and the opinions of our informants, leads us to formulate the working hypothesis that there is not much more to be found in this field.

We have checked whether important ties existed between Austrian and Italian sociologies of political wings other than the 'radical-liberal-democratic' studied above. Thus there was in Italy a 'Catholic school' of social studies headed by Giuseppe Toniolo and later by Luigi Sturzo. A brief look at their works, and at works about them, failed to produce any substantial evidence.

Almost nothing from German language sources can be found in Sturzo. In Toniolo the references are numerous, perhaps more than to any other culture area, but mostly to German authors proper, and then mostly to economists (he was an adherent of the institutional-historical school of economics) and social reformers, and hardly any to sociologists. He did have contact to the Austrian 'social catholics' or 'catholic reformists' led by Baron Vogelsang, and advocated their cause with the Vatican, but the sociological-scientific import of these ties remains to be evaluated.[28]

Another field of enquiry could be Marxist socialism. Certainly Hilferding was known to some extent in socialist circles in Italy, but it seems rather that the most distinct Austrian contribution to Marxist and socialist theory - that of Max Adler, Otto Bauer and Karl Renner - found no audience whatsoever in Italy. According to one of the few Italian studies of the topic, the ideas of Austro-Marxism were briefly discussed by the socialists of Trieste, but were flatly rejected in the only paper to deal with them in the whole of early Italian Marxist literature, an occasional conference paper by A. Labriola[29].

A survey of contemporary sociologists could yield more precise details of occasional Italian-Austrian cooperation in sociological research in the last two or three decades. Certainly at least two sociological institutions - one rather large, the Faculty of Sociology at Trento, and one much more modest, the Institute of International Sociology at Gorizia - set themselves the goal inter alia of strengthening social-scientific cooperation with Austrian, German and Central-Eastern European colleagues respectively. What resulted in fact was much below the expectations. In the case of Trento, the development toward the northern neighbours was soon shattered by the events of 1968, which involved Trento sociologists in quite different affairs. And there was perhaps a certain amount of hostility on the part of Bozen against the project on the grounds of potential competition and out of fear of 'bilingualism', i.e. fear for the purity of the Tyrolean identity. Trento then established an Italian-German institute of *historical*, not sociological, studies. Only quite recently, under the indefatigable drive of Professor Franco Demarchi, was the project revived and has taken the form of an Italian-German sociological yearbook, appealing to the whole German-speaking area, and thus also to Austria.[30]

Franco Demarchi was also the founder of the Gorizia institute, one of whose very first acts was to establish ties with Austrian institutes dealing with similar topics, in particular with the Österreichisches Ost- und Südost Europa Institut in Vienna. Ties were also sought with other more properly sociological centres, but soon the Gorizia institute developed different interests and little came out in the field of Italian-Austian sociological relations.

As stated in the opening remarks of this paper, the most general cause of this state of affairs can perhaps be found in the common dependence of both Italian and Austrian sociologies on a world-dominating American sociology, which characterized the sociological condition in the Fifties and Sixties. But things have changed substantially since; European sociology has regained status and dignity, initiatives for the setting up of European journals, associa-

tions, research programmes etc. multiply. Sociologists are being weaned away from their old trans-Atlantic fixations, and to a lesser extent, from their national fixations, and are beginning to look around, across their immediate boundaries and to reach out for neighbourly contacts.[31] The initiative of the Austrian Sociological Association seems exemplary in this direction.

More systematic research into the historical and current relationship between national sociological schools in Europe is clearly needed. However, we think that this is a matter for us to build into the future, rather than to search into the past.

Notes

1 E.g. in the several hundred works listed in C. Bono et al., Bibliografia della sociologia italiana, 1969-1975, Angeli, Milano 1978, we could find only one article dealing with an Austrian author, H. Zeisel.

2 We have consulted with Filippo Barbano, F. Demarchi, A. Izzo and G. Sola and gratefully acknowledge their kind help. Sola in particular supplied me liberally with materials and advice based on his large treasure of knowledge of positivistic sociology, of which he is the foremost expert in Italy. Of course, though this paper owes very much to his help, its shortcomings and errors are all my own responsibility.

3 I have already written at length on this in Strassoldo, Il contributo austriaco allo sviluppo delle scienze sociali, in VV.AA, La filosofia nella Mitteleuropa, Atti del convegno, Istituto per gli Incontri Mitteleuropei, Gorizia 1974. Today I would not stress so much Austria's merit in cradling modern positivistic tendencies, quantitative and systemic approaches, etc.; those panegyrics are to be read in the context of Italian sociological tendencies of 1974, still tending mostly towards Marxism, dialectics, the Frankfurt school, discoursive and qualitative speculations, etc. But it seems to me that the main bulk of that analysis (strongly based on Torrance's, The Counter-sociological Influence of Vienna, paper presented at the VIII. ISA World Congress, Toronto 1974), is still defensible.

4 W. Johnston, The Austrian Mind, 1848-1938, University of California Press, 1972. Perhaps more properly, others speak of the Viennese mind. The issue is pursued in my and Torrance's work, supra.

5 An international symposium was held in 1985 in Trieste by M. Accerboni to celebrate the town's role in the spread of psychoanalysis in Italy. In that case the middle man was a physician, Edoardo Weiss, who, like most medical students from Trieste, had studied in Vienna.

6 G. Kanitza, one of the patriarchs of Italy's experimental psychology, studied in Graz. He is still active in Trieste.

7 To this I would only add that Claudio Magris' latest book 'Danube' (Garzanti, Milano 1986) has been on the national bestseller list for several weeks and immediately collected a number of the country's most important literary prizes (Campiello, Bancarella). Claudio Magris, the Germanist from Trieste, was of course the key figure in the starting of the whole Mitteleuropa fashion in Italy with his 1963 book on the subject.

8 Further discussions on the Jewish question can be found in my work (see Note 3); but of course the subject is central to all discussions of 'Mittel-european' culture.

9 The extent to which Hungarian scholars, even with German-sounding names and writing in German, can be labelled 'Austrian' is also a very thorny issue. In most cases, moreover, they were also Jewish. On the amazing explosion of intellectual creativity in this group and its sociological bases, see McCagg (1972). Karl Mannheim is particularly hard to keep within the Austrian concept since he studied in Berlin and conversed mainly with German sociologists.

10 This seems the case for Morgenstern, Lazarsfeld and Luckmann. Deutsch is doing the same for Germany proper.

11 The best sourcebooks for an analysis of these influences are probably the two Italian dictionaries of sociology, Demarchi and Ellena, Dizionario di Sociologia, E Roma 1976 (2nd ed. 1987) and Gallino, Dizionario di Sociologia, UTET Torino 1978.

12 The double life of Italian sociology is formally demonstrated by the vicissitudes professional association. The 'new' one was founded in April 1983 in Viareggio difficult and long gestation. It accepts academic sociologists only, because of the destructive 'invasion' by practitioners and intellectuals of all sorts, since sociology a catch-all, undefinable sphere of life and thought. But a gradual opening up those doing clearly sociological work in other institutions is foreseen. One of the rifts within the sociological community is of course ideological - 'catholics' versus socialists'. But a second line of division is geographical - North versus Rome a South. These tensions notwithstanding, the new AIS seems securely established. W not clear is what happened to the old AIS founded in Rome in 1910 and still ali active in 1962. Renato Treves, then president of the old AIS, helped to establish th one. But Franco Ferrarotti refused to join and still claims to be the president only legitimate, old AIS, although he seems to be alone.

13 Histories of modern Italian sociology are scarce. A bitingly partisan but intellige amusing one is L. Balbo, L'inferma scienza, Bologna 1971.

14 This is alleged to be the proportion of Italian works reported in Sociological Ab and more or less the proportion of Italian participants at the ISA World Congresses.

15 Michels of course was a German and also worked many years in Switzerland, but usually assigned to the 'Italian Elitist school' because of his many ties with this c and because he ended up as professor here.

16 Thus in an official guide of the Istituto Nazionale Fascista di Cultura (N. Evola, e dottrina del fascismo, Sansoni, Firenze 1935), we find sociology among the ac disciplines, and a list of sociological works any good fascist should know, among th course Pareto and Michels.

17 This the hypothesis advanced by G. Sola.

18 RIS, Sept.-Dec. 1909, p. 780. Of course Max Weber did write something on the physical aspects of industrial (textile) work.

19 Thus in RIS, Dec. 1904, V. Recca summarizes a paper on this subject by the Fren G. Weil, and straightforwardly predicts the imminent and necessary dissolution Empire; in 1908 a bitingly irredentist article on the political situation in Trent approvingly summarized.

20 I have lamented and discussed at length the 'nationalization of European sociology' Temi d'sociologia delle relazioni internazionali, op cit.

21 I am indebted to G. Sola for this observation.

22 Savorgnan conserved his correspondence with Gumplowicz with great care all hi this archive certainly deserves to be studied.

23 I have dwelled at length on these and related aspects of the 'theory of borders' border regions, in several papers (see eg. Strassoldo 1976/77; Strassoldo 1969). Of almost everything basic on the subject had already been said by Georg Simmel.

24 By 'ecological destiny' is meant something very similar to 'geographical influenc constancy of some social and cultural phenomena due to the constancy of spatia tions (location, distance etc.). The expression was apparently used by Max Weber, could not locate the source. The role of space in the structuration of social re seems to be undergoing a serious reevaluation in contemporary sociological theor for instance the recent writings of A. Giddens. It has for some time been the focus of the present author's research.

25 Personal communication by Franco Savorgnan's son, Mr. Emilio Savorgnan. I am indebted to him for his most kind and efficient collaboration and for a wealth o bibliographical material on his father.

26 Among which, La question Yougo-slave, 'Scientia' April 1917.

27 According to G. De Meo's obituary in the 'Revue de l'Institut International de S que' v. 31, n. 3, 1963, Savorgnan published in 1928 a preface entitled Soziolo Grundgedanke to Gumplowicz's Soziologische essay, but we could not locate this The same obituary contains a list of Savorgnan's main works, among which the Co demografia, Nistri-Lischi, Pisa 1936. The same source reports a work entitled Be and Gumplowicz: sociological remarks on the fall of the birth rate in France, of 1954.

28 Besides Toniolo's collected works we have consulted AA.VV., Attualita del pensiero di G. Toniolo, Angeli, Milano 1982, and Passerin d'Entreves and Repgen (ed.) Il cattolicesimo politico e sociale in Italia e in Germania dal 1870 al 1914, Il Mulino Bologna 1977.

29 Agnelli, Questione nazionale e socialismo, Il Mulino Bolgna 1969, p 109 n. However, the organ of the Italian socialists, 'La Critica Sociale,' carried an article by Bauer, La via al socialismo, in Feb. 1920.

30 The first issue appeared in 1985. It is an impressive volume of almost 400 pages; each article is in Italian and German. Directors are jointly F. Demarchi (Trento), P. Ammassari (Rome), H.J. Helle (Munich) and A. Zingerle (Bayreuth). There is a larger scientific board, with some of the most prominent Italian and German (Austrian) professors of sociology, and a third tier of other younger scholars that make up the 'staff'.

31 Thus there are talks of a European Sociological Association, a European section of the Social Ecology Committee, and, closer to our concerns, a network of sociologists in the 'Alpe-Adria' area.