PIOTR SZTOMPKA
Jagiellonian University

The Return to Values in Recent Sociological Theory

Abstract: The author reviews two opposite traditional positions on the role of values and value judgements in sociological research and theory: treating values as a bias interfering in research, or treating values as ideology providing privileged access to knowledge. He traces the recent revival of the debate about valuations, focusing particularly on the claims of the so-called "public sociology." Then the author's own position is outlined based on the fundamental particularity of the social sciences as contrasted with the natural sciences. The old argument that values do not follow from facts is acknowledged as true in the sense of logical deduction, but in the social sciences we encounter different mechanism of implication, which may be called "sociological syllogism:" values may follow from facts, and facts may imply values because, on the one hand, people act on their axiological beliefs, and human actions constitute social facts, and on the other hand, social facts (e.g. about poverty, inequality, degradation, crime, terrorism) mobilize moral impulses and valuational commitments. In other words values shape meanings of human actions and resulting social facts, and the knowledge of facts acquires valuational meaning by mobilizing human axiological impulses. The strict separation of facts and values does not work in the social sciences; there is a two-directional link between the two. This opens the possibility for "sociological ethics" deriving normative standards of social life from the research results of sociology.

Keywords: Values, value-judgments, valuations, ideology, syllogism, meaning, moral impulse

Why "the Return"?

The problem of value judgments and their role in sociological thinking is one of the perennial riddles of sociology. Already for the founding fathers of the discipline in the 19th century the distinction of scholarly, fact-oriented and moral, normative discourse created grave difficulties. Their intellectual roots were in philosophy—political philosophy, philosophy of history, philosophical anthropology, ethics—and hence they were ready to speak about "good society," "social progress," "human nature," "justice" etc., all these notions infused with valuations. At the same time their ambition was to create a "science" of society, and in their days it was synonymous with "positive science," focusing on facts, data, and at most observable relations of coexistence or temporal sequence among facts. They were not able to solve this dilemma and in their writings we can find parallel, sometimes overlapping, sometimes separate forms of discourse: just reporting but also critical, descriptive and prescriptive, explanatory and visionary, fact-oriented or stipulating values.

Then, in the 20th century the aspiration to be truly "scientific" in order to safeguard for sociology the legitimate position in the academic institutions, became dominant. For a long time the positivist creed has been ruling, with the attempt to purge values

from sociological, empirical inquiry, and either ignore them altogether or allow only as data of social consciousness disclosed by value surveys and opinion polls, and treated just like any other facts, at a distance, with "cold," detached, and purely descriptive attitude. This was typical for the whole epoch of narrow empiricism, trapped in the futile attempt to catch up with the standards of the natural sciences. Any trace of value judgments was considered unscientific.

And it is only recently that sociology opens again toward values and embraces values again as an integral, legitimate component of sociological work. But it does not indicate simple return to the masters who were torn—as we have seen—by ambivalence, because the riddle of valuations is approached in an entirely new way. To render this novelty clear I will leave a historical overview and introduce an analytic typology of three ways in which values have been treated in sociology: (a) as a bias, (b) as an ideology, (c) as a part of meaning.

Values as a Bias

The first position treats values as personal and subjective biases, which sociologists, being human, cannot avoid and which interfere in research. They are the nuisance, obstacle to valid, many-sided and "objective" knowledge. Therefore they must be briddled, tamed, controlled or if possible entirely eliminated from the domain of science.

Let us look at some influential examples of such an approach. Herbert Spencer in *The Study of Sociology* (1894) gives a list of pernicious biases to which researchers should be sensitized and which should be avoided. They create "difficulties in the way of sociological science which arise from the various emotions excited by the matters it deals with" (Spencer 1903 [1894]). He discusses the educational bias, the bias of patriotism, the class bias, the political bias, the theological bias etc. The remedy he proposes, in a typical positivist mood, is rigorous traininng of sociologists in some fields of natural science which would provide them with the requisite discipline of thought insulating against biases.

In a similar vein Emile Durkheim in *The Rules of Sociological Method* (1897) recommends suspending all presuppositions, coming to research with open, clear and unprejudiced mind and assuming a detached, objective attitude "treating social facts as things" (of course not in the ontological sense of material objects, but as a methodological posture akin to that of the natural scientists). "The sociologist must emancipate himself from the fallacious ideas that dominate the mind of the layman" (Durkheim 1962 [1897]: 32).

A more sophisticated solution is proposed by Max Weber in the famous doctrine of "Wertfreiheit." First, he distinguishes teaching from research, demanding complete neutrality and objectivism of educational, pedagogical work. It is illegitimate to assert values from the lectern, the students must only be given intellectual resources for their own valuational conclusions. The role of academic teacher must be separate from the role of active citizen. Entering the lecture hall professors should leave

their ideological views, like a coat in the cloakroom. Second, within the research process proper, Weber distinguishes the heuristic phase (what Hans Reichenbach called later "the context of discovery" (1949) and the research phase (in the language of Reichenbach "the context of justification"). Whereas values are admitted and even inndispensible for the selection of problems and shaping tentative hypotheses, the solving of problems, testing hypotheses and validating solutions must be entirely value-free. "There must be a rigorous distinction between empirical knowledge and value judgments" (Weber 1949: 49). "An empirical science cannot tell anyone what he should do—but rather what he can do—and under certain circumstances what he wishes to do" (Weber 1949: 54). Third, values that the people hold to (as different from the values of the researcher) are the crucial subject matter of sociological research, because human reality, in Weberian account, is pervaded with values, which are its indispensable, constitutive dimension. But values can be studied in value-free, scientific mood. Sociology of religion is not the same as theology, sociology of morals—not the same as ethics, political science—not the same as ideological doctrine.

In the 20th century sociology we find very characteristic pronouncement of similar approach in Gunnar Myrdal's little book *Objectivity in the Social Sciences* (1969). He focuses on stereotypes, prejudices and folk wisdom which influence the researcher. And argues that "disinterested social science has never existed and for logical reasons can never exist" (1969: 55). The only road to objectivity in the social sciences is not to pretend freedom from values, to hide inevitable valuations, but "to raise the valuations actually determininng our theoretical as well as practical research to full awareness" (1969: 5), and then to reveal them frankly and openly together with research results. In other words: "to expose the valuations in full light, make them conscious, specific and explicit (1969: 56). The open disclosure of valuations, the debate and clash among competing biases will neutralize and eliminate their impact, leading to a more objective picture of the social world.

Values as Ideology

The second traditional approach to values treats them as synonymous with ideologies, i.e. not as pernicious individual, subjective biases but just the reverse—as cognitively beneficial and enlightening collective perspectives, not blocking but actually facilitating the access to true knowledge. The central claim is rooted in the so-called sociology of knowledge and goes as follows: the existential social situation of researchers and different cognitive horizons which attach to that, give them unequal opportunities for reaching full and adequate knowledge about society. Social knowledge is therefore always perspectivistic, ideological, reflects interests and values. But—and this is a crucial proviso—not all ideologies are equal in cognitive chances. One should identify the conducive, fruitful perspectives from which society should be approached to obtain best cognitive results.

    This implies the search in two directions. The first is taken by Karl Mannheim: he identifies groups whose existential condition makes them least polluted by particularistic interests and values. Their universalistic *Weltanshauung* guarantees impartiality. In *Ideology and Utopia* he points to the "free-floating unattached intellectuals" as those who are predisposed for objectivity (Mannheim 1960). The second direction is taken by Karl Marx and some later Marxists, as well as other brands of left-wing scholars. They search for groups whose particularistic perspective is most revealing, giving privileged access to the truth about society. In other words: instead of affirming universalism, they affirm some, supposedly eye-opening particularism. There are two suggestions. According to one it is the positions of oppressed, excluded, discriminated against, the underdogs which open the eyes to true problems of society. They do not hide realities, just the reverse, it is in their best interests to reveal the mechanisms of exploitation, identify the exploiters, and debunk their ideologies. The classical formulation comes from Marx himself and is elaborated by Georgy Lukacs in *History and Class Consciousness* (Lukacs 1971); the sociologist should adopt the perspective of the proletariat. Members of this class, most oppressed, exploited and de-humanized in the capitalist system "have nothing to lose but their chains" as Marx and Engels put it in the *Communist Manifesto* (Marx and Engels 1998 [1848]), so they do not have any interest in hiding oppressive social realities. Some more recent version of this approach can be found in the radical sociology which calls for the adoption of the perspective of the minorities, as well as in the feminist sociology which considers the perspective of women as cognitively privileged and demands purging sociology of the one-sided and distorting "masculine gaze." The alternative way to search for privileged epistemological position is suggested by the proponents of what Robert K.Merton ridicules and criticizes as the doctrine of "insiderism," namely the belief that knowledge can be attained only by direct experience, reliving the social situations from the inside (e.g. that Blacks may be only understood by Blacks, women by women, homosexuals by homosexuals) (Merton 1973).

Areas of Commonality Between Two Approaches

At the first glance the negative view of values as detrimental bias, and the positive view of values as facilitating ideology, are fundamentally opposite. But in their extremism neither seems to be fully satisfactory. In order to overcome both extreme positions one must unravel some basic, deeper-lying assumptions that they both share. Only by identifying and then rejecting such assumptions we shall be able to formulate a third approach, more adequate than the other two (for the explication and various applications of this strategy see: Sztompka 1979).

    There are several common assumptions of both traditional approaches. First, and most importantly, they take for granted the radical dichotomy of facts and values, categorical statements and value judgments, so strongly advocated by positivist, neo-positivist and all other "scientistic" models of science. As we remember one position claims that in the context of inquiry values are bad, another that values are good, but

none questions the fundamental distinction of values from facts. They are particularly adamant in emphasizing that no facts can ever imply values. And equally strongly that no values can imply facts. Second, both approaches focus on researchers, the values they personally hold, rather than the values pervading their subject-matter, shared by the members of society, embedded in a culture and acquiring the quality of Durkheimian "social facts" (Durkheim 1962). Third, both approaches locate values in the research process, as its distorting or enabling factor, rather than in the content of the research results, as the component of their meaning. Fourth, both approaches seem to believe in the strict separation of research process from the subject of research, an external relationship between students of society and the society being studied.

Taken for granted, one may say paradigmatic for a long time, these assumptions started to be undermined by two kinds of developments. The new approach to the riddle of valuations has been made possible by the intellectual, intrinsic changes in the discipline of sociology , linked to the ontological, real changes in sociology' subject matter, the human society.

Some Tendencies of Current Sociology

Already long ago the discipline witnessed the anti-naturalistic and anti-positivistic turn, symbolized by the names such as Max Weber, George Herbert Mead, Florian Znaniecki, Talcott Parsons, then followed the subjectivist turn in the sixties with the work of Erving Goffman, Harold Garfinkel, or Alfred Shutz, then the culturalist turn announced by Jeffrey Alexander, Steven Seidman and the whole school of "cultural studies." As a result by the end of the 20th century the humanistic sociology, or as some called it "the second sociology" (Dawe 1970), gained ascendance and now seems dominant . It focuses on human action and conceives of it as meaningful, with a particular stress on normative and axiological orientation drawn from a culture.

The relatively new tendency is the treatment of society as an incessant process, rather than stable system, as a fluid field of forces in permanent transformation, rather than fixed structure, or metaphorically—as social life rather than social organism. Examples of such perspective can be found in Anthony Giddens' idea of structuration rather than structure, Norbert Elias' concept of figurations rather than forms, Pierre Bourdieu's focus on practices, or my own on emphasis on social becoming rather than social being (Sztompka 1991).

Third trend is the break away from evolutionism, developmentalism and all other deterministic, fatalistic and finalistic views of change (which Karl Popper put under the label of "historicism") and instead focusing on constructing, making history by human agency (Sztompka 1993) . Most sociologists would now treat the people, either individual or in collectivities, and their actions either single or collective, as the ultimate driving force of all social processes, with every stage seen as construction, achievement by social actors, and the direction of the process as contingent on what people choose and do. A highly elaborated statement of this perspective is provided

by Margaret Archer in the theory of morphogenesis (Archer 1986, 1995, 2000). I join the same stream of theorizing with my theory of social becoming (Sztompka 1991).

As the fourth novelty we have witnessed the discovery of the phenomenon of reflexiveness (pre-figured by the Mertonian concepts of self-fulfilling and self-destroying prophecies), indicating that in the human society, as distinct from the world of nature, the very knowledge about society feeds-back on its subject matter, directly influencing people's beliefs, their motivations and consequently their actions. This idea became the foundation of the whole theory of reflexive modernity by Anthony Giddens, Ulrich Beck, Scott Lash and others.

Fifth, we observe the refocusing the attention of sociologists from the macro-structural to micro-processual level, or in other words to the domain of everyday life or the "life-world," as central area of social functioning. The switch started with Goffman's dramaturgical theory, Garfinkel's ethnomethodology, Schutz's and then Berger and Luckman fenomenological sociology, and is currently represented by the theory of "interaction ritual chains" by Randall Collins (Collins 2004), the "radical microsociology" of Jonathan Turner (Turner 2002), and the proclamation of the new "performative turn" by Jeffrey Alexander, Bernd Giesen and others (Alexander et al. 2006).

The last and sixth tendency is the extention of the notion of society from the level of nation-state to the global level of humanity, and demonstrating how the processes of globalization impinge upon the life-world of common people and their consciousness and imagination. Extending their horizon, providing with spatially unlimited, and rich information and opinions via mass media and new techniques of telecommunication, they radically transform awareness of the masses. Running under the label of cosmopolitan vision this view of current societies is particularly strongly elaborated by Martin Albrow and Ulrich Beck (Albrow 1997, Beck 2006).

New Tendencies in Human Society

Such intellectual trends within sociology are never detached from the actual course of social life. They were to a great extent responsive to the changes in the nature of human societies in the current period known as late modernity, reflexive modernity or simply second modernity. After all, sociology is nothing else but the intellectual reflex of society. As Jeffrey Alexander puts it: "Understanding and changing the world simply cannot be separated. (…) If the world is itself based on collective understandings, then changing the world always involves, in some large part, changing these understandings" (Alexander 2003: 193). Changing of society and changing of social theory to some extent coincide. And at the turn of centuries sociologists have observed a number of new crucial phenomena.

First, the acceleration and growing pervasiveness of social change as such, including its peak revolutionary manifestations, resulting in phenomena of anomie, trauma, anxiety, uncertainty and disorientation. These makes common people more often ask

the questions: where we are, where we are coming from, where we are moving, and is it good or bad? Among other sources they turn to sociology for enlightment.

Second, we are witnessing expanding democratization and liberalization, crucially enlarging the field of opportunities and options for making history by human agents, individual or collective (voters and consumers, social movement and political parties), and making their choices decisive for future developments. Recognizing their growing power people want to use it rationally, and among other sources they also look to sociology for advice.

Third, there is the educational revolution, which has made masses of people generally more knowledgeable and particularly more sensitive and receptive to the knowledge about themselves, to the self-awareness provided among other fields—by sociology.

Fourth, there is the growing saturation of the life-world with mass media, as well as new communication and telecommunication technologies opening unprecedented opportunities for public debate, in which sociology becomes an important resource.

Last but not least, there is ongoing process of globalization which sensitizes the people to the universal dimensions of human fate, global solidarity, human rights, and pushes them to search solutions for the new scale of problems in, among other sources, sociological knowledge.

Some Steps Toward a New Perspective on Values

As a result of all these sociological and societal changes the problem of values returns to the fore of sociological debate. There are several steps leading to the new solution of this old issue. Again, let us start from a historical overview, to turn later to analytical considerations.

At the end of the century we observe the revival of the influence of C.Wright Mills, and particularly his book on *Sociological Imagination* (1959). In the plebiscite for the books of the century among members of ISA in 1998, this book came close to the top, right after Max Weber's *Economy and Society*. Mills collected works have just been re-edited, his biography has been rewritten. And Mills was quite straightforward about the problem of valuations: "By their work all students of man and society assume and imply moral and political decisions. (…) There is no way in which any social scientist can avoid assuming choices of values and implying them in his work as a whole" (1959: 76, 177).

In 2000 Ben Agger argues in his *Public Sociology* for personalized and normative style of sociology able to enter a dialogue with wider publics. "Scholarly rigor would be mixed with perspective and passion, turning sociology outward toward a world that calls it forth" (Agger 2000: 264). In his view if an author writes in the genre of public sociology "she acknowledges that her text both constructs the world and intervenes in it deliberately" (ibid.: 258). "Good sociology is unashamed of its advocacy, grounding objectivity in choices" (ibid.: 257).

A year later in 2001 Bent Flyvbjerg publishes *Making Social Science Matter*, where he formulates the principles of—what he calls after Aristotle's distinction of *episteme* (i.e. cognitive account), *techne* (i.e. application of knowledge) and *phronesis* (prudent advice on practice referring also to values)—the phronetic approach. "The point of departure for classical phronetic research can be summarized in the following three value-rational questions: "Where are we going?," "Is this desirable?," "What should be done?"" (Flyvbjerg 2001: 60). The whole point of the study is to enter into a dialogue with individuals and society and to assist them —after they have assisted the researchers—in reflecting on their values. The aim is to make moral debate a part of public life" (ibid.: 63).

In 2003 Jeffrey Alexander declares in *The Meanings of Social Life* that "unless we recognize the interpenetration of science and ideology in social theory, neither element can be evaluated or clarified in a rational way (Alexander 2003: 197), and argues for the new brand of theories which "must be pushed to maintain a de-centered, self-conscious reflexivity about their ideological dimensions even while they continue in their efforts to create a new explanatory scientific theory. For only if they become aware of themselves as moral constructions—as codes and as narratives—will they be able to avoid the totalizing conceit" (ibid.: 228).

In 2004 *The British Journal of Sociology* organizes a debate about "making social science useful" where the leitmotif is the role of sociology as "part of a democratic conversation" (Lauder, Brown and Halsey 2004: 8). The participants are almost unanimous: "The concept of self-reflexivity suggests that agents can now be more knowledgeable about themselves and their place in the world and should be included in any debate about policies concerning fundamental social problems" (ibid.). Therefore the role of sociology in democratic public debate is growing.

The same year 2004 Michael Burawoy delivers a presidential address at the American Sociological Association sentennial convention in San Francisco titled "For Public Sociology" (Burawoy 2005a). He claims that because sociology is now formally established and acquired a solid corpus of knowledge, the time has come to return its debt to society, and it can afford to return to the consideration of values. "We have spent a century building professional knowledge, translating common sense into science, so that now we are more than ready to embark on a systematic back-translation, taking knowledge back to those from whom it came, making public issues out of private troubles, and thus regenerating sociology's moral fiber. (ibid.: 2). "Reflexive knowledge interrogates the value premises of society as well as our profession" (ibid.: 8). "Public sociology brings sociology into a conversation with publics, understood as people who are themselves involved in conversation. It entails, therefore, a double conversation" (ibid.: 4). In his perspective public sociology builds a bridge between sociologists and common people, and therefore constitutes a new development complementary to three traditional brands of sociology: professional sociology and critical sociology engaging exclusively the sociologists, and policy sociology linking sociologists in a service relationship with the clients dictating goals. Burawoy identifies the forerunners of public sociology: W. E. B. DuBois of *The Souls of Black Folk* (1903), Gunnar Myrdal of *American Dilemma* (1944), David Riesman of *Lonely*

Crowd (1950)—the all time sociological bestseller—and Robert Bellah's *Habits of the Heart* (1985).

Very soon after publishing Burawoy's 'manifesto' the rich debate evolves on pages of *The British Journal of Sociology* (vol. 56, No. 3/2005). Craig Calhoun indicates the possible contributions of sociology to public debate: "part of what sociology brings to public discourse is greater capacity for critical analysis of the possibilities open beyond existing circumstances, of the social conditions for realizing those possibilities, of the interests served by existing institutions, and of the reasons for the blindspots in many intellectual arguments" (Calhoun 2005: 358). Richard Ericson is explicit about the necessity of valuations in public sociology and he singles out the points where valuations inevitably enter: "as analysts of principled courses of action, sociologists cannot escape making choices among preferred principles and thereby contribute to policy. They make such choices in the topics they select for research, the classifications they construct, the analyses they undertake, and the techniques through which they structure their research communications" (Ericson 2005: 368). Amitai Etzioni ridicules value-free experts: "public sociologists who believe they can contribute to dialogues on public matters by merely relying on and referring to evidence (which by itself tends to reflect normative assumptions) are mistaken. Whatever position they take has normative implications" (Etzioni 2005: 374). Saskia Sassen emphasizes heuristic role of the dialogue with sociology's subjects, common people, as a corrective for some blind spots of professional sociology: "part of having a vigorous public sociology is that we can work at theorizing with our publics accepting that they also can theorize—can see, and may indeed see what we cannot see, because we are blinded by the enormous clarity of our theories" (Sassen 2005: 403). In summarizing the discussion Burawoy puts an emphasis on the normative (valuational) dimension of public sociology: "Public sociology (…) makes both dialogue and normative stances central to its preoccupation" (Burawoy 2005b).

The New Approach: Valuations as Construction of Meaning

I submit that in all these recent statements and comments, values are no longer treated as a bias, nor as an ideology, but as the immanent part of meaning that informs human individual and collective action. This is the third, new approach to the role of values. More specifically it involves four claims. First, an obvious point for the whole humanistic, anti-positivist sociology—that people endow their actions, situations, institutions with meaning. Second, that meaning is drawn from various sources (tradition, religion, mass media etc.). Third, that meanings are shaped in the dialogue, debate—what I like to call "meaning industry"—both direct through conversation and indirect through mass media, literature, art, movies and dramas. The scope for such dialogue is growing. Fourth, that one of the sources of meaning attaining growing importance in this dialogue, an important component of "meaning industry" in our time, is sociology: its data, concepts, models and theories. And fifth, that sociological research results of all kinds include or at least imply values.

If we accept such an approach to values, all assumptions of the traditional approaches, common for both the view of values as a bias, and the view of values as ideology are reversed. First, the focus is now on the values held by the members of society, and the way in which values help them to make sense of their life, rather than on the values held by sociologists.

Second, the role of sociology in promoting values as tools for the meaning-construction by common people is recognized. And accordingly the role of a sociologist is redefined. The question of Alfred McClung Lee: "Sociology for whom?," who are the addressees of sociological knowledge, (Lee 1976) is answered in a new way, by adding one more type of audiences. Most often two roles, and respective audiences were mentioned before. Sociologist as an explorer, pure scholar—was seen as addressing other sociologists, subjecting the results to the scrutiny of the "peers." That was a typical role in the domain of pure social science, serving Aristotelian "Episteme." On the other hand a sociologist as an expert was seen as addressing the power holders with instrumental advice concerning sociologically justified means to ends as defined by them. This kind of service-role was treated as typical for applied social science, social engineering, socio-technique etc. It served Aristotelian "Techne." Now, in the third role, sociologist as a mentor is seen as engaging with common people with both factual and unashamedly axiological messages. One purpose of this contact is promoting certain values. Another is debunking, unravelling the false assumptions and pernicious implications of prejudices, stereotypes, "derivations" (Pareto), "false consciousness" (Marx). Doing all this a sociologist is serving Aristotelian "Phronesis" i.e. providing prudent practical wisdom, or to put it in different terms is involved in Dahrendorf's "representative actions" (Dahrendorf 1980) indicating the pool of possible futures for the wider public. Whether knowingly or not a sociologist becomes a Burawoy's "public sociologist" involved in axiological dialogue with the common people. Taking up this kind of a role is ever more common. "Public sociology is flourishing. It simply does not have a public profile but operates in the interstices of society in neighbourhood, in schools, in classrooms, in factories, in short, wherever sociologists find themselves" (Burawoy 2005b: 426).

The next traditional assumption which falls down has to do with locating valuations in research practices. The new approach locates values in research results, which become the resource, pool of values to be used by common people in the construction of meaning (rather than by professional sociologists in the process of research). What types of results sociology can provide which may either directly include valuations, or indirectly imply values? Here another famous question posed by Robert Lynd (1939) is relevant: "Sociology for what?" There are five types of such results.

Sociology articulates special vocabulary, the language, concepts for thinking about society and necessary for identifying phenomena and events, pinning down the significant aspects of social life. Many sociological concepts entered the vernacular. Some are new, invented by sociologists, e.g. social role, role models, status, self-fulfilling prophecy, social capital, stigma, social class, exclusion, habitus. Others have acquired new sociologically clarified meaning e.g. ideology, culture, deviance, identity. Among them we find a special category of concepts with strong valuational content e.g. justice,

equality, meritocracy, consensus, democracy, equilibrium, trust, development, modernization, trauma, progress and many others. They immediately "smuggle" values into public debate.

Sociology provides descriptions: the mirrors in which society can look at itself, recognize its traits, distribution of beliefs, degree of conflict etc.. Statistical data, survey data, opinion polls, value studies etc. are intentionally objective, detached. Even when they report about values, they do not articulate valuations themselves. And yet, as I shall argue they often have indirect valuational implications.

Sociology constructs models and theories, the maps of social terrain which specify the mechanisms, regularities of social phenomena, the overall, generalized pictures of social life. Again, we shall argue that they have strong valuational implications.

Sociology may paint the visions of the future, the images of the good society, social utopias, scenarios of possible development discerning progressive from regressive alternatives. Here valuations are directly formulated.

Finally, sociology may formulate the agendas of problems to be solved. Here it answers directly the question "Sociology of what?" It identifies coming challenges, vital social issues, pressing concerns as defined by the members of society, in a word real "social problems," rather than intra-disciplinary "sociological problems" attended to by sociologists. Here the strongest input of common people may be discerned. And of course the choice of problems, their hierarchy of importance assumes and implies values.

Sociological Syllogism

Thus we come to the strongest, primary assumption shared by traditional approaches, namely that values do not follow from any facts (research results), nor any facts follow from values. This is a strict dichotomy of facts and values fundamental for positivist view of science.

Even assuming that it is true in the natural sciences, in the social sciences the peculiar epistemological relation of the researcher (the sociologist) and the object studied (society, consisting of self-aware people), inescapably brings valuations into the cognitive process. Even assuming that logically, in the deductive sense values do not follow from facts, one should accept that they are implied by sociological claims in the other way which I would call "sociological syllogism" rather than "logical implication." It operates in five ways. First, the sociological results may provide the language for speaking about society which favors certain values. This is the valuational load of sociological concepts. For example discussing community, consensus, cooperation, democracy, trust promotes some values, contrary to the language of hatred, struggle, suspicion or xenophobia.

Second, sociological results may mobilize emotions and moral impulse strengthening attached values This is the role of sociological descriptions and diagnoses. For example learning about the scale of human poverty and degradation may mobilize compassion or altruism, unraveling the atrocities of war may galvanize the value of

peace, finding out about the beliefs and opinions of others may break "pluralistic ignorance" and mobilize solidarity and activism. Here we may also recall the early intuitions of Emile Durkheim in his paradoxical claim about the positive functions of crime. Namely the criminal act, and the information about it, awakens moral impulse, allows the people to draw a clear border between behavior which is good, and one which is bad, to define the limits of virtue and of sin. Currently in the widely reported phenomenon of "moral panics" as mass reactions to particularly shocking or widespread deviances or social pathologies, we observe the same situation when facts "sociologically imply" values.

But the truly central role as the suggestive source of values is played, third, by sociological models and theories. They persuade that certain values are functional and other dysfunctional for the operation of society, and even that some are necessary imperatives. For example the theory of social becoming which emphasizes the role of agency in permanent self-transformation of society, implies the values of activism, freedom, equal life-chances, democratic constitution of the field of opportunities— as pre-requisites for the creative making of history. On the other hand all brands of evolutionism or developmentalism assuming some inexorable Laws of History working above human heads, imply passivism, adaptation and wait-and-see attitude. Models and theories may also show the link between—what C. Wright Mills called— "private troubles and public issues" (Mills 1959), or in other words between the micro-experiences of everyday life and macro-structural and historical processes. In this way they help to shape "sociological imagination" sensitive to public issues and concerned with the huge social and historical tendencies as they impinge on our fate. To pay attention, to participate, to be active—become valuational implications of such a perspective. Finally, theories demonstrate that in our time most phenomena and processes attain global dimensions, and that human fate is decided no longer within the tribe, local community, ethnic group, or even nation-state, but at the level of humanity as a whole. Theories of globalization produce "global awareness," or "global imagination," which in turn imply such values as cosmopolitanism, transnational solidarity, tolerance, pluralism and diversity, inclusion, personal dignity, human rights etc. Their important quality is that they are universalistic, rather than particularistic values. They do not represent certain classes (like Marx's proletariat), or certain groups (like Mannheim's "unattached intellectuals," or Becker's outsiders) but the humanity as a whole. The quintessential codification of such values is provided by the catalogues of "human rights."

Fourth, sociological results may suggest which scenarios for the future action are beneficial for society and which are destructive, by unraveling the whole spectrum of unintended and unrecognized consequences, side effects, boomerang effects and the whole "balance of functions and dysfunctions" of various alternatives. This is the role of sociological visions. For example the projections of the consequences of unfettered growth and unrestrained exploitation of resources, allow to stipulate sustainable development, harmony with nature and other ecological values.

Finally, sociologists may sensitize the people to the neglected or ignored values by including them in their research.. Through articulating and ordering values in

a set of preferences in the research instruments (interviews, questionnaires, focus-group debates etc.). they may influence societal, common-sense definition of pressing problems and issues, and change priorities of individual or collective actions. This is the role of sociological agendas. For example the very study of poverty, or corruption, or injustice may mobilize the research-subjects to ponder about these pathologies of social life and take measures to eradicate them.

All these five situations demonstrate how scientific results may carry in themselves or imply values. In other words how "facts" widely understood, due to the "sociological syllogism" are consequential for values. But "sociological syllogism" has also the reverse vector. It shows contrary to positivistic claim that values may engender facts. How come? This seems more obvious. The early intuition was phrased already by Karl Marx: "Ideas become material forces if they mobilize the masses" (Marx 1964 [1844]). This claim may be unpacked in the following way. If we assume the standpoint of humanistic "second sociology" society is constituted of human actions—individual and collective. Society becomes what it is only due to certain actions taken up by its members. People act on their beliefs, incorporating them in the motivations, reasons, incentives, justifications for action. Among their beliefs we find values which push people to action in their defense or for their affirmation. Thus values which people hold to, which become widespread, embedded in a culture as Durkheimian "social facts," in important sense determine what people do, and thus what the society is like. Innumerable illustrations from history show how acting on such values as justice, equality, sovereignty, solidarity etc. people were basically and fundamentally changing their societies, eg. through revolutions. Thus values "sociologically imply" hard, factual realities of social life.

Sociological Ethics

The valuations accepted and applied by the common people in their choices and decisions make up the ethos of a group, community or society. The clearly articulated and organized sets of values proposed by the intellectuals, philosophers, moralists, politicians—and sociologists—make up the various ethical systems. They are tanta-mount to good, right, proper, in a word condoned ethos. This obviously involves a sort of meta-evaluation: judgement about the merit of some values as opposed to others.

There are many ways to justify, legitimize ethical systems and argue for their preponderance, e.g. by reference to God, revelation, intuition, to natural law, com-mon emotions. And thus many ethical systems, variously justified, compete for social attention and acceptance, for the chance of being turned into dominant ethos.

I propose a sociological justification: values worth defending are inferred by what I have called "sociological syllogism" from the mechanisms of social life as unravelled by sociology, its concepts, diagnoses, explanations, visions and agendas. This is a vari-ety of the argument from Natural Law. Except that it focuses on something akin to the Social Law, the ways society really operates which are slowly unraveled by sociology. The "sociological ethics" should enter as an important competitor into the contest of

ethical systems. As its strength one may indicate that it does not derive from faith, or intuition, or whims of emotions, but from scientific study of society. As long as we believe in the privileged status of science as the way to knowledge, this argument has to be taken seriously.

Choice is the fundamental human predicament, values as criteria of choice are indispensable components of human existence. People draw values from various pools, articulate values, apply values and make choices in incessant dialogue, debate, conversation with their fellows—both direct and indirect, both with living and dead. In this way they give meaning, make sense of their personal situations and biographies, social environments and histories of their society. There is no reason why sociologists should stand aside, excuse themselves from this universal human game of meaning-construction, and remain passive, detached onlookers. According to the new conception of valuations that I have tried to present in this article, they should rather engage their wisdom—together, aside or against other voices—in the public axiological debate, contributing with their sociologically grounded values to higher collective rationality.

References

A g g e r, B. 2000. *Public Sociology*. Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield.
A l b r o w, M. 1997. *The Global Age; State and Society Beyond Modernit*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
A l e x a n d e r, J. 2003. *The Meanings of Social Life*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
A l e x a n d e r, J. et al. 2006. *Social Performance; Symbolic Action, Cultural Pragmatics and Ritual*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
A r c h e r, M. 1986. *Culture and Agency*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
A r c h e r, M. 1995. *Realist Social Theory; The Morphogenetic Approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
A r c h e r, M. 2000. *Being Human; The Problem of Agency*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
B e c k, U. 2006. *The Cosmopolitan Vision*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
B e l l a h, R. et al. 1985. *Habits of the Heart; Individualism and Commitment in American Life*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
B e l l a h, R. et al. 1991. *The Good Society*. New York: Knopf.
B u r a w o y, M. 2005a. "For Public Sociology." *The British Journal of Sociology* 2: 259–294.
B u r a w o y, M. 2005b. "Response: Public sociology: populist fad or path to renewal?" *The British Journal of Sociology* 3: 417–432.
C a l h o u n, C. 2005. "The promise of public sociology." *The British Journal of Sociology* 3: 355–363.
C o l l i n s, R. 2004. *Interaction Ritual Chain*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
D a h r e n d o r f, R. 1980. "On representative activities," in: T. Gieryn, (ed.), *Science and Social Structure: a Festschrift for Robert K. Merton*. New York: New York Academy of Sciences.
D a w e, A. 1970. "The Two Sociologies." *The British Journal of Sociology* 2: 207–218.
D u r k h e i m, E. 1962. *The Rules of Sociological Method*. New York: Free Press.
D u B o i s, W. E. B. 1903. *The Souls of Black Folk*. New York: A. C. McClurg.
E r i c s o n, R. 2005 "Publicizing Sociology." *The British Journal of Sociology* 3: 365–372.
E t z i o n i, A. 2005. "Bookmarks for Public Sociologists." *The British Journal of Sociology* 3: 373–381.
F l y v b j e r g, B. 2001. *Making Social Science Matter*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
L a u d e r, H., B r o w n, P., and H a l s e y, A. H. 2004. "Sociology and Political Arithmetic: Some Principles of a New Policy Science," *The British Journal of Sociology* 1: 3–22.
L e e, Alfred McClung. 1976. "Sociology for Whom?" *American Sociological Review* 41: 926–936.
L u k a c s, G. 1971. *History and Class Consciousness*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
L y n d, R. 1939. *Knowledge For Whom?* Princeton: Princeton University Press.
M a n n h e i m, K. 1960. *Ideology and Utopia*. London: Routledge.

M a r x, K. 1964. *Early Writings*. New York: McGraw Hill.

M a r x, K., E n g e l s, F. 1998. *The Communist Manifesto; New Interpretation*, edited by M. Cowling. New York: New York University Press.

M e r t o n, R. 1973. "Insiders and Outsiders," in: N. Storer, (ed.), *The Sociology of Science*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

M i l l s, C. W. 1959. *The Sociological Imagination*. New York: Oxford University Press.

M y r d a l, G. 1944. *An American Dilemma; The Negro Problem and Modern Democracy*. New York: Harper and Row.

M y r d a l, G. 1969. *Objectivity in Social Research*. New York: Pantheon Books.

R e i c h e n b a c h, H. 1949. *Experience and Prediction*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

R i e s m a n, D. 1950. *The Lonely Crowd*. New Haven: Yaöe University Press.

S a s s e n, S. 2005., "Digging in the Penumbra of Master Categories." *The British Journal of Sociology* 3: 401–403.

S p e n c e r, H. 1903. *The Study of Sociology*. New York: Appleton.

S z t o m p k a, P. 1979. *Sociological Dilemmas*. New York: Academic Press.

S z t o m p k a, P. 1991. *Society in Action: The Theory of Social Becoming*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

S z t o m p k a, P. 1993. *The Sociology of Social Change*. Oxford: Blackwell.

T u r n e r, J. 2002. *Face-To-Face; Toward a Sociological Theory of Interpersonal Behavior*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

W e b e r, M. 1949. *On The Methodology of the Social Sciences*. Glencoe: Free Press.

Biographical Note: Piotr Sztompka is Professor of Sociology at the Jagiellonian University, Kraków, Poland. He is internationally known for his books: *System and Function* (1974), *Sociological Dilemmas* (1979), *Society in Action* (1991), *The Sociology of Social Change* (1993), *Trust* (1999), *Cultural Trauma and Collective Identity* (co-authored) (2006), as well as his biographical publications on Robert K.Merton. Member of the Polish Academy of Sciences, Academia Europaea (London) and American Academy of Arts and Sciences (Cambridge, Massachusetts). Between 2002 and 2006 he served as an elected President of the International Sociological Association (ISA).

Address: Institute of Sociology, Jagiellonian University; Grodzka 52, Kraków, Poland; e-mail: ussztomp@cyf-kr.edu.pl