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FOREWORD

I did not close myself to the fact of a collectively realized inhumanity in the same manner as the majority of my elders.

-- Jurgen Habermas

As a teenager Jurgen Habermas was shocked by Nazism's demonic disembowelment of the intellectually sophisticated and "high" culture of Germany. How could such horrors occur in a country as civilized as Germany? Why did the German university system, church, political assemblies, industry, and German intellectuals lend themselves to those inhuman excesses? What do these historical facts mean for contemporary industrial societies? These questions and others occupied Habermas as he crafted a critical theory of society, a theory that attempted to liberate human beings from new forms of domination he saw arising in postwar societies. Finding answers to such complex issues was not easy, however. For, in coming to grips with modern social realities, Habermas had to rethink the very basis of rationality and its attending processes. In his formulations he perceived that the dominance of academic positivism had narrowed and restricted the scope of reason and inquiry.

What Habermas observed in Nazi Germany and in postwar industrial society is not unlike current developments within American society, and we cite references to support this contention. This observation is actually our serendipitous
discovery, although our study began as a reflexive examination of to what extent sociologists informed introductory students about the Vietnam War. As we discovered, the Vietnam War is one manifestation of systemic foreign and domestic violence intrinsic to what President Dwight David Eisenhower called the American "military-industrial complex." Indeed, the war industry is big business, employing large segments of the population of major American cities (Chambliss and Ryther, 1975). Moreover, during the 1950s and 1960s the military consumed "over half" of the total federal budget (Chirot, 1977:196).

Because war divests public monies away from education and social welfare, programs that benefit the nonelite segments of society, domestic violence -- civil "war" -- is also intrinsically American.

Yet our sample of textbooks virtually ignored this dehumanizing feature within American society. More than that, textbooks reflected false images of society or what their orienting theories disposed them to see. Further, these texts forwarded images of a unified sociology actively engaged in discerning the social terrain to help alleviate society’s chronic woes. Such incomplete textbook representations seem not only acts of distortion, but also serve to abort intelligent and creative insight for ordering the social experience of the majority of introductory students.

As the evidence accumulated, what began as an exploratory
study ended with critical observations about how sociology is presented to students and, by implication, how the discipline pursues its study of social problems and society. Also, in recapitulating Mills' and Gouldner's longstanding critical insights of the discipline, we concluded that sociology has not effectively addressed what Gouldner (1970) augured sixteen years ago as the discipline's "coming crisis."

Let us briefly mention the format of our study. In chapter one we define the problem and its parameters, list and define general concepts of our examination, and outline sensitizing questions providing focus to our inquiry. Likewise, we establish why textbooks are important in the socialization process for both major and nonmajor introductory students. Because they legitimate and certify dominant ideas in the discipline, they are significant indicators of sociology's emphasis of what constitutes a proper understanding of society.

Chapter two examines the social, cultural, historical, and institutional factors contributing to functionalism's continued legacy in shaping textbook images of the ethos of society. In that chapter we elaborate four main paradigms extant in sociological analysis of society. This explication clarifies major assumptions, analytical tools, domains of social reality emphasized, and philosophical views of each model. Detailing the paradigms in this
fashion helps us see how these models guide and shape analysis of the Vietnam War. It also permits us to assume how textbooks from each paradigm would conceive of and present the war to introductory students.

Chapter three contains our research methodology while in chapter four (along with Appendix III) we detail our findings from our content analysis of textbooks. Chapter five offers a theoretical and empirical critique of the kind of social forecasting provided by the end-of-ideology (Bell, 1962), the social action equivalent embodied within functionalism. Chapter six reviews our impressionistic findings of a postwar textbook paradigm shift, the commodification of sociology, and implications for future inquiry and textbook format.

Two special features of this study warrant mention. For continuity the findings section (chapter four) precedes our critique of the end-of-ideology. Though slightly deviating from the standard format for dissertations, this change presents disruption since the final chapter draws indirectly from the end-of-ideology critique. Secondly, we have deemed it significant to include analysis of the end-of-ideology programme. Why is it essential to the study? In the end-of-ideology we witness a singular apology to align American sociology with elite domestic and foreign development policy. In effect this is structural functionalism social forecasting par exemplar. That
mainstream American sociology has endeavored to salvage capitalism from inherent wars, depressions, inflations and social upheavals seems beyond question in certain sectors of sociology. But, as we show, the very structures chartered to design and strengthen democratic structures nationally and abroad are the sources of revolution and poverty. We include the end-of-ideology critique to show that although it is an antiquated view of social change, its tenets still guide current American social and foreign policy.
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ABSTRACT

Textbooks are important representative statements of certified and legitimated knowledge within an academic discipline, and the manner in which introductory sociology textbooks assess society reflect the power and sophistication of theories in discerning social patterns and structures. That the pivotal historical event of the Vietnam War and its implications for contemporary American social institutions was virtually omitted in our sample of one hundred-twenty textbooks raises critical issues for sociology. Content analysis of Vietnam War era textbooks (1954-1975) revealed 75% of the sample, divided among four major research orienting paradigms extant in sociology, ignored mention of the war and only the conflict-oriented texts afforded analysis of the American structural dynamics connected with Vietnam. Apart from these texts, the rest of the sample assumed an intentional or unintentional functional perspective regarding the Vietnam War and corresponding structurally induced domestic and foreign violence endemic to America's military-industrial complex. This paradigmatic bias toward macrolevel phenomena is traceable to historical, social, cultural and institutional factors in sociology's emergence and development in the Academy. Marketing considerations may further impede the textbook representation of opposing viewpoints of the consensual and shared-goal value embodied in the sampled...
texts. Too, since academic sociology is institutionally aligned with a welfare-warfare state philosophy, and is institutionally enjoined to train students for jobs in post-industrial society, its classical discovery process is commodified, resulting in an unbalanced presentation of American society to introductory students and to future professional sociologists. Such dominant textbook images, values and ideas about American institutions impede creative insight and comprehension of elemental domains of society that warrant wide professional review.
Chapter One

INTRODUCTION

And the end of the fight is a tombstone white
With the name of the late deceased,
And the epitaph drear: "A Fool lies here who
Tried to hustle the East."

— Rudyard Kipling

For over two decades the United States was militarily, politically, and economically involved in a policy of intervention in what has come to be known simply and inclusively as the "Vietnam War." It is perhaps the single most important sociological event of the last quarter of a century in United States history, and yet, to date sociologists as a group have remained relatively silent on the issue. In an era when American sociology was in its "heyday" on college and university campuses one could find a preponderance of courses devoted to the study of political behavior, deviance, and crime. During the same period while the United States was pouring billions of dollars in aid and thousands of men in assistance into Vietnam, one could scarcely find any literature and even fewer course offerings on the subject of the Vietnam War. Was this fortuitous or intentional? Were American sociologists claiming an "intellectual exemption" as though they were part of what Mannheim (1936) termed a "socially unattached intelligentsia" (freischeswebende intelligenz)? Did sociologists judge the study of the Vietnam War as a "taboo" subject or at best
an issue of little concern given the myriad of topics in the American social milieu? Whatever the reasons, it seems a significantly important enough issue to warrant a sociological investigation into what extent American sociology formally dealt with the relevant philosophical, political, intellectual, and sociological implications of the Vietnam War. The purpose of this study is to examine the degree to which sociologists paid attention to the Vietnam War as an issue of public concern, and based on written evidence, to compare the relationship between what sociologists were saying and what was documented as fact during that period in American history.¹

This study is therefore reflexive in nature. Also, as will become apparent in subsequent pages, this examination can be subsumed under the rubric of "critical sociology," a tradition initiated in the discipline by C. Wright Mills. Though Mills' pronouncements about the focus and emphasis of mainstream sociological analysis are long established within sociology, they have been consigned to marginal status within professional debate (cf. Burawoy, 1982; Gouldner, 1970). The focus of this reflexive and critical examination involves the "powers of theory" in the explanation of social events (cf. Alford and Friedland, 1985). More specifically, this examination explores how adequately sociological theories account for modern social phenomena such as the Vietnam War.

¹ Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
In recent years sociology has witnessed the development of its own highly specialized organization within a much larger educational bureaucracy directed toward increased efficiency and rationalization. Concurrently, there has developed an increased dependency upon a mathematically based quantitative research strategy with its supporting technology. Such developments mesh nicely with advanced or postindustrial society's demand for a technologically based social system, or more succinctly, a technocracy; wherein the bases of power become increasingly less democratic and more technocratic. A large amount of literature has been written about the technocratic postindustrial society concerning its conceptions and assumed tendencies. Jeffrey Straussman states, however:

...it is still possible to discern two major arguments about the nature of technocracy in industrial society that are clearly incompatible. One dominant assessment of the growth of technocracy asserts that industrial society, with its tendencies toward norms of efficiency and rationalization coupled with role differentiation inherent in bureaucratic organization, inevitably leads to a shift of power from politicians (in the public sector) and entrepreneurs (in the private sector) to specialists, often characterized as "new men," the "new class," or the "knowledge elites." At the other extreme one finds an appraisal of technocracy that stresses the mandarin aspects of experts and their specialized knowledge. This second position, while recognizing changes in the class structure of industrialized societies as well as the emergence of new knowledge elites, suggests that these new elites, who pose no threats to entrenched forms of power and property that continue to be based on wealth and privilege, merely serve those who have always controlled both private and public institutions of power in industrial society (1976:127).
A discussion of technocracy and postindustrial society is warranted and will be reviewed in a later chapter as it reveals sociological parameters and conditions imposing upon the power of theoretical positions to direct the work of the scientist. For now, however, suffice it to say that sociology's critique of postindustrial society has continued to develop and will have further impact on social theory.

One of the features of the so-called "postindustrial society" is the evolution of technocratic modes of scientific research and development. In fact, in order to better understand the role of the social sciences (and the physical sciences) in a technocratic industrial society such as the United States, one has to know something of the scientific tradition in the United States. C. Wright Mills (1958) has pointed out that historically the United States has not developed a steadfast scientific tradition similar to the classical European academic tradition in which small scientific investigative groups are part of an uncoordinated cultural tradition. Instead, in the United States, science has been virtually identified with its technological products; its experts; its engineering developments, both social and physical; and its legacy of industrial and military exploitation. Further Mills states:

In brief, the U.S. has built a Science Machine; a corporate organization and rationalization of the process of technological development and to some extent -- I believe unknown -- of scientific discovery itself (1958:159).
Mills felt that much of the intellectual community in the United States had become subordinate parts of the "Science Machine"; that these machines had become essential parts of the apparatus of war. Even though he felt that "war and peace are now the most important issues men anywhere can reason about," many of his colleagues did not share that opinion (Mills, 1958:6). When writing about his contemporaries, Mills says:

Many scholars say -- and many more feel -- that only a fool would now publicly discuss the causes of war and the roads to peace. They believe that the human mind cannot grapple successfully with the total and ultimate issues involved, that any inquiry not more "specialized" is bound to be inadequate. Yet many, perhaps in fear of being thought unpatriotic, become nationalist propagandists; others, perhaps in fear of being thought unscientific, become nationalist technicians. Neither type seems able to transcend the official terms in which the world encounter is now defined. As propagandists, they are no more enlightening than any other propagandists; as technicians, they are committed in advance to some one or another narrow range of policy which they elaborate and justify. As a result, such knowledge and skill as many students of man and society have are largely wasted so far as the human problems of war and peace are concerned (1958:6-7).

The validity of Mills' statements has been the issue of an ensuing debate by many sociologists and other social scientists, the reasons for which are not the subject of this study. Some of the questions Mills raises, however, are of direct concern and must be addressed more conscientiously than by mere perusal. One such question, which is consistent with the kinds of issues examined in this study,
brings to the fore the essence of what reflexive socio-
logical thinking should embrace; that is:

What Western scholar can claim to be part of the big
discourse of reason and yet retreat to formal triviali-
ties and exact nonsense, in a world in which reason and
freedom are being held in contempt, being smashed,
being allowed to fade out of the human condition?
(1958:125)

The essential, and perhaps the most fundamental part of
Mills' previous statement is echoed in what Peter Berger
(1963) posits as the central concern of sociology — the
human condition.³ If this be true, then it follows that the
study of situations and events that directly effect the
human condition are most pertinent to sociology proper.
Otherwise, what reasonable justification for the acquisi-
tion, indexing, and accumulation of knowledge under the
general rubric of sociology? Put more succinctly, to quote
Robert Lynd (1939), "knowledge for what?"

The concept of "knowledge" is often so broad as to
include every and all types of knowledge: theories, ideas,
information, ideology, world-view, etc. And some will
assert, as Berger and Luckmann have stated, that "the
sociology of knowledge must concern itself with everything
that passes for 'knowledge' in a society" (1966:15). This
would be a rather ambitious undertaking and beyond the scope
of this present study. This study is, however, specifically
concerned with the social location of "ideas" or
"theoretical thought" relative to a specific era in American
history, and thus is the concern of the sociology of knowledge.

Although the sociology of knowledge has been variously and confusedly defined, the need still exists to find an operational definition which meets the requisites of the present study. For this purpose, and not to hastily exclude the epistemological and methodological problems plaguing the field, the sociology of knowledge (wissenssoziologie) will be defined as the relationship between social reality (as perceived by the actors) and any objective knowledge (observable, public statements, documents or artifacts).

Our definition attempts a humanistic incorporation of perceived social reality in the sense that Berger and Luckmann conceptualize "reality," that is:

...the sociology of knowledge must first of all concern itself with what people 'know' as 'reality' in their everyday, non- or pre-theoretical lives. In other words, commonsense 'knowledge' rather than 'ideas' must be the central focus for the sociology of knowledge. It is precisely this 'knowledge' that constitutes the fabric of meanings without which no society could exist (1966:15).

Common sense, however, is a curious blend of fact and fiction and to accept "commonsense knowledge" as the sole basis for understanding social reality could lead to a distortion of any sociological findings. Simultaneously, accepting "documented facts" without regard for "commonsense knowledge" could result in the forfeit of valuable insight into the world-view (weltanschauung) of a people.
The sociology of knowledge then, must concern itself with what is perceived as real as well as what is documented as fact within a specific historical context of a given society. Or more simply, it is reflexive.

Traditionally, criticism of the sociology of knowledge has focused on the often ambiguous usage of the term "knowledge." In an attempt to obviate as much as possible any debate issue, "knowledge" is defined as objective knowledge. Put differently, objective knowledge, as I will demonstrate in another chapter, is observable public evidence of mental activities. It includes any political, religious, scientific or ideological statements or any written, recorded, or televised evidence of such.

Statement of the Problem

The intent of this study is to discover the extent sociologists; in the textbooks they author or adopt for their introductory sociology classes, provide an analysis which might enable the student to understand the Vietnam War's socio-historical relevance and its implications regarding the nature and structure of contemporary American society. Further, we feel it is significant that sociologists have yet to clarify their professional involvement regarding the Vietnam War (1954-1975). Though admittedly complex, part of sociology's neglect and ambiguity regarding Vietnam is ideological. More to the point, we feel that the philosophical and theoretical
orientation of structural functionalism has dominated "standard American sociology" (Mullins, 1973). We attempt to explore how this hegemony has obfuscated the discipline's comprehension of the Vietnam War and contemporary social phenomena. Further, we explore how different theoretical perspectives correspond to knowledge content and structures imparted by sociologists. This study constitutes a historical document analysis of introductory sociology textbooks pertaining to the period of direct American involvement in the Vietnam War. Because of the concern with the distribution and types of knowledge produced during that era and their relationship to existential situations (seinsverbundenheiten des existeng), the study falls within the scope of the sociology of knowledge.

Textbooks and the Socialization of Scientific Ideas

Why undertake a reflexive study of sociology using introductory textbooks? What purpose can such an examination serve? According to Thomas Kuhn (1977:xix) to become a member of the discipline, a scientist acquires "standard ways to solve selective problems." Further, Kuhn likens this socialization process of a scholar to that of learning a language. In both examples a "paradigm" is imparted: a certain way of seeing and responding to natural or social phenomena. For the scholar this process of acquiring a paradigm begins with the introductory textbook.
[Textbooks] exhibit concrete problem solutions that the profession has come to accept as paradigms, and they then ask the student... to solve for himself problems very closely related in both method and substance to those through which the textbook or accompanying lecture has led him. (Kuhn, 1977:xix).

Kuhn's ideas about paradigms, and established methods in selecting certain problems for attention apply to science generally. Friedrichs (1970), in his reflexive study of sociology, focuses his analysis on revolutions in social science while still borrowing Kuhnian concepts. According to Friedrichs, textbooks serve valuable functions when new paradigms arise to challenge established ones:

[T]he revolution does not so much seek any direct conversion of the mass membership of the community but rather tries to capture those key figures who are the "gatekeepers" to the texts that guide the younger generation through the disciplines rites of passage and on into full responsibility in the field. A key to the maturity of a science ... lies in the degree of dependence upon textbooks throughout the apprenticeship period (1970:7).

Robert Perrucci (1980) and Robert Rothman (1971) authored articles on textbooks to which we refer in a later chapter. Their analysis suggests further the importance of textbooks for American sociology. According to Perrucci the introductory textbook should be of concern to sociologists for a number of general reasons:

(1) The introductory textbook is the primary teaching device by which students first learn about sociology.
(2) Textbooks are presented, by authors and publishers, as representative of the field.

(3) The ideas contained in textbooks can shape a field of study through their impact upon teachers who use them and those students who may become professional sociologists (1980:40).

For Rothman (1971) textbooks, subject to a professional certification process, reflect institutionalized definitions of acceptable knowledge to be disseminated among students. As such, textbooks are good indicators of how knowledge is distributed historically within a social institution, e.g., academic sociology.

Yet another significant justification for examining textbooks is offered by Mullins (1973). In his analysis of the institutional processes affecting the success and prominence of theory groups within the discipline, textbook publication represents a level of maturation and acceptance within the discipline for a given theory. According to Mullins (1973) textbooks appear only at the final stage of a theory's institutionalization process, what he terms the "specialty stage." Such a development implies that a theory has met the following conditions:

1. A theoretical orientation (break) different from that of the parent discipline — developed and directed by an intellectual leader, verbalized in a program statement and supported by intellectual successes....

2. A loss of disinterestedness — organized and directed by a social organizational leader; this aspect includes conscious group development ("social engineering"), seeking jobs for members, and acquiring students.
3. A research center — the site or sites of close interaction, often leading to aberrant work and recreation habits.

4. Training Centers — for teaching the centers the students who are necessary to carry out the research program ....


Small Groups theory, for example, failed as theory in part because it did not proceed in stepwise fashion through this process (cf. Mullins, 1973:105). Further, ethnomethodology fulfilled all the developmental stages except that of producing a textbook. The Radical/Critical theory (conflict) failed to negotiate any of the stages of Mullins' developmental theory model (cf. Mullins, 1973:270-282). This development, which we address in chapter two, holds significant import for the content and kinds of knowledge available in mainstream sociology textbooks.

Our reflexive study incorporates the introductory textbook to explore two domains of the American practice of sociology. The first domain examines (1) what kind of information textbooks offer introductory students about the Vietnam War, and (2) how this knowledge is presented by the respective paradigms. We will discuss this in the next chapter. Chapter four details our findings with regard to how well our sample of textbooks met (1) and (2). Using these findings, we extrapolate from the first domain -- the treatment textbooks accorded the Vietnam War -- to explore
what implications, if any, such a presentation implies about the practice of contemporary sociology. More specifically, we use the findings from the first domain to examine what they suggest about the nature and structure of socially situated knowledge within sociology's institutionalized variant, the academy.

While textbooks can clarify social reality they can likewise distort it. This is one idea that we offer later, and is also forwarded by one textbook from our sample. William Chambliss and Thomas Ryther, in their provocative introductory textbook Sociology: The Discipline and Its Direction (1975:xi) avow that "the image of 'society' which ... dominated American sociology" (the structural functional hegemony) does not reflect the nature and intrinsic reality of the American social system.

Several generations of sometimes careless textbook writing had not only represented society as an essentially healthy, self-correcting organism with a few minor illnesses ("social problems") and a few maladjusted individuals ("deviants"), but had reduced society to a contemporary phenomenon (Chambliss and Ryther, 1975:xii).

In summing up, textbooks are elemental to the development, evaluation, and foremost, the accuracy of perception and conception within a scientific discipline. In subsequent chapters, we will suggest that mainstream sociology textbooks in neglecting the Vietnam War, may have failed to
perceive dominant trends and influences shaping the contemporary American social scene.

In view of these sources, textbooks are of fundamental importance to science and, therefore, to sociology. They serve to orient a new generation of scholars and researchers to what is considered the important and significant images of their discipline, to how to conduct research on pre-selected topics based on the established paradigms in vogue in that discipline. Additionally, textbooks present the discipline to nonmajors, instilling in them what is deemed important about their subject matter. Since sociology addresses the inclusive topic of "American social life," textbooks — while not the only systematic and analytical exposure to American social realities that majors will receive — are for nonmajors the sole resource in comprehending the dynamic and taken-for-granted processes and structures of American society. Here, most students receive an image of the kind of social structure within which they will assume roles and, for the major, the kinds of questions their professional research and inquiry into American social life will address. An idea we introduce later is that textbooks, with notable exceptions, tend to distort the image of American society and thus may be ethically remiss in providing essential information concerning the American society. While this holds true for the majority of textbooks, so it does for mainstream American sociology.
Sensitizing Questions

As documents of historical analysis Vietnam War era textbooks offer significant sociological information about the institutional practice of sociology. To obtain such information and to delineate the study's parameters we pursue some sensitizing questions. For example, what were sociology's dominant perceptions of the Vietnam War? Relatedly, what are the discipline's dominant images of American society? Do these images have historical, social, and cultural antecedents? Are there institutional factors within sociology that influence inquiry of society? To what degree did the "end-of-ideology" thesis invalidate a conflict analysis of the Vietnam War? How useful are textbooks in depicting the dynamics and patterns of American society? Of the goals and purposes of sociology? What factors influence introductory textbook content?

Since the primary focus of this research is on introductory sociology textbooks, an elaboration of the research procedure employed in this study will be discussed in chapter three under the heading Content Analysis.

In the following chapter we first survey the history and development of theoretical thought within sociology, citing the contributions of Marx, Durkheim, Weber, and others. These intellectual giants erected the foundations of the general paradigms that we then discuss. Here, examining the assumptions of these paradigms, we observe the
historical backdrop from which contemporary sociological research originates. This review and general analysis of paradigms further sensitizes us to the possible kinds of information that introductory textbook authors would make available to beginning sociology students. More relevant to our research interests, this review and analysis suggests how introductory textbooks comprising our sample might address the Vietnam War and how that historical phenomenon interrelates to other structural components of the American social system.
FOOTNOTES

1 Though individual sociologists and others (political scientists, historians, etc.) may have been addressing the Vietnam War informally through teach-ins, lectures, etc., our study is concerned with the discipline's formal presentation of the subject.

2 Not all scholars accept the veracity of the "post-industrial society." Krishan Kumar (1978) has determined the concept derives from the need of a constructive typology and not from real history. In his analysis of Daniel Bell, the major apologist of the end-of-ideology thesis, Kumar determined that Bell developed "post-industrial society" as a concept to contrast contemporary social processes and patterns from those exposted by Durkheim, Marx, and Weber in their analysis of industrial society.

3 C. Wright Mills asserts this thematic concern in his celebrated Sociological Imagination, by stating: "In brief, I believe that what may be called classic social analysis is a definable and usable set of traditions; that its essential feature is the concern with historical social structures; and that its problems are of direct relevance to urgent public issues and insistent human troubles" (1959:21).

4 In The Homeless Mind, Peter Berger, et al, posit that "all social reality has an essential component of consciousness... Consciousness in this context does not refer to ideas, theories or sophisticated constructions of meaning. The consciousness of everyday life is, most of the time (even by the way, in the case of intellectuals), pre-theoretical consciousness. Therefore, the sociology of knowledge must not concern itself primarily with the analysis of theoretical consciousness like the history of ideas or the history of philosophy, but rather with the consciousness of ordinary people as they lead their ordinary lives" (1973:12).

5 This refers to the period of the United States' direct involvement in the Vietnam War (cf. Appendix II).

6 Ex post facto Mullins' (1973) claim that critical sociology had not reached the specialty stage in his development scheme, Chambliss and Ryther published a radical/critical textbook in 1975.
Chapter Two

THEORETICAL PARADIGMS
AND THEIR HISTORICAL UNDERPINNINGS

The tension of political positions seems to be a sine qua non for an advance in sociological history. The predominance of any political action, left, right, or center, results in an intellectual orthodoxy which is the end of creativity.

-- Randall Collins

The fit between theories and sentiments has a good deal to do with the career of a theory.

-- Alvin Gouldner

Factors Influencing the Structural Functional Hegemony

To paraphrase Kuhn (1962) ideas persist beyond the phenomena they derived from and, as obsolete constructs, obscure perception of new events. Further, he noted that scientific ideas manifest patterns and stages of development, yielding their dominance only when humans, in the context of novel or unexplained phenomena ("anomalies"), must rethink what was once assumed and taken-for-granted. Humans qua professional sociologists are likewise subject to these Kuhnian ideational processes. As participants in a social institution (e.g., American sociology) their thinking about social reality embodies both their own biographical experience as well as that of the respective theoretical masters who crafted the discipline's social theory. Moreover, the preference of some ideas over others and the channels of their transmission also demonstrate a history in sociocultural context.
Our analysis explores in part the history of ideas as manifested in introductory textbooks. We are concerned with sociological knowledge and types of ideas in textbooks, not only as they reflect classical social theory, but also those ideas as they embody class ideology of those crafting them and the historical factors shaping the institutionalized patterns in making social knowledge available to sociology students (cf. Rothman, 1971; Mullins, 1973; Gouldner, 1970). What are some of the historical, social and cultural factors that determine information flow in sociology, as expressed in textbooks? What are some of the institutional constraints within sociology itself shaping the presentation of social reality? Of primary concern to our analysis are the conditioning influences underlying the dominance of Parsonsian positivism in introductory textbooks. During a period of rampant civil strife and a war that claimed more money, and aerial bomb tonnage than did World War II, why did textbooks emphasize a consensus-equilibrium-stasis social perspective? Moreover, why has "Standard American Sociology" (Mullins, 1973) attempted "to avoid at all costs any interpretation of the United States which emphasized class conflict?" (Chambliss and Ryther, 1975:52)

To explore this paradigmatic bias in textbooks, a brief historical review of social theory and of past and present structural conditions in sociology can help us to understand this situation. The review we provide is not intended to
show fidelity to the full development of social theory. Rather our purpose is to sketch the factors and developments leading up to the hegemony of structural functionalism in American sociology. We give scant reference to significant European strains of social theory -- those forwarded by the French, German, and English -- because Parsonsian formulations assimilated these ideas, casting them in a distinctive American flavor, in a distinctive Parsonsian form (Gouldner, 1970:139; Collins, 1981:337). Parsons' influence in sociological thinking and the concomitant perspective to social phenomena cannot be underestimated.

...more than any other contemporary social theorist, Parsons has influenced and captured the attention of academic sociologists, and not only in the United States but throughout the world (Gouldner, 1970:168).

Further, though American functionalism was supplemented in the 1960s by other theories, these derived from a social constructionist paradigm; they were unable to fashion a coherent, assertive statement concerning the structure and nature of dominant American institutional patterns (McNall and Johnson, 1975), and thus constitute, in effect, what Mullins (1973) terms a "loyal opposition." Also, mainstream sociology's perceptions and conceptions of American economic and political patterns, as reflected in textbooks, still embody the Parsonsian legacy of ignoring conflictual features within American society (cf. Chambliss and Ryther, 1975; Anderson, 1971, 1974).  

*Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
From Gouldner (1970) and Friedrichs (1970) we learn that "functional sociology," an "apology for the status quo" (Chambliss and Ryther, 1975:32), originated in a Europe under the throes of rapid industrialization. The influx of industry radically shifted the economic base of agrarian societies, spawning working class movements across Europe which, in time, embraced Marxism as their own apology in ordering their new social experience. In the resulting social reordering of society, functionalism as the emerging social theory in the emerging social sciences, became the bracing ideology of the ruling and middle classes who suddenly saw their legitimacy challenged.

The successful appeal of functionalism has resulted, in part, on its ability to resonate congenially the protracted, utilitarian sentiments of men [sic] socialized into a dominant middle-class culture, men who feel that things and people must be, and are, legitimated by their on going usefulness... Sociological Functionalism was congenial to the middle class in its struggle against the new classes and, if need be, against the old elites (Gouldner, 1970:121).

Challenging the entrenched ideology of the social elite was Marxism, which depicted the economically privileged as oppressors and manipulators of the masses. Cast in such radical terms, Marxism became the "key polemical target" of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century sociology (Gouldner, 1970:116).

Examining functionalism's uneven development in other European societies underscores the cultural, social and
historical factors shaping a social theory's acceptance or rejection. In Germany, functionalism was rejected because of existing intellectual preferences and traditions, not the least of which were the cultural differences in the respective experiences of Durkheim and Weber concerning "moral values" (cf. Gouldner, 1970:122). In England, the theory's development reflected aristocratic sentiments, the exigencies of the Empire. Unlike France, where the elites were justified for their social utility, the English aristocracy was legitimated by its own sense of "natural" superiority, and thus had no need of functionalism. As such, and due to the middle classes' accommodation to the aristocracy in response to the working class movement, sociology had no basis in the society.

The aristocracy's eminence and prerogatives were held to derive from what history had made it, from what it was, and not merely from what it now did in society. A sociology that incorporated middle-class sentiments of utility and of legitimacy would subvert rather than sustain such an aristocracy... (Gouldner, 1970:125-126).

While order and legitimacy for the aristocracy at home was never undermined, this was not the case for the post World War I British colonies. As the old British confidence faded, evolutionism, squarely founded on the "natural" supremacy of Anglo civilization, yielded to a functional anthropology. As the problem of control and order became more pronounced, functionalism, as it had done in France,
provided the necessary ideology for the legitimacy of control and domination abroad.

Functionalism... arose following World War I, which is to say, against the backdrop of a violent challenge to English domination and Empire; it arose when English precedence was no longer taken for granted, when the English could no longer feel confident that their own society represented the culmination of an evolutionary process from which they might look down benignly upon "lower" peoples (Gouldner, 1970).

Though English anthropologists advocated the legitimacy "of native institutions and sought to preserve them," they were employed by a government dedicated to manipulating those institutions for extracting cheap labor and resources for higher profit in England (cf. Frank, 1967).^6

In the 1930s, America was suffering from the harsh social dislocations of "the greatest international economic crisis that capitalism has known" (Gouldner, 1970:138). It was in this cultural crisis for American capitalism that Parsons fashioned an ideology to bolster the sagging confidence of a middle class suddenly questioning its legitimacy. It was in these conditions that American sociology aligned itself with the "official America," maintaining a "respectable affiliation in university, business and government" (Berger, 1963:44).^7

Sociology in the United States received much of its incentive and impetus from its efforts to salvage capitalism. Its classical heritage partially consists of supplying theoretical schemes to combat the external and internal threats which arose from time to time as capitalism was undergoing dramatic changes. The
external threats existed in the form of foreign oppositions to the... "democratic empire." The internal security was threatened by various "deviants" whose behavior and/or ideas were inconsistent with the development of capitalism (Smith, 1971:28).

We have tried to show that functionalism is foremost an ideology of the privileged disguised as social "theory." Further, we briefly traced its origins and development in both Europe and America, arising as industrialization radically altered traditional agrarian social structure. What would be illustrative at this point would be to trace the institutionalization of structural functionalism within American sociology. In so doing, we are also introducing factors that have in part precluded the codification of conflict theory within the American Academy. Following these remarks on the institutionalization of structural functionalism we discuss the radical-critical (conflict) perspective's relationship to American sociology.

Following the 1920s American sociology relocated its intellectual center from Chicago to the Eastern Seaboard, with Columbia and Harvard usurping the University of Chicago as the most prestigious school of sociology. Between 1935 and 1945 these two eastern schools solidified their dominance of mainstream sociology, as well as that of academic sociology worldwide (Gouldner, 1970:157). Particularly at Harvard, after Parsons connected a "minor department into a major part of the university" (Mullins, 1973:47), scores of Parsons-trained sociologists, many of
eminence within the field, assumed positions in major universities across the country (cf. Mullins, 1973:51). In turn these former students trained other students, presumably in Parsons' systems analysis of society.

Parsons' list of students... although long, does not include all the well-known and important sociologists who were trained at Harvard during the period in question [1936-1968].... Yet it was the continuing wave of Harvard Ph.D.s influenced by Parsons, Homans, Stouffer, Bales, and other students of Parsons, whose members dominated so much of sociology's intellectual conduct from 1950 through 1968 (Mullins, 1973:50).

These sociologists, trained in standard American sociology concepts, created a network of written communication throughout the American Academy (cf. Mullins, 1973:63), virtually capturing the major journals. This networking of ideas through books, articles, and reviews acted as an institutional censor to ideas not congenial to the then existing orthodoxy in American sociology. 8

Exclusion of Dissent: The Views of Conflict 9

Earlier we noted that although other social theories arose in the 1960s to challenge the hegemony of standard American sociology, these addressed microlevel analysis, constituting in effect a "loyal opposition" to the then dominant view of the nature and basis of modern social structures. Of course, in Marxism, there existed antithetical views to those proffered in structural functionalism. But a Marxist view, unlike functionalism, is
inimical to the continued privilege and power of a society's favored classes. Further, it was the ascendancy of Marxist interpretation of society that functionalism attempted to suppress. Moreover, Marxism's harsh legacy in Russia further diminished its acceptability to many Americans (cf. Gouldner, 1970:157). Marxism's exclusion from academic sociology is "a central feature of the historical structure of Western sociology" (Gouldner, 1970:158). Therefore, tracing its genealogy within American sociology will help us understand the ambiguous state it has within the discipline.

Because Parsons translated German social thought (especially the works of Max Weber) and codified it in his formulations, Marxian implications are neglected serious attention in his model. Not until German social scientists from the Frankfurt School (of Frankfurt am Main) emigrated to America, escaping Hitler's fascist threat, did American sociology obtain its first clear sighted vision of Marx. Through subsequent translations of Marx's works, his ideas were gradually afforded greater currency in American society.

There are several reasons why Marx's ideas have failed to receive respectability among American sociologists. Foremost, his ideas have not been easily accessible. Due to the brilliance of Marx, scholars who studied and interpreted him "have produced hundreds of different and shifting interpretations of what Marx said and what he meant"
(Mullins, 1973:272); no definitive statement exists -- nor should we expect one, for that matter. Secondly, there has existed confusion over Marx's texts, while some of his other work has only recently been translated (cf. Marx, 1971). Also, the general inability of American critical scholars and of their students "to read other languages with any subtlety" has hampered the dissemination of his ideas.

While the difficulty in determining Marx's thinking about conflict and power has contributed to its absence from professional debate, other factors must also be considered. According to Mullins (1973:272) "American social science largely ignored the direct study of Marx during the 1940s and 1950s." Though he offers no explanation for this, it must be attributed in part to the dominance of structural functionalism (Friedrichs, 1970). Even when Marxism is examined by functionalist oriented scholars (cf. Daniel Bell and Seymour Martin Lipset) their findings are couched in "an apolitical sociological Marxism" (Burawoy, 1982:2). The Academy was not intellectually inclined, then, to an balanced portrayal of Marxism.

Burawoy (1982) described the social climate in America as another conditioning factor leading to the Academy's neglect of conflict theory. In the 1930s, during the turbulence of the Depression, Marxism was often seriously embraced, then discarded, particularly after Stalin's murderous excesses. During World War Two, with the country
fighting Nazism, few scholars seriously challenged capitalism, particularly as it filled the breach with the impending collapse of Europe; America became "Big Brother" to the world. And in the 1950s, as McCarthy's communist baiting harangues cowered the liberal impulse in America, dissent was purged:

In the face of anti-communist repression and the absence of a strong socialist movement or Marxist intellectual tradition in the United States, there were few Marxists able to sustain a creative dialogue and critique to counter the euphoria of 1950 sociology (Burawoy, 1982:2-3).

Not until the systemic imbalances of capitalism resurfaced in the 1960s did Marxism, now more tolerated in an intellectually freer social environment, begin to attract serious and widespread appeal, both popularly and academically.

But radical-critical thought nonetheless had a difficult time gaining any appreciable academic legitimacy. This must be attributed partly to circumstances within the discipline. Primarily the institutional structure of sociology, until the last fifteen years, has largely excluded critical sociologists and their ideas. According to Mullins (1973) one of the reasons for conflict theory's failure to become successfully grounded within the American Academy is the lack of personnel -- faculty and recruited students -- in which to network ideas and support. Virtually all of the radical-critical activity--
recruitment, publication of articles -- has had to occur outside the institutionalized channels within sociology (cf. Mullins, 1973:50-51;270;273;284). Without access to the traditional networks within sociology, conflict theory has been left to makeshift structures which, by their transitory and unstable nature, have not fostered growth and acceptance by mainstream sociology.\(^\text{11}\)

What is the potential for conflict theory to obtain legitimacy and an increased presence within the Academy? When Gouldner wrote (1970:437-443) there seemed little opportunity for these developments. Why was this so? Because, the "infrastructure" of functionalism and of academic sociology tended to discourage the structures and patterns (cf. Mullins, 1973) essential for networking of faculty, students and the communication of critical ideas. In a word, there will remain within academic sociology a structural censure of ideas.

But Gouldner (1970) did foresee opportunities, if pursued, for academic sociology to incorporate a critical sociology and, by implication, circumvent what he interpreted as its "coming crisis." First, though functionalism's infrastructure will persist, its dominance will recede, permitting "the development of social theories of a less conservative character" (Gouldner, 1970:437). Moreover, because of a growing cadre of younger sociologists, conflict theory, though confined to a marginal
status within sociology, holds potential for increased legitimacy within the discipline (cf. Burawoy, 1982).

Yet, before such a situation manifests itself, three conditions must be met:

(1) the changing political praxis and, in particular, the growing efforts of some sociologists, again, particularly the young, to actively change the community and the university in more humane and democratic directions; (2) the increasing interaction between Academic Sociology and Marxism, particularly the more Hegelian versions of Marxism; and (3) the inherent contradictions of Academic Sociology itself will generate certain instabilities and open it to a measure of change (Gouldner, 1970:438).

Gouldner's (1970) observations of the structural contradictions within academic sociology fostering development of a radical contingent warrant mention. First, academic sociology, "the market researchers for the Welfare State" (Gouldner, 1970:439), must comprehend that this role is founded on the fallacy of Parsonsian functionalism's notion of "pattern maintenance."

This role exposes sociologists to two contradictory, even if not equally powerful, experiences: on one side, it limits the sociologist to the reformist solutions of the Welfare State; but, on the other, it exposes him to the failure of this state and of the society with whose problems it seeks to cope. Such Academic Sociologists have a vested interest in the very failures of this society -- in a real sense their careers depend upon it; but at the same time their very work makes them intimately familiar with the human suffering engendered by these failures. Even if it is the special business of such sociologists to help clean up the vomit of modern society, they are also sometimes revolted by what they see. Thus the sociologists' funding tie to the Welfare State does not produce an unambivalent loyalty to it or to the social system it
seeks to maintain. To be "bought" and to be "paid for" are two different things — and that is a contradiction of the Welfare State not peculiar to its relations with sociologists (Gouldner, 1970:439).

Moreover, it is academic sociology's allegiance since World War Two to the growing interventionist goals, national and abroad, of the Welfare-Warfare State that pressure sociology in following theory congenial to this research and management role (Gouldner, 1970:349; Mills, 1958).

A second, and related contradiction academic sociology must perceive is its claims of methodological objectivity. Such a position, posits Gouldner (1970:439), given its role as state welfare researcher and manager, "fosters the sociologist's accommodation to the way things are"... while providing a "disguise for... devotion or capitulation to the status quo."

For some sociologists the claim to objectivity serves as a facade for their own alienation from and resentment toward a society whose elites, even today, basically treat them as Romans treated their Greek slaves: as skilled servants, useful but lower beings (Gouldner, 1970:439).

These and other structural contradictions within academic sociology, which Gouldner (1970) elaborates, though solidly entrenched, are in the beginning states of modification. Largely, these changes derive from the "growing activism of sociologists" and "the growing dialogue of increasing intensity with various versions of Marxism" (Gouldner, 1970:437). Hernes (1976), a critical sociologist

Explication of Theoretical Paradigms

In the previous section we briefly surveyed significant variables impinging upon two opposing views of macrolevel analysis within American sociology. Further, we have shown why functionalism was more congenial to the dominant sentiments of American society, thereby usurping the conflict (radical-critical) perspective within standard American sociology. We turn now to explicate major theoretical paradigms within academic sociology. The purpose here is not to elaborate on any one paradigm in detail nor to lay the foundation for some new social theory. It is an attempt to analyze four particular approaches which are generally representative of sociological theorizing. These approaches or their variants have been adopted by other sociologists for similar purposes, namely, to acquaint the reader with information necessary for a general understanding of sociological theory.
One detail here on our paradigm discussion warrants mentioning. We discuss phenomenology as a sophisticated representative of microsociology, though ethnomethodology and cognitive sociology have contributed to this burgeoning development in this level of sociological analysis (Collins, 1981:2). Although Brown (1976) mentions the availability of phenomenology textbooks, our sample did not contain texts that could be assigned to the category. Nonetheless, we feel phenomenology a significant paradigm to implement within a reflexive sociology, and so have discussed it in the following section of this chapter.

The first approach to be reviewed is sociological positivism. It views society as a homeostatic, functionally integrated system of culturally related subsystems. Its view, especially in its modern genre (e.g., structural functionalism), represents a systemic approach to the political, economic and social needs of contemporary society.

The second approach, conflict or critical sociology, owes its beginning to Karl Marx, who had an emancipatory interest in transforming society. This orientation views society as conflict-oriented, macrosystemic, and based on competition and struggle for domination between groups.

The third mode represented is social constructionism. Society from this perspective is viewed as a microscopically
based system of norms, values, and social interpretations (Kinloch, 1977) derived via social interaction. This approach is inductive, process oriented, and one in which society is emergent through microsocial processes of human interaction studied by sympathetic introspection and observation.

Phenomenology, the fourth mode, focuses on the processes involved in the development of societal consciousness. This position conceives of society as a cultural, symbolic, and existential system based on individual and group definitions of reality.

**Positivism (Functionalism)**

The sociological positivistic mode of thought had its beginnings about the first quarter of the nineteenth century in France, and its primary contributors were Claude-Henri de Rouvroy, le Comte de Saint-Simon and Auguste Comte. Both men drew their ideas in a period of transition from the aftermath of the French Revolution and the restoration which followed. Saint-Simon's conception of sociology is clearly seen as a natural extension of the scientific outlook of the physical sciences, that is, man and society needed to be studied scientifically. Traditionally, science was based on a faith founded in philosophical realism. For the most part Saint-Simon and Comte accepted the realist's philosophical assumptions about existence: the primary objective is to discover the laws of the real world. Herein a knowable
social order is assumed to exist and it is the sociologist's task to discover that order. It follows the simple epistemology that absolutely separates the observer from the observed, assuming that objectivity is possible because, in the case of sociology, the sociologist believes that an order (society) exists independent of the sociologist. The sociologist's cognitive apparatus, according to Richard Quinney:

...supposedly does not affect the nature of what is known. Given enough knowledge, accumulated systematically, the scientist presumably could predict future events and control their occurrence. An orderly universe could be established through man's knowledge and manipulation of the external world.

The overriding emphasis of positivistic thought is on the explanation of events. And in following a mechanistic conception of the relation of social facts, the positivist usually couches his explanations in terms of causality (1974:2-3).

Causality is a construct that has been used by the scientist in an attempt to understand the world he or she experiences. The scientist demonstrates his or her understanding of a selected phenomenon by positing a logical explanation of any relationships in terms of what causes what. In short, an explanation, then, is a causal account of a phenomenon (Ryan, 1970:60). In recent years, however, social research has witnessed a loss of some faith in causal logic and theory (Noblit, 1977). For example, Kerlinger (1973) in a methods text with a strong quantitative emphasis has come to believe that causal thinking is an endless maze,
and is not necessary for scientific research. Further, he argues that causality cannot even be demonstrated empirically.

Basically, what has happened is there has been a tendency in the social sciences to copy the philosophical assumptions of the physical sciences as well as their particular methods and techniques (Friedrichs, 1970; Giddens, 1975, 1982; House, 1976; Quinney and Wildemann, 1977; Held, 1980). Accordingly, the social scientist imaginatively reconstructs models of other people's mental and emotional processes to explain their behavior (House, 1976:95). Alfred Schutz describes this in the following way:

Thus, adopting the scientific attitude, the social scientist observes human interaction patterns or their results insofar as they are accessible to his observation and open to his interpretation. He begins to construct typical course-of-action patterns corresponding to the observed events. Thereupon he co-ordinates to these typical course-of-action patterns a personal type, a model of an actor whom he imagines as being gifted with consciousness... Yet these models of actors are not human beings living within their biographical situation in the social world of everyday life. Strictly speaking, they do not have any biography or any history, and the situation into which they are placed is not a situation defined by them but defined by their creator, the social scientist (1962: 64-65).

This may have merit in relation to the observational field of the physical sciences; however, social scientists do not examine nor are they even aware of the philosophical
assumptions by which the observer operates (Louch, 1969).

As Schutz later points out:

The world of nature, as explored by the natural scientist, does not "mean" anything to molecules, atoms, and electrons. But the observational field of the social scientific — social reality — has a specific meaning and relevance structure for the human beings living, acting, and thinking within it (1963:242).

The intellectual failure of positivism is that it is not reflexive — positivists fail to comprehend that the process of knowing cannot be severed from the historical struggle between human beings and the world (Held, 1980:165). Or as Quinney put it:

There is neither a recognition that the nature of explanation depends upon the kinds of things investigated nor that explanation requires a description of the unique context in which events occur. Likewise, the positivist refuses to recognize that to access and make statements about human actions is to engage in a moral endeavor. Instead, the positivist regards his activity as being "value free" (1974:3).

Positivists do not examine the scientific assumptions upon which their theory and methods are based, nor do they question the prevailing "state of affairs." On the contrary, as Marcuse (1941) expressed it, positivism affirms the existing order against those who assert the need for changing it. This does not negate the necessity for progressive dynamics, it simply prescribes the form of which any changes will take. Or as Marcuse argues, the form of any changes are always given by "the machinery of the
established order" (1941:343). Held spells out Marcuse's account of the principles of positivist philosophy that ensure the legitimation of the existing order as those:

...which attempt to justify the authority of observation against alternative forms of reason and imagination. Resignation to the given follows from the positivist view that concepts must be grounded in observed facts, and from the notion that the real connection between facts represents an 'inexorable order.' In emphasizing the importance of natural laws of societal 'statics' and 'dynamics'; human activity is subsumed under the category of objective necessity. Further, in maintaining that sociology as positive science has no relation to value judgements, and that facts and values are quite separate entities, there is held to be no objective basis independent of science and its findings to criticize society (1980:162).

This leads to the view that positivism is inherently conservative, incapable of challenging the existing system (Ritzer, 1983:261).

Very legitimately akin to sociological positivism, in terms of sentiments and scientific assumptions, is modern functionalism. Alvin Gouldner writes:

While modern Functionalism renounces certain assumptions important to earlier Positivism, particularly its evolutionism and cultural lag theory, Functionalism has always remained loyal to Positivism's central 'programmatic concept' -- a concern with the "positive" functions of institutions -- and, moreover, to certain of the core sentiments adhering to it (1970:113).

Advocates of functionalism, especially Talcott Parsons, have attempted to develop grand theories in an effort to explain social reality primarily from a systems approach. In fact, at a time when functional theorists were devoid of a unified
theoretical paradigm it was Parsons who offered the discipline the image of a "system" as a focal conceptual referent (Friedrichs, 1970). Post World War II sociology now had a paradigm that uniquely fit the "climate of the times." As Friedrichs states:

It was a period in the history of the American intellectual that provided every kind of subtle support the system advocate might wish for a paradigm whose point of return was dedicated by the relative equilibrium that was the image’s unstated premise (1970:17).

It was during the 1950s that many, being supportive of Kingley Davis’s (1959) position that structural functionalism was synonymous with sociology, deemed functionalism to represent sociological orthodoxy (Friedrichs, 1970).

Fundamentally, structural functionalists take a macroscopic approach, focusing on the social system as a whole made up of structural or institutional components. Generally speaking:

The parts of the system, as well as the system as a whole, are seen as existing in a state of equilibrium, so that changes in one part will lead to changes in other parts. Changes in parts may balance each other so that there is no change in the system as a whole; if they do not, the entire system will probably change. Thus while structural functionalism adopts an equilibrium perspective, it is not necessarily a static point of view. In this moving equilibrium of the social system, those changes that do occur are seen as doing so in an orderly, not a revolutionary, way (Ritzer, 1983:224).

Functionalism’s most obvious affiliation with positivist philosophy is its tendency to maintain a conservative
bias by focusing almost exclusively on the normative order of society, while largely ignoring history, conflict and social change. One of the basic difficulties with functionalism or structural functionalist approaches is the inability to deal adequately with conflict issues such as economic development and social change (Mills, 1959; Cohen, 1968; Gouldner, 1970; Abrahamson, 1978; Turner and Maryanski, 1979). It is to these issues that the sociology of development addresses itself.\(^{17}\)

The sociology of development is largely the product of economically developed countries of the West (particularly the United States) which is intended to promote the economic, political, and social development of underdeveloped countries.\(^{18}\) Although the sociology of development is not theoretically limited to the functionalist approach, it is by and large the dominant sociological approach to "developmentalism", particularly in the United States.\(^{19}\) This sociology came to prominence at the same time as another functionalist sociological theory, the "end-of-ideology" (Bell, 1962) was being received in Western academic circles.\(^{20}\) Ironically, at this time Ho Chi Minh and Fidel Castro were leading revolts against the status quo political hegemony of the West, which would send the end-of-ideologists and developmentalists back to their think-tanks.

The central tenets of the sociology of development are outlined in what Manning Nash describes as the "only three
modes of attacking the problem of social change and economic development" (1963:5). Paraphrasing Nash, the first mode is the "ideal typical index approach", and its major contributors are Bert Hoselitz (1960) and Talcott Parsons (1960, 1964). This mode posits that there are ideal typical characteristics of development. With this approach, "the general features of a developed economy are abstracted as an ideal type and then contrasted with equally ideal typical features of a poor society" (Nash, 1963:5). Development, in this approach, is viewed as a linear transformation from the underdeveloped type into the developed societal type. The second approach, or the "diffusionist approach", concerns how those ideal typical characteristics of the first approach are supposedly diffused from the developed countries to the underdeveloped ones. Finally, the third mode or the "psychological approach" tells us how the ideal typical characteristics that are identified in the first approach and diffused according to the second approach are to be acculturated by the underdeveloped countries if they wish to be developed (Frank, 1967).

In criticizing these approaches for their theoretical adequacy, Andre Gunder Frank states:

The pioneers of these three modes have progressed; to social dualism, they have added sociological dualism. Their whole theory and theorizing is split down the middle. They see one set of characteristics, take note of one social structure if any; construct one theory for one part of what has been one world economic and social system for half a millenium and construct
another pattern and theory for the other part. And all that in the name of universalism (1967:54).

In effect, Frank is saying, like earlier positivistic approaches, modern functionalism (especially as applied in the sociology of development) has aided in facilitating a palpable "program" of development by developed nations to the heretofore poorly understood countries of the underdeveloped world.

**Conflict**

In an attempt to transcend German philosophical idealism, Karl Marx developed a largely historical materialist thesis which contains components of both economic determinism and Saint-Simonian socialism. For Marx, human society was best understood as an historical process of the continuous creation, satisfaction and re-creation of human needs (Giddens, 1971). "In direct contrast to German philosophy," Marx states, "life is not determined by consciousness, but consciousness by life" (1846:47). Marx's critical mode of inquiry is a radical philosophy -- one that goes to the roots of our lives, to the foundations and fundamentals, to the essentials of consciousness. As Marx delineates:

This method of approach is not devoid of premises. It starts out from the real premises and does not abandon them for a moment. Its premises are men, not in any fantastic isolation and rigidity, but in their actual, empirically perceptible process of development under definite conditions. As soon as this life-process is
described, history ceases to be a collection of dead facts as it is with the empiricists (themselves still abstract), or an imagined activity of imagined subjects as with the idealists.

Where speculation ends -- in real life -- there real, positive science begins: the representation of the practical activity, of the practical process of development of men. Empty talk about consciousness ceases, and real knowledge has to take its place. When reality is depicted, philosophy as an independent branch of knowledge loses its medium of existence. At the best its place can only be taken by a summing-up of the most general results, abstractions which arise from the observation of the historical development of men. Viewed apart from real history, these abstractions have in themselves no value whatsoever. They can only serve to facilitate the arrangement of historical material, to indicate the sequence of its separate strata. But they by no means afford a recipe or schema, as does philosophy, for neatly trimming the epochs of history. On the contrary, our difficulties begin only when we set about the observation and the arrangement -- the real depiction -- of our historical material, whether of past epoch or of the present (1846:47-48).

Through the demystifying exercise of self-reflection, the Marxist, or critical theorist, seeks to expunge or obliterate as much as is humanly possible all prior assumptions and suppositions in order to be open to every possible alternative to existing reality. By taking this point of departure critical thinking seeks to minimize the possibility of a false consciousness that is rooted in an uncritical acceptance of a reified social order, a social order that is at the same time alienating and oppressive. Thus, conflict or critical mode of thought is best conceived of as a liberating force, a struggle toward the birth of a new consciousness (Quinney and Wildemann, 1977:122).
The classical philosophical tradition holds the attitude that ideas are to inform actions, that life is to be enlightened by thought. A critical philosophy is one that destroys the illusion of objectivism (the illusion of a consciousness apart from reality). It lets us break with the ideology of the age, for built into critical thinking is the ability to think negatively. This dialectical form of thought allows us to question current experience (Marcuse, 1941). Thus, by being able to entertain an alternative, Marxist sociology offers a better understanding of what exists (existent). Instead of merely looking for any objective reality, Marxian or critical theorists are interested in negating the established order, which will make us better able to understand what we experience. Without critical thought we are bound to the only form of social life we know -- the current one (Quinney and Wilde-mann, 1977).

Critical sociologists do not tell us which forms of social life would be preferred to the present one, only how to bring about change -- through revolution. Marx himself never systematically outlined or chartered his conception of a preferred society. He did, however, make some predictions about the fate of capitalism and a forthcoming socialist revolution. In a passage from The Communist Manifesto, Marx declares:
When, in the course of development, class distinctions have disappeared, and all production has been concentrated in the hands of a vast association of the whole nation, the public power will lose its political character. Political power, properly so called, is merely the organized power of one class for oppressing another. If the proletariat during its contest with the bourgeoisie is compelled, by force of circumstances, to organize itself as a class, if, by means of a revolution, it makes itself the ruling class, and, as such, sweeps away by force the old conditions of production, then it will, along with these conditions, have swept away the conditions for the existence of class antagonisms and of classes generally, and will thereby have abolished its own supremacy as a class. In place of the old bourgeois society, with its classes and class antagonism, we shall have an association in which the free development of each is the condition for the free development of all (1848:94-95).

Marx’s forecast for a classless, rationally ordered society has not yet been realized in the modern world of the twentieth century, nor does there appear much chance for such in the near future. More importantly, Marx’s materialist interpretation of history has as a source of strength its emphasis on dialectics -- its insistence that history is inherently conflict-laden, and that its conflictual elements yield their meanings only when we understand them as "contradictions" within a dialectical framework (Heilbroner, 1980). Heilbroner writes:

The idea of contradiction...is that social systems may display tendencies that are both necessary for their existence and yet incompatible with it. Such a conception provides a unifying overview with respect to many eras of historic change that otherwise appear only chaotic or patternless (1980:77-78).
Also, it is important to remember that Marx's sociology offers both the Marxist and the non-Marxist, a methodology in dialectical thinking, that "enables us to perceive the complex, relational nature of ideas or entities that appear to the undialectical eye as simple or self-contained (Heilbroner, 1980:36).

Any substantive criticism of Marxism (conflict/critical) is often hindered by confusion over the question of the relation between political Marxism and intellectual Marxism, between the revolutionary and the academician, or as Mills (1962) depicted, between the "vulgar" and the "sophisticated". Finding middle ground is no easy task when one is confronted with a revolutionary intellectual and political force that "polarizes virtually everyone with whom it comes into contact -- for or against" (Heilbroner, 1980:26). To go beyond the attraction of either pole of this revolutionary magnet is to do, in effect, what Heilbroner (1980) attempts, that is, take the position of for and against -- to critique Marxism reflexively in terms of the presuppositions of Marxist logic.

Despite the nature of Marx's dialectic (Ritzer, 1983), many critics of Marx continue to focus their criticism on the economic determinist elements of his theory (Mills, 1962; Habermas, 1968; Stewart, 1978; Heilbroner, 1980). Mills (1962) suggests that Marx was conceptually imprecise,
and that Marx's theory does not fully develop the fundamentals of his economism. As Mills points out:

Exactly what is included and what is not included in "economic base" is not altogether clear, nor are the "forces" and "relations" of production precisely defined and consistently used (1962:105).

Others argue that the "economic determinist" criticism is a matter of interpretation (Agger, 1978; Heilbroner, 1980; Ritzer, 1983). For example, Heilbroner suggest that this "crude 'economism' that has marked Marxist historiography is not...inherently in its materialist emphasis" (1980:66). Also, Ritzer writes:

Although Marx did see the economic sector as pre-eminent, at least in capitalist society, as a dialectician he could not have taken a deterministic position because the dialectic is characterized by the notion that there is continual feedback and mutual interaction among the various sectors of society (1983:256).

Heilbroner's impressive critique of the materialist interpretation of history points up a number of problems with Marxist theory that are both challenging and insightful. First of all, Heilbroner (1980) asserts that the materialist view -- "that the course of history lies in the ultimate, dominating influence of mankind's productive activities" -- poses a problem of definition. The difficulty, as Heilbroner writes:

...lies in defining the material sphere itself without introducing elements of idealism; or if you will, in distinguishing activities in the base from those in the
superstructure.... The intermingling of nonmaterial activities with material ones, the suffusion of ideational elements throughout the body of society, the inextricable unity of "social" and "economic" life, make it difficult to draw boundaries around the material sphere. The problem for a materialist version of history, therefore, is to take into ideology, and other elements of the ideational realm, without losing the distinctive emphasis that is materialism's claim for superiority (1980:82-84).

Secondly, Heilbroner (1980) proposes that dialectics itself "must remain a hypothesis." He cites two difficulties within the subject of Marxian dialectics:

...first...is the tendency to blur the distinction between a "conflict" and a "contradiction".... It is one thing,...to seek a materialist perspective on social change or on the dynamics of various socio-economic formations, and it is another to label these changes as "dialectical" or "contradictory"....

A second problem posed by dialectics has to do with...the ideas of class struggle and alienation; namely, the assumption that the dialectical processes underlying these themes of history would lead to their resolution in a final class struggle, ultimately overcoming the condition of alienated being (1980:84-85).

Though there have been so-called "Marxist" revolutions, a proletarian revolution of the sort Marx had in mind has never occurred (Mills, 1962:122). Mills (1962) cites the "theoretical deficiencies of his categories" and "his general model of capitalism" as reasons for the failure of Marx's expectations. Heilbroner (1980:87), on the other hand, argues that what really matters in Marx's predictions is that they reveal a telltale weakness of the dialectical view -- its tacit teleology, its unstated millenial assumptions. The Marxist dialectical view of history:
...is not content to declare that ceaseless change is inherent in history as an aspect of the nature of all reality. It imposes a Design on the course of history, a design in no wise less idealist than the vast mystical resolution attributed to Hegel. A view of history as a pageant of ceaseless change without moral transcendence is not one that Marxists can accept (Heilbroner, 1980:87).

Social Constructionism

Social constructionist thought begins with a recognition of philosophical idealism. Social constructionists operate with an ontology that questions the existence of an objective reality apart from the individual’s imagination (Quinney, 1974). That is to say, social constructionism assumes that objects cannot exist independently of our minds, that any reality is important only as long as it can be perceived. Therefore, social reality can only exist through the subjective perceptions with other social actors by the use of symbols. These symbols represent imagined constructs (i.e., an association, a bureaucracy, a club, etc.), not the tangible, physical realities that people mistake them for. For example, no one has ever seen an institution or any organization, and yet, people believe in them; "know" that they exist. What they "know," as Collins and Makowsky have pointed out, is a world that:

...is populated by entities (General Motors, the Pentagon, the University of California, the city of San Francisco) that exist only in people’s minds; we are misled into thinking of them as physical things because the people who enact these symbolic entities are usually found in specific physical places. As long as some people believe in them, organizations are real in
their effects, and people who do not accept their rules are punished as criminals, madmen, or revolutionaries (1972:208).

Or, put more succinctly in what has come to be known by sociologists as the "Thomas theorem": "If men define situations as real, they are real in their consequences" (Thomas and Thomas 1928:572).

The epistemological assumption of social constructionism is that society, characterized by various symbols, is emergent from the behaviors of humans. Humans, however, tend to view subjective processes (i.e., social construction) as objective realities (Quinney, 1974). Following this assumption, the social scientist's constructs have to be founded upon the world created by social actors. Hence, the world that is important to the social constructionist is the one created by the social actions of human beings, through interaction and intercommunication with others (Quinney, 1974). It is via symbolic interaction that human beings construct social reality. This social reality involves the social meanings and the products of the subjective world of everyday life (Berger and Luckmann, 1966). Berger and Luckmann continue to point out:

The world of everyday life is not only taken for granted as reality by the ordinary members of society in the subjectively meaningful conduct of their lives. It is a world that originates in their thought and actions, and is maintained as real by these (1966: 19-20).
This "reality of everyday life,"\textsuperscript{24} consists of those objects and meanings of objects which people accept as their own (identify with) in dealing with the situations of their lives. People do not see this "reality" as being or as having been constructed by others or themselves in communication and interaction. This "reality of everyday life" is the means with which the members of a group explain the world in which they live. This "reality" is a "taken-for-granted" perspective (collection of meanings) — it consists of objects and the meanings of objects that are believed to be what they are because they could not be otherwise. This is called the "natural attitude" (the sum total of what everybody knows) or "commonsense". As Berger and Luckmann have explained:

Among the multiple realities there is one that presents itself as the reality par excellence. This is the reality of everyday life. Its privileged position entitles it to the designation of paramount reality. The tension of consciousness is highest in everyday life, that is, the latter imposes itself upon consciousness in the most massive, urgent and intense manner. It is impossible to ignore, difficult even to weaken in its imperative presence. Consequently, it forces me to be attentive to it in the fullest way. I experience everyday life in the state of being wide-awake. This wide-awake state of existing in and apprehending the reality of everyday life is taken by me to be normal and self-evident, that is, it constitutes my natural attitude (1966:21).

For Berger and Luckmann (1966), the "natural attitude" toward "everyday life" becomes not the be-all and end-all of the entire sociological enterprise but rather an exception-
ally fruitful focus for any enlarged exercise in the sociology of knowledge (Friedrichs, 1970:309). However, they conceive sociology not simply as a tool for understanding the "commonsense world," but as:

...a medium by which we are able to transcend the determinate forms and meanings we ourselves as men have given it (Friedrichs, 1970:309).

Social constructionist thought is generally microscopic, inductive, process oriented and follows the assumption that social reality is constructed out of tacit understandings among humans engaged in symbolic interaction (Goffman, 1959; Rose, 1962; Blumer, 1969; Manis and Meltzer, 1978). Symbolic interactionism, although diverse in orientation, is a major substantive theory within our conception of social constructionism. The crucial assumption of symbolic interaction is that human beings possess the ability to think and act reflectively and not respond like machines (Ritzer, 1983:307). This reflective process, "the turning back of the experience of the individual upon himself", first proffered by Mead (1934:134), has become a critical methodological tool for many qualitative sociological craftsmen. The symbolic interactionist's concern for reflexivity, however, is that it is assumed to be an elemental factor in the human mind's process of continually structuring and restructuring social reality through interaction with other human beings. Hence, reflexivity is
part of a "process"; the process of interaction, which Turner (1974) says appears to be the primary concern of symbolic interaction. Herbert Blumer, who coined the term "symbolic interaction" and is one of the leading developers of this perspective, summarizes some of its fundamental postulates in this way:

The term "symbolic interaction" refers, of course, to the peculiar and distinctive character of interaction as it takes place between human beings. The peculiarity consists in the fact that human beings interpret or "define" each other's actions. Their "response" is not made directly to the actions of one another but instead is based on the meaning which they attach to such actions. Thus, human interaction is mediated by the use of symbols, by interpretation, or by ascertaining the meaning of one another's actions. This mediation is equivalent to inserting a process of interpretation between stimulus and response in the case of human behavior (1969:78-79).

In short, Blumer contends that people do not respond to one another directly; people interpret one another's actions in terms of the meanings and symbols supplied to them by their culture through social interaction.

The major criticism of symbolic interactionism is its tendency to underemphasize macro-social structure (Turner, 1974; Meltzer, Petras and Reynolds, 1975; Weinstein and Tanur, 1976; Stryker, 1980). Many symbolic interactionists see larger social structures as simply a "framework: or a "stage" within which people engage in interaction. Weinstein and Tanur, however, argue that the "concept of social structure is necessary to deal with the incredible density
and complexity of relations through which episodes of interaction are connected" (1976:106).

Another criticism of symbolic interactionism is that it is conceptually vague or imprecise (Kuhn, 1964; Turner, 1974; Stryker, 1980). Turner asserts that much of symbolic interaction:

...consists of gallant assertions that "society is symbolic interaction", without indicating what type of emergent structures are created, sustained, and changed by what types of interaction in what types of contexts.... If such is the case, the current inability of symbolic interaction to document just how interaction creates, sustains, and changes social structures may be due, in part at least, to the fact that its concepts denote only a limited range of micro phenomena (1974:190-191).

In effect, Turner is saying that the answer to just how social reality is constructed by a process called symbolic interaction is not currently available under the prevailing technical and conceptual limits of the theory.

Social constructionist thought has been criticized for being "overly subjective" and as having given up on "conventional scientific techniques" (Lichtman, 1970-71; Collins, 1975; Weinstein and Tanur, 1976). For the social constructionist, causal explanation in scientific inquiry is not viewed as a valid goal. As Collins explains:

The emphasis on the subjectivity of the human actor, the timebound processes of behavior and experience, and the denial of external structure and of the scientific ideal of explanation -- all of these leave the interpretive sociologist in the position of needing some criterion for what he is going to say (1975:30-31).
Social constructionist thought has been criticized (Friedrich, 1970; Lichtman, 1970-71; Quinney, 1974), for its inability to provide a stance that would allow us to transcend reality "taken-for-granted"; which is usually that defined as the official reality. While social constructionists furnish us with the beginnings for an examination of multiple realities, they fail to provide a measurement for evaluating individual and collective preferability. Hence, as Marxists often point out, social relativism prevails at the expense of a critical understanding of the social world (Quinney, 1974). Most existing social conditions then are not providential or unintended events but are themselves social constructions, created by those who are in positions of power in society.

Phenomenology

Phenomenological thought differs noticeably from social constructionist thought in its basic aim. Whereas social constructionism is concerned with the explanation of social life, phenomenology begins by examining the process by which we understand the world in which we live. "The phenomenologist does not deny the existence of the outer world, but for his analytical purpose he makes up his mind to suspend belief in its existence -- that is, to refrain intentionally and systematically from all judgements related directly or indirectly to the existence of the outer world" (Shutz, 1962:104). Using what Edmund Husserl called "phenomeno-
logical reduction" or "putting the world in brackets," the phenomenologist seeks to transcend the world of everyday life or the "life-world" (lebenswelt), even to the point where explanation (scientific) as a form of thought is itself analyzed.27

Phenomenologists, while differing considerably among themselves, generally agree that our knowledge of the physical world comes from our experiences of objects in that world (Lauer, 1965). But, they continue, when we talk about the physical world we are not limited by these experiences. That is, we are not limited by our actual experiences, thus altering our perception of things in the world (Quinney, 1974; Lauer, 1965; Zaner, 1970; Psathas, 1973). The phenomenologist, therefore, by the very nature of his discipline, must leave behind the object-bound intentionality of everyday life in an attempt to perceive the essence of things.

The phenomenologist is primarily interested in the phenomenon, or the appearance of reality itself (Lauer, 1965). Yet, it is possible to think about what is not known, the "thing-in-itself," or the noumenon, of which the phenomenon is the known aspect. Our ability to think about the "thing-in-itself," signifies that our knowledge of phenomena is always subject to revision (Quinney, 1974). Hence, our consciousness of phenomena is continually altering, or stated differently, we are conscious of the
world as consisting of multiple realities (Berger and Luckmann, 1966).

From consciousness itself we get our understanding of the world. And, as Berger and Luckmann point out:

Consciousness is always intentional; it always intends or is directed toward objects. We can never apprehend some putative substratum of consciousness as such, only consciousness of something or other. This is so regardless of whether the object of consciousness is experienced as belonging to an external physical world or apprehended as an element of any inward subjective reality (1966:20).

Any understanding of any objective thing can come about only through our consciousness of the thing; reality is to be found in our consciousness of it. The essence of things, or the essential, is thus what the human mind understands through its consciousness, during its experiences in the world.

Phenomenologists are intent upon examining the experience of man's existence, of man's involvement with what exists and is within his reach in the form of objects, nature and persons. The phenomenologist achieves this by "surrendering" all preestablished interpretations and presumptions of any event; by "letting go" of one's predetermined conception of oneself. The phenomenologist "surrenders" to the event, becoming totally immersed in the experience of it, not merely as participant observer, but more as participant non-observer. The difficulty of such an activity is the act of "surrendering". As Kurt Wolff explains it,
surrendering to the situation means that you let go of yourself, you "experience" the event and your experiencing it simultaneously. Thus the goal of the activity is "surrender itself." Or, as Wolff describes it:

Surrender is the most radical mode of being we are capable of this side of insanity or disorder (1976: 168).

This ability to surrender enables the phenomenologist to experience "worlds" heretofore unknown, to think in ways unimagined. It creates an urge to think and understand, rather than, to accept knowledge as objectively given.

Phenomenological thought urges us to think about the "here" and the "now" of everyday life in the world. This urge to think forces us to transcend our conventional knowledge about the world and our place in it (Quinney, 1974). It allows us to remove ourselves momentarily from our corporeal experiences and engage in what Heidegger has termed "meditative thinking." And, as Heidegger writes:

Meditative thinking demands of us not to cling one-sidedly to a single idea, nor to run down a one-track course of ideas. Meditative thinking demands of us that we engage ourselves with what at first sight does not go together at all (1966:53).

Via meditative thinking, the phenomenologist seeks the essential; the transcendent. It is in the transcendental thinking of the phenomenologist that we find the inspiration for moving beyond the conventional wisdom of the age,
including our contemporary knowledge of society and our own world-view (weltanschauung). Instead of reifying the social order or merely giving an account of ordered existence, the movement is toward a transcendence of our experience.\textsuperscript{28}

The possibility of a Husserlian based phenomenological sociology is highly questionable (Heap and Roth, 1973:361). Heap and Roth (1973) argue that this is due, fundamentally, to the fact that many sociologists have misunderstood and misinterpreted many of Husserl's concepts and central ideas; including his idea of phenomenon. To many sociologists, "phenomena" are theoretical constructs or empirical abstractions (such as Durkheim's "social facts"), whereas Husserl urged that phenomenology be concerned with the things in themselves, phenomena devoid of reality attributed to them by actors in the real world (Ritzer, 1983:331).\textsuperscript{29}

Much of the criticism leveled at phenomenology is similar to that directed against symbolic interactionism; it is reductionistic; it neglects larger social structure; and, as yet, it offers more of a perspective rather than a unified social theory. Although it presents sociology with a much needed model of "critical reflexivity," phenomenology is unsuited in its present form for either the immediate or contextual needs of sociology (Friedrichs, 1970).

In this chapter we, first, briefly outlined the history and evolution of major sociological theoretical orientations. In part, this discussion indicates the
subsequent hegemony of structural functionalism within "Standard American Sociology," a point we take up again in chapter five with the "end-of-ideology" thesis, the exemplar expression of the structural functional paradigm. We concluded with an explication of the four major paradigms—the major assumptions and philosophies underlying their respective views and analysis of social reality. This paradigmatic overview was necessary to determine the sociological features each gives primary emphasis in viewing social phenomena such as the Vietnam War.

In the next chapter we elaborate our methodology to determine, first, the extent our textbook sample mentioned the Vietnam War, and secondly, how these textbooks as representatives of the four paradigms depicted the war to introductory sociology students. Due to the nature of our research—reflexive, qualitative, exploratory, inductive—we attempt to devise a research design suitable to the kind of knowledge domains in sociology we wish to explore.
1"Friedrichs (1970) argues that a synthesis of theoretical traditions in sociology existed and dominated American sociology from 1951 through the middle of the 1960s. Friedrichs called this synthesis structural functionalist theory...." (Mullins, 1973:40).

2"Ideological denial of stratification is an innovation of modern America" (Collins and Makowsky, 1972:5). One implication of this observation is that social theory, possibly embodies entrenched cultural myths. We need only recall the passage from the Pledge of Allegiance which reads: "...One nation under God with justice and liberty for all." Or, from the song "My Country 'Tis of Thee," the line: "...from every mountain-side, let freedom ring." The Americanization of Native Americans, African Blacks, Orientals, Eastern Europeans, and some Western European groups fails to empirically confirm these laudatory ideals. We contend that the cultural experiences of these groups in America, inevitably given the inherent conditions of dominant American economic patterns, have been excluded in Parsonsian formulations.

3Let us quote Mullins (1973:vii) on the "risky venture" of a sociological history of ideas: "[I]t is always hazardous to write about intellectual history. As has frequently been argued, the view of history that any person holds is profoundly affected by where and by whom he was trained and by his present objective conditions."

4"To be sure, positivism is still with us. But it has nothing like the theoretical prestige it once had..." (Collins, 1981:2). We contend that positivism still dominates in textbooks. One point should be made here. While our analysis is decidedly critical of structural functionalism's legacy of macrostructural analysis of American society, this is not to deny the immense contribution Parsons made to American sociology. Foremost, he codified the discipline and bestowed it with legitimacy and validity during the development of American sociology. What we criticize, however, is the inability of Parsonsian formulations to comprehend that the structural foundations underlying modern social phenomena such as the Vietnam War. Further, as long as these consensus-equilibrium images of American society proffered in textbooks persist, we feel the introductory student will leave the course with illusions about the society in which he or she will assume an adult role.
Virtually all of our remarks on the social, cultural and historical conditions involved in structural functionalism are derived from Alvin Gouldner's *The Coming Crisis of Western Sociology*. Later, when we discuss the institutional variables within sociology that shaped functionalism's ascendency in the American Academy, we follow Mullins' (1973) theoretical model of theory and theory groups.

Richard Attenborough's "Ghandhi" provides an Academy Award winning portrait of India's long struggle to overthrow British capitalism and economic exploitation. However, as all good art, the movie did not confine itself to the one theme. The inhumanity of humans and their entrenched hatred and bitterness was also showcased. Attenborough's theme was that humans, not "capitalism," are our main enemy.

Gouldner (1970:141-142) noted that after World War Two, when sociology "acquired a first hand gratifying experience with power, prestige and resources of the state apparatus" the discipline became more aligned and attuned with state needs. Mills' *The Sociological Imagination* (1959) further elaborates this observation with regard to how "grand theory" (e.g. Parsonsian functionalism) lends itself well to the abstracted empiricism necessary to the evolving state bureaucracy.

We would offer here that Parsonsian worldview became so dominant because the ideas embodied in structural functionalism resonate well popular cultural myths of America -- "America Right or Wrong. Love It or Leave It." These slogans embody the spirit of capitalism and pioneer spirit which so readily move the popular mind, a mind, according to Marx, characterized by a "false consciousness"-- that is, identifying itself with policies not favorable to its interests. This intellectual climate would make the acceptance of conflict theory within mainstream sociology less than enthusiastic. We discuss this point later in the chapter.

In our discussion of conflict, we interchange freely concepts that are theoretically distinct: conflict theory, Marxism, radical-critical sociology. While we recognize the distinction among these, we group them together, for the purposes of discussion of alternative structural views offered by structural functionalism.

Mullins makes the observation on Ralf Dahrendorf's radical-critical book: "Ralf Dahrendorf was a (German) student of Horkheimer's whose discussion of societal organization (Class and Conflict in Industrial Society) was published in English in 1959. This work directly challenged
structural functionalist theory, which had never considered Marxism, from a European, Marxist perspective. The critique had no effect on structural functional theory, in part because American students lacked the training in Marxist thought to digest and utilize the criticism." Mullins goes on to say that only at Stanford, where Dahrendorf was an Advanced Student in 1958, does critical sociology began to gain acceptability in sociology.

11 Collins (1981:338) questions Mullins' assessment of the conflict/radical-critical paradigm. From his examination an institutional base has existed at Frankfurt-am-Main, with significant "beachheads" at major American universities: Columbia (Mills), Berkeley, Washington University in St. Louis, and Wisconsin. These developments, according to Collins, have afforded development of radical-critical sociology in America, and with the appearance of textbooks — Anderson, 1971, 1974; Chambliss and Ryther, 1975 — we tend to agree.

12 This relationship between academic sociology and the state suggests a theme forwarded by Krishan Kumar (1976) of the inevitable commodification of sociology. According to Marx within a capitalistic state everything becomes a commodity, even ideas. We elaborate Kumars observation in chapter six.

13 Any attempt at analyzing social theories is subject to a number of limitations and the present scheme is no exception. The choice of the four theoretical modes does not represent an exhaustive history of social ideas, all the dimensions of sociological theorizing, or any indepth examination of any particular theory's historical and social context. Rather, it represents an attempt to abstract the major types or categories of sociological theory.

14 See Graham Charles Kinloch's Sociological Theory, Richard Quinney and John Wildemann's The Problem of Crime, for their use of theoretical categories. Also, for classical treatment of theoretical categorizing see Don Martin-dale's The Nature and Types of Sociological Theory, Johathan Turner's The Structure of Sociological Theory, and Walter Wallace's Sociological Theory; An Introduction.

15 See David Held's Introduction to Critical Theory, wherein he discusses positivist separation of fact and value (1980: 169-170) by arguing that the "ideals of objectivity and value-freedom are themselves values."

16 See Alvin W. Gouldner's The Coming Crisis of Western Sociology for his discussion of positivism and Marxism in
Chapter four — "What Happened in Sociology: An Historical Model of Structural Development."

17 See Andre Gunder Frank's "Sociology of Development and Underdevelopment of Sociology" for further analysis and criticism of the sociology of development; and his "Functionalism, Dialectics, and Synthetics" for a more detailed critique of the theoretical limitations of functionalism in the sociology of development.

18 See Peter Berger's Pyramids of Sacrifice for a comprehensive review and critique of "developmentalism".

19 For the purposes of this discussion, the "sociology of development" will refer to the functionalist approach and interpretation of developmentalism unless otherwise stated.

20 The end-of-ideology characterized "an era of unparalleled conformity and commitment to the status quo" (Friedrichs, 1970:17), and is discussed at length in chapter five.

21 Talcott Parsons gives an amplified example of this approach in his Structure and Process in Modern Society, and advances his analysis by later submitting what he calls "evolutionary universals" as typical indicators of social change and societal development in his "Evolutionary universals in society."

22 See Anthony Giddens' Capitalism and Modern Social Theory, for a detailed analysis of the central sociological ideas contained in Marx's historical materialist thesis.

23 An understanding of Marx's concept of "real history" is perhaps best derived from recognizing that Marx began with materialist premises and evolved a theory of how "classes" are produced and their relationship to the historical process. It must also be noted that history was often referred to as written history -- see Engels' note about Marx's opening words in The Communist Manifesto: "The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles" (1848:57).


26 Gouldner points out that this reflexivity has the enabling capacity to: "...transform the sociologist, to penetrate deeply into his daily life and work, enriching them with new sensitivities, and to raise the sociologist's self-awareness to a new historical level (1970:489).

27 In Ideas: General Introduction to Pure Phenomenology, and later in The Crisis of European Sciences and Transcendental Phenomenology, Husserl describes the concept of "life-world" (lebenswelt), which he considers the focus of phenomenological concern. Also, see Farber's The Foundation of Phenomenology for an introduction to Husserl's writings.


30 "Standard American Sociology" is the title that Nicholas Mullins (1973) applies to the synthesis resulting in structural functionalist domination of American academic sociology in the twentieth century. "Structural functionalism is the specific term applied to the social theory that emerged toward the end of standard American sociology's cluster stage and took over the theory side of most sociology departments after 1951" (Mullins, 1973:41).
Chapter Three

METHODOLOGY

Science increases the pressure on sensual joy: empiricism becomes empiricide, the murder of experience. Science uses the senses but does not enjoy them; finally buries them under theory, abstraction, mathematical generalization.

-- Theodore Roszak

Acquiring accurate knowledge of any social phenomenon is often a dubious undertaking. The present study to ascertain the degree and quality of information concerning the Vietnam War is no exception. One factor complicating this study's expressed intention to analyze this kind of knowledge (ideology) is the rapidity of social change within both popular and scholarly structures. Allowing this, information flow always lags behind the phenomenon it purports to conceptualize and analyze (cf. Toffler, 1970). Therefore, attempts at empirically verifying the relationships between positions of a social institution (e.g., sociology), and of certain contributors (e.g., authors), to that institution's epistemology and established channels of information are subject to differing interpretations. Furthermore, not only is the content of knowledge rapidly changing; the structures of knowledge itself are changing, acutely deviating from established epistemologies assumed by scholars (Thompson, 1981; Capra, 1983; cf. Collins, 1981:ix).
These observations on the nature of knowledge within rapidly changing structures of society indicate the difficulty in establishing a suitable methodology for framing the kind of information needed for this study. Given this situation, prevailing methodologies standard to sociological research will not be employed. Instead, we intend to modify existing methodological techniques to fashion an inductive and exploratory research design. Such a design is necessary, we feel; for rather than confirming or rejecting hypotheses generated from any existing theory, we wish to explore historical and social conditions that generate types of sociological knowledge: knowledge about the Vietnam War extant in the discipline, as manifested in introductory textbooks and how the structure and nature of principal American institutions are correspondingly depicted. For this kind of reflexive examination of sociology, an open ended design is essential to explore the information generating patterns and structures within the discipline.

**Historical Document Analysis**

In chapter one we discussed the importance of textbooks to science, to sociology, and to our reflexive examination. As historical documents they collectively present information about the Vietnam War and, too, reveal how the study of society was conceived and disseminated to students at one point in time. A historical document analysis is
congenial to our research for two reasons. First, this methodological tool is most suitable to an inductive qualitative study because, rather than test or verify hypotheses (Shibutani, 1966), we wish to formulate hypotheses concerning issues outside the purview of "standard American sociology" (Mullins, 1973). Using historical documents in this manner engenders exploration of domains outside conventional research concerns.¹

Second, historical document research offers the most comprehensive strategy for evaluating the contributions of the participants themselves in terms of their historical and contextual relevance. A historical approach precludes the assumptions of sociological positivism which have been dominant in some spheres of social science during the twentieth century (Bailey, 1978).² Instead, it allows for an interpretative understanding of an event and its historical process, and it does so in terms of the meaning categories of the participants, e.g., textbook authors (Noblit, 1977). Historical document research also has the advantage of having little or no reactivity, characteristic of direct observation and other unobtrusive measurement techniques. However, as Schwartz and Jacobs warn us:

'...while unobtrusive measures provide the investigator with a strategy for transcending the problem of his own reactive influence, they have other serious limitations, with regard to the questions those in the reality reconstruction business seek to answer. Unobtrusive measures... offer few, if any, clues to what's going on in people's heads. Rather they are
indicative of life styles, behavior patterns, or technological stages, and 'world-views.' Useful as these indicators may be for gaining access to some facets of group life, they offer very little direct evidence of the social meanings of social actions to the participants involved (1979:76).

Others would contend just the opposite; they argue that behavior (e.g., social action) is the essence of meaning. For example, in his discussion of gestures in social action, Stryker says:

The meaning of a gesture (an early stage of an act) is the behavior which follows it (the later stages of the act): meaning is, by definition, behavior (1978:325).

From a phenomenological perspective, these two techniques -- historical document analysis and behavior analysis -- are not as oppositional in nature as might appear. Because thought is a form of behavior (Schutz, 1962), representing a mode of being and of orientation to the world, historical documents can be analyzed to determine the categories of meaning bearing upon the author. The phenomenological premise serves our purpose well since we are concerned with first how sociologists conceived and addressed the Vietnam War, and second, what this manner of representation indicates about the institutional processes within sociology itself.

To introduce a compromise between this historical and behavior/meaning opposition, another unobtrusive measure will supplement the primary research strategy, namely,
content analysis, which will be discussed later in this chapter.

Obviously, qualitative studies are primarily humanistic rather than mechanistic in orientation (Bruyn, 1966; Lofland, 1971; Schatzman and Strauss, 1973; Bailey, 1978). They are concerned with discovering "a more direct sense of what other people are about and what their lives are like than that provided by casual and unexamined typification" (Lofland, 1971:2). Unlike quantitative studies which attempt to establish causality mathematically, qualitative analyses offer a more comprehensive understanding of the setting and subjects under study. In short, rather than impose upon a people a preconceived scheme of what they are about, qualitative historical analysis provides an interpretative understanding of the world under observation in terms provided by the people themselves.

The analysis begins with the review of introductory sociology textbooks, written and published during the Vietnam War period of direct American involvement (1954-1975). This analysis will be organized around the following criteria: the general content; the advocacy of paradigmatic preferences; and indexed references to the "Vietnam War." With respect to content, attention will be given to chapter organization and selection of substantive topic areas. Regarding the advocacy of paradigmatic preferences, the concern here is with the overall description and presen-
tation of sociology in terms of its diverse theoretical perspectives or orientations. Finally, since we are specifically concerned with sociological accounts of the "Vietnam War", references to the Vietnam War appearing in the subject index of each textbook will serve as an indicator of the degree of interest in or the importance of such a topic to the authors or contributors of the textbook.

There have been a number of studies which have employed historical and content analyses of introductory textbooks. Bain (1962), Oromaner (1968), and most recently Perrucci (1980), have analyzed textbooks in order to discover the most frequently cited sociologists. Inkeles (1964) did a thematic analysis of textbook subject matter, while Rothman (1971) focused on the processes of scientific knowledge accumulation and the subsequent role of textbooks as knowledge disseminators. Brown (1976) adds to this compendium by reporting on the content and accessibility of introductory sociology texts from 1974 and 1975, and she included a rating chart of intro texts published in those two years. Though this does not exhaust the literature on introductory sociology textbook research, on the contrary, it is used as an exemplary sample in an attempt to illustrate that a precedent has been established, with regard to historical-content analysis research techniques which are being employed in this present study.\(^4\)
Our data, which we present graphically and with accompanying analysis in the next chapter, are organized around two general categories. The first is concerned with the textbook's theoretical orientation and in its presentation of sociology and the discipline's proper subject matter. The specific criteria used to assign our sample of textbooks to either "positivist," "conflict," "social constructionist," or "eclectic" orientation are detailed later in this chapter. The second category used to order our data we derived from the subject index of each introductory text. Although we graphically detail how each theoretical orientation addresses specific social problems -- poverty, racism, sexism, et al -- we are primarily concerned with those textbooks that index either "Vietnam War" or some symbol variant (cf. Recording Unit, this chapter). We first determine the total number of textbooks that contain these references, then the frequency that each of the four orientations (paradigms) respectively index the Vietnam War. Finally, we take our categorized data and examine the extent and manner each Vietnam War-indexing text addresses the war. Here, we are concerned with how the texts, as representatives of one of the four orientations, discussed the Vietnam War, for then we can determine which orientation, if any, most effectively presented the war and its important implications to the introductory sociology student.
Assigning Textbooks to Paradigms

The one hundred-twenty textbooks comprising our sample have been placed within one of the four paradigms earlier discussed in chapter two. In assigning these books to paradigms, we followed a stepwise procedure. First, some textbook authors declared in their foreword the general orientation favored in presenting their work. Since many stated their bias in this manner, no further analysis of paradigm preference was undertaken. If, however, the foreword omitted reference to the textbook's orientation, we analyzed the chapters and kinds of topics in each to determine the author's paradigmatic bias to social phenomena.

These two criteria usually sufficed in assigning textbooks to their appropriate paradigms. Yet other texts warranted additional criteria in determining their orientation toward social reality. Another factor, suggested by Perrucci (1980:44-45), involved examining those authors most frequently cited. Understandably, certain sociologists are favored by certain schools of thought, thus suggesting a preferred theoretical orientation. Another criterion influencing how textbooks were categorized involved earlier categorizations used by textbook examiners. Brown (1976) examined numerous textbooks comprising our sample (cf. Brown, 1976:127-129), and, when applicable, we followed her categorization, especially with
regard to eclectic textbooks. A final criterion involved was content analysis of the text itself. This entailed examining the texts according to the epistemological premises explicated in our earlier discussion of paradigms.

This step-by-step strategy permitted textbooks to be readily assigned to appropriate paradigms. One problem area was encountered, however, related in the main with textbooks professing an eclectic presentation of sociological analysis. We, as did Brown (1976:124), found some eclectic textbooks disposed to a structural functional presentation with scant references to conflict oriented sociology. Even though these textbooks were more positivist than eclectic in presentation, we nonetheless designated them to the eclectic paradigm.

**Content Analysis**

Content analysis is a research technique for the objective, systematic and quantitative description of the manifest content of communication, not the latent content (Kaplan, 1943; Berelson, 1952, 1954). One of the basic goals of this research technique is to transform a qualitative document into quantitative data. As Bailey writes:

> Content analysis is the equivalent in document study to survey research. It is conducive to the use of formal hypotheses, large scientifically drawn samples, and quantitative data that can be analyzed with computers and modern statistical techniques (1978:313).
Many researchers consider quantification an essential element of content analysis (Berelson, 1952; Cartwright, 1953; Pool, 1959). However, there are areas of research where "qualitative" rather than "quantitative" analysis provides the information desired by the researcher (Budd and Thorp, 1963). The quantitative-qualitative "dilemma" in content analysis has been the issue for concern among some researchers and the source of confusion for others. But, as Goode and Hatt point out:

...modern research must reject as a false dichotomy the separation between "qualitative" and "quantitative" studies, or between the "statistical" and the "non-statistical" approach. The application of mathematics ...does not ensure rigor of proof, any more than the use of "insight" guarantees the significance of the research (1952:313).

Most researchers agree that both quantitative and qualitative approaches have their weaknesses. They agree also that, whether one uses quantitative or qualitative analyses, strength lies in systematic research. Since we are not testing formal hypotheses, yet have a need to measure our data, we need to develop a systematic research technique employing both quantitative and qualitative analyses. Therefore, in an attempt to resolve some of this "dilemma", and in keeping with the general exploratory nature of our research design, we will use a technique combining both quantitative and qualitative analyses. As Budd and Thorp describe the fundamentals of the technique:
One frequently-used method of combing qualitative and quantitative analyses is to read a sample of the material chosen for study for the purpose of noting some relevant content categories, possible relationships to be investigated, and general impression of the material. This impressionistic treatment also may be useful in formulating hypotheses for later testing by the results of the systematic, quantitative research. Combining the two approaches serves to give the researcher the disadvantages of neither and the advantages of both (1963:2-3).

The general theme of this document analysis is to explore the potential of this material to be used for cultivating a world view, based on the assumption that introductory texts are influential in the development of social consciousness (Kuhn, 1962; Friedrichs, 1970). In other words, we intend to explore not only what was said, but also to determine how the information contained in introductory sociology texts relate to the students, within the context of the society in which they live. Put simply, our content analysis is concerned with practical or pragmatic consideration, not merely the semantical. As Kaplan points out, content analysis must take into account practical characteristics in determining which aspects of the content will be analyzed, and in what ways (1943:233). Though it is not the central concern of content analysis to refer to other than semantical considerations, Kaplan says:

There is a certain sense in which consideration of purely pragmatical characteristics, such as "intentions" and "responses" seems to be unavoidable. For semantics is an abstraction from the concrete situation studied by pragmatics. Language is empirically presented to us as a certain behavior complex.
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Organisms use certain physical objects or events, which we call signs, to modify their own and others' behavior. The relationships of such signs to one another and to the objects to which they refer are discoverable, fundamentally, only by an examination of the modifications in behavior associated with the use of the signs in question. "What is said," in short, is an abstraction from the concrete situation involving "who says it" and "who is affected, and how." Signs acquire the particular significations which they have only in so far as they tend to produce such and such effects in such and such situations. And in understanding the signs we are therefore in a certain sense taking account of these effects.... We must make clear, therefore, in what respects intentions and effects are taken into account, and in what respects not (1943:233).

To this end, our analyses will consider "intentions" and "effects" in terms of the meaning context; the intended or comprehended significations of signs (symbols) as they are "usually" purported. Lasswell states this position clearly:

We do not try to anticipate in detail the effects of any statement. We do no more than describe what is said according to the usual meaning of the language to those who use it and by whom it is assumed the statement is read (1941:4).

Summarily, content analysis cannot tell us what the author of any document had in mind at the time of its composition, nor the effect the author sought to elicit from his or her audience. Content analysis cannot tell us the effect of a document upon the audience. As Kaplan (1943), Berelson (1952, 1954), and others have pointed out, content analysis provides a description of the manifest content of the document. "It will show only the recurrence or absence
of content symbols — symbols which have been given certain 'meaning' by the analyst" (Budd and Thorp, 1963:16). The "meanings" ascribed to the content must correspond to the "meanings" intended by the author of the document. In other words, content analysis assumes the existence of a common culture (e.g., usual language) between the author of the document, the audience, and the analyst (Berelson, 1952). Content analysis in the present study then is intended to show the presence or absence of content symbols — references to the "Vietnam War" — in the subject index of introductory sociology textbooks written and published during the period 1954-1975. Specifically, this study employs a nonfrequency analytical technique (which is discussed later in this chapter) since we are concerned solely with the occurrence or non-occurrence of content symbols.

Since we have chosen to use a systematic or structured content analysis technique, there are a number of steps or tasks that must be completed which, in effect, constitute our program of analysis. Bailey (1978:314-315) lists the five chief tasks facing a content analyst as:

1. Draw the sample of documents.
2. Define the content categories. The actual content depends upon the purpose of the study.
3. Define the recording unit.
4. Define the context unit.
5. Define the system of enumeration.

What follows is a procedural elaboration of these analytical tasks in order of their program precedence.

**Sampling**

As stated earlier, this study is comprised of an analysis of introductory sociology textbooks produced by sociologists, and published during the Vietnam War period of direct American involvement (1954-1975). Also, it should be noted that because some introductory sociology textbooks produced during this period are, for logistical or financial reasons, not available to this researcher, only those introductory sociology textbooks that are accessible will be included in the document analysis. Because we employ all (theoretically) introductory sociology textbooks written and published during a specific period in American history, as the basis for our analysis, the data represent the universe under study. Concisely, the introductory sociology texts used in this study include personal copies, those donated by friends and colleagues, and especially those that were available at the Troy H. Middleton Library, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana.

**Categories**

For purposes of comparative analysis and to obtain the most objective description possible of the contents of the
document under study, categories will be used. As Berelson has clearly stated:

Content analysis stands or falls by its categories. ...since the categories contain the substance of the investigation, a content analysis can be no better than its system of categories (1952:147).

Content categories, as Holsti (1969:95) points out, should reflect the purposes of the research, and be exhaustive, mutually exclusive, and independent. In meeting these requirements we derived two broad categories in organizing the content of introductory textbooks. The first category contains texts which reference the Vietnam War in the index, and is entitled "Occurrence." To qualify for this category a text must include reference indicators (recording units), such as "Vietnam War", "Vietnam", "Indochina War," in the index. If a textbook contained no index, then the table of contents or lists of subjects addressed by the author(s) was consulted to further determine if the text contained material relevant to our analysis. The second category, "Nonoccurrence," is comprised of texts that did not provide information about the Vietnam War. As we elaborate further in this study the omission of the Vietnam War from introductory texts holds significant import to our analysis.

In addition to our categories, and to aid in the construction of a typology for analyzing textbooks in terms of their theoretical or philosophic content, we employ the
paradigms elaborated in chapter two. These paradigms were derived to organize sociological works according to established sociological theory (Martindale, 1960; Wallace, 1969; Gouldner, 1970; Quinney, 1974; Turner, 1974; Kinloch, 1977). For example, the social constructionist paradigm contains several distinct theories — cognitive sociology, ethnomethodology, dramaturgy, symbolic interaction — devoted to the microlevel dynamics of macrostructures. Further, the positivist paradigm, containing structural functionalism, offers views on the nature and structure of institutions in a system. This paradigm is contrasted with conflict theory, which offers a radically different perspective on the same social phenomena. Separately, each paradigm represents different perspectives and interpretations of the structures and ongoing social processes essential to culture.

With the combining of our categories and the four paradigms we have devised a typology. This model will enable us to establish which paradigm provided relevant textbook information about the Vietnam War to introductory students. In this manner, we can determine which, if any, paradigm assessed the Vietnam War most substantively, and which, if any, paradigm portrayed most substantively the nature and structure of dominant American social institutions.
**Recording Unit**

The recording units are the actual indicators of a category. They are like the operational definitions of a category. Thus, the recording units are indicators which determine whether any given unit should fall within the category. This study employs two types of recording units: word or symbol, and theme. Since the content categories are thematic in nature the "theme" type of recording unit will be used as the unit of analysis. Hereafter, any discussion of theme analysis will refer to the technique used in determining the actual content of the text being analyzed.

Theme refers to the assertion of a purpose or goal of a document or portion of a document (Bailey, 1978; Berelson, 1952; Cartwright, 1953). Theme is being used in concert with words or symbols as recording units because a thematic analysis will help facilitate the identification and description of the types of statements or content categories under investigation. Thematic analysis is especially valuable in cases where there is an absence of content indicators (word or symbol) and yet, the sentence or portion of a sentence makes an assertion about which one of the content categories can be subsumed. For example, in the following sentence an assertion is made in which no content indicators (in this case, references to "Marxism, Dialectics, or Ideological") appear:
In an act of plutocratic exploitation, South Vietnamese peasants were impressed into General Nguyen Khanh's active militia.

Using a thematic analysis, the assertive phrase "plutocratic exploitation," can be analyzed and classified as having an "ideological" theme. Hence one can infer from the analysis that the sentence is making an ideological type of statement.

Even though determining the boundaries of a theme may be more difficult and subjective than determining the boundaries of a word or symbol (Bailey, 1978), the theme is perhaps the most objective method of getting at direction (Budd and Thorp, 1963). That is to say, thematic analysis can demonstrate more clearly what an author was doing in writing the document or his or her orientation toward the subject of the document. For example, themes, as intended for this research, help determine whether an author or contributor is substantively addressing the subject matter of the document. Using the content categories previously delineated as theme categories, thematic analysis directs attention to language usage, any assertions about a subject matter, and the context in which the assertion was made.

The categories, "nonoccurrence" or "occurrence" of indexed references to the Vietnam War, also employ the word or symbol type of recording unit. The use of a single word or symbol has an obvious disadvantage, in that, depending on the length of the document, there may simply be too many
words or symbols to manage. The advantage of using a word or symbol as the recording unit, however, is that a single word is discrete, has clear boundaries, and is relatively easy to identify (Bailey, 1978:317). In preparing to study the contents of the subject indices of the introductory sociology texts, we have drawn up a list of key symbols which represent the content indicators for the category. The key symbols for this analysis are any word or words that either suggest or directly indicate that the text contains some information about the "Vietnam War." The key symbols are listed below:

Vietnam War
Vietnam
Indochina War
Asian War
Southeast Asian War
Viet Cong
Vietnam Conflict

**Context Unit**

The context unit is used to determine to which category the recording unit belongs. As Budd and Thorp put it:

The context unit is the body of material surrounding the recording unit or, more precisely, as much of the context as is required to characterize the recording unit being analyzed (1963:23).

Since the present analysis uses two types of recording units (word or symbol, and theme), two distinct context units will be used. For the word (symbol) recording unit, the amount of text regarded as a context unit will be the subject index.
of the introductory sociology textbook being analyzed. The theme, which refers to assertions made about a subject matter, will be considered in the context of the entire document. Thus, the context unit for the thematic analysis will be the introductory sociology text being analyzed.

**System of Enumeration**

The present study utilizes content analysis to determine the type and frequency of statements or assertions used in addressing the Vietnam War in introductory textbooks. To accomplish this, the recording units will be measured by both quantitative and qualitative measurement techniques. To forego any confusion over the statement of purpose, in terms of the general methodological assumptions of the qualitative (impressionistic: "determine the type") and the quantitative (statistical: "frequency of") approaches, we need to differentiate between the two approaches in terms of the methods of measurement utilized in each approach. Attempting to make such a distinction, Alexander George introduces a new set of terms:

... We employ the term "nonfrequency" to describe the type of nonquantitative, nonstatistical content analysis which uses the presence or absence of a certain content characteristic or syndrome as a content indicator in an inferential hypothesis. In contrast, a "frequency" content indicator is one in which the number of times one or more content characteristics occur is regarded as relevant for the purpose of inference (1959:10).
George (1959:10) makes it clear that the basis for distinction between the two approaches does not lie in the assumption that frequency or quantitative content analysis is concerned solely with language attributes capable of strict measurement whereas nonfrequency or qualitative analysis deals exclusively with dichotomous attributes (attributes which can be predicated only as belonging or not belonging to an object). Rather, as George plainly states:

...the difference between the two approaches is that frequency analysis, even when it deals with dichotomous attributes, always singles out frequency distributions as a basis for making inferences. In contrast, the nonfrequency approach utilizes the mere occurrence or nonoccurrence of attributes (as against their frequency distributions) for purposes of inference (1959:10-11).

The nonfrequency analysis technique will be used as the system of enumeration for the categories being investigated. In the case where words or symbols are used as content indicators, the mere occurrence or nonoccurrence of a content indicator will be noted for analytical purposes. The same technique is used where the theme is used as a recording unit. This involves noting any occurrence of an assertion that can be construed as evidence or the existence of a theme category wherever there is no occurrence of a content indicator. Further, the counting procedures used in frequency analysis do not apply since in thematic analysis we are not concerned with how often an indicator occurs.
... The fact that a content feature does occur more than once within a communication does not oblige the investigator to count its frequency. The important fact about that content feature for his inference may be that it occurs at all within the prescribed communication (George, 1959:11).

Therefore, because thematic analysis, as employed in this study, is an interpretive approach, we can draw inferences on the basis of the occurrence or nonoccurrence of content indicators (theme categories or assertions).

We have described the research tools of our methodology and the rationale involved for choosing these components. In the next chapter we focus on the respective frequency and manner the paradigms reference and explicate the Vietnam War in textbooks. We offer graphs representing what we feel to be key information regarding the textbooks' presentation of the Vietnam War. The chapter concludes with a discussion on the respective treatment each paradigm offers with regard to the war.
FOOTNOTES

1 "Conventional research" here refers to standard models of research, of which the dissertation is the quintessential expression. In demonstrating mastery of basic concepts, a body of literature and research methodology, dissertations normally follow a general formula: conceive and formulate a problem within a theoretical paradigm; generate hypotheses about what is to be found with regard to a theoretical paradigm; formulate a methodology to collect statistical data to confirm or refute the hypotheses. Our study does not strictly follow this model. We ask that our methodology and attending concerns be understood as an exploration of issues outside the standard dissertation. As discussed in chapter one we are interested not only about sociological treatment of the Vietnam War but what this treatment implies about contemporary sociology -- the historical, social and cultural processes shaping the discipline's dominate view of social reality.

2 See our discussion of sociological positivism in chapter two.

3 If we can extrapolate from archaeology, the textbook is an artifact for the interpretation of culture. Miles Richardson, in using the ideas of G.H. Mead, has attempted to establish a "Meadian Archaeology," an archaeology oriented toward a "social interpretation of material culture." Related to our study, textbook-as-artifact represent documents "that describe our past, an image that reflects our present, and a sign that calls us into the future" (Richardson, 1986:1). Such an observation lends well to understanding textbooks as important artifacts in comprehending cultural elements of a group, for example, professional sociologists. For further reference to Dr. Richardson's ideas, see his "The Artifact As Abbreviated Act: A Social Interpretation of Material Culture," a paper to be presented at the World Archaeological Congress, meeting in London on September 1-7, 1986.

4 Robert Rothman points us beyond the ancillary and technical considerations of methodology when he declares "The major point is that the contents of introductory textbooks are intricately related to the growth of knowledge and to the process of the certification of knowledge" (1971:127). Hence, Rothman's (1971) focus on the philosophical and ontological implications of content analysis underscores an area of fundamental concern to this researcher, namely, the relationship between ideas and the men who produce them. Also, see Thomas Kuhn's (1962) "The Route to Normal Science," in The Structure of Scientific
Revolutions, and Friedrichs' (1970) discussion of Kuhn in the first chapter of A Sociology of Sociology.

Some of the introductory sociology textbooks have been reviewed by other reviewers, and often these reviewers describe the texts in theoretical terms. These reviews, in addition to the perspectives employed in, or the stated paradigmatic preference of the authors of the texts, will be considered in determining paradigm assignment.

See Richard Budd and Robert Thorp's An Introduction to Content Analysis, for their discussion of the quantitative-qualitative "dilemma" in chapter one -- "Content Analysis: Introduction, Definition, and the Quantitative-Qualitative 'Dilemma'.'

Kaplan considers intentions and effects in two contexts, which he calls the causal context and the meaning context. "In the causal context, the intention is embodied in the act of the speaker, in all its concreteness, involving the speaker's motives and purposes; the effect in the causal context is similarly the concrete reaction of the audience, including whatever overt responses may result from interpreting the signs [symbols] in question. In the meaning context, the intention and effect are the intended and comprehended significations, not in the concrete case, but as an abstraction from the whole class of causal contexts in which signs occur" (1943:233).
Chapter Four

ANALYSIS

For so it is Oh Lord, My God, I measure it but what it is I measure I do not know.

— Saint Augustine

Hobbs (1951) and Odum (1951) separately undertook content analysis of introductory sociology textbooks that, as the literature reveals, was not replicated until the 1960s. At that time Bain (1962) analyzed ten textbooks published between 1958 and 1962 to ascertain the most frequently cited sociologists. In 1968 Oromaner completed a duplicated study, again sampling ten introductory texts, to determine those sociologists most widely cited between 1963 and 1967. Brown (1976) surveyed introductory texts and found between 1973 and 1975 twenty-five new publications and eighteen revisions of earlier published works—an unparalleled period for introductory texts. In devising an elaborate chart, her intent was to assist instructors of introductory sociology courses to choose texts according to selected criteria.

of intended objectives. Specifically, Perrucci noted that the texts contained "errors and inaccuracies, as well as being dated" (1980:48). In light of increasing complexities in American society and of an emerging world system during the sampled period (of twenty years), basic content and structure changed little. Also lacking were "new or unconventional chapters" -- "chapters on 'uses of sociology,' 'social policy,' 'international problems,' 'social planning,' and 'social problems'" (Perrucci, 1980:41-42).

Further, while issues of values and ethics were covered in the more recent textbooks (six out of ten in the 1973-1977 period) the most recent of the texts abandoned such "controversial issues." Perrucci interprets this as "a return to a blander and more consensus-oriented characterization of the field" (1980:43).

Seeing these trends in introductory textbooks, Perrucci (1980) suggests changes in publication emphasis to make them more representative of the discipline. From his understanding of sociology's themes and issues, of its perspective on looking at the world, textbooks should be more "substantive than at present" (1980:49) and less standardized as dictated by market conditions. Perrucci, seemingly in tacit agreement with McGee (1977), is concerned about the consequences of "a textbook market dominated by large publishing houses and conglomerate corporations" (1980:40).
Many introductory textbooks surveyed in this study have been analyzed by reviewers referenced above, particularly Brown (1976) and Perrucci (1980). Therefore, concerning one criteria used in this analysis -- general content -- findings will in the main concur with theirs. Unlike their content analyses, however, this study's central purpose is to explore the extent to which sociologists provided any sociological knowledge relevant to a more complete understanding of the Vietnam War. To better determine the degree to which this was achieved, two additional criteria have been incorporated in this analysis: advocacy of paradigmatic preferences and frequency of indexed references to the Vietnam War. Though there will be replication and substantiation of earlier textbook findings, this descriptive study intends to engender an understanding of introductory textbooks' role in the transmission of sociological knowledge primarily to students of society during the "apprenticeship period" (Friedrichs, 1970) of their professional training.

General Content

Concerning the criterion of general content, each introductory text surveyed contained traditional themes and subject matters. Generally, all texts contained core chapters on culture, socialization, stratification and sociological perspective, which typically discussed analysis, theory and methods. Discussions on institutions --
family, education, economy, religion, politics — delineated these either in a composite chapter or, more commonly, in a separate chapter devoted to each. Issues and dynamics of social processes were normally subsumed in discussions of social change, social movements, deviance, and in the later texts, of social problems. Another traditional feature of texts were chapter discussions about sex roles, primary groups and minorities.

This study's findings corroborate some of those of earlier reviewers of introductory textbooks. Most obvious in terms of general content were the constancy of content and structure, a finding supporting that of Perrucci (1980). Implied with this observation is the lack of "new or unconventional chapters", again concurring with Perrucci (1980). Further, the textbook materials were dated (e.g., currency of events, the relevance of topic issues). Lacking too were discussions on modernization and the sociology of development theories. These two perspectives are more likely to address social change issues such as the Vietnam War.

Before further elaboration of general content findings of the sample textbooks, some mention is warranted about the data format. (See Appendix I for data and formatting.) Following Brown's analytical scheme (1976:127-129), "institutions" here refer to family, education, economy, religion and politics. "Problems" refers to deviance, minorities, war, death, poverty, discrimination and sexism. Additional
social problems mentioned in textbooks sampled here are communism (Biesanz and Biesanz, 1964); population (CRM, 1973); delinquency (Bogardus, 1954); underdevelopment (Hodges, 1971); racism and urbanism (Kirch, 1971); mental illness (Henslin, 1975); stress (Abcarian and Palmer, 1971); housing (Rose, 1965); crime (Barron, 1964); and alcoholism (Rose, 1965). The remaining categories are self-explanatory except "other", which is used here for computer reference.

After compiling and formatting the data, certain qualitative statistics were performed and these have been displayed in tables and graphs for further analysis. Of concern at this point are those findings relevant to the general content of the introductory texts. Following these comments are observations on the four paradigms' -- positivist, social constructionism, conflict, and eclectic -- treatment of institutions and social problems, especially that of warfare. The final section of the analysis chapter are findings concerning textbooks references to the Vietnam War.

From the tables and graphs, other generalizations about the textbooks' content were evident. First, the mean pages for each text were (536), while mean chapters were (20). Of the four paradigms, that of the positivists treated social institutions the most frequently (54%), followed by the eclectics at 29%. (See Table 1) The conflict and social constructionists addressed the designated social
TABLE 1

Incidence of Occurrence of Chapters on Societal Institutions in Introductory Sociology Textbooks by Theoretical Paradigm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Positivism</th>
<th>Conflict</th>
<th>Social Construction</th>
<th>Eclectic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economy</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Textbooks</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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institutions at 10% and 6% respectively.

The next topic is to examine the four paradigms respective advocacy position. One means of determining each model’s accomplishment of this goal is to compare each’s treatment of selected social problems. Before undertaking this end, however, some statistical information concerning overall frequency of social problems is needed.

Those social problems treated most frequently were minorities (37%) and deviance (36%), at 60 and 59 occasions respectively. (See Table 2 and 3) The next most frequently treated social problems were war (7%), which will be later discussed, and crime (6%). All other designated problems received considerably less treatment, with delinquency and poverty the next most frequently addressed at 2% each.

How do the paradigms compare in their respective frequency of discussions regarding social problems? Referring to table 2 and 3 again, such a comparison can be easily made. Of the 164 total observations of social problems -- eighteen total problems -- the eclectic texts offered 40%. Positivist texts were next in number of observations at 35%. Following positivists were conflict texts at 16% and the social constructionists at 10%.

Though the figures suggest that the eclectic introductory texts might serve more of an advocacy for the inclusion of social problems, Brown (1976) avowed such texts often propounded a positivist or functionalist position. This
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Positivism</th>
<th>Conflict</th>
<th>Social Construction</th>
<th>Eclectic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alcoholism</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communism</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delinquent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deviance</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrimin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Ill</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 2

Incidence of Occurrence of Chapters on Social Problems in Introductory Sociology Textbooks by Theoretical Paradigms (1)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theoretical Paradigms</th>
<th>Positivism</th>
<th>Conflict</th>
<th>Social Construction</th>
<th>Eclectic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minorities</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexism</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underdevel</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbanism</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
generalization may also be valid regarding those cases of the eclectic category of textbooks.

Because this study's central focus is the Vietnam War and its implications for the discipline, the social problem of warfare deserves mention. As noted, war appeared eleven times in the sampled textbooks. The eclectics treated the topic five times, the positivists four and the conflict texts twice. Bogardus (1954) first treated warfare but only as a historical phenomenon particularly with regard to World War II. In fact, the remaining references treat warfare in a similar vein, i.e., as the American military complex in a peacekeeping role.

Indexed references to the Vietnam War

The next issue of discussion in this chapter are those findings concerning the introductory textbooks' indexed references to the Vietnam War. These data are instrumental in assessing the calibre of information available to university students -- representing the new generation who will direct the future social, economic, and political evolution of American society -- and to future professional sociologists. Elements of this topic under discussion included the frequency of respective textbooks of the four paradigms during the period of direct American involvement in the Vietnam War (1954 to 1975). Also to be reported are findings on the frequency of each paradigm and of respective textbooks as each referenced the Vietnam War. The final
aspect of the topic is the occurrence by year in which the inventoried textbooks referenced the Vietnam War.

The line graph (see Figure 1) plots the four paradigms and their relative textbook frequency for the Vietnam War years. Examination of the chart reveals that positivists authored three introductory texts in 1954. Not until 1956, with the social constructionists' single text is there any challenge to the positivist's domination of the textbook field. The era 1962-1964 marks an intensification of textbook publication, a period roughly corresponding to American sociology's florescence in inaugurating the scientifically ordered "good society" -- particularly as theorized by the end-of-ideologists. At this time, the first eclectic texts are available, while the positivists increase their output. In 1965 the social constructionists offer two texts, which is the most offered any year of the sample (5 instances). Also in 1965 the Marxists enter the scene with one text and achieve their greatest output (5) in 1971, topping the field for that year. Coincidently, the year 1965 saw the first teach-ins on the war in Vietnam (Burawoy, 1982:53) and 1971 is a year of violent social upheaval when American university students, through major demonstrations, challenge the officially sanctioned version of the Vietnam War. From the graph, we see that introductory texts appear with greater frequency during the 1970s.
Figure 1

Distribution of Introductory Sociology Textbooks by Theoretical Paradigm and the Year in Which They Appeared
During the Vietnam War how do the four paradigms compare in textbook production? Further, with what frequency do the texts within each paradigm mention the Vietnam War? Also, of the total textbooks sampled in this study, what is the percentage of references and the percentage of nonreferences to the Vietnam War?

For the 1954-1975 period of the Vietnam War, the surveyed positivist texts provided the most textbooks for introductory courses of sociology -- fully half of the sample (see Table 4). The eclectics are next (37), followed by the conflict and social constructionists, at 12 and 11 respectively.

Among the four paradigms there exists not only differences in textbook frequency, but differences within each with regard to Vietnam War references. For example, of the sixty texts offered by the positivists only six (10%) mention the war (see Table 4, and Figure 2 for a graphic representation). Most frequently mentioning the war were the conflict oriented texts with seven references, or 58% of the twelve books of the sample. The textbooks of the eclectic paradigm referenced the Vietnam War in fifteen texts, or 40% of the thirty-seven cases.

One other statistic from Table 4 warrants reporting (also see Figure 3). For the years in question, three quarters (75%) of the textbooks failed to mention the war. Thirty textbooks (25%), however, do reference the war.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paradigm</th>
<th>Occurrence</th>
<th>Nonoccurrence</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>7 (6%)</td>
<td>5 (4%)</td>
<td>12 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eclectic</td>
<td>15 (13%)</td>
<td>22 (18%)</td>
<td>37 (31%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positivism</td>
<td>6 (5%)</td>
<td>54 (45%)</td>
<td>60 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>2 (2%)</td>
<td>9 (7%)</td>
<td>11 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30 (25%)</td>
<td>90 (75%)</td>
<td>120 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 4**

Occurrence of Indexed References to Vietnam War by Theoretical Paradigm
Figure 2

Occurrence of Indexed Reference to Vietnam War by Theoretical Paradigm
Figure 3
Occurrence of Indexed Reference to Vietnam War by All Introductory Sociology Textbooks
These figures help confirm that as a discipline American sociology did not -- as did many protesting university students (and as early as 1968) -- concern themselves with the Vietnam War as a social problem with extreme moral, social, economic, and political implications for American society. This line of reasoning will be developed in the following chapter.

From Table 4 further comparisons among the paradigms' frequency of textbook references to the Vietnam War are also available. Again, of the one hundred twenty texts comprising this study's sample, thirty texts have an indexed reference to the Vietnam War. Of this figure, 23% are Marxist or conflict oriented texts. The eclectics provide 48% of the referenced texts, while the positivists offer 20% of the total. Finally, the social constructionists contribute 7% of these textbooks that mention the Vietnam War.

One remaining graph (see Figure 4)\(^1\) reveals the year and frequency that American introductory sociology textbooks devote print to the Vietnam War. From 1954 to 1969 -- fourteen years of American military, economic, and political involvement with Vietnam's internal affairs -- no references to the war appear in introductory textbooks. Not until 1970 (2 textbooks) does American sociology consider the war a significant enough social phenomenon to bring to the attention of university freshmen and sophomores -- men of eligible age who were required by federal law to register.
FIGURE 4

Indexed Reference to Vietnam War by Year of Occurrence
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with the selective service as a potential Vietnam War combatant.

Representative quotes from textbook analysis

Our tables and charts confirm that the Vietnam War was not a significant issue of analysis for the majority of textbooks sampled; only thirty mention the war, most do so briefly, and many of these references appear in texts published toward the end of U.S. military presence in Vietnam. At this point we examine how the respective paradigms treated the war as a social phenomena. Below are representative quotes and analyses of the manner that structural functional, symbolic interaction, conflict and eclectic textbooks discussed the Vietnam War. For a more detailed listing of how each text referenced the war and in what context it was mentioned, refer to appendix III.

Positivist

Six positivist textbooks reference the war, and of these Vander Zander's (1971) text mentions Vietnam most frequently, twice in the introduction and twice again in chapters on groups and associations and collective behavior. Jackson Toby (1971) discusses Vietnam three times -- twice in the context of political structures in industrial societies, once again in his chapter on deviance and social control. The remaining texts referencing the war do so once or twice.
How do these textbooks address the Vietnam War? In each instance the Vietnam War, rather than a social phenomenon indicative of structural patterns in society, is cited as an example for topics such as politics, collective behavior, groups, stratification. The majority of the references include the war in passing, typically in a line, more rarely in a paragraph. For example, Toby's (1971) discussion of the war in the context of American political structure, where we would expect analysis of the nature of United States involvement, he writes thus:

Recall that many American colleges and universities participated in protests against their government's Vietnam policy on October 15, 1969... The Vietnam War, unpopular though it became, did not destroy the American political system (1971: 316,317).

The books authored by Lenski and Lenski (1970, 1974), which uniquely take a comparative, holistic approach to human societies, would be likely candidates in disclosing the linkages between Third World societies such as Vietnam and the imperialistic actions of capitalistic societies. However, in each instance the war is referenced -- even in a discussion of political structure -- there is no analysis of American involvement in the "political unrest" of the country (1970:446).

Given the assumptions of structural functionalism delineated in chapter two, this omission of the structural inevitability of wars like Vietnam is no surprise. Because
this major paradigm assumes the positive functions of institutions (Gouldner, 1970: 113), supports the status quo (Ritzer, 1983: 261), and assumes a system toward relative equilibrium and so disinclined to war and conflict, this paradigm is conceptually circumvented from discerning the structural basis of American political and economic realities associated with Vietnam (cf. Chirot, 1977). Cogently arguing this conceptual myopia, Chambliss and Ryther (1975) present a point by point exposition of the cul de sac in ascertaining structural realities underlying Vietnam and other violent phenomena in the emerging world system.

Social Constructionist

Of the thirty introductory textbooks in our sample referencing the war two were symbolic interactionist in orientation. These books were slightly more critical of American involvement in Vietnam, though they lacked substantive treatment of this involvement. Henslin (1975), for example, includes remarks on Vietnam in a section entitled "Staging Reality: Social Control and the Political System." Here the war serves as an example of how the federal government manipulates symbols, statistics, and images to serve elite interests.

A group of persons extremely disenchanted with the political scene in the United States repeatedly stated during the war that the United States became involved in Indochina for reasons disassociated from goals of
political or military victory. Persons of the more radical persuasion said that the goal of the United States, despite official political pronouncements, never was to achieve victory. Although this view was quite unpopular, they said that the goal instead was profit for a select segment in our society, especially for the industrial leaders who head up our various armaments industries (1975:296).

For the remainder of the section Henslin provided numerous examples of the duplicity of the American government. In no uncertain terms the author underscores the point that government does not serve the commonweal.

The other symbolic interactionist text (Hammond, et al, 1975) is more patterned in accordance with the positivist's presentation of the war. Citing Vietnam four times, the war is mentioned only in brief, again as an example of some other topic. The authors make the following observation in a final paragraph of a section on social stratification:

Corporate interests, of course, are not always clear-cut, and it is patently not the case that foreign policy is only on behalf of the economic elite. The decade-long quagmire in Vietnam is a good example of a foreign policy stance by a number of noneconomic factors (1975:340).

Symbolic interaction, rather than focus on macrolevels of social analysis, examines the interactional basis of social structures. Thus, that most of the texts espousing this orientation ignored the war is understandable, and Henslin's reference to the government's duplicity with regard to Vietnam must be considered somewhat of an anomaly. Though he fails to comprehend the structural basis of the
war using Goffman's concepts of staging reality, he does sensitize the student to the government's distortion of reality and to the fact that Vietnam resided in a capitalistic interpretation of social relationships.

**Eclectic**

The paradigm designated "eclectic" refers to textbooks compiled for which a dominant theoretical orientation to arrange the material either could not be identified or were said to be by the authors encyclopedic. For example, Light and Keller (1975) present each substantive chapter incorporating the other three paradigms used in our textbook analysis. This category of textbook contains half (15) of our sample addressing the war, and also displays a diverse style in handling the Vietnam War.

Like the positivists, some of the texts mention Vietnam only in brief, usually in a sentence, as an example of another point under discussion. Baali and Bryant (1970) mention Vietnam as an impetus for student protest in their chapter on collective behavior. Medley and Conyers (1972) offer a chapter on warfare ("The Price of War") where Vietnam is mentioned as an example of the economic and social costs curtailed in fighting; written by a non-sociologist, the section ignores the structural basis of warfare. Van den Berghe (1975), a later published text in our sample, discusses Vietnam four times, each very briefly.
The world's most industrialized country, the United States, also leads in homicide rates. The Second World War was far more murderous than the First, itself a previous record. Never in human history has a country been as ravaged by three decades of war as Vietnam with its defoliated forests, displaced population, and crater dotted landscape (1975:49).

Other eclectic texts offer little more substance regarding Vietnam and its implications for American society. Lowry and Rankin (1972), however, do make some interesting remarks about the war in their chapter on conflict. Citing Kornhauser's research on revolutionary conflict, they offer that international conflict no longer fits concepts of conventional warfare, resulting in confusion of the United States government's "peace" [sic] keeping role.

Insufficient understanding of the situation can lead to the use of inappropriate techniques and means of control. The seemingly indecisive nature of the resolution of the Korean conflict to all participants, the continuing confusion and meaninglessness of the Vietnam conflict, and the apparent intractability of both participants in the Arab-Israeli dispute are all illustrative of this process (1975:659).

These remarks leave the impression that the United States is justified in its role a "peace keeper", as the Big Brother to the world community. Further, this role can be better executed if the political arm of government comprehends the nature and history of Third World societies' internal conflicts. As our comments in a later chapter reveal, such views serve as apologia for foreign policy while ignoring the economic structures underlying our

The Duskin Publishing Group's textbook twice mentions Vietnam in the context of a manipulated war by an elite network of politicians, industrialists, and Pentagonists:

...C. Wright Mills argued... that the United States is... dominated by an interlocking directorate of several thousand men placed in the most important corporations, foundations, universities, government bureaucracies, mass media institutions, and private associations.... G. William Domhoff... has accumulated a body of data that supports the thesis that the power elite governs is the interests of the upper class and is particularly effective in the area of foreign policy (1975:200).

These remarks orient the student to social realities underlyig Vietnam. However, the authors have done little to expand and develop these insights and relate them to not only Vietnam, but to other domains of social problems within society.

Of the eclectic textbooks mentioning the war, two coauthored by Irving Horowitz were included in our sample. The first text (1971) mentions the war twice briefly, but in his later work (1975) we see a more insightful analysis of Vietnam, not as a social problem per se, but as an ethical problem for the discipline. In two papers Horowitz has explored the dubious relationship between social science and the U.S. military. He suggests that this liaison is reprehensible, and in need of critical examination.
Conflict

Seven textbooks espousing a conflict orientation give respectable coverage to Vietnam. While we a priori assume that this orientation would incisively analyze the war, we must note that five conflict texts ignored Vietnam. That this oversight occurred is itself an issue worthy of attention. There are certainly variations on the conflict theme, and that different approaches to conflict and class would be presented is no basis for surprise. But these five texts neglecting the war present an anomaly to the paradigm.

Moreover, the seven textbooks mentioning the war varied in their style and depth of presentation. For example, Hodges (1971) mentions Vietnam briefly in the context of disaffected American youth and their protest of all things Establishment. In fairness, Hodges, in other chapters, elucidates that American power structures greatly impinge upon the lives of the less powerful. His chapter on the counterculture of the disaffected American youth leaves little doubt that American cultural life is oppressive and even "murderous" to human existence (cf. Hodges, 1971:543). What is lacking in Hodges' (1971) analysis are the consequences of the American system exported to Third World societies such as Vietnam. In another conflict text by Hardent, et al (1974), Vietnam is mentioned just once. He does make the point that, given the inherent nature of
nation-states, wars like Vietnam are essential features of the American system.

The two editions of Charles Anderson (1971, 1974) and of Defleur, et al (1971, 1975) mention the war more frequently than do those conflict oriented texts just discussed. In particular, Anderson's analysis of the military-industrial complex underscores the elite vested interests associated with American involvement in Vietnam. Citing Mills, the author views modern warfare in this fashion:

In so far as the corporate elite are aware of their profit interests... they press for a continuation of their sources of profit, which often means a continuation of the preparation of war (1974:200).

In this and other passages of this section, Anderson is acutely sensitive to the basis of warfare and makes these connections available to the introductory student. Comparatively, De Fleur, et al (1971, 1975) are more obtuse in their treatment of warfare and of the root causes of the Vietnam War, failing to effectively communicate the significance of the war for American society.

In William Chambliss and Thomas Ryther (1975) we find a cogent presentation of the chronic social problems of which Vietnam is symptomatic. Further, their analysis reveals why mainstream sociology overlooks such phenomena as warfare and thus Vietnam: the dominance of structural functionalism precludes accurate perception of such realities. Discarding
the outmoded concepts of this model and by using conflict
premises and concepts, they provide empirical evidence to
show the relationship of Vietnam to political structures.
Their analysis suggests that Vietnam was a manifestation of
imperialistic capitalism rather than any expression of
"democratic" foreign policy of the "government" of the
American "society." More importantly, they argue that those
terms in quotes above are obsolete concepts in framing an
accurate perception of social reality. From their analysis
of American society, an introductory sociology student would
derive a vastly different image of the nature and structure
of social life than that imparted in less critical
textbooks.

In their text the authors establish what they feel are
dire consequences of the dynamics of class conflict:
increased urbanization, worldwide overpopulation, increased
hunger and poverty, environmental pollution, excessive
exploitation of natural resources. Further their analysis
includes the introduction of the world system concept. It
is elites worldwide who act from class interests, and not
those traditional allegiances of nationality, political
party, occupation, community, etc. One point that we take
up in chapter six is their view of government. They provide
empirical evidence that the American "government" is
concerned with little more than furthering elite interests
We will not quote from Chambliss and Ryther (1975) here, for we use their materials in a later chapter to suggest the need to rethink the manner in which society tends to be represented to introductory students. But their analysis is unequivocal: given the endemic features and structures of power, government and elites in capitalistic societies we should expect increased international violence (cf. El Salvador, Guatemala, and Nicaragua) along with increasing social chaos such as hunger and poverty, both nationally and internationally.
FOOTNOTES

1On examining Figure 4 we observe that after 1970 textbooks increasingly reference the Vietnam War. Moreover, one impression obtained from these post-1970 frequencies is that positivist textbooks inform students about the structural basis of the Vietnam War. This is an erroneous assumption, as our thematic analysis in Appendix III reveals; positivist textbooks address the war only in a cursory, superficial manner. Only the conflict oriented textbooks assess the structural dynamics underlying American involvement in the Vietnam War.

2In the place of phenomenological textbooks, we have assigned the category "eclectic." Those textbooks designated thereby demonstrate an intention to present their introduction to sociology from a range of perspectives rather than from a functionalist, symbolic interactionist, or conflict perspective. They are general or encyclopedic in orientation.

3At the time of this research, current events in Latin America are paralleling the events in Southeast Asia during the 1960s. In an April 15, 1985 issue of Time, it is reported that Daniel Ellsberg, "[T]he onetime Rand Corp. analyst who leaked the Pentagon Papers,... is a traveling college lecturer, telling audiences that the undeclared war syndrome is recurring." Ellsberg is reported as saying, "The time for a new Viet Nam seems certainly at hand,... In Central America we are at about the 1961 stage of involvement."
Chapter Five

POSTINDUSTRIAL POLITICAL SOCIOLOGY
A Review of the End of Ideology Thesis

The Social Forecastsers: Waiting for Godot

Godot's function seems to be to keep his dependents unconscious.

"Social forecasters" refers to social scientists who are involved with forecasting societal activity (Mullins, 1973:156). Though they might lack a common theoretical orientation, forecasters are concerned with predicting the future, whose work are primarily "discussions of the rationale and means for predicting the future. The means proposed for making predictions are a series of technical devices whose purpose is to produce believable estimates of the future" (Mullins, 1973:156).

With the end-of-ideologists we see a group who, according to the critiques presented below, share a theoretical orientation, though Mullins (1973:158) suggests that as professionals applying their predictive models their interests were "quite separate." But what was the intellectual commonality of their forecasting? As students, contemporaries, and colleagues of Parsons, sharing his faith in the status quo and his elite position at elite schools, these forecasters, as we demonstrate, embody the cheery
optimism forwarded in structural functionalism. This is not to say that all were trained in Parsonsian systems theory, though some forecasters indeed were. Yet, their forecasting and professional activity, as we show, did not deviate in any significant measure from Parsons' theoretical premises in ordering and structuring for equitable and just social structures. As such, if they were not structural functionalist in expressed philosophy, their forecasting is clearly founded in that body of social theory.

Thus, the end-of-ideologists represented the exemplar expression of Parsonsian formulations projected toward social action. Foremost, it has sanctioned the domestic and foreign development program of American capitalism. In the first section of this chapter we examine the numerous critiques, most theoretical, some empirical, of the end-of-ideology thesis. As the logical evidence suggests it was clearly flawed, a projection of elite minds in legitimating their social status and privilege within an unstable economic system (Gouldner, 1970; Smith, 1971). In the last section of this chapter, we survey the human consequences of this brand of social forecasting projected abroad with American Third World development policy. This evidence is even more telling of the moribund logic that the American status quo follows in pursuing its Godot-like policy of a world democracy. Though the end-of-ideologists have little academic credibility within sociology as a valid approach to
forecasting, their legacy endures as an unconscious model in conceiving of American macrostructures. More dramatically, their intellectually underdeveloped perspective is still applied by current social scientists in their development efforts, domestic and foreign.

America, during the postwar years of the 1950s, experienced an unprecedented rate of technological and economic growth. This, coupled with the rapid social changes which occurred at the time, led many prominent social scientists to believe that a "new society" was evolving. With the emergence of this technological or postindustrial society, social theorists felt that new theories were needed to replace the traditional and inadequate social, political, and economic theories of the prewar past (Kleinberg, 1973:2). One such theory, "the end-of-ideology," was proposed to explain the new technologically advanced society's social, political, and economic phenomena. Although much of the end-of-ideology theory is an attempt to explain the cultural and economic aspects of a society, most of the early "end-of-ideologists" were primarily concerned with the political possibilities of this seemingly optimistic theory of growth and progress for Western societies.

The "end-of-ideologists" viewed the political scene in the West during the 1950s, not as a period of complacency, but as a period when the more technologically advanced
societies of the West turned from conflict to consensus. They argued that Western democracies had put the principles of consensus in the forefront of the political arena. "End-of-ideologists" felt that struggles and controversies present in Western democracies would continue within and because of democracy itself, and that such struggles would not warrant any serious political inquiry by young intellectuals nor would it warrant any ideology (Lipset, 1960). Thus, it was the consensus of the end-of-ideologists at least, that technology, democracy, and prosperity had ushered in the "good society" and ushered out ideological politics and its resultant social divisions.

In view of the turmoil and social upheaval which characterized the 1960s (which later came to be known as a "Decade of Violence"), the end-of-ideology thesis could not have seemed a more inappropriate theory for explaining the socio-political reality of the technologically advanced Western societies. It was during this period that America, the most highly technocratic and affluent nation in the West, was dumping billions of dollars into a war it was losing, students on major campuses were revolting against the Vietnam War and the "Establishment", and ethnic groups were becoming more militant in their quest for civil rights. No established American institutions were immune to the effects of the changes which occurred at this time.
Focusing on the events of the 1960s, many end-of-ideologists were confronted with an apparent dilemma concerning the viability and validity of the end-of-ideology thesis. Many scholars criticize the thesis as being "an empirical overstatement, biased by normative preferences, or view many of its hypotheses as incorrect" (DiPalma, 1973:1). Others claim that the end-of-ideology has no testable hypotheses and there is lack of a common definition of the term "ideology" (Aron, 1968; DiPalma, 1973).

Although there is perhaps a need to further critique the end-of-ideology thesis, that is not the purpose of this review. However, this chapter presents an examination of recent empirical and theoretical studies regarding the end-of-ideology thesis, and it is intended to describe and clarify the issues surrounding the end-of-ideology controversy. More precisely, this review will attempt to [1] give a concise statement of the end-of-ideology thesis; [2] examine whether or not the end-of-ideology thesis has been empirically tested; and [3] examine the current theoretical status of the end-of-ideology.

What is the "End-of-Ideology" thesis?

One of the central issues in the end-of-ideology thesis is the controversy over the definition of the term "ideology." From its inception to the present, the term ideology has had many connotations, it has caused intellectual and emotional confusion, and its use by many social
theorists is often vague and ambiguous. Therefore, in order to understand the more substantive study and criticism of the end-of-ideology thesis, it is important that the term be rigorously defined.

At the end of the eighteenth century, the French philosopher Destutt de Tracy (1754-1836), attempted to define a way of discovering "truth" apart from the contemporary methodology of his time, namely, authority and religion. As a result of his pursuits, he was instrumental in a new science of ideas which he called "ideology." For Tracy, ideology meant the totally repressive function of social institutions in suppressing individual reason. It was Napoleon Bonaparte who, through his denouncement of "ideologues" as immoral and unpatriotic subversives, is responsible for the negative connotations given the term. But it was Karl Marx who began to change and broaden the meaning of ideology. For Marx, ideologies are false ideas created and fostered by the ruling class in order to maintain their possession of the means of production (Bell, 1962). Marx's conception of ideology has its roots in the critical philosophies of both Hegel and Feuerbach, and can be traced through a number of stages in Marx's intellectual development. In Marx's early writings, though the term "ideology" does not appear, "the material elements of the future concept are already present in his critique of religion and of the Hegelian conception of the state which
are described as 'inversions' concealing the real character of things" (Larrain, 1983). According to Larrain (1983), Marx's break with Feuerbach in 1845 marks the beginning of his second stage of intellectual development. It was during this period when Marx and Engels were developing their historical materialism that the concept of ideology was first introduced. Marx's conception of ideology grew out of his search for understanding the relationship between subject (social man), and object -- those things which he produces (e.g., politics and the state). To Marx:

...man's relations with that which he produces by his unaided efforts are two-fold. On the one hand he realizes himself in them.... On the other hand -- or rather, at the same time -- man loses himself in his works. He loses his way among the products of his own effort, which turn against him and weight him down, become a burden. At one moment, he sets off a succession of events that carries him away: this is history. At another moment, what he has created takes on a life of its own that enslaves him: politics and the state. Now his own invention dazzles and fascinates him: this is the power of ideology (Lefebvre, 1968:8-9).

Consequently, for Marx, it is these contradictions of social life that give rise to ideology, which in turn conceals those contradictions by distorting man's perception of his alienated being. Hence, by concealing contradictions the ideological distortion contributes to their reproduction and therefore serves the interest of the ruling class (Larrain, 1983:220).
Karl Mannheim (1936) made a distinction between what he called "the particular conception of ideology" and "the total conception of ideology." According to Mannheim, concern with motivational distortion or the contention that men are self-deceiving, is what led to his conception of "particular ideology." The "total" conception of ideology, however, refers to an age, a historic class, or social group. Yet, it was with Marx that Mannheim's total conception of ideology truly began. In fact, Mannheim is indebted to Marx for his belief that social class determines ideas, that ideology is situationally influenced by small groups or "special class" interests, and that systems of thought are subject to ideological analysis. Speaking on the situational determination of ideas, Mannheim says:

Men living in groups... act with and against one another in diversely organized groups, and while doing so they think with and against one another. These persons, bound together into groups, strive in accordance with the character and position of the groups to which they belong to change the surrounding world of nature and society or attempt to maintain it in a given condition. It is the direction of this will to change or to maintain, of this collective activity, which produces the guiding thread for the emergence of their problems, their concepts, and their forms of thought (Mannheim, 1952:3).

Or, in Marxian terms, consciousness arises when the forces of production are unequally distributed and social classes become aware of their exploitation. Thus, for Marx, as well as for Mannheim, ideology (total) is a system of ideas motivated by class interests as an attempt to maintain the
status quo. It was from Mannheim's distinction between total and particular ideology that Daniel Bell (1962), drawing from his interpretation of the "total conception of ideology" as a "secular religion," derived the following definition:

*Ideology is the conversion of ideas into social levers.... What gives ideology its force is its passion.... For the ideologue, truth arises in action, and meaning is given to experience by the 'transforming moment' (Waxman, 1968:3).*

Indeed, the concept has historically implied numerous variations and subtle turns of meaning. It is precisely this form of conceptual vagueness which has made the term "ideology" confusing for laymen and scholars alike.

Robert A. Haber, an early critic of the end-of-ideology thesis, sensed the problems developing over the lack of a coherent and rigorous definition of the term ideology. He proposed to clarify this issue by distinguishing the difference between ideology and ideological politics, a distinction which he felt that the end-of-ideologists had failed to make. Haber (1968) defined ideology as "an intellectual production describing society," and politics, as "an attempt to influence the allocation of rewards in a society" (1968:186). In addition, Haber views ideology as "the set of ideas underlying a political movement," and he proposes that:
For ideology to be linked to a political movement and for that movement to develop a mass following certain requisites must be met: (1) the ideas must be easily communicated, which involves their simplification and sloganization, (2) they must establish a claim to truth, and (3) they must demand a commitment to action.

In this process the ideology as an intellectual production is altered. A basis of authority -- divine, institutional or charismatic -- is invoked to establish and maintain the claim to truth and the focus of the idea system is shifted to intermediate goals and instrumental actions (1968:186).

From the distinction made between ideology and ideological politics, Haber (1968) deduced that the "end-of-ideology" theory is more correctly an "end-of-ideological politics" theory. With this distinction in mind, it is perhaps easier to understand what Bell (1962) means when he asserts that, "today, these ideologies (Marxist, leftist, or utopian political ideas) are exhausted, they have lost their 'truth' and power to persuade, and the ideological age has ended." Bell (1962) and Lipset (1960) both felt that there is no longer a need for ideology (ideological politics) in the West because of democratization, bureaucratization and affluence exhibited within the politically stable, modern industrial Western societies. Hence, Lipset was able to come away from a world congress of intellectuals on "The Future of Freedom" held in Milan, Italy, in September of 1955, proclaiming that Western democracy had produced the "good society." He further asserted, even though the democratic class struggle would continue, it would "be fight
without ideologies, without red flags, without May Day parades" (1960:445), and that "democracy is not only or even primarily a means through which different groups can attain their ends or seek the good society; it is the good society itself in operation" (1960:439).

Briefly stated, the end-of-ideology thesis argues that "we have witnessed in recent history the 'exhaustion of political ideas' and a concomitant decline in the ideological content of political institutions and activities" (Lopreato and Hazelrigg, 1972:153). Waxman comments that "the end-of-ideology thesis involves two basic premises" (1968:5). The first premise, as stated earlier, is a situational observation that there is the absence of ideological politics in modern industrial Western society. Most critics and analysts are in agreement with this contention. However, it is on the second point that the debate ensues. Waxman says:

The second premise at least implicit in the end-of-ideology thesis is a positive value-judgement about this reality: "We've reached or at least are well on our way to reaching 'the good society,' and ideology can only serve to hinder the progress we are making" (1968:5).

Many critics agree that the empirical evidence on the decline of ideological politics in the advanced industrialized West is beyond refutation. However, they contend that the interpretation of these facts are distorted, conservatively biased, and even polemical, in that, the phrase "the
end-of-ideology" itself becomes just another slogan used in the suppression of ideological politics and socialism.

C. Wright Mills, an ardent critic of the end-of-ideology, contends that the 'end-of-ideology' proclaimers were mainly the intellectuals of the rich Western countries, and that this new slogan contained not ideas, but "liberal rhetoric...used as an uncriticized weapon with which to attack Marxism" (1968:127). Mills continues to point out, that:

Ultimately, the end-of-ideology is based upon a disillusionment with any real commitment to socialism in any recognizable form. That is the only 'ideology' that has really ended for these writers. But with its ending, all ideology, they think, has ended. That ideology they talk about; their own ideological assumption, they do not (1968:128).

Mills did not see, as Bell, Lipset, et al, thought they saw, the collapse of Marxism in American sociology. Instead, he continued to lead in the critique of Parsonsian structural functionalism in its "totalizing mission" (Burawoy, 1982) of American sociology.

Haber (1968) attempts to translate the end-of-ideology thesis into empirically testable hypotheses in order to determine whether or not ideology (ideological politics) has ended, and to discover if the value judgements implicit within the theory influence empirical analysis.8

Haber's analysis leads him to assert a number of relationships that he feels warrant empirical testing.
These relationships center around his distinction between two types of political thinking, namely, ideological and reformist. Haber further maintains that the "New Left" exhibits a basic ideological character, reflective of his hypothesized conditions for ideological thinking. The conditions which Haber believes are necessary for ideological thinking include the existence of:

1) an independent intellectual class or group
2) the existence of real conflict
3) the existence of institutions which can develop and carry ideology
4) a language in which it can formulate its critique
5) the possibility of change (1968:196).

The evidence that these conditions exist less in the 1950s and 1960s than they did earlier in this century or the nineteenth century, suggests that ideology has declined. However, Haber contends that "the existence of a "New Left" struggling with the intellectual and organizational problems of non-revolutionary radicalism indicates that ideology has not ended," but it has changed (1968:195). Haber posits that a number of former "leftist" intellectuals changed their political position to that which he characterizes as "reformist." The "reformist intellectuals" -- which includes the end-of-ideologists -- are committed primarily to supporting the 'status quo' and 'establishment ideology.' In order to test this, Haber "developed a number of
hypotheses designed to differentiate ideological from reformist intellectuals on such dimensions as social position, past experience, status, self-image, approach to work, and attitude to national authority" (1968:205). Though he does not actually conduct a study to test his hypotheses, Haber does contend that:

The outcome of such a study would, I believe, confirm that the 'end-of-ideology' is a status quo ideological formulation designed to rationalize the incorporation of intellectuals into the American way of life (1968:205).

What is the current status of the "End-of-Ideology?"

The end-of-ideology has been subjected to a number of different criticisms, empirical tests and theoretical analyses, the most substantively important of which have been the subject of this chapter. Therefore in attempting to determine the current status of the end-of-ideology it is necessary to briefly review the conclusions of some of these studies and critiques.

Mills (1968), forwarding a theoretical critique of the end-of-ideology, offers perhaps the most substantive (and blistering) opposition to the thesis. Like DiPalma (1973), Mills (1968) contends that end-of-ideologists comprise the intellectual elite of affluent Western societies who sloganize elite rhetoric. What do these intellectuals intend with their arsenal of propositions embodied in the end-of-ideology? They seek annulment of the intellectual respect-
ability of classical socialism — more precisely, the rending of Marxism from the debate about the nature and direction of Western civilization. For Mills (1968) this position of the end-of-ideology must be itself seen as ideology — as class propagated legitimation for an imaginary social structure of equality. Further, Mills (1968) remonstrates more insidious and far-reaching implications represented by this brand of social science: a corporate spawned Science Machine co-opting "scientific discovery itself" (Mills, 1968:159) that renders obliging social scientists to the status of war legitimating technocrats (Horowitz, 1981).

Haber (1968) examined the end-of-ideologist's thesis and detected bad science by way of inadequately defined concepts and the lack of testable hypotheses. Under closer examination, so maintained Haber, the end-of-ideologists failed to distinguish between social and political ideology — between class generated ideas about society and those ideas which influence the distribution of societal rewards. Social ideology is inherent among social groups and endemic roles and an interpretation of reality. What the end-of-ideologists implicitly state in their thesis was that Marxism and utopian ideals were obsolete because of the abounding affluence and political stability characteristic of Western societies.
When discussing the end-of-ideology, the subject of "elites" seems to be a recurring phenomenon. This is especially evident in the work of Giuseppe DiPalma (1973) who centers his criticism of the end-of-ideology around an analysis based on conflict theory and elite behavior. In fact, as DiPalma points out, one of the shortcomings of the end-of-ideology thesis is its reliance on an "incomplete theory of conflict" (1973:19). DiPalma feels that because of the apparent incompleteness, it is impossible to encompass, within the context of the end-of-ideology thesis, recent social and political developments in areas such as the role of institutions and elites in conflict accommodation and political decision making. In short, DiPalma feels that the end-of-ideology thesis is a "grand theory" of society and is, therefore, inadequate in dealing with short-range changes encompassed by a more accommodating theory of politics.

John Field and G. Lowell Higley concluded from their study of Norwegian elites that the end-of-ideology is not "an end of idea-systems," and that the phrase "end-of-ideology" can in no way refer to mass phenomenon. However, they think that, "the phrase end-of-ideology can well be used to characterize the initial experience with level 4 (their analytical category denoting advanced social and economic development) conditions of a society of the Western cultural tradition having a unified elite" (Field and
Higley, 1972:38). Above all, Field and Higley (1972) conclude that the end-of-ideology is an exclusively elite phenomenon; an elaborate belief system characteristic of these politically and economically powerful persons occupying positions in the highest levels of society. In their own words:

Among social scientists and other observers there is much discussion of the "end-of-ideology," a thesis which is probably best viewed as a rationalization of the more widespread mixture of blandly optimistic and essentially complacent views of the level 4 social landscape, especially as seen from the vantage point of the most strategic positions in society (Field and Higley, 1972:32).

Power structures and elite phenomena endemic to the cultural tradition in American society generate continuing controversy among social scientists. The nature, origins, and pervasiveness of elite influence on American economic and political spheres remain ambiguous in part due to the encapsulating perceptions inherent within the end-of-ideology position (cf. DiPalma, 1973:19). Different scholars see different forces at work in the society. For example, one group posits that elite behavior and hegemony fails to impede participatory and "pluralistic democracy" -- "mutual consent" rather than elite domination characterizes the ethos of American economic and political life (cf. Dahl, 1982). This position is predominant among most economists and political scientists, who, without the conceptual tool
of ideology, generally reflect the ideology of America's dominant elite.

Increasingly, scholars who examine American power structures more objectively find this view naive, and clearly embodying end-of-ideology tenets in their analyses. Though concurring on this point, these same scholars disagree on substantive issues regarding American power structures. One group of scholars perceive that elite economic and political hegemony resides within American institutional arrangements -- the military, the executive branch of the government, the media, et al (Mills, 1956; Dye, 1976, 1979, 1983). Other scholars contest this view. According to their analyses American power structures are class based, so "elites" is an inappropriate term to reflect social reality (Domhoff, 1967, 1983). On the other hand, the Marxists question the veracity of both positions. Personalistic and individualistic in nature, these latter two perspectives direct attention away from the real issue: the laws of motion that underlie the development of capitalism (cf. Domhoff, 1983:211). Apart from these minor controversies, these three approaches to American power structures -- the elite institutions, social class, Marxist -- would agree that the state apparatus is "in all respects the ultimate sanctioning agency" of this concentrated power (Miliband, 1977:54). The state, capitalistic in nature, legitimates elite hegemony worldwide (cf. Chirot, 1977).
Benjamin Kleinberg attacks the end-of-ideologists for their proposal for the dissolution of "ideology" and its subsequent replacement by centralized technocratic planning, as being a projection of no more than "technocratic scientific rationalism." Kleinberg (1973) further implies that the end-of-ideologists have ignored the historical function of ideology, and that, it is only to them that "ideology" is no longer a viable means of social analysis or interpretation. The end-of-ideologists proffer that "social science" theory is the most viable mode for analyzing the new postindustrial society. Concerning this, Kleinberg writes:

Today, according to the end-of-ideologists, social theory must play the role of interpreting the pattern of the present and of suggesting paths to the future. However, left in their hands, it will be a social theory which incorporates the technical methods and outlook of the new technocratic meritocracy of which they view as destined and qualified to guide the future development of postindustrial society (1973:228).

Kleinberg (1973) criticizes the end-of-ideologists for their apparent lack of an understanding of the meaning of history and their failure to relativize. It is Kleinberg's thesis that:

...what the end-of-ideologists, as theorists of technocratic decision making, have done is to put forward a "premature" theory -- one which prematurely proclaims the dominance of newly emergent social structures, and which tends to overlook the fact that even the most profound, revolutionary social changes typically carry over with them important elements of the preceding historical period (1973:41).
The end-of-ideologists seemingly view the term "ideology" in much the same way as Dolbeare and Dolbeare define it, that is, as "beliefs about the present nature of the world and hopes about the future" (1971:3). What is apparent in their discussion, is the lack of a historical and comparative dimension, as they continue:

Such beliefs and hopes, when integrated into a more or less coherent picture of (1) how the present social, economic, and political order operates, (2) why this is so, and (3) what should be done about it, if anything, may be termed as Ideology (Dolbeare and Dolbeare, 1971:3).

Cesar Hernandez-Cela points out that, historically the concept of ideology belongs to the recent past (1971:133). Nonetheless, it is essential for any realistic criticism of culture and society. Without genuine criticism our sociology is incomplete, partly because we have an incomplete theory of history. Ideology in history allows for a more comprehensive understanding of historical processes and social change. More importantly, the usefulness of present-day sociology relies heavily upon its propensity to relativize history. Otherwise, sociology becomes nothing more than another intellectual means of perpetuating an Orwellian plutocracy under the guise of participatory democracy.10

We must keep in mind, that it was "in an age of bubbling optimism and touching faith in the American century" that C. Wright Mills first "articulated a new pluralistic basis for left thought; a pragmatic vision, part
of the debates on the left from which the excitement of the 1960s seemed to flow" (Horowitz, 1981:495). It was a period when America was engaged in foreign civil disruption in Southeast Asia while domestically rebounding from McCarthyisms political blackmail. It was on the eve of America's civil rights revolution that the end-of-ideology was proclaimed.

We have listed numerous points of critiques on the end-of-ideology thesis. But who were these social forecasters of "sunshine and happiness"? (Smith, 1971) Essentially, they were colleagues or students of Talcott Parsons--Seymour Martin Lipset, Nathan Glazer, Amitai Etzioni, Daniel Bell, Edward Shils, Sidney Hook (cf. Mullins, 1973). And where were these functional sociologists situated in the university system? Predominately at elite schools--Columbia, Harvard, Chicago, and Berkeley. Liberal educators in liberal academies, they championed the virtues of American capitalistic development for the poorer sectors of American society, and most importantly, abroad where the threat of post war communism threatened access to strategic resources essential to capitalistic societies (cf. Chirot, 1977). Moreover, in the idealism of the 1960s American university students imbibed the ideology of the "good society" that would make it better for the Third World. Writes Chirot:
Only someone who recalls those years from the perspective of that time, rather than from the perspective of today's more cynical atmosphere, can believe that learned professors in the liberal academies actually stood in front of their students and said that it could be done, and that it was the duty of young Americans to do it. The later full scale, though undeclared, war in Vietnam was the logical result of this...originally quite logical and consistent liberal doctrine of development (1977:4).

In the spirit of the sixties, the liberal academies, according to Chirot (1977), exhorted students to contribute to the government's efforts toward democratic societies abroad. One can almost hear echoes of John Kennedy's inaugural address where he effectively decreed "Ask not what your country can do for you, but ask what you can do for your country." The end-of-ideology school of social forecasting, the public policy exemplar, and the logical extension of Parsonsian formulations of macrostructures and systems analysis wholly embodied this groundswell of national optimism.

In his analysis of the "end-of-ideology," (social forecasting) Mullins (1973) references Samuel Beckett's absurdist play, Waiting for Godot. The two protagonists futilely await the appearance of Godot, an apparently mythical figure who was to fulfill their undisclosed agenda. Mullins' choice of literary allusion graphically underscores the ostensibly naive and simplistic elite reasoning comprising their social forecasting for Third World democracy. It was their faith in the status quo and of the
adaptability of existing American institutions to develop a global commonweal predicated on American terms. With Mullins' allusion and subsequent research, however, critics have pointed out that those structures chartered to usher in "the first new nation" and worldwide democracy were the very sources "inducing the disorder" (Gouldner, 1970:147). In a word, the solutions were the problems, and the more the prescribed social policies were followed, the more social chaos engendered (cf. Capra, 1983). 11

What would be illustrative now is to examine the consequences of this elite development policy projected into Third World societies. Such an examination does not inspire faith nor contentment with American liberal humanism abroad. For, when we pause to reflect on the conditions in "developing" societies (cf. Frank, 1967), on the depth of human suffering resulting from current development ideology, Mullins' absurdist allusion yields to surrealist images, approaching even the insanely demonic depicted in Francis Ford Coppola's Apocalypse Now, a cinematic statement, in part, on the consequences of American democratic resolve in Vietnam. While we do not maintain that the end-of-ideologists helped implement their modernization formulae in the Third World, nor do we know if they actively lobbied such measures, we contend that they explicitly endorsed the foreign development policy exported abroad by the United States government. However, we do know that some social
scientists — economists, historians, political scientists— advocated and implemented government policy resembling that of the end-of-ideology thesis (cf. Horowitz, 1981). Further, as the evidence suggests, social scientists still fashion careers pursuing development philosophy enumerated by end-of-ideology social forecasters (cf. George, 1981). In examining the consequences of elite ideology abroad, we can comprehend the inevitable instabilities of "Vietnam, the Philippines, Central America, and perhaps, the Middle East" (Corson, 1986:88; cf. Frank, 1969).

From an end-of-ideology perspective American political and economic institutions, entrusted with their sense of paternal responsibility, would strive for a global commonweal. This humane sense of universal purpose, founded on national pride, coalesced after World War II, when America emerged from the war as the only solvent capitalistic economy. As "Big Brother" to the world, how did the United States propose to ground his ideal of global democracy into a realizable action policy? How was the United States to assist technologically underdeveloped countries like Chile, Nicaragua, Guatemala, Kenya, Indonesia and the Philippines toward cultural parity with the United States, the obvious cultural model for the world to emulate?

The strategy was government intervention via a network of development agencies such as the Association for International Development (AID), United Nations Educational,
Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), and Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). Moreover, political coalitions such as the Organization of American States (OAS) and the Alliance for Progress (AP) would assist in overseeing and administering the exchange of money and expertise between the United States and developing countries. Other programs, such as the Peace Corps and funded programs using the skills of American anthropologists (cf. Cleaver, 1982), were inaugurated by the Kennedy Administration. Rather than a "top-down" development effort of the development agencies, these grassroots programs would organize the peasant sectors of the target society to receive the intended benefits of modernization. Underwriting the technical experts and the development apparatus were public monies and loans from major financial institutions, and later in the process, from multinational corporations (Barnett and Muller, 1974; Barry, et al, 1982). Though the overall apparatus is more involved than what is depicted here, this arrangement comprised the infrastructure of development America would implement to export democracy abroad.¹³

Because of historical factors Vietnam, a strategic source of valuable natural resources important to Western capitalism (Chirot, 1977), did not fit this development formula. Rather than peacefully intervene in that society's economic and political structures, the United States
intervened militarily in Vietnam in 1954. With the French Army on the verge of defeat by North Vietnamese guerrillas and de Gaulle beset with massive protest at the government's intervention there, the United States salvaged the situation for Western capitalism, effectively repressing the popular uprising against French domination. During the early stages of American intervention, the United States bolstered the faltering South Vietnamese government with millions of dollars of war materials, military consultantship, and the training of government officials at major American universities. As the American Academy assumed a greater role in the government's military efforts there, one major university even organized and equipped South Vietnam internal security forces (Nicolaus, 1968). Later, following Kennedy's election, the government, in their "Americanization" program, instituted the newly christened development apparatus.

Like the war itself, the development program failed. American efforts at exporting democracy elsewhere in the Third World have met with similar, if less publicly dramatic, failure. Latin America offers incontrovertible evidence of the catastrophic consequences fostered in the American formula of development (Frank, 1967, 1969, 1973). Development in the mode advanced by Washington, Bonn, Paris, London, and Tokyo results in "the pillage of the Third World" (Jalee, 1968). Other analysts, in examining the
structure of development, declare that American aid is tantamount to "imperialism" (Hayter, 1971; Jalee, 1972). Because development systematically impoverishes the majority of a society's population, the result is the inevitable explosion and disintegration of Third World social systems (Kolko, 1973:15). As these social systems deteriorate, the governments, comprised of obliging elites that condone the ubiquitous multinationals who extract immense profits from the "developing" economy (Barry, et al, 1982), employ totalitarian measures in maintaining internal security (cf. Marcuse, 1970:372-387). 15 Faced with a deteriorating standard of life (cf. Feder, 1980; George, 1977; Dewey, 1981; Nigh, 1980) and denied redress through existing political channels, the systematically pauperized have no recourse but popular revolution (Frank, 1969). Moreover, when economic and political forms emerge fostering equitable distribution of resources and services among a society's population, the United States, through military intervention, abort these more democratic patterns, reinstituting political arrangements favorable to American interests (Bosch, 1968; cf. Collins, Lappe, and Allen 1982; Neumann, 1982). 16

These observations are extreme, and in some circles, even treasonable claims to forward. Yet the evidence proliferates, and an established body of literature exists clearly supportive, if not in detail then in substance, of
this grim portrait we have offered of "development-as-impoverishment-as-revolution". Relatedly, mainstream American social science, persisting in the development ideology that legitimated Michigan State's complicity in Vietnam War atrocities (Nicolaus, 1968), continues to fashion erroneous analysis supportive of the government's position that underdevelopment, overpopulation, and Soviet interference underlie Third World instability (George, 1981; cf. Nigh, 1980; George, 1977; Perlman, 1977). Moreover, sociologists likewise ignore corresponding political and economic arrangements destabilizing Third World societies operative upon Native Americans, women, Blacks, Hispanics, Haitians, the working class, and the unemployed (Chambliss and Ryther, 1975).

Such world conditions raise serious issues for American sociology. This systematic pauperization of nonelite sectors of populations, domestic and foreign, is excluded from both respectable dialogue in the profession and from virtually all introductory textbooks of our sample. Why are these powerful social dynamics excluded from the attention of students? If these conditions are Durkheimian "social facts", if Weberian life chances are affected to such a profound degree by American political and economic structures, why are they excluded mention? The absence of analysis and content of these social forces dictates two critical points we develop later. First, textbooks are
educative tools of little value in socializing future sociologists. Second, textbooks are a collective act of distortion in sensitizing nonmajors to dominate political and economic conditions profoundly shaping their future adult roles.
FOOTNOTES

1See the contributions of Lipset (1960), Bell (1962), and Waxman (1968). Also, writing in American Society in the Postindustrial Age, Benjamin Kleinberg states that "the evolving technocratic theory, first formulated in American social science by the 'end-of-ideologists'...puts forward a significant new model of a society in which technologically sophisticated administrative coordination within and between giant organizations replaces earlier uncoordinated competitive modes of economic and political control" (1973:2).

2In The End of Ideology Debate, Chaim I. Waxman comments that "To a large extent the end-of-ideology debate is due more to the lack of a common definition of the term 'ideology' than to a disagreement over the basic issues. Almost no two writers maintain the same definition" (1968:3).


4See Jorge Larrain's "Ideology" in Tom Bottomore's, A Dictionary of Marxist Thought.

5According to Bell (1962:401), Mannheim's particular concept of ideology suggests that ideas and beliefs (ideology) are linked with status interests such as an ethnic group that seeks social equality in a stratified society. The total concept of ideology, on the other hand, "is an all inclusive system of comprehensive reality, it is a set of beliefs, infused with passion, and seeks to transform the whole of a way of life."

6For further clarification on how this definition was derived and an exposition on the elements concordant with this definition of "ideology," see the essay by Robert A. Haber, "The End of Ideology as Ideology," in Waxman's, ed., Debate (1968:182-205).

7It is important to note that the exact wording of the thesis varies with different authors. For the essential statements on the end-of-ideology and its major themes, see Daniel Bell, The End of Ideology (1962); Daniel Bell and Henry David Aiken, "Ideology -- A Debate," (1964:69-76); Waxman, ed., Debate (1968); and Stephen W. Rousseas and James Farganis, "American Politics and the End of Ideology," (1972:309-324).
Haber claims Lipset's (1960) contention that conflict has been displaced by democratic consensus in advanced Western societies virtually ignores "the more important suppression of conflict" in those societies (1968:189).

Haber believes "It should be possible to test the relationships suggested in these hypotheses. A sample of intellectuals would be divided on the basis of ideological versus reformist (as determined by questionnaire, interview or content analysis of the writing). Correlations would then be sought with the social condition" (1968:205).

See Dusky Lee Smith's "The Sunshine Boys: Toward a Sociology of Happiness," particularly the article's last paragraph, which resounds of tones of Orwellian "double-speak" and "doublethink."

One is reminded of the Pogo cartoon with the catch line "We have met the enemy and he be we".

There are notable exceptions to this "sunshine and happiness" forecasting. Robert Heilbroner augured a grim global future in An Inquiry into the Human Prospect (1974). Though alternative views to those of Bell and Lipset have been written, because of their critical and negative views they do not fit the dominant ideas about the prospects of domestic and foreign hegemony.

For an indepth account of the American development apparatus and philosophy, see Immanuel Wallerstein's The Capitalistic World-Economy (1979).

Nicolaus writes: "The conditions that made it possible to use American professors as they were used in Vietnam persist. The Michigan State University Group (MSUG) was not an unrepeatable event. More and more it appears as the prototype, the pilot model of a growing family of overseas 'research projects'..." If Nicolaus' observations are accurate, American professors, funded with government monies, continue to conduct research and forward scholarship based on end-of-ideology premises. Susan George argues this position in "Scholarship, Power and Hunger," in Food Monitor, November/December, 1981.

For recent accounts of the growing totalitarian character in keeping internal security in America, see Leonard Peikoff's Ominous Parallels, John S. Soloma's Ominous Politics: The New Conservative Labyrinth, and Richard Rubenstein's The Cunning of History: The Holocaust and the American Future. Each offers comparisons between developments in America and those of Nazi Germany. See also Bertram M. Gross' "Friendly Fascism: A Model for America."

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Further, to see how journalistic dissent is being systematically suppressed by corporate interests in American courts, see Jack Anderson's "Open Season on Journalists," Penthouse, September, 1983:98. For a journalistic account of the growing network of national security agents, foreign and domestic, see Jim Hougan's book Spooks. He argues government and private business employ agents for means of control and security.

16Chambliss and Ryther (1975) argue throughout their textbook that American domestic groups, all nonelites, are subjected to economic and political impoverishment that we have chronicled for Third World populations.
Chapter Six

CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION

As the lie commonly agreed upon, history becomes the apology for whatever class is in power or wishes to come to power.

-- William Irwin Thompson

Power seems to magnify human frailty.

-- Richard Berk

All powers-that-be are inimical to the highest ideals of sociology.

-- Alvin Gouldner

An Overview

In this exploratory reflexive study we examined the kind and depth of information offered students about the Vietnam War in introductory textbooks. Secondarily, because textbooks are important representative statements of certified and legitimatized knowledge within the discipline, the manner in which the war was presented would indicate the level of theoretical sophistication employed to analyze war and related disruptive social phenomena. This second consideration led us to ask the related question of which mode of knowledge (paradigm), if any, most substantively assessed the war for introductory students. Further, part of our reflexive study examined historical, social, cultural and institutional variables impinging upon the discipline’s views about macrolevel phenomena. We were concerned also if these factors have biased American sociology’s interpreta-
tion and textbook representation of the American social system.

Our research has suggested need of a sustained critical examination of established paradigms and institutional definitions of macrostructural social phenomena. Generalizing from our sample analyses, we discovered that textbooks virtually ignored the Vietnam War during the period of direct American involvement (1954-1975). Further, but for three notable exceptions, those texts discussing the Vietnam War did so as empirical evidence for other topics—group structure, socialization, collective behavior (cf. Appendix III). This manner of analysis means that the war and related social phenomena, domestic and foreign, were unrelated to the endemic socially disruptive structures of American political and economic institutions (Anderson, 1971; 1974; Chambliss and Ryther, 1975; Chirot, 1977; cf. Mills, 1958).

If textbooks represent certified and legitimated knowledge, this manner of analysis of the war implies paradigmatic myopia to key facets of American institutional life. The reason for American sociology's omission of the Vietnam War's relatedness to the American social system, we discovered, must be attributed to historical and social variables shaping structural functionalism's unchallenged dominance in defining the nature, structure, and bases of macrolevel phenomena. We also discovered institutional
variables have fostered structural functionalism's hegemony within American sociology (Mullins, 1973). Collectively, these factors have excluded oppositional views from widespread dialogue and acceptance within the discipline. From the findings of our study, we can say that cultural and institutional factors acted as a structural censor of opposing viewpoints. In this way elite definitions (ideology) have biased American sociology's perspectives, research and interpretation of significant patterns and dynamics operative in the United States and abroad.

**Textbooks and American Sociology**

At this juncture of our study, we wish to review in more detail some empirical findings from our research design. From a sample of one hundred-twenty introductory textbooks, we assigned each to one of four paradigms. These paradigms were explicated in chapter two, and the criteria used to make textbook assignments were specified in chapter three. Such a design enabled us to a priori assume which paradigm would substantively assess macrolevel phenomena, of which the Vietnam War was a manifestation. We would also assume that textbook representation of the war (content) could only be as accurate as the paradigm (structure) allowed.

Our findings revealed that only thirty Vietnam War era textbooks referenced the war. Moreover, most of these textbooks address the war briefly, mostly as supportive
evidence for other topics. Only textbooks forwarding a conflict perspective addressed the structural dynamics underlying the Vietnam War; thus, only conflict oriented textbooks adequately represented the nature and basis of American involvement in Vietnam to introductory students. But our findings further revealed that of the twelve conflict oriented textbooks comprising our sample, five neglect the war, and of these remaining seven that do reference Vietnam, only three present it in a manner that would have enabled the introductory student to deduce the profound political implications of America's most significant historical event since World War II. In light of this observation, our findings suggest differing levels of theoretical sophistication within the conflict paradigm itself (cf. Collins, 1981).

Of the textbooks in our sample, Chambliss and Ryther (1975) afforded the introductory student insight into the systemic relationship between the Vietnam War and the impoverishment of the Third World; the increased presence of domestic violence; the pauperization of the working class, Blacks, women and Native Americans; the structural anomalies endemic to Central America's instability; ecological degradation; the increasing level of domestic and foreign totalitarianism; the conditions that foster revolutions in Latin America; the growing militancy of American farmers and of Catholic and Protestant churches, opting for civil
disobedience by providing sanctuary for Central American refugees; the increasing occurrence of Middle Eastern terrorism. (Chambliss and Ryther, 1975), incorporating a conflict perspective, sensitize the student to these social facts shaping future adult roles beyond the university.

The date that this textbook appeared may suggest changes in textbooks content following the war. Appearing in the last year of our sample, the sophistication of their analysis may indicate a post-Vietnam War paradigm shift within sociology. With the appearance of their textbook, Chambliss and Ryther (1975) may have completed Mullins' (1973) developmental stages a theory must fulfill before it becomes legitimated and accepted within the discipline. Such a development may be auguring the acceptance of conflict theory within mainstream sociology. If this is accurate, can we expect postwar textbooks to sensitize students to those powerful systemic forces shaping the world economic system?

Before pursuing this issue, however, we wish to examine Perrucci's (1980) textbook research and compare his findings with our own. In so doing, we wish to show that the questions to which he attempted to provide answers have in part shaped our own research. Also, his findings tend to corroborate our own: that Parsonsian formulations about American economic and political institutions influence the kind of information afforded introductory students.
Additionally, because his sample contained post-Vietnam War textbooks, his findings can help us determine if post-war textbooks published after 1975 demonstrate a paradigm shift.

In chapter one we discussed the importance of textbooks to the development and maturation of science. Reviewing some of these help us situate Perrucci's (1980) observations in the context of our own research. Textbooks are basic guides "into full responsibility in the field" (Friedrichs, 1970:7). Moreover, they help impart a mental paradigm, a certified standard in defining what phenomena comprise a "problem," what methods and logic comprise "solutions" to selected problems (Kuhn, 1977). Textbooks thus certify and legitimate ideas, and represent to the developing scientist what definitions and intellectual distinctions are accepted knowledge (Rothman, 1971). Conversely, omission of information implies that other phenomena are not worthy of study, since no problems are to exist apart from the paradigm's definition. Importantly, to the degree that textbooks validate certain views of reality in imparting mental paradigms, they shape research interests. Relatedly, holding ideas and views contrary to established paradigms is to court professional censure.¹

While textbooks are important to future sociologists for these reasons, they are also a potentially valuable source of information for the nonmajor (Perrucci, 1980). Because of the nature of the subject matter, sociology, more
than any other discipline in the university, is conceptually equipped to impart substantive information of society-in-humans and humans-in-society (cf. Berger, 1963). With these considerations of the nonmajor in mind, Perrucci (1980) noted that textbooks, if creatively conceived and written, instill a critical intellect in debunking favored social illusions. He cites Louis Schneider's (1975) textbook as an excellent example that effectively challenged nonmajors to develop the sociological imagination and to look beyond the taken-for-granted. By cultivating a "sociological view" students can think beyond comfortable illusions, and by implication, lead freer, more meaningful lives.

But how well do textbooks fulfill these ideal functions for majors and nonmajors? Another way of asking this question is, How accurate are introductory textbooks in sensitizing students to the dynamics and structures operative in the American social system? Perrucci (1980) maintained that textbooks failed the needs of both groups of introductory students. He noted that the established publication format all but ignores the personal and vocation needs of nonmajors; in their current form, textbooks impart information of questionable relevance for future roles beyond the university. For the socialization of majors, Perrucci (1980) observed that textbooks are essentially ineffective. His analysis disclosed that they fail "to convey to students the tremendous diversity of views that
exists in the field regarding theory, approaches to the study of social phenomena, and the purposes of sociology" (1980:48). Moreover, the information contained in textbooks, according to his analysis, not only was dated, but was even of dubious accuracy. His findings seem to suggest that textbooks, rather than serve the educative needs of the student, fulfill other purposes.

Noting the simplifications and distortions of the discipline conveyed in textbooks, Perrucci made this observation:

The image of the field contained in textbooks suggests that sociologists share a common view of the discipline, that there is, therefore, theoretical coherence and consensus on the questions to be examined, and how to go about dealing with them. We apparently all share the goal of creating a body of scientific knowledge about society (1980:48).

This passage helps us see, as our study has suggested, the enduring legacy of structural functionalism's approach to social phenomena. What are the unconscious images conveyed to future sociologists about their discipline? We see "a common view", "coherence and consensus", a discipline where "all share the goal" of a unified purpose, while critical analysis of society and the discipline is not part of the discipline's ongoing activity. Does not the discipline's textbook image of itself reflect Parsons ideas about American society? Therefore, do not future sociologists come to see their discipline as a reflection of the larger
coherent, consensual unified whole, the American society? In this manner textbooks, though failing in students' educative process, instill images that the discipline is a harmonious manifestation of the social system which it purports to study. Most importantly, textbook contents and their dominant images apparently socialize future sociologists into legitimated ideas and roles that perpetuate the discipline's longstanding myopia to macrostructural phenomena. Mills (1958:125) would refer to this condition as trivialized nonsense and an insult to reason.

**Textbooks: A Post-Vietnam War Paradigm Shift?**

But has there been a paradigm shift in post-Vietnam War textbooks? We mentioned that the appearance of Chambliss and Ryther's (1975) conflict text might suggest the inclusion of critical ideas within the discipline, manifesting as certified knowledge in subsequent textbooks (cf. Rothman, 1971). Some evidence does suggest this. First, Norwegian critical sociologist Hernes (1976) crafted a synthesis between functionalism and Marxism, taking the best ingredients of each paradigm to devise a more relevant theory toward macro- and micro-level phenomena. Perrucci (1980) also noted the discipline's theoretical diversity; and Collins (1981) has indicated that not only does there exist more incisive reflexivity, but Marxism is playing a greater role in fashioning more sophisticated social theory.
Further, Burawoy (1982) mentioned that the tumultuous sixties served to introduce Marxist thinking into sociology, as well as into the general society. Also, Chambliss and Ryther (1975:52), in their point by point debunking of structural functionalism's intellectual poverty, observed that more sociologists were beginning to think about society in terms of class, power, and conflict.

If there is a paradigm shift can we assume that later textbooks, reflecting this newly certified knowledge, will sensitize both majors and nonmajors to the global ravages and violent domestic upheavals Chambliss and Ryther (1975) detail in their text? Will the emerging paradigms and textbooks reflecting the shift provide students a framework to understand their Vietnams currently brewing in the Philippines, Central America, and perhaps the Middle East (Corson, 1986:88)? Will post-Vietnam War textbooks, embodying these emerging paradigms, further sensitize students -- Blacks, women, Native Americans, Hispanics, the working classes -- to social dynamics relegating them to marginal economic status in American society, and thus, to future roles increasingly characterized by violence and anomie? Will the new paradigms provide future sociologists with more accurate, up-to-date, and relevant sociological knowledge of the society they are to research?

Though some sociologists suggest we might expect more recent textbooks to reflect these paradigm shifts, other
lines of thinking tend to undermine this optimistic view. Burawoy (1982) noted that due to the history of sociology’s development and its ongoing efforts to legitimate capitalism’s endemic structural upheavals (cf. Smith, 1971), Marxism must remain the discipline’s ugly sister, confined to a marginal status. He even offered that if Marxist tenets are accepted they are no longer Marxist. Gouldner (1970), though guardedly optimistic that conflict ideas could be legitimated by Academic Sociology, foresaw their necessary exclusion in shaping social views and research. From his analysis, sociology’s established role as researcher, and implicit legitimator, of America’s version of the Welfare-Warfare State could not permit radically divergent assumptions socialized into future sociologists, who must be legitimated and certified into views that would not challenge this institutional arrangement (cf. Smith, 1971). Exposure to conflict ideas might disrupt this long enduring relationship and, by logical extension, also the careers of sociologists who benefit personally and professionally from the status quo. Further, Perrucci (1980) noted that textbooks followed an established, long enduring publication format, with few changes during the twenty year span covered by his sample. Mullins (1973:43) has even forwarded that Park and Burgess’ 1921 textbook, the discipline’s first, "still sets the pattern for most contemporary sociology texts."
So the evidence, suggestive of a paradigm shift under development within the discipline, nonetheless indicates that post-Vietnam War textbooks probably forward a consensus, shared-goal view of the discipline, and thus, of society. But while we might a priori expect textbooks to retain their conservative bias, what empirical evidence exists? Pursuing this question removes us from the parameters of our research issue and design -- how did sociologists address the Vietnam War and what information did they provide introductory students? Still, we would like to offer impressionistic evidence supporting the premise that textbooks have ignored the compelling evidence provided students by Chambliss and Ryther (1975), and have opted for repetition of information that fails to sensitize majors and nonmajors to the society in which they live.

We mentioned that Perrucci (1980) sampled textbooks published in 1977, two years after the Vietnam War's end. Using three standard indicators--most frequently cited sociologists, citations to award books, citations to research literature in sociology -- he offered that textbooks comprising the most recent period of his sample (1973-1977) neglected significant information within the discipline. First, his later texts tended to ignore the most recently published articles on stratification (1980:46). Also, this period of textbooks favored referencing "science-building" award books, while references
to award winning books devoted to social problems received smaller percentages of references (1980:47). Though the most recent group of textbooks did reference Marx most frequently, and all but one afforded some discussion of conflict or Marxian theory, his theoretical perspective was rarely incorporated "in the remaining substantive chapters" (1980:43). Moreover, these most recent textbooks excluded "such controversial topics" as "values and ethics in sociology... signaling, perhaps, a return to a blander and more consensus-oriented characterization of the field" (Perrucci, 1980:43).

While Perrucci's (1980) post-Vietnam War texts revealed no paradigm shift, what evidence might we offer confirming or denying his observation? To determine if the kind of conflict analysis as that of Chambliss and Ryther (1975) is more widely certified in textbooks (cf. Rothman, 1971), we assembled fifteen introductory textbooks published between 1978 and 1985. Unlike those of our original sample we did not establish if they demonstrated a paradigmatic preference, since, a priori, we assume post-Vietnam War textbooks to contain information grounded in alternative macrolevel perspectives. What we did with these texts was check the index for the topics of "Vietnam War," "military-industrial complex," and "Third World". Using these indicators we assumed that to the extent these topics were
discussed would suggest how "critical" textbooks became following the Vietnam War.

Our first observation from examining our textbooks was that none afforded the analysis of American society in the manner of Chambliss and Ryther (1975). This finding of itself would tentatively suggest against accepting the notion of a paradigm shift, since we would expect that Chambliss and Ryther’s (1975) empirical evidence, supported with even more recent empirical research than we provided, would be subsumed and developed in later texts. Moreover, unlike Chambliss and Ryther’s (1975) text, none of the post-war publications included separate chapters that deviated from the traditional format noted in our original sample and that of Perrucci (1980). That is to say no chapters were devoted to the military in American or to American underdevelopment of the Third World, or to the omnipresence of multinational corporations abroad. Though we cautiously generalize from this admittedly unrepresentative evidence, we feel safe in denying that a conflict perspective has usurped the Parsonsian legacy of consensus, coherence and shared goals images generally depicted in textbooks of the discipline, as well as of the American society.

Unlike Perrucci (1980), however, we can not on the basis of our evidence say that post-war textbooks manifest a "bland" consensus. While all texts referenced Marx, some minimally, and only four referenced the Vietnam War (most
obliquely) other controversial topics did receive discussion. For example, four texts discuss the military-industrial complex, and one (Ritzer, et al, 1979) develops this topic approaching the depth of perception, if not the scope, of Chambliss and Ryther (1975). Four texts reference the Third World, two briefly, two in a decidedly critical vein. Relatedly, though we did not examine directly how the texts approached domestic problems, some appeared critical of certain segments of the social system, especially the presidency, the political apparatus and multinationals. Thus, rather than a systemic criticism of structurally inducted conflict in foreign and domestic societies, authors focus on areas of their respective expertise and interests.\(^5\) We feel confident in saying that though textbook authors seem to offer critical images of American society, this criticism of these segments of society are not described as related to each other. Again, because of our unrepresentative evidence, we tentatively forward these observations.

**The Commodification of Sociology**

We have sought reasons why sociologists omitted substantive presentation of the Vietnam War to introductory students. While the exclusion of such significant information implies that students are inadequately informed about key features of American society, we further suggested that this lack of coverage is indicative of paradigmatic myopia within the discipline itself. In chapter one, citing
Mills' (1959) study, we mentioned that sociology's discovery process had been coopted due to the nature of "grand theory," methodology and standard types of research, and the discipline's relationship to the evolving American bureaucratic structure. Later, in following Gouldner's (1970) analysis (which is an eloquent elaboration and development of Mills' original argument) we traced the development and hegemony of ideology-as-theory, and its subsequent certification and legitimation by Academic Sociology. These social conditions insured the exclusion of oppositional views within mainstream sociology and, by logical extension, a critical assessment of the Vietnam War and systemically related social phenomena.

These critical insights of academic sociology are long established, though confined to the margins of respectable dialogue in the discipline. In the course of our own reflexive study we detected a related reason for the persistence of consensual, shared-goal images of American society and of the discipline's dominant view of itself depicted in textbooks. To discuss these persistent images within textbooks, and to try to suggest they are not unrelated, we introduce the concept of commodification (cf. Gouldner, 1970:383). By examining the notion that textbooks and the ideas underlying their views of social reality reflect economic infrastructure, we indicate the structural exigencies why the discipline systematically omits elemental...
features of American institutions, of which the Vietnam War is a direct manifestation (cf. Chirot, 1977).

Marx's observations on profit-oriented industrialization adumbrated Gouldner's (1970) elaboration and refinement of the commodification concept. As Marx analyzed the evolving structural arrangements that were replacing the traditional agrarian social patterns, he detected in capitalism an underlying, persistent ethos: the exchange of goods and services, the buying and selling of commodities. His imagination led him to foresee that in the developed capitalistic state, all areas and states of human interaction, from the interpersonal to the workplace, would be profoundly altered by this market ethos. The kind of humans demanded by such a social system necessitated a level and degree of depersonalization never witnessed by humanity. His descriptions of human relationships within profit-oriented structures, and the kind of moral values these relationships must embody to be "adapted" to such structures are now as legend as they are startling. Marx's view of life in the modern technocracy was that of everything, even people for sale and exchange.6

If we look at contemporary social theory, we can see market metaphors used to suggest the tenor of social relationships in a buy/sell economy. Homans' "exchange" theory, as we see, is very congenial to, and representative of, the kinds of adaptive values and attitudes in a capitalistic
social system. Commenting on Homans' post-World War II theorizing, Gouldner observed:

This return to a revisionist social utilitarianism in postwar American sociology was largely completed in George Homans' theory rooted in a mercantile metaphor of "exchange." Homans focused on the individual gratification "exchange" provided, and he treated moral values as themselves emergents of ongoing exchanges.... It is the most unabashedly individualistic utilitarianism in modern sociology (1970:139-140).

Also, Erving Goffman's dramaturgy model of microlevel analysis reveals the kind of human values underlying capitalistic structures. In his contribution to the social constructionist paradigm, traditional bourgeoisie morals and virtues (the kind Parsons subscribed to in his functionalism) are deemed obsolete, replaced by a code of situational values necessary for opportunistic advantage in a profit-oriented system (Gouldner, 1970:383).

In their capacity as performers, individuals will be concerned with maintaining the impression that they are living up to the many standards by which they and their products are judged.... But, qua performers, individuals are concerned not with the moral issue of realizing these standards, but with the amoral issue of engineering a convincing impression that these standards are being realized. Our activity, then, is largely concerned with moral matters, but as performers we do not have a moral concern in these moral matters. As performers we are merchants of morality (Goffman, 1956:162)

So in America, the epitome of a market exchange ethos, our selves, as do the products of our labor, have a "bottom line" value. Because we have no intrinsic worth, we become
products, selling ourselves as necessary on the open market of interpersonal exchange.\textsuperscript{8}

These views of debit/credit relationships further obtain in the recently emerging social system. As American society shifts from less an industrial to more a service and information society (postindustrial), knowledge supplants property as the main determinants of class structures (Anderson, 1971:201). Knowledge in postindustrial society becomes the basis of power — and abuse. With these social transformations the university, classically conceived as liberal educator, now becomes the factory, dispensing pragmatic information for competitive survival in the evolving service economy. Kumar, in his analysis of the role of knowledge-as-commodity, has described the radical changes in postindustrial the university system:

While the Grosstadt [the nineteenth-century industrial city] was founded on the industrial worker, the megalopolis [of postindustrial society] is founded on, and organized around, the knowledge worker, with information as its foremost output as well as its foremost need. The college campus rather than the factory chimney is likely to be the distinctive feature of the megalopolis, the college student rather than the 'proletarian' its central political fact (1978:221-222).

Moreover, the postindustrial society's mass education demands altered roles for educators. To be competitive in the marketplace of ideas, educators, even the humanists, are compelled to become "social scientists." Confining their inquiry to specialized journals and their understanding to
"predigested textbooks prepared especially for the enormous classes favored by the... edubusiness," these educators become government consultants and "the educators of the next generation" (Thompson, 1981:52).

The profit in selling ideas has even freed some educators, allowing them, more flexible roles as "information specialists" in the postindustrial society. As editors and writers they are nonetheless subject to the all-pervading commodity ethos:

I remember one occasion after a long negotiating session with a publisher for whom [Erving] Goffman and I are both editors. "These fellows are treating us like commodities." Goffman’s reply was, "That's all right, Al, so long as they treat us as expensive commodities" (Gouldner, 1970:383).

Ideas and university roles become pragmatic commodities in the new marketplace of information and service. How must sociology, a subsystem within the university, fulfill the structural exigencies of disseminators of pragmatic information? Very well, according to Mills (1959) and Gouldner (1970). As we described earlier, functionalism was an apology for elite economic and political institutions, and this provided ideological balm justifying the periodic upheavals endemic to their nature (Smith, 1971). Educated in the ideology to believe in the inherent capacity of American social reform, professors trained new Ph.D.s to research "solutions" the post-World War II Welfare-Warfare State would implement as national social policy (Gouldner,
1970). Also, researchers were groomed for roles not only in government, but business, the military, communications, and advertising. However, regardless of professional domain, the research engendered "managerial and manipulative" uses, reflecting "the political perspective of their bureaucratic clients and chieftains," and strengthened bureaucracy's domination in modern society (Mills, 1958:101).

To what extent does sociology currently train graduates for socially relevant roles in the postindustrial society and its welfare apparatus? According to Gouldner (1970) Parsons resurrected sociology from its socially marginal status and aligned the discipline with elite welfare and development philosophy while further making his social theory congenial to that policy. According to Gouldner (1970) this is necessarily the current status of the discipline. Whether originating in the university or the research institute (cf. Gouldner, 1970:476), sociological inquiry remains couched in the invalid idiom of "social relevance." But to what end does research serve? How is it funded? For whom is it conducted? These are questions usually ignored, for sociologists, due to their professional socialization, take-for-granted that these are unnecessary queries. Yet, funded social research, because it is incorrectly conceived, insures the failure of the reforms it seeks, thus necessitating additional funding for more misconceived research (Gouldner, 1970:439).
In postindustrial society what marketable skills and information can sociology provide non-Ph.D.s? For nonmajors, not much, according to Perrucci (1980). What about B.A.s and M.A.s in sociology? How relevant are these degrees in the competitive service economy? Textbook authors, sensitive to students' needs and in allegiance to the profession, recruit undergraduate majors by indicating job areas for degreed sociologists. Jon Shepard's (1984:29-32) textbook provides a good example of how sociology maintains its relevance and applicability in the information and service economy. In obtaining a B.A. in sociology, this author maintains, the properly socialized undergraduate qualifies for approximately sixty job areas, ranging from demographer to foreign service officer, from correctional officer to market researcher/analyst.10

Books-as-information have also become big commodities in postindustrial society. After sociology became safely ensconced in the university system, the discipline emerged as part of the popular culture, especially between the 1940s and 1960s. Book sales correspondingly soared.

[H]undreds of thousands of sociology books were written. At the same time, the newly emerging paperback book industry made these available as mass literature. They were sold in drug stores, railway stations, air terminals, hotels, and grocery stores, while at the same time, increasing middle class affluence made it easier for students to purchase them, even when not required as textbooks (Gouldner, 1970:4).
Like the books of popularized sociology, textbooks, also have become profitable commodities, especially since the textbook boom of the 1970s (Brown, 1976). Not only do textbooks provide extra revenue to the authors, they help impart essential information, skills and points of view in socializing competitive job seekers. But have market variables unduly shaped textbook content and the social views contained in them?

The growth in enrollments has placed the introductory textbook within the domain of large corporate business. Market considerations help decisions about who should write textbooks, what they should contain, and how they should be used by teachers and students (Perrucci, 1980:39).

Other sociologists fear the "consequences" of textbook publications dictated to by the profit-oriented ethos of big business (McGee, 1977). Moreover, the resulting changes induced by market conditions is seen by others as distancing the textbook, the discipline and students (Geertsen, 1977). By this "distancing" of textbooks and students, we interpret this to mean the disparity between textbook representation of American society and the reality of students' experiences in that society.

Students, educators and editors, ideas and textbooks—all become products to sell and exchange in the post-industrial marketplace. As with the discipline that legitimates and certifies them, textbooks must forward positive, optimistic ideas and images of a stratified
economic infrastructure demanding properly socialized human products.\textsuperscript{11} Therefore, textbooks must cultivate the necessary paradigms that dictate the parameters of criticism and dissent deemed acceptable by the social system that students will work in and pay taxes to. If we look at the current format of textbooks in this light -- as implicit purveyors of an ideology of limited inquiry and sanctioned dissent -- we see that they can not certify and legitimate (cf. Rothman, 1971) a wholesale systemic analysis of American society embodied in a conflict paradigm. Such ideas, in the prevailing educational and technocratic ethos, are not pragmatic products in the marketplace.\textsuperscript{12} Additionally, such ideas tend to undermine uncritical allegiance and unquestioned participation with established structural arrangements. Extending this line of reasoning, because "Vietnam Wars," poverty, imperialism abroad, and marketplace ideas and work roles are interrelated, textbooks need to fail in providing both majors and nonmajors with insightful, critically relevant information about their society (cf. Perrucci, 1980).

**Discussion and Implications for Future Inquiry**

According to Chambliss and Ryther's (1975) interpretation of conflict theory, in the developed stages of a stratified economic system the internal mechanisms for class conflicts increasingly fail, thus implying upheavals, even catastrophe (cf. Hernes, 1976). Durkheim, writing
during the social upheavals of the French Republic, specified the normlessness that pervades the psyche and social being of people caught within these deteriorating structures. Weber also wrote of the limits of rationality and of the disenchantment foisted on modern industrial societies through the necessity of bureaucratic ordering. As was Durkheim and Weber, Marx was deeply disturbed by the massive social disruptions of capitalism and, writing from a working class perspective, foresaw the future plight of the common man (and, eventually, the privileged) cast within such structures. None of these social portraits from the European masters is optimistic for twentieth century humanity.

When Parsons took his Ph.D. in Heidelberg in 1927 he had assimilated these masters’ ideas. His systems analysis and ideas of social change, however, embodied the optimistic spirit endemic to the American elite; his homespun social theory reflected American sentiments of unlimited progress, equality, freedom, and democracy. As Gouldner (1970) also observed, American innocence and optimism offered no soil for the bleak social forecasting of such European minds that had witnessed the ravages of modern history. And because America is preoccupied with “bourgeois respectability” (Berger, 1963), we see that Parsons’ social views were (and remain) congenial to an American ethos that evolved within a privileged geographical and temporal arena of world history.
But discordant historical realities (cf. Appendix II; Gravel, 1971) have sullied America's persistent image of its national integrity and innocence. As early as World War I, and especially with world developments after World War II, critics challenged the dominant elitist interpretation of history and social reality (cf. Zinn, 1970, 1980; Chirot, 1977). In their intellectual formulations they attempted, according to their scholarly bent, to specify the persistent intrinsic anomalies within the American view of domestic and world events. It was this persistent failure of mainstream concepts to account for and order these incomprehensible phenomena that occasioned some scientists, philosophers, and critics to recast their thinking within reflexive paradigms. Husserl (1970) described the future crisis of science in comprehending social events. Barrett (1978), a philosopher of science, noted that the Enlightenment ideals of science and the liberal philosophy predicated upon its tenets are invalid and obsolete. Also, for sociology the reflexive analysis of Gouldner (1970) has used the term "crisis" to describe a field of study that remains committed to outdated paradigms of social reality (cf. Capra, 1983). In the pessimism founded on a critical view of society, Heilbroner (1974) has forecasted stark possibilities for societies that persist in current views and definitions of world and domestic events.
Though these critical insights are long established within the discipline, many sociologists have not grasped their import or implications, especially the criticisms of Mills (1956, 1958, 1959), Habermas (1968), and Gouldner (1970). Rather than see their professional activity in the unflattering mirror, these and other critical sociologists hold up to the discipline, mainstream sociologists persist in the replication of research and of theory building of dubious relevance (cf. Perrucci, 1980). Further, to justify its educative role in an increasingly bureaucraticized university and economic system, the discipline is obliged to train researchers and educators within the "pragmatic" bounds of an obsolete social welfare philosophy that, because of its contradictory nature, insures its own failure (Gouldner, 1970:439). Yet, though they fail to redress the structural conditions underlying poverty, inequality, war, racism or unemployment, they do help to increase bureaucratic domination at all levels of society (Mills, 1958:101). Also, the discipline, in meeting the employment needs of other students, impart skills and information for social adaptation, while essential concepts to comprehend and order their inevitable alienation and commodification receive, at best, cursory examination in textbooks. Most important for our research issue, the discipline, because of its institutional relationship to university and society, is largely precluded from informing students of the structural
anomalies underlying wars like Vietnam. Such ideas hold no pragmatic place in postindustrial society. For to certify and legitimate ideas embodied in a critical/conflict paradigm (cf. Rothman, 1971) would tend to invalidate the current institutional relationship of sociology within the university and the social system that directs and charters the university's goals and purposes.

Certainly, these are decidedly critical insights to forward about the discipline. But, again, they exist in a sociological literature marginal to the mainstream concerns and research pursuits. These critical observations suggest certain questions which the discipline must confront and answer: What recourse would sociology pursue to ameliorate its "crisis of relevancy" (Lowry and Rankin, 1972:5; cf. Gouldner, 1970)? How might sociology recover its classical foundations and its potential as "the most revolutionary discipline in the modern world" (Fernandez, 1975:xi)? And in the Millsian sense of the concept, how might sociology reorient itself for inquiry into "human issues"?

What about textbooks? Because they are important socialization tools for sociologists (Friedrichs, 1970; cf. Kuhn, 1977) how might they better serve the classical ideals of sociology's discovery process (cf. Mills, 1958)? How might they become more sensitive to the dynamic realities underlying modern warfare? In our own impressionistic examination of post-Vietnam War introductory textbooks, we
suggested that although no paradigm shift along the lines of Chambliss and Ryther (1975) or Anderson (1971, 1974) had occurred, some authors were more critical of certain domains of American society. For this trend to continue and expand in textbooks, they must deviate more from the current format largely dictated by market standards (Perrucci, 1980). In pursuing this critical stance in textbooks, we propose authors reexamine empirical evidence of Mills, Chambliss and Ryther, Anderson (and myriad others) to create new chapters reflecting dominant trends of power, wealth and influence within modern American society. To this end, we feel current social circumstances warrant less emphasis on traditional topics, and more presentation of the permanent-war economy embedded within the military-industrial complex (cf. Chambliss and Ryther, 1975). Further, using a conflict paradigm we see the need of a heightened sense of responsibility to the social experiences of Native Americans, Blacks, women, the working class and other systematically disenfranchised segments of American society -- to increasingly include segments of the middle class. By pursuing this form of presenting American society, elite (i.e., "functional") definitions of crime, deviance, and government are reexamined in the style advocated by Chambliss and Ryther (1975).

Such analysis and presentation of American society implies, after Zinn (1980), a "people's sociology," one
founded on the social experience of the many, not the few. It also means reorienting issues and questions very differently then they are currently framed in mainstream sociology. One necessary move in this direction would be to make more accessible to introductory students Daniel Chirot’s *Social Change in the Twentieth Century*. An important book in helping students to disentangle themselves from entrenched journalistic and mass media myths of America’s role in the Third World, it dispels illusions necessary for the continued pillage of poorer societies by American “development” schemes. Chirot’s book helps the student cultivate a critical intellect in comprehending America’s role in the evolving, tightly integrated world system. Further, Chirot’s incisive analysis helps the student understand why poor societies opt for communist models of development:

> Communist development means elimination of core [capitalistic] influence, eradication of the “enclave classes” that benefited from colonial relationships, an end to humiliating dependency on the core, an end to gross inequality, and a chance to create balanced economic development (Chirot, 1977:232-233).

Making Chirot’s book available to introductory students also engenders their perception of the commonality of experience between their own social worlds with those of the economically dominated classes of Third World societies. 

Lastly, in realigning the discipline with its classical ideals, we advocate an increased critical reflexivity as
that pursued by Gouldner (1970). Though his examination of sociology's "coming crisis" is dated, it still applies to much of mainstream's current research interests and style of analysis and presentation of American society to introductory students. Collins (1981) has provided a concise, if incomplete, summation of the sophistication in sociology's theory building paradigms after mid-century, when new social views and insights challenged the orthodoxy of Parsons' functionalism. However, Collins' approach remains a specialty within sociology, far removed from mainstream interests. Nonetheless, we hope his paradigm—a reflexivity on the discipline's theoretical paradigms—can receive wider distribution among sociologists. In later writings Collins described the development as occurring with sociology. Referring to functionalism, symbolic interaction and conflict theory, he sees a convergence of ideas:

The fact that the three traditions have gotten transplanted and somewhat mixed is in my opinion a good thing. It is by the mutual confrontation of ideas that progress is made towards a wider truth. The weakness of one set of ideas can be discarded, and its strong points built up and integrated with the strong points from elsewhere. I have already given indications of where I think this has been happening. Hopefully, the future will show us even more of the same (Collins, 1985:233).
The professional career of C. Wright Mills provides evidence of this last statement. Because his sociology was critical of prevailing paradigms, he was relegated to a marginal status within the discipline by his contemporaries.

Gouldner observes that... "During an earlier period, prior to the present full-scale effort to professionalize sociology, career-seeking young men often manifested their mettle by assaulting the ideas of seniors and, what some thought to be safer, those classical sociologists now safely deceased. With the growth of professionalization, however, young sociologists were increasingly encouraged to seek out what was 'right' in the work of others, not what was wrong. In effect they were enjoined to adopt a constructive attitude; a positive rather than a critical or negative attitude. Rather than a call for criticism, the watchwords of professionalized sociology become: continuity, codification, convergence, and cumulative" (1970:16-17).

It was not until the late 1960s that large segments of the population again began to show significant awareness that basic contradicting interests were present within contemporary society. The Vietnam War and its social and economic implications provided the capstone. Beginning with the civil rights movement and spreading through the ghettos and universities and out into the society at large, class conflict generated by racism, militarism, war, poverty, sexual inequality, unemployment, and other breakdowns has been sporadically growing. Alienation and cynicism regarding the effectiveness of the existing political system is widespread at all levels of the working class. Class conflict may be seen in every ghetto riot and urban disorder, picket line and strike, consumer boycott, welfare demonstration, disobedience to authority, slow down, prison riot, and military desertion (Anderson, 1974:127).

A good example of this selective conflict analysis is Spencer's (1982) textbook. Though she ignores the Vietnam War, excludes reference to the Third World and briefly recapitulates a modified Millsian assessment of the military-industrial complex, Spencer is decidedly critical when she examines gender socialization in patriarchal American society. Her analysis of male dominance is based in conflict theory, and Marx is liberally referenced throughout her publication.
While Marx was mainly concerned with structural arrangements within industrialized societies, other writers have focused instead on the "character" of humans socialized within such societies. Creative authors Henry Miller, D.H. Lawrence, Norman Mailer, Kurt Vonnegut, John Barth and Thomas Pynchon, among others, reflect in prose a lost, absurd, meaningless, even demonic humanity within their industrialized societies, particularly American. Also the word "apocalypse" has received wide currency among Western creative artists since the "Lost Generation" writers—Ernest Hemingway, F. Scott Fitzgerald, James Joyce, T.S. Eliot—who emerged after the debacle of World War I. If their collective testimony holds merit, growing up in America is not conducive to emotional, mental, even physical, well-being.

Gouldner (1970) suggests that cultural crises, such as war and depression, influence the content and emphasis of theory building. During the Great Depression and subsequent war, Parsons formulations of social systems were anti-utilitarian in character, focusing on morality as the glue of society. However, after the war, he, as do other postwar theorists, ignore communal values, opting for social and individual utilitarianism as the values of society. Such an observation reiterates Gouldner's theme that you cannot divorce ideas from the social and institutional context where they derive. Further, as we are suggesting, the institution of sociology is itself subject to comparable cultural dynamics.

For a trenchant analysis of love-as-commodity within industrial societies see Eric Fromm's essay "Love and Its Disintegration in Contemporary Western Society" in his bestselling The Art of Loving. Relatedly, for a view of women-as-commodity in patriarchal American society see Metta Spencer's (1982) conflict analysis of sex roles in her text Foundations of Modern Society. Fromm's essay also provides a model for sociologists to rethink several taken-for-granted concepts within the discipline, to include "democracy", "government", "crime", "deviance." Chambliss and Ryther (1975) have undertaken such an approach by extracting these terms from their conventional grounding in the elite ideological framework of functionalism, and recasting them within a conflict paradigm.

New York literary critic and popular philosopher William Barrett, referring to Max Weber, observed that bureaucratic imperatives eroded the foundation of humanity, good art, and free ideas. "Society becomes larger and more complex, more hierarchical, more rationally planned," eventually undermining the creative thinking in this "all-devouring process... "(Barrett, 1982:10). Mills (1959)
concludes that mainstream sociology's creative imagination has succumbed to this "bureaucratic ethos."

In a gesture of obvious concern, Shepard (1984) also lists places to look for a job and the necessary printed materials and documents undergraduates can consult in learning about careers in sociology. The author presents persuasive evidence that an undergraduate degree in sociology is a good investment toward future employment in postindustrial society.

William Thompson (1981:247) made this observation about educators and the educational processes in postindustrial society: "As psychologists, they are our Thought Police; as professors, they are our Cultural Police; as consultants to government, they are the legislators who empower the Police."

Mills (1959) would define this educational ethos as inimical to sociology as it was classically conceived. Also, writes Berger (1963:175): "Where education is understood in purely technical or professional terms, let sociology be eliminated from the curriculum. It will only interfere with the smooth operation of the latter, provided, of course, that sociology has not been emasculated in accordance with the educational ethos prevailing in such situations." Or, as Kumar (1978:106) states: "The technical, means-to-ends, rationality of bureaucracy comes to substitute itself for the goals for which it was instituted." This Weberian insight means that "academic sociology" has become an end-in-itself, striving foremost to maintain and replicate its structure.

In so far as the corporate elite are aware of these profit interests... they press for a continuation of their source of profit, which often means a continuation of the preparation for war (Anderson, 1974:200).
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APPENDIX I

INTRODUCTORY SOCIOLOGY TEXTBOOKS USED IN ANALYSIS

Data recorded in the following format:

Author
Publisher/Date/edition
  a. Pages/Chapters
  b. Core Chapters: (y/n)
Content Chapters:
  c. Institutions: (fam, educ, econ, rel, pol)
d. Problems: (deviance, minorities, etc.)
e. Other: ID number
f. Index Reference to "Vietnam War": (y/n)

POSITIVISM

Abrahamson, Mark
  a. 340/10
  b. y
  c. fam, educ
  d. deviance
  e. 1
  f. n

Anderson, Walfred A. and Frederick B. Parker
  a. 446/25
  b. y
  c. fam, educ, econ, rel, pol
  d. none
  e. 2
  f. n

Bell, Earl H.
  a. 612/30
  b. y
  c. fam, educ, econ, pol
  d. social malnutrition
  e. 3
  f. n
Bertrand, Alvin L.  
- a. 452/22  
- b. y  
- c. fam, educ, econ, rel, pol  
- d. deviance, crime  
- e. 4  
- f. n

Bertrand, Alvin L.  
- a. 533/22  
- b. y  
- c. fam, educ, econ, rel, pol  
- d. deviance, minorities  
- e. 5  
- f. n

Bierstedt, Robert  
- a. 577/16  
- b. y  
- c. fam, pol  
- d. minorities  
- e. 6  
- f. n

Bierstedt, Robert  
- a. 602/18  
- b. y  
- c. fam, pol  
- d. minorities  
- e. 7  
- f. n

Bierstedt, Robert  
- a. 563/20  
- b. y  
- c. fam, pol  
- d. minorities  
- e. 8  
- f. n
Biesanz, John and Mavis Biesanz
a. 718/32
b. y
c. fam, educ, econ, rel, pol
d. none
e. 9
f. n

Biesanz, John and Mavis Biesanz
a. 740/28
b. y
c. fam, educ, econ, rel, pol
d. minorities
e. 10
f. n

Biesanz, John and Mavis Biesanz
a. 719/29
b. y
c. fam, educ, econ, rel, pol
d. communism
e. 11
f. n

Bogardus, Emory S.
a. 616/17
b. y
c. fam, educ, rel
d. delinq., crime, minorities, war, alcoholism
e. 12
f. n

Caplow, Theodore
a. 681/14
b. y
c. fam
d. deviance, war
e. 13
f. n
Caplow, Theodore
a. 420/15
b. y
c. fam, econ
d. deviance, minorities, war
e. 14
f. y

Chinoy, Ely
a. 404/20
b. y
c. fam, econ, rel, pol
d. deviance, minorities
e. 15
f. n

Chinoy, Ely
a. 556/21
b. y
c. fam, educ, econ, rel, pol
d. deviance, minorities
e. 120
f. n

Cole, Stephan
a. 318/9
b. y
c. none
d. Deviance
e. 16
f. n

Communications Research Machines
a. 547/29
b. y
c. fam, educ, econ, rel, pol
d. deviance, minorities, population
e. 17
f. y
Cuber, John F.
a. 652/34
b. y
c. fam, educ, econ, rel, pol
d. deviance, minorities
e. 18
f. n

Cuber, John F.
a. 663/33
b. y
c. fam, educ, econ, rel, pol
d. deviance, minorities
e. 19
f. n

Cuber, John F.
a. 667/32
b. y
c. fam, educ, econ, rel, pol
d. deviance, minorities
e. 20
f. n

Dobriner, William M.
a. 273/8
b. y
c. none
d. none
e. 21
f. n

Feibleman, James K.
The Institutions of Society. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1956
a. 400/23
b. y
c. fam, educ, econ, rel, pol
d. none
e. 22
f. n
Fichter, Joseph H.
Sociology. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1957
a. 450/18
b. y
c. fam, educ, econ, rel, pol
d. deviance
e. 23
f. n

Fichter, Joseph
a. 496/17
b. y
c. fam, educ, econ, rel, pol
d. deviance
e. 24
f. n

Freeman, Ronald, Amos H. Hawley, Werner S. Landecker, Gerhard Lenski and Horace M. Minor
a. 604/14
b. y
c. none
d. none
e. 25
f. n

Green, Arnold W.
a. 576/26
b. y
c. fam, educ, econ, rel, pol
d. none
e. 26
f. n

Green, Arnold W.
a. 672/27
b. y
c. fam, educ, econ, rel, pol
d. crime
e. 27
f. n
Green, Arnold W.
a. 691/26
b. y
c. fam, educ, econ, rel, pol
d. crime
e. 28
f. n

Hertzler, Joyce O.
a. 452/22
b. y
c. fam, educ, econ, rel, pol
d. none
e. 29
f. n

Hurd, Geoffrey (ed.)
a. 222/14
b. y
c. fam, educ, econ, rel, pol
d. minorities, crime
e. 30
f. n

Johnson, Harry M.
a. 688/22
b. y
c. fam, econ, rel, pol
d. deviance
e. 31
f. n

Kitchens, James A. and Leobardo F. Estrada
a. 292/14
b. y
c. fam, rel, pol
d. deviance, minorities
e. 32
f. n
Landis, Paul H.
a. 726/40
b. y
c. fam, educ, econ, rel, pol
d. none
e. 33
f. n

Lenski, Gerhard
a. 525/16
b. y
c. none
d. none
e. 34
f. y

Lenski, Gerhard and Jean Lenski
a. 528/15
b. y
c. none
d. none
e. 35
f. y

Leslie, Gerald R., Richard F. Larson and Benjamin L. Gorman
a. 321/19
b. y
c. fam, educ, econ, rel, pol
d. deviance, minorities
e. 36
f. n

Lundberg, George A., Clarence C. Schrag and Otto N. Larson
a. 740/18
b. y
c. fam, econ, rel, pol
d. none
e. 37
f. n
Lundberg, George A., et al
a. 785/21
b. y
c. fam, econ, rel, pol
d. deviance
e. 38
f. n

Lundberg, George A., et al
a. 786/25
b. y
c. fam, educ, econ, rel, pol
d. deviance
e. 39
f. n

Mahmoudi, Kooros M. and Bradley W. Parkin
a. 361/25
b. y
c. fam, educ, econ, rel, pol
d. deviance, death
e. 40
f. n

Mercer, Blaine E.
a. 640/16
b. y
c. fam, educ, econ, rel, pol
d. none
e. 41
f. n

Mercer, Blaine E. and Jules J. Wanderer
a. 515/16
b. y
c. fam, educ, econ, rel, pol
d. minorities
e. 42
f. n
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O’Brien, Robert W., Clarence C. Schrag and Walter T. Martin
a. 444/84  
b. y  
c. fam, econ, rel, pol  
d. none  
e. 43  
f. n

Ogburn, William F. and Meyer F. Nimhoff
a. 756/26  
b. y  
c. fam, econ, rel, pol  
d. deviance, war  
e. 44  
f. n

Phillips, Bernard S.
a. 432/17  
b. y  
c. fam, educ, econ, rel, pol  
d. minorities  
e. 45  
f. n

Quinn, James A.
a. 434/18  
b. y  
c. fam, educ, econ, rel, pol  
d. none  
e. 46  
f. n

Remmling, Gunter W. and Robert B. Cambell
a. 384/21  
b. y  
c. fam, educ, econ, rel, pol  
d. none  
e. 54  
f. n
Scott, W. Richard
a. 637/45
b. y
c. none
d. none
e. 47
f. n

Sellew, Gladys, Rev. Paul Hanley Furfey and Rev. William T. Gaughan, C.M.
a. 598/27
b. y
c. fam, educ, econ, rel, pol
d. none
e. 48
f. n

Smelser, Neil J.
a. 744/12
b. y
c. fam, educ, econ, rel, pol
d. deviance
e. 49
f. n

Toby, Jackson
Contemporary Society. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1964
a. 598/17
b. y
c. educ, rel, pol
d. deviance
e. 52
f. n

Toby, Jackson
a. 000/15
b. y
c. fam, educ, econ, rel, pol
d. deviance
e. 53
f. y
Vander Zanden, James W.
a. 508/21
b. y
c. fam, educ, econ, rel, pol
d. none
e. 55
f. n

Vander Zanden, James W.
a. 535/17
b. y
c. fam, educ, econ, rel, pol
d. minorities
e. 56
f. y

Williams, Robin M., Jr.
a. 575/14
b. y
c. fam, educ, econ, rel, pol
d. none
e. 50
f. n

Williams, Robin M., Jr.
a. 639/15
b. y
c. fam, educ, econ, rel, pol
d. none
e. 51
f. n

Wilson, Everett K.
a. 730/16
b. y
c. fam, educ, econ, rel, pol
d. none
e. 57
f. n
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Wilson, Everett K.
Sociology. (revised edition)
Homewood: The Dorsey Press, 1971
a. 687/15
b. y
c. fam, educ, econ, rel, pol
d. deviance
e. 58
f. n

Young, Kimball and Raymond W. Mack
a. 472/24
b. y
c. fam, educ, econ, rel, pol
d. none
e. 59
f. n
CONFLICT

Abcarian, Gilbert and Monte Palmer (eds.)
  a. 438/52
  b. y
  c. pol
  d. deviance, urban, stress
  e. 60
  f. n

Anderson, Charles H.
Toward a New Sociology. Homewood: The Dorsey Press, 1971
  a. 378/14
  b. y
  c. fam, econ, pol
  d. poverty, minorities
  e. 61
  f. y

Anderson, Charles H.
  a. 390/15
  b. y
  c. fam, educ, econ, pol
  d. minorities
  e. 62
  f. y

Baldridge, J. Victor
  a. 497/13
  b. y
  c. econ, educ, pol
  d. poverty, war, discrimination
  e. 63
  f. n

Chambliss, William J. and Thomas E. Ryther
  a. 396/17
  b. y
  c. none
  d. deviance, war
  e. 64
  f. y
   a. 626/18
   b. y
   c. fam, educ, econ, rel, pol
   d. deviance, minorities
   e. 65
   f. y

   a. 642/18
   b. y
   c. fam, educ, econ, rel, pol
   d. deviance, minorities
   e. 66
   f. y

   a. 330/12
   b. y
   c. fam, econ, educ, rel, pol
   d. deviance, minorities
   e. 67
   f. y

   a. 587/16
   b. y
   c. fam, educ, econ, rel, pol
   d. minorities, underdevelopment
   e. 68
   f. y

   a. 303/34
   b. y
   c. fam, educ, rel, pol
   d. poverty, deviance, minorities, urban, sexism
   e. 69
   f. n
Mead, Eugene and Fanchon Mead
  a. 452/14
  b. y
  c. fam, educ, econ, rel, pol
  d. minorities
  e. 70
  f. n

Weinstein, Deena and Michael A. Weinstein
Living Sociology. New York: David McKay Co., Inc., 1974
  a. 488/23
  b. y
  c. econ, educ, rel, pol
  d. deviance
  e. 119
  f. n
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SOCIAL CONSTRUCTIONISM

Biesanz, John and Mavis Biesanz
a. 651/21
b. y
c. fam, econ, pol
d. deviance, minorities
e. 71
f. n

Gouldner, Alvin W. and Helen P. Gouldner
a. 683/15
b. y
c. fam, econ, rel
d. deviance, minorities
e. 72
f. n

Hammond, Phillip E., Louis Wolf Goodman, Scott Greer, Richard H. Hall and Mary Catherine Taylor
a. 718/24
b. y
c. fam, educ, econ, pol
d. deviance, minorities
e. 118
f. y

Henslin, Francis
a. 434/20
b. y
c. none
d. delinquency, mental illness, social control
e. 73
f. y
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Merrill, Francis
a. 592/25
b. y
c. fam
d. none
e. 74
f. n

Merrill, Francis
a. NA
b. NA
c. NA
d. NA
e. 75
f. n

Merrill, Francis
a. 618/25
b. y
c. fam
d. none
e. 76
f. n

Merrill, Francis
a. 449/21
b. y
c. fam
d. deviance, minorities
e. 77
f. n

Rose, Arnold M.
a. 589/17
b. y
c. fam, educ, econ, rel, pol
d. delinquency, minorities
e. 78
f. n
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Rose, Arnold M.
a. 736/17
b. y
c. fam, educ, econ, rel, pol
d. delinquency, poverty, minorities, housing
e. 79
f. n

Shepard, Jon M.
a. 355/16
b. y
c. fam, educ, econ, rel, pol
d. none
e. 80
f. n
Ainsworth, Charles H. (ed.)
Selected Readings for Introductory Sociology. New York: MSS Information Corporation, 1972
a. 177/19
b. y
c. rel, pol
d. mental illness, crime,
e. 81
f. n

Anderson, Charles H. (ed.)
a. 379/72
b. y
c. fam, educ, rel, pol
d. minorities
e. 82
f. n

Baali, Fuad and Clifton D. Bryant (eds.)
a. 569/11
b. y
c. fam, educ, rel, pol
d. deviance, minorities
e. 83
f. y

Barron, Milton
Contemporary Sociology. New York: Dodd, Mead and Co., 1964
a. 662/60
b. y
c. fam, econ, rel, pol
d. deviance, minorities, crime
e. 84
f. n

Bates, Alan P. and Joseph Julian
a. 500/16
b. y
c. fam, educ, rel
d. deviance, minorities
e. 86
f. y
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Bensman, Joseph and Bernard Rosenberg
a. 534/17
b. y
c. fam, econ, rel, pol
d. minorities
e. 88
f. n

Berelson, Bernard and Gary A. Steiner
a. 712/17
b. y
c. fam, educ, econ, rel, pol
d. minorities
e. 85
f. n

Berger, Peter and Brigette Berger
a. 372/17
b. y
c. fam, educ, rel, pol
d. deviance, death
e. 87
f. y

Bredemeier, Harry C. and Richard M. Stevenson
a. 411/12
b. y
c. fam, rel, pol
d. deviance
e. 89
f. n

Broom, Leonard and Philip Selznick
a. 324/9
b. y
c. fam, educ, econ, pol
d.
e. 90
f. n
Broom, Leonard and Philip Selznick
  a. 660/15
  b. y
  c. fam, econ, pol
  d. minorities, crime
  e. 91
  f. n

Broom, Leonard and Philip Selznick
  a. 746/17
  b. y
  c. fam, educ, rel, pol
  d. deviance, minorities
  e. 92
  f. n

Broom, Leonard and Philip Selznick
  a. 653/17
  b. y
  c. fam, educ, rel, pol
  d. minorities
  e. 93
  f. y

Denisoff, R. Serge and Ralph Wahrman
  a. 529/16
  b. y
  c. fam
  d. deviance, minorities
  e. 94
  f. n

Doby, John T., Alvin Boskoff, and William W. Pendleton
  a. 578/18
  b. y
  c. fam, pol
  d. none
  e. 95
  f. n
Duskin Publishing Group, Inc.
a. 660/27
b. y
c. fam, educ, econ, rel, pol
d. deviance, minorities, war, death
e. 96
f. y

Federico, Ronald C.
Sociology. Reading: Addison-Wesley Publ. Co., 1975
a. 735/21
b. y
c. educ, econ, rel, pol
d. deviance, minorities
e. 97
f. n

Fernandez, Ronald
The Promise of Sociology. New York: Praeger Publ., 1975
a. 364/13
b. y
c. fam, educ, econ, rel, pol
d. minorities
e. 98
f. y

Hobbs, Donald A. and Stuart J. Blank
Sociology and the Human Experience. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1975
a. 526/10
b. y
c. educ, econ, rel, pol
d. deviance, minorities
e. 99
f. n

Horowitz, Irving Louis and Mary Symons Strong (eds.)
a. 551/76
b. y
c. fam, econ, rel, pol
d. deviance, minorities, war
e. 100
f. y
Horowitz, Irving Louis and Charles Hanry
a. 607/19
b. y
c. fam, educ, econ, pol
d. deviance, minorities, crime, war
e. 101
f. y

Horton, Paul B. and Chester Hunt
a. 582/20
b. y
c. fam, pol
d. minorities
e. 102
f. n

Horton, Paul B. and Chester L. Hunt
a. 558/21
b. y
c. fam, educ, econ, rel, pol
d. minorities
e. 117
f. n

Renkel, William F. and Ellen Voland
Society in Action. San Francisco: Canfield Press, 1975
a. 534/16
b. y
c. fam, educ, econ, rel, pol
d. deviance, minorities
e. 103
f. n

King, David C. and Melvin Koller
Foundations of Sociology. San Francisco: Rinehart Press, 1975
a. 354/18
b. y
c. educ, econ, rel, pol
d. deviance, minorities, war, crime
e. 104
f. y
Lasswell, Thomas E. and Jerry G. Bode
Sociology in Context: Scientific and Humanistic.
Morristown: General Learning Press, 1974
a. 291/12
b. y
c. none
d. none
e. 105
f. n

Lasswell, Thomas E., John H. Burma and Sidney H. Aronson
Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Co., 1965
a. 661/85
b. y
c. fam, educ, econ, rel, pol
d. deviance, minorities
e. 106
f. n

Light, Donald, Jr. and Suzanne Keller
a. 570/19
b. y
c. fam, educ, rel, pol
d. deviance, minorities
e. 107
f. y

Lowry, Ritchie and Robert P. Rankin
Sociology: Social Science and Social Concern. New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1972
a. 692/12
b. y
c. none
d. deviance, minorities
e. 108
f. y

McNall, Scott G.
a. 218/16
b. y
c. fam, rel, pol
d. deviance, minorities
e. 109
f. n
Medley, Morris L. and James Conyers
a. 397/33
b. y
c. educ, econ, rel, pol
d. deviance, minorities, racism, war
e. 110
f. y

Mizruchi, Ephraim H.
a. 592/13
b. y
c. none
d. deviance
e. 111
f. n

Nisbet, Robert A.
a. 425/14
b. y
c. rel, pol
d. deviance
e. 112
f. n

Perry, John and Erma Perry
a. 575/11
b. y
c. fam, educ, econ, rel, pol
d. minorities
e. 113
f. y

Popenoe, David
a. 675/16
b. y
c. fam, educ, econ, rel, pol
d. deviance, minorities
e. 114
f. y
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Rose, Jerry D.
Introduction to Sociology. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1971
a. 438/20
b. y
c. fam, rel, pol
d. deviance, minorities
e. 115
f. n

Van den Berghe, Pierre L.
a. 300/11
b. y
c. fam, educ, econ, rel, pol
d. none
e. 116
f. y
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APPENDIX II

CHRONOLOGY

Events related to Vietnam War

The following chronograph is mostly an excerpt from Stanley Karnow's *Vietnam: A History*, and it represents the significant events related to the Vietnam War during the period between 1954 and 1975. Because it is chronicled in a journalistic style, many colorful events have been left out which would help broaden an understanding of the dimensions encompassed by the "Vietnam Era" of American history. For example, information disclosed in the Watergate investigations regarding the linkages between government management of the war effort and big business interests are not mentioned, and therefore, makes ambiguous any attempt at historiography or theory building. Also, some events not mentioned by Karnow have been added, once again in an effort to orient rather than to revise history. For a more complete chronology of significant events relating to Vietnam, including those prior to 1954 and following 1975, see Karnow (1983:670-686).

* Indicates events unrelated to Vietnam but useful as reference points.

1954 On January 25, foreign ministers of United States, Britain, France, and Soviet Union meet in Berlin; agree that a conference on Korea and Indochina should be held in April.

1955 United States begins to funnel aid directly to Saigon government in January, agrees to train South Vietnamese army. Diem crushes the Binh Xuyen sect in April. Period ends for French forces and their Vietnamese auxiliaries to deploy to the south, and for Vietminh troops to regroup in the north. Diem rejects the Geneva accords and refuses to participate in nationwide elections on July 16, a decision backed by the United States. Ho Chi Minh, in Moscow in July, accepts Soviet aid, having earlier negotiated in Beijing for Chinese assistance.

* NATO conference on "The Future of Freedom" held in Milan, Italy, in September; Western intellectuals proclaim "the end of ideology."

Diem defeats Bao Dai in a referendum, October 23, becomes chief of state; proclaims the Republic of
Vietnam, with himself as president, October 26.
In December, massive land reform programs begin in
North Vietnam, with landlords tried before "people’s
tribunals."

1956 Prince Sihanouk, now Cambodian prime minister, asserts
his intention in April to pursue a neutralist policy.
Diem begins crackdown on Vietminh suspects and other
dissidents.
* Soviet Union crushes October uprisings in Hungary and
Poland.
* Britain, France, and Israel launch the Suez war in
November.

1957 In January, Soviet Union, favoring a permanent division
of the country, proposes that North and South Vietnam
be admitted to United Nations as separate states.
Diem arrives in U.S. for ten-day visit on May 8.
President Eisenhower reaffirms support for his regime.
Communist insurgent activity in South Vietnam begins in
October in accordance with decision reached in Hanoi to
organize thirty-seven armed companies in Mekong delta.
During the year, guerrillas assassinated more than four
hundred minor South Vietnamese officials.

1958 Communists form a coordinated command structure in
eastern Mekong delta in June.
Prince Souvanna Phouma dissolves his neutralist
government in Laos on July 22; succeeded by Phoui
Sananikone, who with American support adopts anti-Com­
munist stance.

1959 A plot to overthrow Sihanouk uncovered in February,
with a CIA agent involved.
North Vietnam forms Group 559 in May, to begin in­
filtrating cadres and weapons into South Vietnam via
the Ho Chi Minh Trail.
Group 759 organized in July by Communists to send
supplies to the south by sea.
Major Dale Buis and Sergeant Chester Ovnand killed by
guerillas at Bienhoa on July 8, the first American to
die in what would be called the Vietnam Era.
Diem promulgates law authorizing intense repression of
Communist suspects and other dissidents in August.
Hanoi leadership creates Group 959 in September to
furnish weapons and other supplies to Communist
insurgents in Laos.
* In December, Charles de Gaulle takes power in France;
establishes Fifth Republic.

1960 North Vietnam imposes universal military conscription
in April. Eighteen prominent South Vietnamese petition
Diem to reform his government.

Captain Kong Le stages coup d'etat in Laos in August, hands power back to Souvanna Phouma. General Phoumi Nosavan, with CIA help, forms opposition faction in southern Laos.

Lao Dong congress opens in Hanoi, September 5; stresses need to combat Diem regime.


South Vietnamese army units unsuccessfully attempt to overthrow Diem, November 11.

Hanoi leaders form National Liberation Front for South Vietnam, December 20, which Saigon dubs the "Vietcong," meaning Communist Vietnamese.

Crisis erupts in Laos in late December as General Phouma attacks Vientiane. Soviet aircraft fly supplies to Souvanna Phouma's neutralist faction.

1961 As he leaves office, Eisenhower warns Kennedy that Laos is the major crisis in Southeast Asia.

In March, Kennedy asserts American support for the sovereignty of Laos, while Britain and Soviet Union propose an international conference to resolve the crisis.

* American-backed attempt to overthrow Fidel Castro fails at the Bay of Pigs in April.

Vice-President Lyndon B. Johnson visits South Vietnam in May; proposes additional American aid to Diem regime.

Geneva conference on Laos opens, May 16; later creates neutral coalition headed by Souvanna Phouma.

* Kennedy meets Soviet Prime Minister Nikita Khrushchev in Vienna, June 4.

Maxwell Taylor and Walt Rostow visit Vietnam in October; recommend American combat troop intervention disguised as flood relief. Kennedy spurns idea, but decides to give Diem more equipment and advisers.


Two South Vietnamese pilots bomb Diem's palace, February 27, but Diem and his family survive.

In May, Communists form battalion-size units in central Vietnam.

Geneva accords on Laos signed, July 23.

* Kennedy forces the Soviets to withdraw missiles from Cuba in October.

American and Saigon governments promote strategic hamlet program.
1963 Vietcong units defeat South Vietnamese at the battle of Ap Bac, January 2.
Ho Chi Minh and Chinese President Liu Shaoqi denounce "revisionism," May 1, indicating North Vietnamese shift toward China.
South Vietnamese troops and police shoot at Buddhist demonstrators in Hue, May 8. Crisis intensifies as Buddhist monk commits self-immolation in June.
South Vietnamese General Tran Van Don informs Lucien Conein, a CIA agent, on July 4 that officers are plotting against Diem.
Ngo Dinh Nhu's forces attack Buddhist temples, August 21. Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge arrives in Saigon, August 22, replacing Frederick Nolting. On August 24, Washington recommends that Nhu be removed; also suggests American support for mutinous generals against Diem; Lodge concurs.
Kennedy criticizes Diem in a television interview, September 2.
Duong Van Minh and other generals stage a coup against Diem and Nhu, November 1; Diem and Nhu murdered after their surrender next day.
* On November 22, Kennedy assassinated in Dallas; succeeded by Lyndon Johnson.
By year-end, 15,000 American military advisers are in South Vietnam, which has received $500 million in aid during the year.
Communist leadership in Hanoi decides to step up the struggle in the south.

1964 General Nguyen Khanh seizes power in Saigon, January 30; arrests four ruling generals but allows Minh to remain as figurehead chief of state.
Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara visits Vietnam in March; vows support for Khanh.
Dean Rusk, McNamara, and others confer in Honolulu, June 2, on increased aid to South Vietnam. Pentagon strategists refine plans for bombing North Vietnam.
Covert South Vietnamese maritime operations begin against North Vietnam in July.
North Vietnamese patrol boats attack the Maddox, an American destroyer in the Tonkin Gulf, August 2. A doubtful second incident reported two days later. American aircraft bomb North Vietnam for the first time later this month.
Congress passes the Tonkin Gulf resolution on August 7, giving Johnson extraordinary power to act in Southeast Asia.
* China explodes its first atomic bomb in October.
* Khrushchev ousted, October 14; replaced by Leonid Brezhnev and Aleksei Kosygin.
Vietcong attack Bienhoa air base, October 30, but
Johnson rejects proposal for retaliatory raids against North Vietnam.

* Lyndon Johnson defeats Barry Goldwater for the presidency, November 3.
In November, Saigon convulsed by rioters protesting Khanh's rule. Taylor, now ambassador, urges Khanh to leave the country.

1965 Johnson's national security adviser, McGeorge Bundy, arrives in Saigon on February 4, as Soviet Prime Minister Aleksei Kosygin arrives in Hanoi.
Dr. Phan Huy Quat forms government in Saigon, February 18; General Khanh leaves the country.
Operation Rolling Thunder, sustained American bombing of North Vietnam, begins on February 24.
Two marine battalions land to defend Danang airfield, March 8, the first American combat troops in Vietnam.
Johnson, at Johns Hopkins University, April 7, offers Ho Chi Minh participation in a Southeast Asian development plan in exchange for peace.
North Vietnamese Prime Minister Pham Van Dong rejects Johnson's proposal, April 8; says settlement must be based on Vietcong program.
Air Vice Marshal Nguyen Cao Ky takes over as prime minister of a military regime in Saigon, June 11.
American command in Saigon reports on June 26 that Vietcong have put five South Vietnamese combat regiments and nine battalions out of action in recent months.
Johnson reappoints Lodge ambassador to South Vietnam, July 8, to replace Taylor. Eighteen American combat battalions now in the country.
Johnson approves Westmoreland's request, July 28, for forty-four additional combat battalions.
In September, Chinese Defense Minister Lin Biao, in "Long Live the Victory of People's War!," indicates China will not intervene directly in Vietnam. Mao Zedong begins the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution.
American forces defeat North Vietnamese units in the Ia Drang valley in October, the first big conventional clash of war.
By December, American troop strength in Vietnam reaches nearly 200,000.
Johnson suspends bombing of North Vietnam on December 25 in an attempt to induce the Communists to negotiate.
Johnson and South Vietnamese leaders issue a communique, February 8, in Honolulu, emphasizing need for pacification in South Vietnam. Buddhist demonstrators against Saigon regime in Hue and Danang, March 10.


President de Gaulle of France visits Cambodia in September; calls for American withdrawal from Vietnam. American and South Vietnamese leaders conclude conference in Manila, October 25. American troop strength in Vietnam reaches nearly 400,000 by year-end.


* Johnson completes two days of talks with Soviet Prime Minister Kosygin, June 25, at Glassboro, New Jersey. McNamara, testifying before a Senate subcommittee in August, asserts American bombing of North Vietnam is ineffective.

In South Vietnam, Thieu elected president, Ky vice-president, September 3. Communists begin major actions in September. Westmoreland starts to fortify Khesanh. Johnson, in San Antonio on September 29, says United States will stop bombing in exchange for "productive discussions."

Westmoreland, in the United States in November, exudes optimism. Foreign Minister Trinh says on December 29 that North Vietnam "will" talk once the United States halts its bombing. American troop strength in Vietnam approaches 500,000 by year-end. Domestic protests against the war rise.

1968 In January, Sihanouk tells Johnson's emissary, Chester Bowles, that he will not stop American forces from pursuing the Vietcong over the Cambodian border.
* USS Pueblo seized by North Koreans, January 23.
Tet offensive begins, January 31, as North Vietnamese and Vietcong attack South Vietnamese cities and towns. American and South Vietnamese troops recapture Hue on February 25 after twenty-six days of fighting.
General Earle Wheeler, chairman of the joint chiefs of staff, brings request from Westmoreland in Saigon for 206,000 additional American troops.
Clark Clifford, succeeding McNamara as secretary of defense, begins study of troop request; soon favors rejection of buildup.
* Senator Eugene McCarthy of Minnesota nearly defeats Johnson in New Hampshire primary.
Westmoreland appointed army chief of staff, replaced in Vietnam by General Creighton Abrams.
On March 25, "wise men" meet in Washington; advise Johnson against further escalation.
On March 31, Johnson announces partial bombing halt, offers talks, and says he will not run for reelection.
* Martin Luther King, Jr., assassinated in Memphis, April 4; riots broke out in the city.
North Vietnamese diplomats arrive in Paris in mid-May for talks with American delegation headed by Averell Harriman.
* Senator Robert F. Kennedy assassinated in Los Angeles, June 5, after winning the California primary.
* Richard M. Nixon wins Republican nomination for president in Miami, August 8.
* Vice-President Hubert Humphrey wins Democratic nomination for president in Chicago amid riots outside the convention hall.
Johnson stops all bombing of North Vietnam.
* Nixon elected president of the United States, November 5, with Spiro Agnew as vice-president.
* Henry Kissinger chosen by Nixon as national security adviser, December 2.
American troop strength in Vietnam at year-end is 540,000.

Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird invents term "Vietnamization" in March to cover American troop withdrawals.
Nixon, with Thieu on Midway, June 8, announces with-
drawal of 25,000 American troops from Vietnam.
Nixon unveils "Nixon Doctrine" in Guam on July 25.
In August, Kissinger meets covertly in Paris with North Vietnamese negotiator Xuan Thuy.
Ho Chi Minh dies in Hanoi at age of seventy-nine, September 3.
Massive antiwar demonstrations in Washington, October 15.
Nixon delivers "silent majority" speech on November 3.
Another big antiwar demonstration in Washington, November 15.
On November 16, revelation of the Mylai massacre, which took place one year before.
American troop strength in Vietnam reduced by 60,000 by December.

1970
Sihanouk overthrown in Cambodia by Lon Nol and Sisowath Sirik Matak, March 18.
Nixon announces, April 30, that American and South Vietnamese forces have attacked Communist sanctuaries in Cambodia.
Large antiwar protests spread across the United States. National guardsmen kill four students at Kent State University in Ohio on May 4.
Nixon proposes "standstill cease-fire," October 7, but repeats mutual-withdrawal formula the next day.
American combat deaths in Vietnam during last week in October numbered twenty-four, lowest toll since October 1965.
On November 12, Lieutenant William Calley goes on trial at Fort Benning, Georgia, for his part in the Mylai massacre.
American troop strength in Vietnam down to 280,000 men at year-end.

1971
In February, South Vietnamese forces begin incursions in Laos against the Ho Chi Minh Trail.
Lieutenant Calley convicted, March 29, of premeditated murder of South Vietnamese civilians at Mylai.
* On July 15, Nixon announces Kissinger's trip to China.
* Nixon's chief of staff, John Ehrlichman, organizes the "plumbers," July 17, to investigate Daniel Ellsberg, who made the Pentagon Papers public.
Thieu re-elected president of South Vietnam, October 3.
American troop strength in Vietnam down to 140,000 men in December.
1972 Nixon reveals on January 25 that Kissinger has been negotiating secretly with the North Vietnamese.

* Nixon arrives in China, February 21.
  North Vietnam launches offensive across the demilitarized zone, March 30.
  On April 15, Nixon authorizes bombing of area near Hanoi and Haiphong.

* Kissinger goes to Moscow, April 20, to prepare Nixon’s summit meeting with Brezhnev on May 20.
  North Vietnamese capture the city of Quangtri, May 1.

* Five men arrested, June 17, for breaking into Democratic National Committee offices at Watergate complex in Washington, D.C.

Kissinger meets again with Le Duc Tho in Paris, August 1; senses progress. In Saigon, mid-August, senses Thieu’s reluctance to accept cease-fire accord.

Thieu opposes draft agreement in meeting with Kissinger’s assistant, Alexander Haig, October 4.

Breakthrough at Paris meeting between Kissinger and Le Duc Tho, October 8. Back in Saigon in mid-October, Kissinger finds Thieu implacably opposed to agreement.

Hanoi radio broadcasts details of the agreement in an effort to pressure Kissinger. But he is anxious to reassure North Vietnam; declares that "peace is at hand."

* Nixon re-elected, November 7, defeating Senator George McGovern by a landslide.

Kissinger resumes talks with Le Duc Tho, November 20; presents him with sixty-nine amendments to agreement demanded by Thieu. Fresh talks between Kissinger and Le Duc Tho begin again in December and break down.

On December 18, Nixon orders bombing of areas around Hanoi and Haiphong; raids continue for eleven days. Communists agree to resume diplomatic talks when bombing stops.

1973 Kissinger and Le Duc Tho resume talks, January 8; finally initial agreement, January 23.

Cease-fire agreements formally signed in Paris, January 27. Secretary of Defense Laird announces that draft in the United States has ended.

Last American troops leave Vietnam, March 29.

Last American prisoners of war released in Hanoi, April 1.

* Nixon aides H.R. Haldeman, John Ehrlichman, and John Dean and Attorney General Richard Kleindienst resign, April 30, amid charges that the administration has obstructed justice.

Graham Martin sworn in as ambassador to South Vietnam, June 24, replacing Ellsworth Bunker.
* John Dean, former White House counsel, tells a special Senate committee, June 25, that Nixon tried to cover up the Watergate affair. Alexander Butterfield, former Nixon aide, discloses to committee, July 13, existence of tapes of White House conversations. On July 16, Senate Armed Services Committee begins hearings on the secret bombing of Cambodia. United States stops bombing Cambodia, August 14, in accordance with congressional prohibition.

* On August 22, Nixon announces appointment of Kissinger as secretary of state to replace Rogers.

* Agnew resigns, October 10; replaced by Representative Gerald Ford as vice-president.

* On November 7, Congress overrides Nixon's veto of law limiting the presidents right to wage war.

1974 Thieu declares in January that the war has begun again.

* House Judiciary Committee opens impeachment hearings on Nixon, May 9.

Communist buildup of men and supplies proceeds in South Vietnam in June.

* Supreme Court rules, July 24, that Nixon must turn over White House tapes to Leon Jaworski, Watergate special prosecutor; House Judiciary Committee votes, July 30, to recommend impeaching Nixon on three counts.

* Nixon resigns, August 9; replaced by Ford.

* Ford pardons Nixon, September 8, for all federal crimes that he "committed or may have committed." Communists review plans in September to resume fighting during the coming dry season.


North Vietnamese General Van Tien Dung goes south to take command of communist forces, February 5.

Communists capture Banmethuot, March 11.

Thieu meets with his commanders at Camranh, March 15; orders northern provinces of South Vietnam abandoned. Thieu reverses himself, orders Hue held at all costs, March 20. But the city falls to the Communists five days later.

Communists capture Danang, March 30.

On March 31, politburo in Hanoi directs General Dung to push toward Saigon in the "Ho Chi Minh Campaign."

Le Duc Tho arrives at Communist headquarters at Locninh, April 7, to oversee offensive. In Cambodia. Phnompenh falls to the Khmer Rouge, April 17.

Communist capture Xuan Loc, April 21, last South Vietnamese defense line before Saigon.

President Ford, speaking in New Orleans on April 23, calls the war "finished."
Thieu leaves Saigon for Taiwan, April 25. Vice-President Tran Van Huong transfers authority as chief of state to General Duong Van Minh, April 28.

Option IV, evacuation of last Americans from Saigon, begins, April 29. Ambassador Martin departs.

Communist forces capture Saigon, April 30. Colonel Bui Tin takes surrender from Minh.

APPENDIX III

ANNOTATION OF TEXTBOOK REFERENCES TO THE VIETNAM WAR

Outline Format: Author:
Title and year of publication:
Chapter number and title:
Subheading:
ABSTRACT:

Positivist

Caplow, Theodore
Sociology (2nd edition) 1975
1. Ch. 8 - Stratification
   A. The Poor and Urban Poor
   ABSTRACT: p.218 - Citation in a discussion of the
   war on poverty: 'Toward the end of 1966, the war
   on poverty began to be pushed aside by escalation
   of the war in Vietnam.'

Communications Research Machines
Society Today (2nd edition) 1973
1. Ch. 12 - Stratification
   A. Industrial Societies
   ABSTRACT: p. 214 - Citation in a discussion on the
   economics of warfare: 'Even in a war with a small
   agrarian opponent in Vietnam we have run into
   prohibitive costs....'

Lenski, Gerhard
Human Societies 1970
1. Ch. 9 - Agrarian Societies
   A. The Rural Economy
   ABSTRACT: p. 266 - South Vietnam listed in a
   table entitled "Landholdings of the Governing
   Class in Selected Nations in the Mid-twentieth
   Century".
2. Ch. 15 - Industrializing Societies
   A. Cleavages and Conflict
   ABSTRACT: p. 446 - Citation of Vietnam as example
   of a case where "the political unrest and other
   changes associated with industrialization often
   exacerbate historic tensions between religious and
   ethnic groups".
Lenski, Gerhard and Jean Lenski
*Human Societies* (2nd edition) 1974
1. Ch. 12 - Industrial Societies
   A. The Polity
   ABSTRACT: p. 362 - The development of mass weapons technology and their destructive potential have shifted war from major countries to non-industrial ones such as Vietnam.
2. Ch. 15 - Retrospect and Prospect
   A. Looking Back
   ABSTRACT: p. 466 - In the modern era war has lost its "respectability"; the "horrors of Vietnam" have contributed to this situation.
   * This textbook treats warfare extensively throughout, giving the topic thirty-six index references.

Toby, Jackson
*Contemporary Society* (2nd edition) 1971
1. Ch. 9 - The Political Structure of Industrial Societies
   A. Legitimation of Leadership Roles
   ABSTRACT: p. 316 - Citation in a discussion on political integration in pluralistic societies: "Recall that may American colleges and universities participated in protests against their government's Vietnam policy on October 15, 1969."
   B. The Ideological Roots of Consensus
   ABSTRACT: p. 317 - Citation on political stability in democratic societies: "The Vietnam war, unpopular though it became, did not destroy the American political system."
2. Ch. 13 - Deviance and Social Control
   A. Preface remarks to the chapter
   ABSTRACT: p. 478 - Reference to political dissent to the Vietnam war as example for distinguishing deviants from law violators; a moral interpretation of deviance.

Vander Zanden, James W.
*Sociology* (3rd edition) 1975
1. Ch. 1 - Introduction
   A. What is unique about sociology?
   ABSTRACT: p. 4 - Citation on "Some Non-Sociological Views": in the context of considering poverty and life in the "ghettos". Brief mention of Vietnam war in relation to the war on poverty.
   B. Practical Uses of Sociology
   ABSTRACT: p. 24-25 - Discussed in context of the "myth" of value-free sociology. "Deserters from the U.S. Army living in Sweden during the Viet Nam
war, for instance, viewed with suspicion research endeavors even when conducted by sympathetic or 'objective and detached' social scientists."

2. Ch. 6 - Groups and Association
   A. Social Group

ABSTRACT: p. 166-167 - Three paragraphs discuss the evolving of primary group relations of American combat soldiers in Vietnam. This account was adapted from sociologist Charles C. Moskos, Jr. who "spent two summers in Vietnam during which he lived with two rifle squads as they engaged in combat operations."

3. Ch. 9 - Collective Behavior
   A. Opening remarks of the chapter

ABSTRACT: p. 251 - The war mentioned in context of the Berkeley Student Revolt.
Conflict

Anderson, Charles H.
Toward A New Sociology 1971
1. Ch. 2 - Society in Man
   A. Types of Deviance
      ABSTRACT: p. 58 - War discussed in context of corporations breaking the law: "... the American government by its actions in Vietnam has violated world law as written in the Charter of the United Nations and the Geneva Accords."

2. Ch. 8 - The Power Structure
   A. The Military-Industrial Complex
      ABSTRACT: p. 194 - Citation of Vietnam in discussion of Mills' elaboration of the "permanent-war economy" and defense spending: spending for the Vietnam War rose from a few hundred million dollars in 1965 to almost 2 billion in 1968."
   B. Roots of the Warfare State
      ABSTRACT: p. 201 - In summarizing remarks on the "Military-Industrial complex", author cites: "Vietnam has been the capstone and logical outcome of political and economic policies pursued during the rise of the military-industrial complex."

Anderson, Charles H.
Toward A New Sociology (2nd edition) 1974
1. Ch. 1 - Sociological Perspectives
   A. Genetic Freudianism
      ABSTRACT: p. 15 - Citation amidst a critique of "genetic Freudianism" which, according to the argument, views "the U.S. intervention in Vietnam was doomed to failure from the start, not owing to conscious Vietnamese determination to free themselves from foreign economic and political control and build a cooperative society, but rather, due to their animal drives of territoriality, which biologically forced them to fight."

2. Ch. 3 - Society and the Individual
   A. Types of Deviance
      ABSTRACT: p. 39 - As in his earlier textbook, Vietnam mentioned in discussion of corporate sanctioned deviance (see 1971, p. 58).
   B. Social interaction
      ABSTRACT: p. 44 - The war mentioned in discussion of Thomas' "definition of the situation": "Three U.S. presidents for ten years rather successfully controlled the public's definition of what Vietnam was about, while they and two presidents before them helped establish the definitions that led to the Cold War and arms race."
3. Ch. 6 - Social Class
   A. Class Conflict
   ABSTRACT: p. 127 - The Vietnam War's "social and
economic ramifications" become apparent to
nonelites, thus helping them to rethink the basis
of social ills in the terms of class conflict,
ills such as racism, militarism, war, poverty,
sexual inequality, unemployment, and other
structural breakdowns within capitalist America.

B. Students
   ABSTRACT: p. 199 - Vietnam War is one factor in
galvanizing "increasing numbers of students into
political activism."

4. Ch. 9 - The Power Structure
   A. The Military-Industrial Complex
   ABSTRACT: p. 204 - Analysis of the relationship
between war industry and Vietnam War.

B. Roots of the Warfare State
   ABSTRACT: p. 206 - Examination of post World War
Two factors leading to the military structures
that make wars like Vietnam War inevitable.
Includes names of major corporations encouraging
this development.

5. Ch. 14 - The Third World
   A. The American Empire
   ABSTRACT: p. 327-328 - Analysis of American
business' dependence upon Third World natural
resources, including cheap labor. American
foreign policy questioned in this context: "Some
observers of American foreign policy have a
difficult time reconciling the fact that the $150
million expenditure in Vietnam was not worth
protecting the some $250 million in annual profits
taken by American corporations from East Asia."

   B. The Problem of National Unity
   ABSTRACT: p. 342 - Vietnam War represented a
unified national movement to stay the
underdevelopment policy of America's structural
imperialism.

   C. Class and Revolution
   ABSTRACT: p. 353 - Leadership of North Vietnam
peasantry said to originate in socialist
leadership outside the country, e.g. U.S.S.R. and
China.

Chambliss, William and Thomas Ryther
Sociology: The Discipline and Its Direction 1975

1. Ch. 5 - Patterns in Human Social Life
   A. Selection 5-2: "Bombs Anonymous"
   ABSTRACT: p. 78-79 - An illustration on group
structure, the authors examine roles and interrole
relations of B-52 crews who regularly bomb North
Vietnam. Captures the professional detachment of "intelligent, steady family men doing a job they have been told to do": daily bombing assigned troop and civilian concentrations.

B. Selection 5-3: "The Uses of Vietspeak"
ABSTRACT: p. 84 - An analysis of language used by U.S. military personnel and government officials to cover certain unpleasant realities. Focus of section is how government defines reality for its own purposes.

2. Ch. 13 - The Military in America
   A. The Historical Tradition
   ABSTRACT: p. 293-295 - References how the Vietnam War has caused the public to question the military structure in America.
   B. Pattern Variables and Underdevelopment
   ABSTRACT: p. 319 - An excerpt from A.G. Frank's Underdevelopment or Revolution of a "who's who" of American elite of federal employees with links to major colleges and universities, Wall Street firms, etc., all who have a hand in determining and directing Vietnam economic development. Frank's argument is clear: American foreign policy on development serve to preserve U.S. economic and political hegemony in Vietnam and the Third World, coming at the expense of Third World populations.

De Fleur, D'Antonio and De Fleur
Sociology: Man in Society 1971

1. Prologue
   A. The Debate Over Ethical Neutrality
   ABSTRACT: p. 14 - As one example of the turbulent 1960s, Vietnam caused sociologists to question the validity of "ethical neutrality" of their discipline.

2. Ch. 1 - Social Organization
   A. Integrating the Group Through Social Control
   ABSTRACT: p. 42-43 - Vietnam war protesters, as a sub-group opposing official norms, forego formal sanctions and impose their own, thereby subverting established forms of social control.
   B. The Breakdown of Social Organization
   ABSTRACT: p. 50 - Uses the 1968 Peace March in Chicago to protest the Vietnam War as an example of disruption of normal patterns of interaction.

3. Ch. 13 - Mass Communication
   A. Functions of Public Opinions
   ABSTRACT: p. 436-436 - United States government policy in Vietnam has undermined public consensus about the war, thus polarizing the public on a
number of corollary issues, including the military draft.

4. Ch. 14 - The Political System
   A. Consensus and Conflict
   ABSTRACT: p. 450-451 - Vietnam mentioned as a source of public dissent that is undermining the basis of government.

5. Ch. 15 - Religion
   A. Religion and Social Conflict
   ABSTRACT: p. 554-555 - Vietnam violated the religious beliefs of some sects and individuals, causing them to refuse to bear arms.

6. Ch. 18 - Education
   A. The Student Protest
   ABSTRACT: p. 591 - Vietnam and the politics surrounding it created a "credibility gap" between students and authority figures.

De Fleur, D'Antonio and De Fleur
Sociology: Human Society 1974
(See above text; references are identical)

Sociology and Social Issues 1974
1. Ch. 7 - Social Institutions
   A. The State
   ABSTRACT: p. 191-194 - Wars, like the Vietnam War, are an endemic feature of any nation-state, and represent institutionalized patterns necessary to the American economy.

Hodges, Harold Jr.
Conflict and Consensus: An Introduction to Sociology 1971
1. Ch. 16 - Postindustrial Youth and Counterculture
   A. Disaffected Youth: the magnitude of the protest
   ABSTRACT: p. 519 - Vietnam War mentioned as one factor in the protest movement among 1960s college students and American youth in general. Chapter establishes the social disaffection of youth with the U.S. establishment and political ideology.
Social Constructionist

Hammond, Phillip, et al.
The Structure of Human Society 1975
1. Ch. 13 - Social Stratification and Life Chances in America
   A. What is the relationship of wealth and the upper class?
   ABSTRACT: p. 340 - Though corporate interests, representing an economic elite, affected Vietnam policy, "noneconomic factors" influenced the war also.
2. Ch. 15 - Identifying Social Problems
   A. Why is conflict inseparable from deviance?
   ABSTRACT: p. - During the 1960s white college students formed political groups over the issues of racism and the Vietnam War.
3. Ch. 23 - Totalitarian States
   A. Why have the emerging nations tended toward totalitarianism?
   ABSTRACT: p. 654 - Vietnam represented a society committed to the bonds of village life "until the United States bombed many of them out of existence."
4. Ch. 24 - Government Against the People - The People Against Government
   A. Is there any virtue to a mass society?
   ABSTRACT: p. 666 - The mass media brought an "audience once limited by their small worlds" such far off places as South Vietnam.

Henslin, James M.
Introducing Sociology 1975
1. Ch. 15 - Staging Reality: Social Control and the Political System
   A. NA
   ABSTRACT: pp. 294-298 - Vietnam is a war manipulated by the elite in government. A good expose on the elite interests that government serves.
2. Ch. 17 - Maintaining Social Control: Racism
   A. NA
   ABSTRACT: pp. 302-303 - Vietnam War discussed in context of "a profit-seeking system" maintaining definitions of reality to insure collective agreement on political goals.
Introducing Sociology 1970

1. Ch. 10 - Collective Behavior
   A. A Campus Revolution
   ABSTRACT: p. 474 - Vietnam War has spurred the organization of revolt at Berkeley, California.

Sociology 1975

1. Ch. 5 - Communities
   A. The Decline of Community
   ABSTRACT: p. 132 - The Vietnam anti-war movement is mentioned as one example of contemporary social actions where "the search for community" is pursued.

2. Ch. 10 - Collective Behavior
   A. Collective Behavior and Social Change
   ABSTRACT: p. 277, 278 - Though the Vietnam peace movement of the 1960s failed to halt U.S. involvement in Vietnam, as a social movement it did initiate change in public attitudes.

3. Ch. 11 - Social Deviance
   A. Drug Abuse
   ABSTRACT: Reference to Vietnam War and military personnel addicted to drugs.

4. Ch. 12 - Family
   A. Conflict Between Generations
   ABSTRACT: p. 331 - Drug use and opposition to Vietnam were youth activities that assaulted deeply held adult values and norms, thus causing schisms in American families.

5. Ch. 13 - Education
   A. Student Activism
   ABSTRACT: p. 363 - Vietnam as a social issue activating student protest.

6. Ch. 14 - Religion
   A. The Impact on Religious Change and Society
   ABSTRACT: p. 400 - Mainline Protestant denominations protested the Vietnam War and other social problems.

7. Ch. 16 - Societies
   A. Societies and Change
   ABSTRACT: p. 448 - The Vietnam War movement helped launch the feminist movement.
   B. The Practical Value of Studying Total Societies
   ABSTRACT: p. 458 - "Entirely apart from the political goals sought by the U.S. in the Vietnamese war, it appears that war ... was based
on a serious misunderstanding of the nature of Vietnamese society."

Berger, Peter L. and Brigitte Berger
_Sociology: A Biographical Approach_ 1972
1. Ch. 13 - Power
   A. Unintended Consequences and the Irony of History
   ABSTRACT: p. 263 - Vietnam serves as a "distressingly timely illustration" of the "unintended consequences of political action," in a discussion of Weber's approach to "political matters."

Broom, Leonard and Philip Selznick
_Sociology_ (5th edition) 1973
1. Ch. 5 - Primary Groups
   A. Small Groups and Large Organizations
   ABSTRACT: p. 149 - Vietnam as a setting where "self-interest in primary-group solidarity" is studied.
2. Ch. 6 - Stratification
   A. Inequality
3. Ch. 8 - Collective Behavior
   A. Figure 8.1: Popularity of President Johnson and President Nixon during Vietnam War
   ABSTRACT: p. 250 - Graph reveals how public opinion fluctuated with political events like the moon landing, Laos invasion, price and wage freeze, etc.

Duskin Publishing Group
_The Study of Society_ 1974
1. Unit 4 - Culture
   A. American Context
2. Unit 9 - Social Stratification
   A. American Context
   ABSTRACT: p. 200 - C. Wright Mills' _The Power Elite_ overturns the assumption of a pluralistic society, and shows how "the United States is actually dominated by an interlocking directorate of several thousand men" in key agencies and institutions. Disillusionment with Vietnam increased the popularity of Mills' analysis.
3. Unit 20 - Sociology of Politics
   A. The "Burning Issue" Question
ABSTRACT: 455-456 - Reference is made to a study of college students who opposed the cultural and political basis of the Vietnam War.

B. The Research Question

ABSTRACT: p. 461 - Vietnam serves as example to Janis' analysis of group dynamics and values that factor into decision-making.

C. Looking Ahead: Interview

ABSTRACT: p. 464 - In an interview with Irving Louis Horowitz, DPG explores the dynamics involved in political decision making and how "elite decision making", rather than "democratic process," influenced the United States official position in Vietnam.

4. Unit 24 - Drugs and Drug Subcultures

A. The Research Question

ABSTRACT: p. 562 - Ancillary to the stresses of war, Vietnam servicemen receive quantities of drugs from Southeast Asia's "Golden Triangle" contributing to veterans' drug problems.

5. Unit 25 - Youth Culture

A. The "Burning Issue" Question

ABSTRACT: p. 580 - Vietnam served as a focal point for student protest.

B. The Research Question

ABSTRACT: p. 585 - The Vietnam War was one critical issue arousing the initiative of student protest.

---

Fernandez, Ronald

The Promise of Sociology 1975

1. Ch. 3 - The 'I', the 'Me', and 'You'

A. Adult Socialization

ABSTRACT: p. 72 - Adult socialization instills qualities that cultural leaders manipulate to control the citizenry, as did Richard Nixon attempted when he spoke of "peace with honor" when encountering resistance to his Vietnam policy.

2. Ch. 4 - Social Structure

A. Presentation of Self in Everyday Life

ABSTRACT: p. 106 - Nixon's lying about American interference in neutral Cambodia cited as example of a performer who incorporates and exemplifies "the officially accredited values of the society, more so, in fact, than do their behavior as a whole."

3. Ch. 5 - Religious Institutions

A. Religion, Churches and Plausibility

ABSTRACT: p. 198-199 - Religious diversity in Vietnam serves as an example of how religious beliefs conform to social reality and church organization.
B. Secularization
ABSTRACT: p. 205-206 - "When the My Lai massacre became public, reaction varied." To some Lt. Calley was a hero; to others he was a barbarian; and to still others he was obeying legal orders. "This disparity reveals that vital social institutions -- the military -- can operate without a foundation of ultimate values and beliefs."

4. Ch. 9 - The Family
   A. Nature of Family Organization

5. Ch. 10 - Political Institutions
   A. Obedience to Political Authority
ABSTRACT: p. 252 - The author contends that some men obey the draft laws to serve in Vietnam, fearing the consequences if they fail to do so.
   B. Third World Policies
ABSTRACT: p. 268 - Vietnam listed as an instance where imperialistic (French) efforts, after toppling traditional polity of that country, set in motion nationalist sentiments for a different form of government.

6. Ch. 12 - Collective Behavior
   A. Public Opinion

7. Ch. 13 - Sociology and Social Change
   A. The Coming of Post Industrial Society
ABSTRACT: p. 346 - Another social crisis like Vietnam might turn society toward either repression of cultural trends (discovery of the self) or "freeing" of the social structure and polity to make these trends possible.

Horowitz, Irving Louis and Mary S. Strong
Sociological Realities 1971

1. Ch. 6 - Symbolic Interaction and Human Communication
   A. Conflict and Accommodation
ABSTRACT: p. 391-401 - Short analysis, by Moskos on why Vietnam men fight.

2. Ch. 8 - Style and Substance in Sociology
   A. NA
Horowitz, Irving Louis and Charles Hanry

Sociological Realities II 1975

1. Section 3
   A. Individuals - insert article "Why Men Fight"
   ABSTRACT: p. 74 - Moskos examines the microlevel realities involved with the Vietnam fighting man.

2. Section 5
   A. Social Science and Public Policy: Sociology as a Public Statement - insert article "Social Science Yogis and Military Commissars"
   ABSTRACT: p. 572-579 - Chronicles the evolving partnership between the military and social science professors.
   B. Insert article - "The Pentagon Papers and Social Science"
   ABSTRACT: 580-586 - Analyzes the role of social scientists in the designing and implementing of Vietnam policy, in light of the political realities disclosed through Ellsberg's leaked Pentagon Papers.

King, Donald and Melvin Koller

Foundations of Sociology

1. Ch. 18 - War
   A. NA
   ABSTRACT: p. 322-336 - Vietnam is referenced as a contemporary example of the nature and basis of human warfare. Lays the foundations of a structural basis of warfare, and other relevant issues; establishes a foundation of future inquiry into the topic. Good introduction to this emerging area of interest in sociology.

Light, Donald and Suzanne Keller

Sociology 1975

1. Ch. 7 - Social Groups
   A. Group Structure
   ABSTRACT: p. 170 - Because Vietnam War deserters challenged the basis of federal authority that solidified American authority, "the solution to this threat of internal dissension was to close ranks against the deserters, thus preserving the group structures".

2. Ch. 11 - Collective Behavior
   A. Insert article - The Student Movement: From the 1960s to the 1970s
   ABSTRACT: p. 301 - Synopsis of Yankelovich Youth Study, comparing student activism of the 1960s to that of the relatively calm campuses of the 1970s;
compares attitudes on selected questions about the Vietnam War.
3. Ch. 14 - Power and Politics
   A. Insert article - Political Persuasion
4. Ch. 19 - Social Change
   A. The counterculture: A force for change?
      ABSTRACT: p. 554 - Mentions "the war in Southeast Asia" as one area the 1960s counterculture openly demonstrated its opposition.

Lowry, Ritchie and Robert Rankin
*Sociology* 1972
1. Ch. 2 - Self and Society
   A. The Basis of the Social Self
      ABSTRACT: p. 58 - Vietnam mentioned in context of primary group formation and interaction, presented an exception to the expected pattern of combat men.
2. Ch. 3 - Culture
   A. A Sociological Perspective
      ABSTRACT: p. 108 - Studies on the Vietnam infantry soldier revealed heroes to be disliked as much as cowards.
3. Ch. 12 - The Dynamics of Conflict
   A. Types and Forms of Conflict
      ABSTRACT: p. 630 - The political dynamics involved in the Vietnam Peace talks serves as an example of interpersonal bargaining.
   B. National Conflict: Internal War and Revolution
      ABSTRACT: pp. 649-651 - Discussion of Vietnam as a phenomena illustrating Eckstein's typology of "internal war."
      p. 695 - Citation posits that part of the United States' problems in Vietnam stem from the government's inability to understand the nature of "international turmoil." Referring to Kornhouser's study on revolutionary conflict, the political and military institutions should be seen in their own cultural context. No mention is made of the relationship of these institutions to corresponding American institutions.
   C. The Problem of Managing Conflict and Violence
ABSTRACT: p. 661 - Eugene McCarthy’s campaign against social woes like the Vietnam War signaled "the changing nature of contemporary political life."

Medley, Morris L. and James Conyers (eds.)
Sociology for the Seventies 1972
1. Ch. 16 - The Price of War
   A. Insert article by Bruce M. Russett
ABSTRACT: "While not sociologically oriented," the author "presents a rather penetrating statistical analysis of the costs and economic consequences of war." Vietnam is mentioned in this context. Generally, however, Russett is concerned with the overall effect "of an economy bent on war and high military spending."

Perry, John and Erma Perry
The Social Web 1973
1. Ch. 9 - The Political Institution
   A. Interview: Almirante and the once and future fascism
ABSTRACT: A reference is made to Vietnam by Almirante, a neofascist advocating fascism in Italy. The statement refers to the students who wrongly opposed the fighting men of Vietnam.

Popenoe, David
Sociology (2nd edition) 1974
1. Ch. 4 - Socialization
   A. Why Men Fight
ABSTRACT: pp. 142-146 - Examines various orientation -- ecological, biological, national character -- and response of United States' soldiers in Vietnam to the war.
2. Ch. 9 - Education
   A. The Activists
ABSTRACT: pp. 392-393 - An examination of student characteristics and their propensity toward protest against issues such as Vietnam.
3. Ch. 13 - Collective Behavior
   A. Formation of Public Opinion
ABSTRACT: p. 547 - Vietnam is presented as a social phenomena attracting diverse opinions from diverse groups, even though peace was a widely shared value.

Van den Berghe, Pierre
Man in Society 1975
1. Ch. 2 - The Human Animal
   A. Aggression, Hierarchy and Territoriality: The Biosociology of Order and Conflict
ABSTRACT: pp. 49-50 - In a general discussion on modern war, Vietnam is mentioned as a nation suffering acute loss.

2. Ch. 6 - Politics: Forms of Tyranny
   A. Surplus Appropriation
   ABSTRACT: pp. 140-141 - Given the nature of nation states -- a broad range of social stratification usually in inequitable distribution of resources -- an ideology supports the status quo. Given this, North Vietnam is defined as dangerous to "the American way."

3. Ch. 8 - Religion and Magic
   A. Secularization
   ABSTRACT: p. 215 - Secular creeds and heroes acting on those creeds often replace traditional religion. Commenting on how the state can become a "goddess," "the luckless infantryman who stops a bullet in the swamps of Vietnam is a martyr in the cause of freedom."

4. Ch. 11 - Conclusion: Can Things Get Better?
   A. Aggression Again
   ABSTRACT: p. 261 - On a general discussion concerning innate human aggression Vietnam is mentioned as one instance where "red-blooded American G.I.s were as capable of shooting in cold blood Vietnamese women and children, as were there German counterparts with Jews or Russians twenty years earlier."
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