

The Post-war Period: ‘Inventing’ Sociology in Italy

Abstract In the 1950s, the so-called first generation of post-war sociologists saw themselves as contributing to Italian modernization by providing a particular kind of rational, empirically based knowledge aimed at orienting policy decisions. As a result, early post-war sociology emerged as a Janus-faced discipline: Young would-be sociologists had to differentiate their practices from the humanities and sociology as it was understood by statisticians. At the same time, they had the support of powerful academic brokers from the fields of law and philosophy, thus creating an ambiguous situation. The chapter surveys early political–ideological cleavages, pioneering experiences of conducting empirical research and teaching sociology in a hostile academic environment, and the creation of disciplinary hubs in Turin and Florence.

Keywords Disciplinary differentiation · Camillo Pellizzi · Philosophy
Empirical research · Modernization · Academization of sociology

The years between 1945 and the appointment by the nationwide competition of the first three university chairs in sociology in 1961 are often seen as a period of re-emergence of sociology in Italy, with official recognition of the discipline. However, there is much to relate about the multiple pathways leading to professionalization and the institutional trajectory of sociology. Pinto (1981a, p. 672; 1981b) identifies several distinct phases, each lasting a few years: (1) post-war origins, with emphasis on industrial sociology (1950–1955); (2) cultural centrality

(1956–1960); (3) professional consolidation (1960–1965); (4) crisis between reformism and radical change (1966–1972); and (5) national consolidation. What factors governed the development of sociology in each phase? Was it an ‘uprooted’ science, as Barbano (1998) described it, or a polycentric discipline, in conceptual, organizational, institutional, and ecological terms?

If sociology were indeed polycentric, as we believe, we must reconstruct not only its multiple centers of propagation, their emergence and decline, but also its interactions with other sectors in the intellectual field and activities pursued in that context: the creation of journals and centers, relations with academia and powerful international bodies, and the accumulation of intellectual capital by those who identified themselves as ‘sociologists.’

For much of the period considered, sociology was indeed a Janus-like discipline that emerged in an environment of tension: academic versus non-academic styles of sociology; position-taking pursued through theoretical reflection versus applied research; ‘sociology as literature’ versus ‘sociology as science’ (as Pizzorno 1956 put it); idealized standards of sociological practice versus standards created while work was being carried out in ‘the field’—whatever ‘the field’ meant.

The next two chapters must thus be read as a reflection of this binary yet fluid organization of sociology. We thus focus on the attempt to build the academic legitimacy of sociology and on the non-academic infrastructure of research centers and institutions that played an important part in its ecological configuration.

A DUAL DIFFERENTIATION

In addressing the 4th Congress of the International Sociological Association, held in Stresa, Italy, in 1959, the president of the *Associazione italiana di scienze sociali*, Treves (1959, pp. 87–88), identified three reasons for the re-awakening of sociology in post-war Italy: ‘restored freedom,’ which had created ‘a strong desire to learn the true facts about Italian society’; the decline of idealism (and particularly Benedetto Croce’s version) as a dominant philosophical trend and the rise of alternative philosophical viewpoints; and the intensification and strengthening of the ties between Italy and the United States, with increased general interest in the theories and techniques of American sociology.

In the years of its struggle for disciplinary legitimization, sociology had been dismissed as an *inferma scienza* (sick science) and an *americanata*, an Italian term generally used to describe the somewhat boastful, excessive things or situations which people could watch in American movies. Both supporters and detractors, to some extent, played with this image of sociology as an exotic product. Detractors, fully immersed in high Italian culture, so greatly influenced by the humanities, saw little legitimacy in efforts to identify sociology as a 'science'; supporters could produce their self-representations as a vanguard of intellectual and cultural mobilization which offered a radically new way of understanding social 'things' with scientific rigor.

This view often overlooks proximate, ecological constraints imposed by the configuration of relations among disciplines, and especially the permeability of the boundaries between the humanities and social science, on the one hand, and within social science between sociology, statistics, and political science, on the other hand. If we examine the table of contents of the main sociological journals of the 1950s, there are plenty of public calls for differentiation. Distinguishing sociology from the humanities was mainly attempted through theoretical discussion, whereas the focus on methodology (although still too weak) involved a struggle with the version of sociology which had survived through the Fascist years, represented by the statistician Corrado Gini and his school. Gini was indeed perceived by many outside Italy as a true representative of sociology: He had substantial contacts in the International Institute of Sociology (over which he presided from 1950) and an even stronger hold in faculties of statistics.

Gini's tainted reputation as one of Mussolini's advisors and a Fascist intellectual isolated him from the cohort of young sociologists of the 1950s—a fate partly shared with Camillo Pellizzi who, however, came to be appointed to the first chair of sociology in 1950 after a long struggle. (As a prominent fascist, he had been 'purged' after the war and stripped of his university post, to which he was reinstated after several attempts.) In 1960, Pellizzi founded the *Rassegna italiana di sociologia*, which became one of the leading journals in the field—his political isolation did not translate into academic isolation. The status of the groups of Gini and Pellizzi as outliers had political as well as theoretical-cum-methodological roots. On the one hand, there was the taint of what Santoro (2013) has identified as the contribution of sociology and demography (two disciplines which, for Gini, largely overlapped) to Italian

imperialism and the professional management of colonial territories. On the other hand, there was Gini's view that statistics offered the most suitable set of methods for sociology, a legacy of the process of institutionalization and differentiation of statistics as a positive science which had characterized the pre-war years. From this point of view, this conjunction of sociology and statistics offered a methodological sophistication which the first cohort of post-war sociologists lacked, but its weak epistemology was simply not enough in the debate on the foundations of social science and the autonomy of sociology—a discussion which was either silenced or misinterpreted by many in Gini's clique.

The debate was indeed mostly played out by new protagonists—philosophers of an older generation who were more sympathetic to sociology and their students, who turned to the discipline after discovering it by chance or because they were obliged by the structure of the academic system to move to the margins, thus creating incentives for differentiation. This differentiation strategy, however, was conducted under the patronage of their former mentors. The dynamics at the University of Turin, one of the centers of post-war Italian sociology, illustrates this process. Already in 1947 (the first meetings went back to 1945), a group of philosophers which included Nicola Abbagnano, Norberto Bobbio, and Ludovico Geymonat had founded the multidisciplinary Centro di studi metodologici, which soon gained a central position in the Italian epistemological debate (Abbagnano et al. 1954). Together with like-minded philosophers and historians, its founders added to Turin's rich cultural *milieu*—which vaunted one of the Italy's most prominent publishers, Einaudi, some of the nation's leading intellectuals, and a high level of political and cultural commitment—and encouraged junior students to take up sociology.

Felice Balbo, a professor of philosophy but also an external editor for Einaudi, encouraged Franco Ferrarotti to translate Veblen's *Theory of the Leisure Class* for Einaudi. Its publication gave rise to Ferrarotti's first intellectual quarrel, when the *doyen* of Italian philosophy, Benedetto Croce, attacked the young scholar (Ferrarotti was only 23 at the time) in a scathing review in the cultural section of Italy's leading newspaper, *Il corriere della sera* (Melotti 2008). It turned out to be a gift from heaven which put Ferrarotti on the cultural map, and provided a rollicking start for the spread of the new discipline, which had chosen its most identifiable enemy—philosophical idealism: To this, the new intellectuals

opposed the novelty of social science, empiricism, and, in line with their philosophical mentors, a healthy dose of logical positivism. Balbo had multiple connections with would-be sociologists and collaborated with Giorgio Sebreghondi (later head of the sociological section of SVIMEZ) in the magazine *Cultura e realtà*. Abbagnano was both Ferrarotti's thesis advisor (and two of his students, Magda Talamo and Anna Anfossi, were later to build careers as sociologists) and the co-founder of the *Quaderni di sociologia* in 1951. Bobbio, a philosopher and political scientist who co-edited the *Rivista di filosofia* with Abbagnano, was active both in the Centro di studi metodologici and in the debate on sociology and philosophy. Treves and Barbano—who, like Bobbio, were former students of the philosopher Gioele Solari—were part of the same network.

Sociology in Turin thus emerged from an existing infrastructure comprising a network of already established scholars who worked toward multidisciplinary integration, a cluster of journals and publishing companies to which those early supporters had access to, and the relations existing among younger scholars who shared academic affiliations and, to a great extent, even the same academic advisors. Thus, it was that, rather than arising in a vacuum, sociology was encouraged and supported by patrons who already possessed a certain degree of interdisciplinary openness, while also shaping the type of intellectual interventions which the younger cohort could make. For instance, the first volumes of *Quaderni di sociologia* lean heavily toward theory and literature reviews, with little room for empirical work, which the same scholars pursued and published elsewhere (Barbano 1954; Barbano and Viterbi 1959). This first phase, aiming at the definition of an autonomous intellectual and conceptual space for sociology, peaked in 1954 with the organization of the important conference on 'Filosofia e Sociologia' held in Bologna (its papers were published by Il Mulino).

Thus, in this early phase, the relations that young would-be sociologists entertained with academe involved a process of dual differentiation—from 'sociology' as it was practiced by statisticians and from the fields of philosophy and law from which many of the early practitioners of sociology had originally come. This dual differentiation resulted in the peculiar shape of early debates about the status of sociology, in particular intellectual outcomes in terms of theory and research. However, those young pioneers still had to pass through what they saw as the specificity of sociology: They had to be baptized in the field.

THE DISCOVERY OF THE FIELD

Franco Ferrarotti was only 25 at the time of his *début* as deputy editor of *Quaderni di sociologia*, but he had clear ideas about the journal's mission: It was to engage not only in theoretical debates and literature reviews aimed at importing contributions to sociology from outside Italy, but also in empirical research (Ferrarotti 1951). Fieldwork was in fact so new at the time that, in the first issues of the *Quaderni*, a three-part sociological analysis of a village in Piedmont served as a series of methodological guidelines for its replication in other contexts. In the third issue, Friedrich Friedmann published his observations on the rural world of Southern Italy, presenting early results of the researches which he and his team were conducting with the help of Manlio Rossi-Doria's institute in Portici. North and South, urban and rural centers, industrialization and underdevelopment, internal migration, and urbanization were the first topics to become the object of research, in a mix of official data, in-depth interviews, some ethnography, and basic survey research.

One of the first bibliographic overviews of Italian sociology was surprising, due to the absence of what Ferrarotti had characterized as one of the main requisites for its rebirth: empirical, applied work. It is true that there were 'experiments and enquiries' (Barbano 1954, p. 531), some analyses of public opinion and voters' behavior, and a few case studies in the sociology of religion. However, overall, the tendency of those first years was that of creating conceptual frameworks disconnected from the exigencies of research, while sociologists would train themselves in the field. This relative lack of connection between theory and research led to a double-edged situation: pluralism with regard to styles of enquiry, but also opposition between an idealized value-free sociology and the engagement of social scientists, a distinction which has re-emerged periodically in the trajectory of Italian sociology, sometimes as a way of denouncing its increasingly academic character (Bortolini 2012). These tensions cannot be entirely reduced to an alternative between academic and non-academic styles. Rather, they were signs of increasing tension between an effort to achieve disciplinary legitimacy, which came from other sectors of intellectual production, and a desire to forge close links between sociological practice and aspirations to grassroots social reform.

It was within the context of these tensions that the first significant researches were designed, with definite attempts in both the rural South and the industrial North of Italy. Applied sociology did see its first burst

of activity in the South, through the cooperation of the staff of the Institute of Portici headed by Rossi-Doria and groups of scholars based in the United States, including Friedmann and Banfield (1958), whose *The Moral Basis of a Background Society*, a study of the Southern village of Montegrano (actually Chiaromonte, in Basilicata), was regarded for decades as a classic in the sociology of Italy (Marselli 2007). The South had been the setting for 'social' enquiries into poverty and underdevelopment since the late nineteenth century, with the first parliamentary investigations. At the same time, it had always been a subject of great concern, thanks to a current of liberal, progressive, and reformist *meridionalismo*, which not only advocated the solution of the 'Southern question' through social and agrarian reform but which, in the post-war years, also used participatory research, enquiry, and co-research as ways of organizing the dispossessed rural masses—in this sense, Rocco Scotellaro's posthumous book on Southern peasants was particularly influential (Scotellaro 1954). Sociologists did this not only by examining official data, but also by collecting a wide range of autobiographic information data through interviews and memoirs. Danilo Dolci (1956), the fascinating figure of a non-violent activist who carried out field research in Sicily, not only examined the living conditions of rural peasants and the urban underclass, but coupled them with a strongly worded denunciation of the conditions that gave rise to such backwardness (including the lack of large-scale land reform and the pressure of organized crime).

This type of research, commonly called *inchiesta* (enquiry) or co-research, was mainly applied outside academia, by self-trained social researchers like Danilo Montaldi (1960, 1961), who studied the underclass in the North and internal migrants and expanded greatly with the creation of journals like *Quaderni rossi* and *Inchiesta*. It was already in the 1950s, however, that enquiry was a privileged approach for designing research, used by non-academic researchers such as Dolci and Montaldi.¹ For example, enquiry became prominent in the activities of the Ufficio di studi sociali e del lavoro directed by Luciano Cavalli (1957) and Cavalli and Servettaz (1958), who studied workers' lives, their use of leisure time, and local electoral dynamics in Genova, one of the industrial and commercial centers of the North. This project peaked with the publication of research on the *abituri*, or Genova's shack neighborhoods.

Many of these researchers were explicitly concerned with social reform, which involved creating strong ties with their 'natives': Southern peasants, internal migrants moving north, or workers in industrial

cities who had been affected by the country's economic boom. They also showed an allegiance to the left, although their positions often clashed with the dismissal of sociology displayed by the Italian Communist Party. The Socialist Party, at that time moving toward its first experience of participation in the Italian government, was much more receptive.² Cultural magazines such as *Ragionamenti* and *Opinione* were often privileged venues for debates about the compatibility between sociology and Marxism, but the dominant philosophical culture of many Marxist intellectuals still followed sociology's greatest intellectual foe, Croce, and his idealism against social science.

Some of the early interests of sociologists, including the scientific organization of labor and human resources, did inevitably arouse suspicions in many orthodox Marxists. Not only did sociology explicitly question the intellectual compass used by many Marxists in their analysis of Italian society, but it did so with methods and references largely imported from outside Italy. At the same time, it showed an interest in topics which were approached by empirical research, not political evaluation. For example, after his visits to the United States, Ferrarotti (1955, 1959) became specialized (if that term can aptly describe his verbose eclecticism) in labor relations and trade unions. Others took inspiration from the Lynds' famous *Middletown* series to inaugurate a new wave of community studies in rural and urban sociology (Ardigò 1958; Ferrarotti et al. 1959; Anfossi et al. 1959). No topic was excluded by the practitioners of sociology in the 1950s, with substantial research not only in the areas of general sociology and theory, but also in subfields such as political sociology, economic sociology, organizations, and a few pioneering studies on the sociology of culture and communications (Comolli 1957; Gallino 1957; Pellizzi 1950).

On the opposite side of the political spectrum, Catholic intellectuals showed great curiosity about sociology, an attitude which dated back to contributions to the discipline by many self-appointed sociologists of the early twentieth century, such as Giuseppe Toniolo and Romolo Murri. Luigi Sturzo, a priest turned politician who had founded the Partito Popolare Italiano in 1919 and who had been on exile during Mussolini's rule, had published several treatises of sociology in the 1930s and 1940s and was commonly perceived as a point of reference for young Catholic intellectuals. Another imposing figure, Agostino Gemelli—a Franciscan friar, a physician, and the founder of the Catholic University of the Sacred Heart in Milan—was similarly an early proponent of sociology, although he had much more political leverage and influence than Sturzo.

As Buralassi (1990)—himself a priest and a sociologist, like Franco Demarchi and others—correctly remarked, the development of ‘religious sociology’ in Italy predated attempts at professionalization led by secular, left-wing sociologists like Pizzorno, Ferrarotti, and others. The first overviews of the field had been published in the early 1950s (Barbano 1953; Bussi 1950; Droulers and Rimoldi 1952), and the first national conference on religious sociology was held in 1954 under Gemelli’s patronage, with an association of sociologists of religion already operative by 1956 with its own newsletter, *Lettere di sociologia religiosa*. Against interpretations that saw an ‘eclipse of the sacred’ (the title of a book by Sabino Acquaviva published in 1961) in modern society, these Catholic intellectuals were active both in rethinking the relationship between the sacred and modernity (and the Second Vatican Council did in fact emphasize this line of reflection) and in carefully designing case studies covering religious attitudes, participation, and more traditional topics such as the sociology of the family and value research. It was, overall, a very practical kind of sociology, which used applied research and the reflections of social science as means to know and shape the worldly, pastoral action of Catholics (priests or otherwise) in society.

In view of the central role played by the Catholic church in Italy and its active participation in the cultural mobilization of the Cold War, a whole new infrastructure was created: Research centers came into being (such as Buralassi’s Centro di Studi Socio-Religiosi in Pisa), together with schools, courses on social sciences organized by local dioceses, and journals—an example is *Sociologia religiosa*, founded by Acquaviva in 1957. There were also non-disciplinary reviews, like *Vita e Pensiero* and *Studi di sociologia*, which sometimes published works by religious sociologists, and substantial contributions from theological faculties, seminars, and schools. In addition, the founding of the Istituto Luigi Sturzo in 1951 provided a venue for Catholic social scientists, an intellectual space which favored the organizational and intellectual autonomy of Catholic sociologists very early on in the process and which in the long term resulted in the rise of a distinctly Catholic camp in Italian sociology.

TEACHING SOCIOLOGY

The fact that sociologists were employed mostly outside academia meant that there were very few occasions for the formal teaching of sociology in Italian universities, either as part of the curriculum in faculties

and schools of statistics, where it was a required course, or by specially appointed instructors in other faculties. Courses in general sociology were more often offered in postgraduate schools for managers and staff, or within schools of social work.

According to Evangelisti's nearly complete review of syllabi, the small number of courses reflected the precarious situation of sociology in Italian universities. In the academic year 1959–1960, a total of 23 courses in sociology were taught in the country, by 19 instructors who were temporarily appointed to teach them—at that time, only Pellizzi in Florence was a tenured professor. They had the status of *libero docente*, a position more or less equivalent to the German *privatdozent*, which did not entail the formal institution of a chair in the discipline. Within this small group, sociology proper was under-represented: 'Of these 19 instructors, 7 have the *libera docenza* in sociology, 4 in the philosophy of law, 3 in statistics or demography, 2 in labor law, 1 in penal law, 1 in history, 1 in psychology' (Evangelisti 1960, p. 129). Their geographical distribution was somewhat surprising: Nine courses were offered by universities in the North (including Acquaviva in Padova, Barbano in Turin, and Alberoni at the Catholic University in Milan), eight in central Italy, and six in the South, Sicily, and Sardinia—including two universities that were to become important havens for Italian sociology, Catania and Cagliari. This picture contrasted with the uneven development of the discipline in the decades to come, which saw the affirmation of large hubs, mainly situated in the North (Milan, Turin, Bologna, Trento, Padova, and Genova) and the Centre (Florence, Rome, and Pisa).

In view of this variety, it is not surprising to see many strands of sociology represented: On the one hand, course syllabi for schools of statistics still displayed Gini's influence—a notable exception was the course taught in Bologna by Alfredo De Polzer, one of Gini's students and a future member of Parliament for the Italian Communist Party, whose course focused on the 'historical analysis of political and economic systems.' In Florence, Pellizzi's course was subdivided into four parts (a methodological introduction, analysis of social facts, meaningful behavior, and a systematic conclusion) and paid explicit attention to social theory and cultural sociology. Those of the younger generation (Ferrarotti, Barbano, Acquaviva, and Franco Leonardi) were more focused on industrial relations, the 'new' American sociology, and general concepts.

These courses were often given at an introductory level and applied teaching standards typical of Italian academe: a general introduction

usually followed by one or more special topics. Since Italian academic culture is not based on a syllabus as a collection of papers but on the study of material written by the instructor or holder of the chair, the availability of teaching venues created a demand for introductory texts. The result was that within a few years, the publishing infrastructure developed greatly and supplied monographs and translations. In this way, by the end of the 1950s, everything was more or less ready for a further step in the process of institutionalizing sociology: the migration of scholars to universities.

KNOCKING ON HEAVEN'S DOORS? SOCIOLOGISTS ENTER ACADEMIA

This negligible presence of sociology in the universities lasted into the late 1960s, and it was only with a great amount of optimism that one could speak of academic acceptance. The truth was that only a handful of universities had the striking figure of the sociologist in residence, who offered a course and sometimes organized small research units. The primary outcome in terms of recruitment was not, as customarily happened in such cases, the formation of a queue of assistants later co-opted into the ranks of the institute led by 'their' professor, but rather reallocation to research centers and institutions.

For a time, that had been *the* goal of social scientists. While seeking academic legitimacy, they also pursued extra-academic activity as part of their vision—that is, to be the 'field marshals' of Italy's drive toward modernization. In this regard, sociologists always oscillated on the one hand between the search for professionalization and inclusion in a high-status *élite* and, on the other hand, a very pragmatic, operative, and sometimes anti-academic *habitus* which distinguished them from other types of traditional intellectuals. In many cases, sociologists pictured themselves more in terms of advisors to a wide range of state and private institutions, such as enterprises, research centers, and international organizations, than as 'mere' academics. As this vision faded, according to Giuliana Chiaretti, 'the process of institutionalization proceeded on only one track: the academia,' which became the main arena of cultural production for first-generation sociologists and the preferred career path for those of the second generation—after perhaps a brief term of service in a research center, where they could build up credentials as

fieldworkers (Balbo et al. 1975, p. 117). In this situation, an early advantage in favoring the integration of sociology within one particular academic center or institute meant a clear advantage in establishing a 'school' built (often through personal loyalty and affiliation) around one of the elders of the discipline.

However, there were a few exceptions. The impetuous development of academic sociology in Bologna, for example, did not involve the statisticians of Gini's school, Paolo Fortunati and his assistant De Polzer. On the contrary, it emerged within the context of opposition between the group of Catholic scholars led by Achille Ardigò and that of the progressive Catholics and liberals of Il Mulino. The Centro studi sociali e amministrativi, founded by Ardigò in 1956, became the Institute of Sociology of the Faculty of Political Sciences in 1966 (Guidicini 1997), whereas the group around Il Mulino entered the university later. Although the two groups sometimes overlapped, in terms of their members and political position, over the years, they settled into different strongholds—Ardigò at the Faculty of Political Sciences, while the other Bolognese school was largely affiliated to the Faculties of Education and Statistics.

Other hubs of early sociology, like the group led by Manlio Rossi-Doria at the Faculty of Agricultural Studies in Portici, quickly declined, although they played a very important role at the interface of academic and non-academic research in the 1960s and well into the 1970s. This process mirrored the growing marginalization of research centers outside academia, with transfer of staff and knowledge to the universities as sociology began to expand. In a few years, universities became the strategic places for the production of sociological knowledge, acquisition of symbolic and material resources, accumulation of credentials, and the formation of interdisciplinary networks.

In this phase, many memoirs and historical sketches of Italian sociology usually highlight the resistance of traditional academic networks and institutions to accept the new discipline. However, they remain largely silent on a crucial issue: how, once sociology had made its way into academia, the discipline was shaped by existing constraints which quickly led sociologists to reproduce the model involving the co-presence of a chair held by a professor, a close network of junior scholars in subordinate positions who also identified with a school, and university institutes as the organizational expression of this local niche (Clark 1977).

This arrangement was common both to the clusters of sociological practice which eventually declined and to those which prospered and therefore attracted a growing number of scholars in temporary or tenured positions, reaching a point at which differentiation began to occur *within* institutes. Many of the early practitioners of sociology followed a similar path: Except for those who held a chair in another discipline, they usually obtained the *libera docenza* and then set up a small center with the help of some tenured broker. Pellizzi, who headed the Institute of Sociology in Florence, established such a center in labor studies, with which Ferrarotti collaborated. In the early 1960s, Pellizzi hired as the first assistant of sociology in Italy Gianfranco Poggi, a former student of law and one of the first sociologists to profit from graduate training on a Fulbright Fellowship in the United States, where he obtained his Ph.D. at the University of California, Berkeley. There, he established a strong working connection with Joseph LaPalombara—his dissertation on the organization of Catholic Action is probably one of the most remarkable case studies of the early phase of Italian sociology (Poggi 1962).

In Rome, Vittorio Castellano was a prominent member of the group of sociologists in the Faculty of Statistics, in which a Centro di ricerche di sociologia empirica was active. In Turin, Barbano was able to organize a group of sociologists in the Institute of Political Sciences, thanks to the active patronage of the same group which had sponsored the birth of *Quaderni di sociologia*. In Genova, Luciano Cavalli was active in the Ufficio studi sociali e del lavoro, often in collaboration with Gianni Baget Bozzo, a Catholic priest who had been a member of the Catholic left and had close connections with Balbo (and who became a member of the European Parliament in the 1980s and a political advisor to Silvio Berlusconi in the 1990s). In Padova, Acquaviva followed a similar path and later became head of the Institute of Sociology. Similar centers were active in Milan (at both the Catholic University and the Bocconi University, a private management school), and they were the first to develop into departments in the 1980s or, in some cases, faculties.

While these were the first instances of sociologists' organized presence within academia, official and permanent entry could not rely on these small forces. The first obstacle was the narrow acceptance of sociology by the representatives of established academic disciplines. The second, and a very practical one, was the system of rules governing the recruitment of professors. The creation of new professorial chairs, new courses, and institutes was a highly centralized process requiring direct approval by

the state. (Although, once a position had been created, local factors often entered the selection process.) At the same time, in the absence of already established sociologists, the academic committees awarding professorial chairs were mostly composed of non-sociologists. When the first *concorso* (nationwide examination) for three chairs in sociology was held in 1961, the committee included four sympathetic non-sociologists—three philosophers (Abbagnano, Treves, and Franco Lombardi) and an economist (Francesco Maria Vito)—and a quite unconventional sociologist, Pellizzi. After careful consideration and an evaluation of the candidates which did not result in the so-called statement of scientific maturity, they identified the three winners as Ferrarotti, Pizzorno, and Giovanni Sartori, while Alberoni and Angelo Pagani were rejected. In its final observations sent for approval to the Higher Council of Public Education, the committee noted that ‘the competence of the candidates is very varied, since they come from different fields and disciplines’ and stated its wish that—after decades in which sociology had received no ‘official recognition’ and had been ‘abandoned for more than 30 years’—new chairs of sociology would be created (see Ferrarotti 2011).

These appointments, 10 years after Pellizzi’s chair had been renamed from a chair in History and doctrine of Fascism to one in sociology, marked the official entry of sociology into the Italian academic world. Ferrarotti moved to Rome, Sartori obtained the chair of applied sociology at the University of Florence,³ and Pizzorno ended up at the Faculty of Economics at the University of Urbino, then located in Ancona. Sociology had been acknowledged after following a long, winding path involving marginality in academia and considerable work outside it, which had shaped practices and a professional *habitus*. In the next chapter, we focus on the sites, individuals, and organizations which favored the non-academic professionalization of sociology and which represented a training camp for those who eventually entered academia. Acceptance by the latter would indeed have been much harder if these networks and their intellectual and operative infrastructures had not existed.

NOTES

1. Montaldi, however, had strong ties with academic sociology via Pizzorno and other scholars belonging to the socialist left.
2. For a reconstruction of the debate, see Lopez (2013).

3. A political scientist rather than a sociologist, Sartori moved to political science in 1966. In the 1970s, he left Florence for Stanford and then Columbia University.

REFERENCES

- Abbagnano, N., et al. (1954). *Atti del congresso di studi metodologici*. Torino: Taylor.
- Acquaviva, S. S. (1961). *L'eclissi del sacro nella civiltà industriale*. Milan: Edizioni di Comunità.
- Anfossi, A., et al. (1959). *Ragusa comunità in transizione*. Torino: Taylor.
- Ardigò, A. (1958). *Cerveteri tra vecchio e nuovo. Note sui cambiamenti di struttura sociale*. Bologna: Centro di Studi Sociali e Amministrativi.
- Balbo, L., et al. (1975). *L'inferma scienza*. Bologna: Il Mulino.
- Banfield, E. C. (1958). *The moral basis of a backward society*. Glencoe, IL: The Free Press.
- Barbano, F. (1953). Problemi e prospettive di sociologia della religione. *Il politecnico*, 1, 66–79.
- Barbano, F. (1954). La sociologia in Italia oggi. *Il politico*, 4, 494–531.
- Barbano, F. (1998). *La sociologia in Italia. Storia, temi e problemi 1945–1960*. Roma: Carocci.
- Barbano, F., & Viterbi, M. (1959). *Bibliografia della sociologia italiana (1948–1958)*. Torino: Ramella.
- Bortolini, M. (2012). Gli indifferenti. I sociologi, Pier Paolo Pasolini, e la modernizzazione dell'Italia. *Studi culturali*, 9(3), 345–370.
- Burgalassi, S. (1990). Lo stato della sociologia della religione in Italia oggi. *Studi di sociologia*, 28(2), 135–154.
- Bussi, N. (1950). Sociologia della comunità parrocchiale. *Orientamenti pastorali* 1, 96–108.
- Cavalli, L. (1957). *Inchiesta sugli abituri*. Genova, Ufficio di Studi Sociali e del Lavoro del Comune di Genova.
- Cavalli, L., & Servettaz, A. (1958). Una ricerca di sociologia elettorale. *Notiziario di Sociologia*, 1(1), 19–22.
- Clark, B. R. (1977). *Academic power in Italy. Bureaucracy and oligarchy in a national university system*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Comolli, E. (1957). Linguaggio e sociologia. *Difesa sociale*, 38(1), 76–91.
- Dolci, D. (1956). *Inchiesta a Palermo*. Bari-Roma: Laterza.
- Droulers, P., & Rimoldi, A. (1952). La sociologia religiosa in Italia. *La scuola cattolica*, 80(2–3), 89–107.
- Evangelisti, G. (1960). La sociologia nell'università italiana. *Quaderni di Sociologia*, 36, 126–138.
- Ferrarotti, F. (1951). Piano di lavoro. *Quaderni di Sociologia*, 1(1), 2–6.

- Ferrarotti, F. (1955). L'industrializzazione. *Quaderni di Sociologia*, 5(1), 99–104.
- Ferrarotti, F. (1959). *La sociologia industriale in America e in Europa*. Torino: Taylor.
- Ferrarotti, F. (2011). Brevi riflessioni sul ritorno della sociologia in Italia nel secondo dopoguerra (marzo 1997). *La Critica Sociologica*, 178, 87–92.
- Ferrarotti, F., et al. (1959). *La piccola città: dati per l'analisi sociologica di una comunità meridionale*. Milano: Edizioni di Comunità.
- Gallino, L. (1957). Critica letteraria e sociologia della letteratura. *Il Mulino*, 6(3), 159–190.
- Guidicini, P. (1997). L'avvio degli studi sociologici a Bologna: il decennio 1956–1965. In C. Cipolla & S. Porcu (Eds.), *La sociologia di Achille Ardigò*. Milan: FrancoAngeli.
- Lopez, A. (2013). *Sociologia e marxismo. Un dibattito degli anni Cinquanta*. Rome: Edizioni Nuova Cultura.
- Marselli, G. (2007). Cinquant'anni: una vita (1957–2007). *Quaderni di Sociologia*, 2, 175–180.
- Melotti, U. (2008). Franco Ferrarotti. Una nota introduttiva. In U. Melotti & L. M. Solivetti (Eds.), *Perché la sociologia?* (pp. 1–22). Milan: Mondadori Educational.
- Montaldi, D. (1960). *Milano, Corea*. Milano: Feltrinelli.
- Montaldi, D. (1961). *Autobiografie della leggera*. Torino: Einaudi.
- Pellizzi, C. (1950). Proposta di una definizione del simbolo. *Rivista internazionale di scienze sociali*, 50(7), 552–567.
- Pinto, D. (1981a). Sociology, politics, and society in postwar Italy 1950–1980. *Theory and Society*, 10(5), 671–705.
- Pinto, D. (Ed.). (1981b). *Contemporary Italian sociology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pizzorno, A. (1956). Abbandonare la sociologia-letteratura per una sociologia-scienza. *Opinione*, 1(1), 25–26.
- Poggi, G. (1962). *Il clero di riserva*. Milano: Feltrinelli.
- Santoro, M. (2013). Empire for the poor. Imperial dreams and the quest for Italian sociology, 1870s–1950s. In G. Steinmetz (Ed.), *Sociology and empire* (pp. 106–165). Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Scotellaro, R. (1954). *Contadini del Sud*. Bari-Roma: Laterza.
- Treves, R. (1959). Sociological study and research in Italy. In *Transactions of the fourth world congress of sociology* (pp. 73–94). International Sociological Association.



<http://www.springer.com/978-1-137-58940-8>

Italian Sociology, 1945–2010

An Intellectual and Institutional Profile

Cossu, A.; BORTOLINI, M.

2017, VII, 137 p., Hardcover

ISBN: 978-1-137-58940-8

A product of Palgrave Macmillan UK