ἐρεύνης τῶν τοιούτων θεμάτων εἰς τὸν τόπον μας. Τὰ συμπεράσματα καὶ αἱ ἑρμηνεῖαι τῆς παρούσης ἐρεύνης παρέχουν ἔδαφος εἰς ἔλεγχον, παρατηρήσεις καὶ κρίσεις καὶ πάντως ἀποτελοῦν εὐπρόσδεκτον ἀφετηρίαν διὰ τὰς ἐρεύνας τῆς Κοινωνιολογίας τῆς Παιδείας μας.

Διὰ τὰς μελλοντικὰς ἐρεύνας τοῦ εἴδους τούτου θὰ ἐπεθύμουν νὰ ἐπιστήσω τὴν προσοχὴν τῶν ἐρευνητῶν ἐπὶ τῆς ἰδιοτυπίας τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς Κοινωνίας, ἡ ὁποία, ὡς ὀρθῶς παρετήρησεν ἡ κυρία Δημάκη, εἶναι εἰσέτι ἀσχημάτιστος, δι' ὃ καὶ διαφέρει κατὰ τὴν ὑφὴν πρὸς τὰς τῶν παλαιῶν Δυτικῶν Κρατῶν. Ἑπομένως τὰ μέτρα, αἱ ταξινομήσεις, αἱ ἐκτιμήσεις καὶ αἱ μέθοδοι τῶν ξένων πρέπει νὰ χρησιμοποιοῦνται παρ' ἡμῖν μετὰ πολλῆς περισκέψεως. Ἂς ἐνθυμηθῶμεν ἁπλῶς ὅτι πρὸ δύο γενεῶν ἀκόμη ἡ πρωτεύουσά μας δὲν εἶχε περισσοτέρους τῶν 150.000 κατοίκων, ὅτι ὁ πληθυσμός μας ἦτο κατὰ 70 τοῖς ἑκατὸν ἀγροτικός, ὅτι τὸ 80 τοῖς ἑκατὸν τοῦ σημερινοῦ ἀστικοῦ πληθυσμοῦ μας εἶναι νεοπαγὲς καὶ ὅτι τὸ 30 τοῖς ἑκατὸν αὐτοῦ ἀνήκει εἰς οἰκογενείας ὧν τὸ ἥμισυ τῶν μελῶν των διαμένει εἰς τὴν ἐπαρχίαν καθὼς καὶ ἄλλα τινὰ ἰδιότυπα κοινωνικὰ φαινόμενα, ἐκ τῶν ὁποίων καθίσταται πρόδηλον ὅτι αἱ ταξινομήσεις, ὡς λ.χ. ἡ κατάταξις εἰς κοινωνικὰς τάξεις, εἶναι κάπως ἐπισφαλεῖς.

ΠΑΝ. Κ. ΓΕΩΡΓΟΥΝΤΖΟΣ

*

The Applicability of Organizational Sociology, by Chris Argyris, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1972, pp. 138, $. 8.95.

There is first an analysis of the theories of Peter Blau, James Thompson, Charles Perrow, John Goldthorpe and David Lockwood. After criticizing them, Argyris presents his comments and suggestions of a desirable organizational research methodology. Blau, Thompson, and Perrow are criticized because they studied a part of an organization while Goldthorpe and Lockwood «omitted the psychological dimensions from their theory» (p. 53). Blau concentrated on formal organization and especially on top management and therefore his data were biased toward top management view. Though verbally professed to seek an integration of the formal and natural system, Thompson favored the closed system and that was more to the management's liking. Perrow especially stressed the significance of technology. However, since the relationship between technology and variables is not studied by means of other variables such as administrative controls

or leadership styles, etc., their influence is unknown. Generally, Blau, Perrow and Thompson tended to stress a normative position, favoring the present orthodoxy in studies of organization.

Though Argyris does not use the term, it appears to me that Goldthorpe and Lockwood are closer to Durkheimian epistemology. Argyris insightfully points out that workers provide the instrumental explanation to the question «why they work» and yet, as he suggests, the British workers also desired a meaningful and not only an instrumental job.

In the presentation of suggestions contained in the last two chapters, Argyris first refers in varying degrees to other students of organization, he appears quite well read though, I am sorry to observe, he considers only authors who published in English or whose works were translated into English. Argyris epistemological position is a greater emphasis on individual differences and on a greater number of possible variations. As used by him, the term «organic» expresses his framework. What is certainly sympathetic in his conclusion is his emphasis on a possible change and restructuring of organization. From reading his pages, one can feel that he himself is engaged in observations or experiments which should provide a greater opportunity for spontaneity in organizational behavior. Argyris explicitly subscribes to an integration of psychological and sociological data. Generally, he feels that data from any discipline should be available if it helps our explanation. This reviewer could not help but remember Durkheim and his programmatic declaration of the autonomy of sociology. Certainly, Argyris has introduced or seeks to introduce a contrary epistemological position. Especially as analyzed on pp. 109-110, an individual and an organization can be related in contradictory or in coordinated demands. Argyris is, of course, eager to promote the latter relationship. A desired change can be observed or measured in five dimensions: deviance from existing norms; degree of unfreezing of the old that is required; new system required to be self-corrective; degree to which others are required; and degree of personal and system discomfort. Though my failure of a further explanation of these five dimensions leave the reader somewhat at a discomfort, I would like to point out that the dimensions deal with demands on persons as well as on a social system. In this respect Argyris follows his interest that deals with psychological-sociological data. However, could not a change be analyzed within another conceptual framework? Certainly, Argyris would agree. Suppose if an organization would be changed from a charismatic to a bureaucratic leader? Could we consider conflict or ambivalence or compli-

mentary of norms? Generally, my criticism of Argyris' elaboration is that, if I take for example Durkheim's different categories of suicide, they emerge with a disregard of certain psychological variables. By that we do not say that the disregarded variables are irrelevant but that a theory disregards them if it has other certain theoretical explanations. In other words, I would argue that under certain conditions a combination of psychological and sociological data, as far as we can differentiate them, is legitimate while under other conditions that may be less so.

To finish my review I would like to point out the great degree of clarity in which the book is written. He asks his questions in a rather spontaneous way though, I suspect, that behind most questions has accumulated an extensive amount of thinking and reading. As stated earlier, Argyris expresses an energetic optimism that we shall be able to improve our organizations. It is a good book. However, one more point; it would help to compare Blau, Thompson, Perrow, Goldthorpe and Lockwood in more categories than those chosen; or to point out more explicitly in which categories they can be compared or not, probably one could have two separate books: one to deal with certain selected theories, and another with Argyris own elaboration.

JIRI KOLAJA
West Virginia University

*

Elie Dimitras, *Εἰσαγωγὴ εἰς τὴν Κοινωνιολογίαν τῆς Ἀναπτύξεως (Eisagogi eis tin Koinoniologian tis Anaptyxeos)* (Introduction to the Sociology of Development), Athens, Greece: National Centre of Social Research (EKKE), 1973, second edition, pp. 137, $ 4.00.

This book is one of a number of excellent studies recently published by the National Centre of Social Research in Athens, Greece. The volume at hand is the second installment (the first was originally published in 1971) on the growing literature concerning the sociology of development in Greece. This reviewer is familiar with other pertinent works particularly those written by such Greek social scientists as Tsaoussis, Xirotyris, Patras, Tsakonas, Lambiri-Dimaki, Athanasios Kanellopoulos, and Daskalakis.

Professor Dimitras who is also the general director of the National Centre of Social Research in Greece (known better by its Greek acronym EKKE), in a

compact, concise, and analytical volume has given us both the conceptual/theoretical and applied dimensions of sociology and sociotechnology regarding the dissemination of knowledge for development.

The author begins his analysis with an a priori axiom that subsequently becomes his major thesis: that knowledge (broadly defined to mean expertise, know-how, skills, training, education) plays a strategic and primary role in the processes of social, economic, and political development of the developing nations of the third world. His analysis also has implications for the development of the Greek nation and all those with parallel levels of development as those of Greece.

In part one, «The Sociological Principles of Dissemination of Knowledge for the Development», Professor Dimitras shows that the dissemination of knowledge is a concerted effort of national and international communities on one hand and the young and adult generational cohorts on the other. In the first case, the author argues that the international community particularly the more developed nations should assist the less developed ones in mobilizing their human resources, exploiting their natural resources, and providing the necessary capital for developing their national societies. In turn the young and adult age groups of the less developed societies as a matter of tactics and strategy should assume the primary role and responsibility of learning and disseminating new knowledge for the development of their respective societies. The reason for this is that they are more occupationally active and receptive to new ideas and innovations.

More concretely the author believes that the middle range occupational groups and popular leaders should take the initiative in disseminating new skills and knowledge among the lower strata of their societies. Due to their intermediary position between the elites and masses the «middle level» occupational groups are particularly fitted for such a role. The masses on the other hand, the author feels, should also be educated in order for them to actively and constructively participate in the over-all development of their respective societies. The processes of diffusion of learning and teaching new skills and methods should not be confined to schools and formal educational institutions only but on the job training and adult extension education programs should be initiated. (Even in the more advanced societies such programs have been in operation—emphasis mine.)

In his last chapter in part one and after restating his original thesis, Professor Dimitras synopsizes what he refers to as the three basic sociological principles of dissemination of knowledge which he inductively arrived at in his analysis and discussion previously: the geopolitical /diachronic (national / international); the sociodemographic (young and adult); and the sociopolitical (middle and lower strata.)

In his second part of the book Professor Dimitras discusses the practical applications of the three aforementioned sociological principles and offers what he perceives to be the sociotechnological rules and social policies of dissemination of knowledge particularly among the adult segments of the population in the developing societies. In this latter part he illustrates his analysis from the experiences of Morocco and Southern Italy, both of which have successfully implemented adult training programs. Further, he critically reviews the various international technical assistance programs emanating from the more advanced nations to lesser ones and suggests both improvement and expansion of such programs.

Finally Professor Dimitras offers some general conclusions and guidelines for a long range development plan and the optimum utilization of knowledge in the nations of the third world. In his appendix he also takes issue with one of his Greek colleagues who is critical of the absence of a genuine plan and science of development in modern Greece. Professor Dimitras, without being apologetic, argues persuasively that modern Greece has taken some major steps in the last five years or so toward that goal by citing the short and long range plans of development of the national government and the growing literature on the sociology of development in Greece. In this effort Professor Dimitras argues sociology and the other social sciences are called perhaps for the first time to play an important role in the theoretical and applied aspects of dissemination of knowledge for the rapid development of the Greek nation.

In conclusion, this is an important contribution to a significant topic. Professor Dimitras has judiciously accomplished both his stated objectives and limited scope in a fairly compact and parsimonious book. Although his book was originally written for his students at the Supreme Panteios School of Political Science, this reviewer concurs with the author's prolegomenon that his second edition was meant to reach the wider public. To go one step further, Professor Dimitras' important book should not only be read but also followed by the Greek academic community, the policy makers, the students of planning and development and all those who are concerned with the humane processes of directed social change and development of their respective societies.

GEORGE A. KOURVETARIS

Northern Illinois University

ΠΑΡΑΤΗΡΗΣΕΙΣ ΕΠΙ ΤΟΥ ΑΡΘΡΟΥ ΤΟΥ κ. ΤΕΡΛΕΞΗ: «'Εξωτερικὴ πολιτικὴ καὶ 'Εθνικισμὸς στὴν Τουρκία. Σύντομη ἱστορικὴ ἀνασκόπηση», '*Επιθεώρησις Κοινωνικῶν 'Ερευνῶν*, τεῦχος 17.

Τὸ ἄρθρον τοῦ καθηγητοῦ κ. Τερλεξῆ παρουσιάζει πολλὰ ἀξιόλογα σημεῖα καὶ τοποθετεῖ σωστὰ τὸ θέμα ὡς πρὸς τὸ μέλλον τῶν ἑλληνοτουρκικῶν σχέσεων. 'Ιδιαιτέρως σημαντικὴ εἶναι ἡ παρατήρησις ὅτι μερικοὶ ἀπὸ τοὺς ἡγέτας τῶν δύο χωρῶν προσεπάθησαν νὰ εὔρουν λύσεις εἰς τὰς ἑλληνοτουρκικὰς διαφορὰς χωρὶς νὰ ἔχουν κάμει προκαταβολικῶς τὴν παραμικρὰν προσπάθειαν διὰ τὴν ψυχολογικὴν ἐκπαίδευσιν τῶν δύο λαῶν. Πράγματι, ὅπως πολὺ σωστὰ γράφει ὁ κ. Τερλεξῆς, «δὲν ἔγινε καμμία προετοιμασία γιὰ τὴ δημιουργία καταλλήλου ψυχολογικοῦ κλίματος ποὺ θὰ ἐπιδροῦσε στὶς πλατειὲς μάζες ὥστε νὰ δεχθοῦν στενώτερη συνεργασία μεταξὺ τῶν δύο λαῶν», ἐνῶ εἶναι γνωστὸν ὅτι ὑπάρχει «κοινὴ ἱστορία αἰώνων καὶ ὑπομίξη—πολιτιστικὴ καὶ βιολογικὴ—τῶν δύο λαῶν». Εἰς τὴν προϋπόθεσιν αὐτὴν καλλιεργείας εὐνοϊκοῦ ψυχολογικοῦ κλίματος εἰς τὴν κοινὴν γνώμην τῶν δύο λαῶν βασίζεται οὐσιαστικῶς ἡ ὀρθὴ λύσις τῶν σοβαρῶν ἑλληνοτουρκικῶν διαφορῶν. 'Οποιαδήποτε ἀπὸ τὰς δύο κυβερνήσεων εἶναι μακροχρονίως καταδικασμένη ἐὰν δὲν προϋπάρξῃ ἡ ψυχολογικὴ συνεργασία τῶν δύο λαῶν. Καὶ ὁ σκοπὸς αὐτὸς θὰ πραγματοποιηθῇ μόνον μὲ μίαν ἐκπαιδευτικὴν πολιτικὴν ἡ ὁποία θὰ ἐμπνεύσῃ φιλοτουρκικὰ αἰσθήματα εἰς τὴν 'Ελλάδα καὶ φιλελληνικὰ εἰς τὴν Τουρκίαν. Οἱ ἱστορικοὶ καὶ οἱ συγγραφεῖς τῶν σχολικῶν ἐγχειριδίων τῶν δύο χωρῶν ἂς παύσουν ἐπὶ τέλους νὰ ἀλληλοκατηγοροῦνται καὶ ἂς ὑλοποιηθῇ ἡ πρότασις ποὺ ἔχει κάμει ὁ ὑποφαινόμενος διὰ τὴν ἔκδοσιν μιᾶς ἐπιστημονικῆς ἐπιθεωρήσεως ἑλληνοτουρκικῶν μελετῶν εἰς τὴν ἑλληνικὴν καὶ τὴν τουρκικὴν ταυτοχρόνως, μὲ τὴν συνεργασίαν 'Ελλήνων καὶ Τούρκων ἐπιστημόνων.

Τὸ πρῶτο μέρος τοῦ ἄρθρου τοῦ κ. Τερλεξῆ ὑστερεῖ δυστυχῶς διὰ τοὺς ἑξῆς λόγους:

1) Διὰ νὰ συλλάβῃ κανεὶς τὸν τουρκικὸν ἐθνικισμὸν θὰ ἔπρεπε νὰ εἶχε κάμει μίαν ἀναδρομὴ εἰς τὴν περίοδον 1912-1923 καὶ εἰδικῶς εἰς τὸν πατέρα τοῦ τουρκικοῦ ἐθνικισμοῦ Ziya Gokalp καὶ κατόπιν, μέχρι τοῦ 1938, εἰς τὸν Kemal Atatürk.

2) Τὰ τουρκικὰ φασιστικὰ κινήματα τῆς περιόδου 1941-1944 δὲν εἶναι ἀντιπροσωπευτικὰ τοῦ τουρκικοῦ ἐθνικισμοῦ: πρόκειται ἁπλῶς περὶ ὑπερβολῶν ὡρισμένων ἐξτρεμιστῶν ποὺ ἔτυχαν προσοχῆς ἐκείνην τὴν ἐποχὴν λόγῳ τῶν εἰδικῶν περιστάσεων τοῦ Δευτέρου Παγκοσμίου Πολέμου. Εἰς μίαν λοιπὸν μελέτην ἐπὶ τοῦ τουρκικοῦ ἐθνικισμοῦ, ὅπως αὐτὴ τοῦ κ. Τερλεξῆ, ἡ ὑπογράμμισις τῶν κινημάτων τούτων (καὶ χωρὶς μά-