

## SUMMARIES

### E. GOFFMAN, *The interaction order*.

*The interaction order* was the presidential address Erving Goffman delivered at the annual meeting of the A.S.A. (American Sociological Association) in 1982. Often regarded by many critics as his only systematic work, this article explicitly proposes as main object of study that particular social occasion in which two or more individuals find themselves in a situation of mutual co-presence. Starting from this basic definition, the author deals with those social categories having some kind of relation with the interaction order, although this order, as Goffman often underlines, forms an independent domain. It stands somewhere between the two classic and often conflicting categories of social analysis — the individuals on the one end, and the social institutions on the other — and is governed by peculiar (cerimonial) rules. Among these three different domains, though, there is no rigid separation; on the contrary they show many connections and mutual interferences, as Goffman tries to explain in the final part of the essay, reaffirming his striking ability for subtle analyses.

### G. POLLINI, *National belonging: localism and cosmopolitanism*.

After the convergent dynamics of cosmopolitanism and localism, which in the past favoured the formation of the feeling of nationalism and the constitution of the nation-state, today a model seems to be emerging which, by fostering a split between these two orientations, seems to show a «recession» in the feeling of national belonging, either towards regionalism and municipalization, or towards cosmopolitanism (variously characterized) or towards a combination *sui generis* of both. Within this overall framework, this paper examines two distinct phenomena which, one internally and the other externally, represent «critical cases» vis-à-vis national belonging: the phenomenon of «leghe» («leagues») and that of so-called extra-CEE immigration. Both phenomena raise once again the basic problem (beyond apparent easy solutions) of the distinction and the differentiation between the aspects of «national community» and «local communities», on the one hand, and of «government» (understood politically) on the other, apart from the rise of various kinds of fundamentalism.

### M. MAGATTI, *Comparative analysis and social theory*.

Comparative analysis is taken into account in relation to recent changes in social theory. By distinguishing different ways of doing comparative research, their limits and potentialities, the A. highlights the close link between social theory and empirical research. More precisely, the A. holds that only after a critical re-examination of this link it is possible to explain the role played by comparative analysis on the theory of social action during the last decades.

### A. SCAGLIA, *German sociology in Italy*.

The article aims to discuss the reception of the German sociology in Italy. The A. argues that the lack of reciprocal and systematic scientific interpretation between these two linguistic areas is largely due to this defective process. Beyond serious linguistic difficulties, the distance between these two sociological traditions depends on the different epistemological evolution followed by social sci-

ences within the two countries: in Germany historicism *à la* Dilthey, the weberian tradition and phenomenology have dominated the debate while in Italy there has been a prevailing positivistic orientation, a strong tendency towards political structuralism and a large diffusion of idealistic historicism due to the influence of B. Croce. R. Michels's article published in Germany in 1923 in the *Kolnwer Vierteljahreshefte für Soziologie Review* constituted an occasion for more positive and systematic relations. In that article, Michels recommended to German sociologists to read Italian scholars, and in particular V. Pareto. After the period dominated by positivism, the Italian sociology knew German sociology through Adorno and König and through historicism thanks to R. Aron and P. Rossi. In the last twenty years various German scholars have been largely read in Italy (M. Weber, F. Tönnies, G. Simmel, M. Scheler, K. Mannheim; and more recently (T. Adorno, H. Marcuse, M. Horkheimer, J. Habermas, R. Dahrendorf, N. Luhmann). Yet, the diffusion of the Italian sociological thinking is still very limited in Germany. From this point of view the relationship between the two schools should be furtherly strengthened. This is the goal pursued by bilingual sociological reviews such as *Annali di Sociologia-Soziologisches Jahrbuch* and by Italian-German associations, such as the *Associazione di Sociologia — Italienisch Gesellschaft für Soziologie*.

F. SIDOTI, *The political function of religion: a comparative view.*

An influential school of thought — from Tocqueville to Niebhuur — holds that only the christian culture may constitute a solid ground for democracy. At the same time, religion may delegitimize political power. In advanced economies, the Church may affect the social organization in various ways. For example in the US' religion has an extraordinary political function since it is a pervasive dimension which has deep consequences on the way of thinking. Within the political and economic set of possibilities defined by the *Centesimus Annus*, catholics may chose between two different scenarios: on the one hand, they may be forced to become one among many other religions in a polytheistic world; on the other hand, they may become the core of a new ecumenical religion which is going to be built up and which does not have only the ONU as a extra-national point of reference.

A. TAROZZI, *Interpreting development: a new frontier for sociological analysis.*

According to the A. the process of development cannot be reduced to the economic and quantitative dimensions. As a number of international institutions and even economists suggest, the process of development cannot be simply viewed in terms of market or in terms of state planning either. It is necessary to take into account other aspects, such as the various forms of reciprocity. However, this effort should avoid the rap of an unfruitful cultural relativism. This is made possible by employing new analytical tools which allow the researcher to understand the relationship between man and social system, between man and the natural system, and among different systems. This approach represents a new challenge for the sociological analysis in the future years.