

SUMMARY

For around 50 years the world is undergoing a period of complex changes. Non-Western communities (China, India, countries of southeastern Asia etc.) are rapidly modernizing, the majority of them not following the Western development pattern. At the same time, Western countries are not stagnant as well. They are restructurizing: changing relationship between different life spheres (private and public), people prefer membership in short-term moral-aesthetic communities to formal organizations (*neotribalism*), increasing choice of different identity models in the private sector, decreasing differences between ideologies in political life etc. A new globalization wave is following the decolonization and world fragmentation period of the 60s and 70s of the 20th century. The globalization itself is a contradictory process. When the world is continuously liaising by global connections, its unification and diversification are taking place at the same time. As a reaction to unification tendencies, the old collective (national, religious and civilizational) identities are wanted to be newly re-established. The outcome of this process is the rebirth of religious fundamentalism and nationalism. Radical changes are observed in the economical sector as well. The transition from *industrial society*, based on manufacturing of goods, to *informational society*, with the goal to create informational services, is becoming faster and faster. After the collapse of communist system in 1989, the Eastern European countries are undergoing post-communist transformation.

The abovementioned processes have become a challenge for the conventional social sciences. They require to rethink many traditional theoretical and methodological presuppositions of these sciences and to find more adequate points of view. In this context, the works of Lithuanian-American

sociologist and one of the leaders of Lithuanian émigré in Post-war years, Vytautas Kavolis, are of significant importance.

Kavolis was born in the provisional Lithuanian capital Kaunas on 8th September 1930. In 1944, he retreated together with his parents from Lithuania to the Western Germany. Kavolis finished gymnasium in Hanau. In 1949, he arrived to the USA. In the USA, Kavolis studied in the University of Chicago, of Wisconsin and of Harvard. In 1960 he defended doctoral thesis *The Failures of Totalitarian Socialization: A Theoretically Oriented Case Study of the East German Socialization System*. Kavolis taught various sociological courses, mainly from the field of social theory, of social psychology and of civilizational studies, in Tufts University in 1958-1959, in Defiance College in 1960-1964 and in Dickinson College in 1964-1996. The scientist published over 100 scientific articles and reviews, wrote 11 books and edited 4 collections of scientific articles. His scientific interests covered sociology of visual arts and of literature, social psychology, comparative studies of civilizations and Lithuanian Studies. Kavolis was a president of *International Society for the Comparative Study of Civilizations* in 1977-1983 and an editor of its journal *Comparative Civilizations Review* in 1978-1996.

Kavolis played an active role in political and cultural life of Lithuanian émigré in Post-war years. He was a publicist, a one of the founders and leaders of liberally oriented organization *Santara-Šviesa* (Accord-Light) and an editor of cultural and political journal *Metmenys* (Sketches) in 1959-1996. After the restoration of Independence of Lithuania in 1990, Kavolis enthusiastically joined its public and academic activities. In 1993, the scientist was awarded *The Lithuanian National Prize* for his contribution to Lithuanian Studies. Kavolis died on 25th June 1996 in Vilnius.

The monograph dissociates from the analysis of Kavolis' political and social views and focuses on his scientific legacy. It is true that ideological views of scientists influence their scientific activities, but the author of the monograph takes position that in the case of Kavolis, it is meaningful to

consider this question only after comprehensive examination of his scientific works. Only then it is possible to avoid the declarative postulations about influence of the ideological views recognized openly by Kavolis himself on his scientific activities made on presupposition of unity of personality and to start a fruitful inquiry *what, how* and *how much* conditioned the author's thought.

One of the hardest theoretical difficulties of Kavolis' sociology is its coherence. The author himself did not reveal neither the central theme of his research, neither the logics of its development, nor the general methodological principles. Neither did he thoroughly explain the concepts in use. That is why at first sight, Kavolis sociology resembles a mosaic, whose elements are not logically connected. An impression of its chaoticity is strengthened even more by the sociologist's use of multiple theoretical and empirical resources from various branches of humanities and social sciences frequently without sufficient explanation how they fit into whole scientific enterprise.

The main aim of the monograph is to reconstruct and critically examine the general theoretical and methodological presuppositions of Kavolis' sociology: the central theme, logics of development, founding concepts and general methodological principles.

In order to reach the aim, comparative method is mostly used in the monograph. First of all, Kavolis' scientific beliefs are compared with the ones of the authors who worked in the same problematic field. Comparative method enables not only to establish the general theoretical and methodological presuppositions of Kavolis sociology, but also to identify its relations to other theories and methodologies – to find parallels and differences between Kavolis and other theorists and their influence to his thinking. Comparative method is used to reconstruct the evolution of Kavolis thought as well. Comparison of its different stages allows detection of continuations, transformations and interruptions in Kavolis' scientific beliefs

throughout his academic carrier. Comparison is not the only method used. The other tool is historical-analytical method.

Reconstruction of the general theoretical and methodological presuppositions of Kavolis sociology is based on analysis of published works. Unpublished works, notebooks, drafts are out of interest. All Kavolis monographs, collections of articles, studies and published courses are used as the primary sources of research. That is: *Žmogaus genezė: psichologinė Vinco Kudirkos studija* (Genesis of Man: Psychological Study of Vincas Kudirka) (1994a(1963)), *Nužemintųjų generacija: egzilio pasaulejaautos eskizai* (The Generation of the Humiliated: Sketches of Psychology of Exile) (1994b(1968)), *Artistic Expression - A Sociological Analysis* (1968), *History on Art's Side: Social Dynamics in Artistic Efflorescences* (1972a), *Sąmoningumo trajektorijos: lietuvių kultūros modernėjimo aspektai* (*Trajectories of Consciousness: Aspects of Modernization of Lithuanian Culture*) (1994c(1986)), *Epochų signatūros* (Signatures of Epochs) (1994d(1991)), *Moterys ir vyrai lietuvių kultūroje* (Women and Men in Lithuanian Culture) (1992), *Moralizing Cultures* (1993a), *Civilization Analysis as a Sociology of Culture* (1995a), *Kultūrinė psichologija* (Cultural Psychology) (1995b), *Kultūros dirbtuvė* (Workshop of Culture) (1996), *Civilizacijų analizė* (Civilizational Analysis) (1998a) ir *Nepriklausomųjų kelias: Publicistikos straipsniai (1951–1965)* (The Road of Independents: Publicistic Articles) (2006). The analysis relies on articles not included into monographs or collections of articles as well. This is especially true about the articles on sociology of literature and civilization analysis. It should be noted that in the case when an originally English publication is translated into Lithuanian, preference in citation is given to the translation. Lithuanian translations are preferred in order to keep a continuation with previous research of Kavolis scientific legacy and facilitate for future Lithuanian researches by using publications more accessible in Lithuania.

Kavolis' ideas are compared with the ones of American sociologist Talcott Parsons, Russian-American sociologist Pitirim A. Sorokin, French

sociologist Émile Durkheim, German sociologists Max Weber and Georg Simmel, Hungarian sociologist of art Arnold Hauser, American sociologist of art Walter Abell, French sociologist of art Lucien Goldmann, representatives of the Frankfurt school Erich Fromm and Leo Lowenthal, German philosopher of culture Oswald Spengler, British historian Arnold J. Toynbee, American sociologist of culture Benjamin Nelson, American anthropologist Alfred L. Kroeber, French poststructuralist Michel Foucault and of other authors.

Reception of Kavolis ideas is reviewed focusing on the American and Lithuanian contexts. Until now, Kavolis' works have not received appropriate attention in American sociology. They were reviewed, cited, referred and included into collections of articles. Notwithstanding, they were not analyzed deeply. Until now, Kavolis received no study or article.

The lack of attention to Kavolis' sociology could be explained by three reasons. The first reason is related to the general situation of structural functionalism in the context of American sociology. After domination in American sociology in fifties of XX century, structural functionalism was little by little pushed to its margins from the early sixties. This sociological school became unacceptable due to its fundamental assumptions, it was considered too erratic (preference given to harmony and not conflict; structure but not action; integration but not fragmentation). Evaluation of structural functionalism changed from negative to positive only in the middle of eighties, when Talcott Parsons was rehabilitated and neo-functionalism emerged. Kavolis worked within the framework of structural functionalism mainly, therefore for a long time he was surrounded by fairly negative intellectual climate.

Secondly, the lack of attention could be conditioned not only by the general theoretical orientation of Kavolis sociology, but as well by the character of its investigation. The sociologist was interested in things that were not considered significant in American sociology until middle of eighties, when the boom of research of culture started.

The third obstacle to a wider acknowledgement lies in Kavolis creative work itself. His sociology was in a continuous state of evolution. In 1962–1974, the scientist was developing structural functional sociology of the visual art, in 1969–1971, he studied social pathology and wrote about cultural psychology close to American historical psychology (Erich Fromm, Zevedei Barbu), and discussed the impact of modernization process on personality; in 1970–1972 and 1988–1992, his literary sociology was close to Lucien Goldmann's literary analysis, where he analyzed the influence of modernization process and other socio-cultural factors on the structure of literary works; in 1973–1996, he concentrated on civilization analysis. The reception of Kavolis ideas was complicated even more by the fact that his works in the different fields were not systemized at all or only in the preparatory phase. From this point of view, the only exception is the author's sociology of visual art. The major part of the received results from this branch of sociology is summarized in two monographs.

The first Kavolis' book *Artistic Expression – Sociological Analysis* received the widest recognition. It was reviewed 11 times (Eastham 1969, Golde 1970, Kramer 1970, Lengyel 1971, Lilienfeld 1971, Logan 1969, Nash 1969, Peacock 1969, Upfold 1969, Ziolkowski 1969, Wilson 1970) and was translated into Hispanic and Swedish¹. The second book *History on Art's Side* was reviewed four times (Albrecht 1973, Hughes 1977, Johnston 1973, Mariner 1973). *Moralizing Cultures* received one review (Bourg 1995).

The first Lithuanian reactions to Kavolis' works took place in exile. Algirdas J. Greimas (1964) and Vincas Trumpa (1963) reviewed *Žmogaus genezė*. Vytautas A. Jonynas (1969) wrote about *Nužemintųjų generacija*. Antanas Musteikis (1971) critically examined *Artistic Expression – Sociological Analysis*. An exchange of opinions on Kavolis' article *Neaiškumo*

¹ *La expresion artistica: un estudio sociologico*. Trad. Anibal C. Leal, revision tecnica Carlos Flood. Buenos Aires: Amorrortu Editores, 1968; *Vad konsten speglar: En konstsociologisk analys*. Stockholm: Natur och Kultur, 1970.

patologijos (Pathologies of Uncertainty) (Kavolis 1969a) between Kęstutis Girnius (a.k.a. K. Kalvėnas) (1970a, 1970b) and Vincas Trumpa (1970) took place. Mykolas J. Drunga (1972) systematically examined all Kavolis' articles on psychological consequences of modernization process published in *Metmenys*. Kavolis' ideas were surveyed by Algis Mickūnas (1994, 2000, 2011) and Rimvydas Šilbajoris (2000).

Kavolis works were known in Soviet Lithuania, but due to strict censorship, they were rarely debated in public. One of few public examinations of Kavolis thought can be found in collective monograph *Ideologinės srovės lietuvių išėivijoje: socialinės politinės ir filosofinės koncepcijos po Antrojo pasaulinio karo* (Ideological Trends in Lithuanian Emigration: Social-Political and Philosophical Conceptions after World War II) (1978).

Situation in reception of Kavolis' sociology changed significantly after the restoration of independence of Lithuania. It attracted attention of many scientists of Independent Lithuania and an entire field of research devoted to Kavolis' legacy was established. Until now, three collections of articles have been published: *Vytautas Kavolis: asmuo ir idėjos* (Vytautas Kavolis: Person and Ideas) (2000), *Vytautas Kavolis: Humanistica vs liberalia* (2005) ir *Vytauto Kavolio kultūros tyrimų metodologijos profiliai* (Vytautas Kavolis Cultural Research: Profiles of Methodology) (2011). The sociologist's ideas were analyzed by the scientists such as Egidijus Aleksandravičius (2000), Antanas Andrijauskas (2001), Lilijana Astra (2011), Solveiga Daugirdaitė (2005), Viktorija Daujotytė (1997a, 1997b), Leonidas Donskis (1995, 1997, 1998, 2000a, 2000b, 2000c, 2001, 2002, 2004, 2005a, 2005b, 2005c), Naglis Kardelis (2011), Ramutis Karmalavičius (2005), Karolis Klimka (2005), Darius Kuolys (2011), Gintautas Mažeikis (2011), Elina Naujokaitienė (2005), Alvydas Noreika (2004a, 2004b, 2005, 2006, 2008a, 2008b, 2008c, 2009, 2011a, 2011b, 2011c, 2011d, 2012, 2013), Rimantas Skeivys (2005), Paulius Subačius (1992, 2005), Arūnas Sverdiolas (1992, 1997, 2000, 2005, 2011, 2012), Arvydas Šliogeris (2000), Artūras Tereškinas (1992, 1995, 2000),

Laimutė Tidikytė (2005), Algimantas Valantiejus (2000, 2005a, 2005b, 2011), Laura Varnauskaitė (2011, 2013), Audrius Zakarauskas (1994) and Saulius Žukas (1994, 2000).

All studies of Kavolis' sociology done in Independent Lithuania could be divided into two groups. The first group consists of works which either overview the general evolution of Kavolis sociology or analyze its theoretical basis and context. From this kind of works, Valantiejus' studies deserve to be mentioned. The scientist not only seeks to establish the general theoretical features of Kavolis sociology, but looks for ways of its creative development as well. The second group consists of works which investigate the ideological background of Kavolis sociology. In this group, Donskis' and Sverdiolas' analysis of Kavolis ideological views is outstanding. Donskis stressed the impact of liberalism and nationalism upon Kavolis scientific thinking, whereas Sverdiolas saw ideological origins of Kavolis sociology in existentialist philosophy.

The monograph, „Culture and Emotions in Vytautas Kavolis' Sociology“, consists of introduction, three main parts, conclusions, and a list of sources and references.

The introduction presents the research problem and its substantiation, formulates the main aim and its objectives, indicates the methods of the research, and surveys the sources and references of the monograph.

The first part of the monograph, „The Central Theme of Kavolis Sociology“, explores the theme which the author developed throughout his entire scientific career. It is stated that the central theme of Kavolis sociology is a *collective emotionality and its symbolic expression*. Collective emotionality is the sensibilities shared by members of some society or its social group. The shared sensibilities are not defined as self-contained psychic powers, but as the *attitudes* directed towards objects of physic, social and cultural environments and depended on them.

Explaining emotional affinity of individuals, Kavolis follows individualistic strategy consistently. According to him, collective emotionality does not mean supraindividual emotions, but the fact that individuals have similar emotional attitudes towards the same objects, as in the case of authoritarian power, they may feel sympathy or antipathy. Similarity of individuals' attitudes is explained by similarity of social, cultural and historical conditions of their existence. Living in similar conditions, individuals become emotionally congenial as well. The described course is taken due the fact that individuals' personalities are shaped by the conditions of their existence.

In the view of Kavolis, collective emotionality does not remain in the depths of individuals' personalities. It is embodied in objects of culture. The forms of symbolic expression, images and meanings embodied in the works of philosophy, science, religion, art and in verbal and non-verbal language are perceived as hieroglyphs, after deciphering of which emotional life of social groups and its social, cultural and historical conditions become transparent.

Taking into account what determinants of personality and culture are chosen and what methods of research are used, three Kavolis' approaches to the theme of collective emotionality and its symbolic expression are discerned. It is stated that the sociologist considers the theme from three different perspectives - *Freudian*, *Existential* and *Neo-Freudian*.

The approaches differ in their importance. The Neo-Freudian approach is the most significant. The largest part of Kavolis studies is based on it, whereas uses of Freudian and Existentialist approaches are limited. First of all, two books *Žmogaus genezė* (1994a(1963)) and *Nužemintųjų generacija* (1994b(1968)) were written under their influence. The first book is methodologically based upon Freudian theory. The second book falls under influence of Existentialist philosophy. The elements of both approaches can be found integrated into the works based on Neo-Freudianism as well.

The theme of collective emotionality and its symbolic expression is developed in Kavolis' sociology in varying degrees of intensity. It seems to be developed in sociology of visual art, studies of social pathology, cultural psychology and sociology of literature the most intensively. All studies in these fields are directed to the fulfillment of the theme. There is no question that is not related to it. All researches of forms of expression, their excellence and images in visual arts, personality in crisis, metaphors of revolutions, psychological consequences of modernization process, revisionist ethics, avant-garde artistic cultures, social pathologies and literature are devoted to collective emotionality and its symbolic expression. Situation of the central theme is different in civilization analysis and the Lithuanian studies done from 70s to 90s. In these fields of research, collective emotionality and its symbolic expression is subordinated to a larger theme. In civilization analysis it is a part of *civilizational problematic*, and in the Lithuanian studies, it is subordinated to *history of consciousness*.

Kavolis inquires collective emotionality and its symbolic expression using two strategies. Firstly, all the significant elements of the theme are considered. The social and cultural determinants conditioning personality and creativity significantly are pointed out. It is explained what shared emotional attitudes are established under influence of certain social and cultural determinants. He is interested in symbolic expression of the shared attitudes, too. This strategy is broadly used in sociology of visual art and literature and cultural psychology. Secondly, the author chooses partial analysis of the theme instead of a complete one. In such cases, he does not investigate everything, but only some elements of the theme.

Inquiring into the nature of development of Kavolis sociology, the monograph focuses on an interplay of immanent and institutional factors. Studies at Harvard University are regarded as the crucial institutional factor that pushed Kavolis towards collective emotionality and its symbolic expression. After involvement with studies there, the sociologist takes an

interest in collective emotionality as one of features of national character and masters theoretical and methodological basis of national character studies, under which later on his Neo-Freudian approach was built.

The national character studies at Harvard University, which focused on Soviet character and national Lithuanian personality, gave rise to two directions of research of collective emotionality and its symbolic expression. The first direction consists of sociology of visual art, studies of social pathology, cultural psychology and civilization analysis. The second direction involves Lithuanian studies (*Žmogaus genezė, Nužemintųjų generacija* and history of Lithuanian consciousness). They differ in their aims. Delevoping the first direction, Kavolis seeks to establish universal regularities of collective emotionality and its symbolic expression. Whereas in the case of the second direction, the emotional aspect of Lithuanian national character is the focus of the research. Sociology of literature is placed between these two directions. It analyses works of Lithuanian authors, but seeks the aims that are higher than the Lithuanian ones.

The directions of development of the central theme differs in their relationship to Kavolis' national character studies. Research of the emotional aspect of the Lithuanian character naturally continues and supllents the things that were said in 50s. In the case of the second direction, the situation is different. It is doubtful that Kavolis' interest in art, with which starts his a few decades long inquiry into universal regularities of collective emotionality and its symbolic expression, was dictated by any theoretical problems of national character studies or institutional factors. It is questionable whether the sociologist's moral, political or philosophical beliefs plaid any role in this context. Most likely, personal features of Kavolis character exerted their influence.

Kavolis' turn from sociology of visual art to studies of social pathology and related to them cultural psychology is primarily explained by social mission of American sociology. Launching the large-scale social programs

aimed at promotion of social inclusion of marginal groups in 50s and 60s, the Government of the United States waited for help from American sociologists. It was expected that sociologists could help in identifying and effectively solving emerging social problems. So Kavolis, like many of his American colleagues, did not stay away from important problems in American society in those days.

There were two pressing social issues: aggression in society and the rise of youth counterculture that challenged the United States and other Western societies in 60s. The first issue is solved in studies of social pathology. Youth counter-culture and its origins is explained in cultural psychology.

Kavolis looks for origins of youth counter-culture in the modernization process. After realizing the inadequacy of modernization theory in explaining the events of 60s, the author turns from cultural psychology to civilization studies. These studies were considered enabling to view the youth counter-culture and related items from a broader cultural and historical perspective.

Theoretical and methodological presuppositions of the Freudian, Existentialist and Neo-Freudian approaches do not completely coincide. Taking into consideration the fact that Neo-Freudian approach dominates Kavolis' sociology, the monograph focuses on its conceptual and methodological apparatus. It is thought that analysis of Neo-Freudian approach is enough to disclose conceptual and methodological core of Kavolis sociology.

The second part, „Basic Concepts of Kavolis Sociology“, deals with the conceptual apparatus of the Neo-Freudian approach. It is stated that basis of the apparatus consists of concepts such as culture, personality and society. More concrete concepts are defined or introduced with the aim of illumination of certain aspects of their content. Concepts of art and civilization are the most significant among the more concrete ones. Their theoretical

relevance depends on the fact that they are basic concepts of the two fields of research – sociology of visual art and literature and civilization analysis on which Kavolis worked for the majority of the time.

Concepts of culture, art, civilization, personality and society are poorly explicated by Kavolis himself. The sociologist produced no completion of their definitions in any published text. Instead of complete definitions, there are many half-explicated or known from the context aspects of content of the concepts.

The careless view to a systematic theorization is explained by the general strategy of theorizing chosen by Kavolis. The author is a stranger to deductive reasoning, when it is aimed to do from established fundamental presuppositions all possible conclusions and to answer to all questions emerging in process of deduction. Instead of top-down way of reasoning, Kavolis chooses a down-top approach. In other words, he starts from cognitive instruments already used in practice and seeks to unite them in a broader framework. Alas, work of building of broader framework is rarely done to the logical end. The general strategy of theorizing undoubtedly echoes in the formation of basic concepts.

The basic concepts of Kavolis sociology are defined on the grounds of principles of structural functionalism. Perhaps the largest influence upon Kavolis was made by two American sociologists – Talcott Parsons and Pitirim A. Sorokin. It has to be noted that Parsons played a much bigger role in formation of Kavolis' basic concepts than Sorokin.

Kavolis prescribes to culture qualities such as *symbolism*, *normativity*, *sharedness*, *longevity* and *universality*. Symbolism means that culture consists of *symbols*, or of any kind *signs* (audible, graphic, visual etc.). Cultural symbols do not only have meaning, but they also exert a normative power. Symbols regulate individual's relationships with himself, other individuals and the world. In other words, symbols command how an individual perceives one or another thing, what emotions he feels in regard to it and

how he behaves. If symbols do not have normative functions, they don't belong to culture.

What concerns normativity, culture embraces symbols which are shared by either all members of society, or members of its social group. These symbols can be called *shared symbols*. Whereas symbols regulating separate individuals, and not social groups, *idiosyncratic symbols*, are not attributed to culture. Culture is the whole of shared symbols.

Kavolis' decision on attribution of symbols to culture is based on structural-functional presupposition that culture's aim is to guarantee an integration of social system. Integrality of social system is related to concord of social interactions. It is supposed that individuals interact smoothly when they act in accordance of expectations of each other. It is stated that smooth social interactions would be impossible without interacting individuals' orientation to shared symbols.

Requirement of longevity is connected to the abovementioned culture's function of integration. According to Kavolis, in order for those social interactions to go smoothly, shared symbols have to be relatively stable in time. Short-term symbols are viewed as unable to guarantee smoothness of reciprocal expectations and therefore as unexerting functions of integration at all.

Universality of culture is perceived as recognition of importance of its symbols not only by its adhereres, but also by those belonging to other cultures. In order for strangers to respect foreign symbols, they must be perfect.

In his definition of culture, Kavolis excludes products of material culture, mass culture of 20th century, value orientations and ways of behavior having no symbolic expression and all having no regulating power, idiosyncratic, short-term and particularistic symbols. Only long-term, pretending to universality and regulating consciousness (perception, thinking, feeling) and behavior of individuals of social groups symbols satisfy his definition

of culture. According to the scientist, such symbols are first of all found in objects of non-material culture created on the base of writing. They exist in non-verbal language of body and natural spoken language, too.

Art, as part of culture, shows the same qualities as the whole culture: symbolism, normativity, sharedness, longevity and universality. Art is distinguished from all symbolism of culture by specific functions. First, works of art perform the function of affective orientation. Artistic forms of expression and images can induce individuals to respond to socio-cultural objects and structural features of social reality positively or negatively. Second, art integrates social system and personality. Third, artistic images not only emotionally orient or integrate, but also prescribe how an individual has to behave with particular socio-cultural objects and indicates what they can hope for their behavior. In short, artistic images stimulate to play certain behavioral roles. Fourth, artworks may analyze possible tendencies and consequences of development of emotions and behavior related to them.

Art may perform functions characteristic to other cultural systems: moral, ideological and cognitive functions. In the case of art, these functions are considered to be secondary. Whereas the abovementioned functions are treated as primary ones. The primary functions are latent. Neither artist nor his public comprehend the influence of artistic forms of expression and images upon society and emotional life of its members.

Notwithstanding emphasis on functionality of art, Kavolis' conception of art hides the idea of its disfunctionality as well. The idea of art's disfunctionality is implicated by the author's presupposition that artistic style can induce not only positive emotional attitudes towards social reality, but as well negative ones. It is meant such negative emotional attitudes that are directed not to the things harmful to social system, but to social system and its significant structural parts, for example, to economy, polity or system of social stratification. Therefore, artistic styles and their elements which induce individuals not to approve of social system or its elements cannot

be considered contributing to the stability of a social system. Contrary, they don't allow social system to reach condition of relative equilibrium or undermine it. In other words, they do not perform the function of integration, but a disintegrating one. The only styles or their elements can be considered as performing function of integration are those that induce positive emotional relationships with social system.

Kavolis defines civilization as a culture. Defining civilization in this way, the author refuses to differentiate between culture and social structure. Social structure is considered to be a projection of culture, though not necessarily an exact one. Civilization differs from other types of culture in size, complexity, having writing and cities, intellectual potency to answer to any question, specific structural coherence and dynamics. Civilization is integrated by specific principles: *constellations of formal designs* (models of structural relationships) and *range of theory-practice articulations*. Change of these principles determines specificity of civilizational dynamics.

Kavolis identifies personality with motivational structure of individual. Personality is constituted not by the behavioral patterns established on the basis of stimulus-reaction scheme, but by *attitudes*, or *value orientations*, hidden inside an individual. On primary level of personality, attitudes are organized in the way of binary oppositions. Constructions of higher levels emerge from the binary oppositions of attitudes.

Personality is considered to be a mediator between culture and society. According to the sociologist, society shapes personality and this influence is objectified in cultural symbols. And on the contrary, cultural symbols have power to change society through acting on personality. The most significant element of personality taking part in interchange of society and culture is emotional attitudes. They are regarded as the main channel of the interchange. Kavolis stresses, society and culture can act on each other only through emotions. The whole process of societal determination of culture is explained in this way: social factors and institutionalized norms

(cultural factors) condition an individual's emotional attitudes, and the latter induce creative imagination to choose defined means of symbolic expression (forms of expression, images and meanings). A similar approach to the mechanism of cultural determination of society is developed. It is stated that when cultural symbols get into a new social and psychological environment, they first of all transform emotional attitudes, the latter change other sub-systems of personality and push individuals to change their social environment in such way that it would correspond their psychological structure. In this case, there are two presuppositions. First, it is supposed that embodying emotions symbols acquire power to control them: to relate anew to societal conditions that gave birth to them, strengthen and even excite in those who had not them before. Second, it is presupposed that culture, personality and society have to be in harmony with each other. If there is no harmony, for example, one of them is inadequate to other two, then it will be sooner or later established.

The research of collective emotionality and its symbolic expression focuses on one of the aspects of the interrelationships of society, personality and culture – on society's impact on culture. Kavolis' analysis of societal determination of culture seeks to identify the factors that are the most influential from standpoint of psychology and culture, and to explore their impact on emotionality of members of social groups and ways of symbolization of collective emotionality.

Kavolis develops relational conception of society. According to it, society is a total sum of social relations. Social relations are not derived from psychological properties of interacting individuals. They are objective. Society is organized in such a way that its the lowest level is made up of *social actions*, the higher of statuses-roles and the highest one of four sub-systems – *economics, politics, societal community* and *fiduciary system*. Society is integrated to a certain degree. Not all that exists in it contributes to the maintenance of society. There are dysfunctional things, too.

The third part, „The General Methodological Principles of Kavolis Sociology“, discusses the general methodological principles of the Neo-Freudian approach. It is argued that Kavolis' methodology is integrated by five principles: *comparative-historical method*, *objectifying interpretation of cultural symbols*, *structural analysis*, *interdisciplinary approach* and *analysis of artworks*.

Kavolis' comparative-historical method is based on various presuppositions, one of which kept continuity during the course of time and other changed. The authors stayed faithful to the smallest unit of analysis and typologization. Meanwhile, he changed his position in regard to an aim of research, way of comparing and limits of uses of causal explanation.

Kavolis' sociology of visual art and literature, studies of social pathology and cultural psychology try to establish what is common and true regardless of time and socio-cultural environment. Whereas civilization analysis aims at identifying what is specific to each civilization.

Individual elements of style are compared and the question how individual elements are united into the whole and compose a style is not considered in sociology of visual art. Attention is turned to the wholes in cultural psychology and sociology of literature, but this turn has no influence upon the way of comparing. Kavolis holds a position that in comparing individual elements, in this case parts of personality system and ones of structure of literary work, there is no need to relate them to the wholes. It means that it is not necessary to take into consideration their location in personality system or structure of literary work. Meanwhile, developing technique of comparing in civilization analysis the author insists on relating small-scale civilizational units and processes to large-scale ones, including civilization as the whole.

In sociology of visual art, Kavolis refuses any limits of use of causal explanation and constructs solely causal explanations. Meanwhile, in cultural psychology, sociology of literature and civilization analysis, the

sociologist sets limits to uses of causal explanation. Such theoretical step opens possibility to use description not as a mean or as preparatory stage of explanation, but as a purpose in itself. This possibility is broadly exploited in civilization analysis, where exceptional role of description in research of symbolic structures is stated.

Defining conditions of use of causal explanation, Kavolis leans on the presupposition that cultural works can embody positive or negative emotional attitudes of social groups to their socio-cultural environment and that established cultural traditions, political structures, religious organizations and social organization of artistic enterprise can influence embodying these attitudes in cultural symbols. Meanwhile, the possibility of use of description as self-sufficient mean of inquiry is opened by the presupposition that final word in choosing symbolic means of embodiment of collective emotionality and in manipulating them belongs not to socio-cultural reality, but to the imagination of a cultural creator.

Kavolis' theory of culture creates conditions to develop comparative-historical research in three directions: to analyze symbolic, institutional or internalized aspects of culture. The author gives preference to the first direction. Kavolis takes an objectivistic position in interpreting cultural symbolism. According to him, symbols exist independently from interpreters. Not interpreters, but the functions objectively characteristic to symbols determine their belonging to defined sections of culture's symbolism. Kavolis believes that symbols' functions can be objectively identified and symbols' power to resist to external manipulations can be described. In order to describe *deformations* and *deformation-resisting core* of symbols exactly, researcher must have a proper competence.

Kavolis uses no hermeneutic method in the analysis of culture's symbolism. He prefers other methods: in sociology of visual art stylistic analysis, in sociology of literature, civilization analysis and history of Lithuanian consciousness various species of structuralism and post-structuralism.

The preference for methods was dictated by the fact that the sociologist was interested not only in meanings, but also in formal elements of symbols. Probably, formal elements of symbols are the most intensively analyzed in sociology of visual art. It is devoted essentially to forms of artistic expression and their excellency's changes throughout the history. In sociology of literature, attention to structural elements of symbols weakens. Instead of forms of expression, semantic structure of literary work is inquired. Formal items are considered only so much as an inquiry into relations of *cognitive systems* making depth level of structure of literary work goes.

In civilization analysis, Kavolis inquires formal aspect of culture's symbolism with a new power. His inquiry focuses on *forms of relation*, one of the types of formal designs. Their conception is developed on the ground of synthesis of ideas of Formal School in sociology and structuralism. Forms of relation are models of structural relationship: on the symbolic level, they unite meanings into assemblages, and on the level of consciousness and behavior, they guarantee a coherence of experience.

Other types of formal designs, *forms of construction and forms of movement*, are treated as models of structural relationships, too. Really, they can be considered to be a model of structural relationships only on the level consciousness and behavior. Meanwhile, on the symbolic level, they are not. The both types of forms would be semantic units there. Forms of construction would correspond to theories of being, and forms of movement would be conceptions of biographical and collective time.

Interdisciplinarity is coded at the core of Kavolis sociology. It is constructed on the basis of theoretical and methodological presuppositions of three disciplines – of cultural sciences, psychology and sociology. Interdisciplinarity is expressed in Kavolis' sociology in two ways. The author seeks to use both theoretical and methodological resources of social sciences and humanities and their accumulated data. Kavolis' fields of research differ in their relative interest in theoretical and methodological resources or data.

Perhaps sociology of visual art is more interested in data. Postulated hypotheses on relationships between elements of artistic styles and socio-cultural factors are verified by the facts borrowed from sociology, history of art, history of culture and society, cultural anthropology and experimental psychology. Meanwhile, civilization analysis is most interested in theoretical and methodological resources of social sciences and humanities. These resources are handled in two ways. First, they are used in building a general theory of civilization. Second, they are foreseen for use in inquiry into historical civilizations and their dynamics as methodological tools.

Developing his social methodology, Kavolis solves not only the questions related to the method, but he deals with problems of selection of sources as well. Theoretically, he prefers an analysis of works of art. This preference is in operation not only in sociology of visual art and literature, where discipline's logic forces to do such preference itself, but also in cultural psychology, Lithuanian studies and civilization analysis. Practically, Kavolis analyses secondary sources, and not primary ones. Sociology of literature and Lithuanian studies are vivid exceptions in this context.