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試験開始の合図があるまで、この問題冊子を開いてはいけない。
次の英文を読み、以下の問いに答えなさい。

【1】下線部（2）を日本語に訳しなさい。

【2】下線部（3）を日本語に訳しなさい。

【3】下線部（4）を日本語に訳しなさい。

【4】本文全体の内容を要約しなさい。

【5】下線部（1）について、自身の研究テーマと関連づけながら、あなたの考えを簡潔に述べなさい。

Since its formal inception in the first half of the nineteenth century, sociology has been, generally implicitly, located in a tension or contradiction between becoming a science of particular nation-states and a science of global or universal processes. It developed ambiguously as both a science of the specific societies of the industrial world and as a science of humanity. Although the vocabulary of sociology is typically couched at a sufficiently abstract level to suggest that it is a science of universal social processes ('action', 'structuration', 'norm' or 'social system'), in practice sociology has been developed to explain and understand local or national destinies. From a sociology of knowledge point of view, we might be surprised if this nationalistic purpose were absent. Paradoxically, we might argue that the greater the sociologist, the more local the purpose, namely that sociology developed by means of brilliant insights into concrete issues of local capitalist development. I wish to explore these paradoxes through a commentary on certain classical sociologists, but the burden of this examination will focus on France and Germany up to the First World War.

Percy Bysshe Shelley once argued in his A Defence of Poetry in 1821 that poets were the 'hierophants of an unapprehended inspiration' because they possessed a superior imagination. Although I would not want to claim such heroic powers for sociologists, we should at least expect that sociology would reflect, if possible sooner rather than later, the major cultural tensions and developments of given societies. Since the modern world is itself subject to the contradictory tensions of globalization and localization, secularization and fundamentalization, of modernization and postmodernization, we should expect to see these contradictions reflected in the conceptual apparatus of sociology itself. My purpose in this chapter is therefore to examine the relationship between the emergence of a universalistic concept of citizenship and global notions of humanity and simultaneously to review the various ways in which sociology has been implicated in these global developments.

The idea that sociology is a product of the French and Industrial Revolutions, mediated by the three principal ideologies of modern politics (namely conservatism, liberalism and socialism) is controversial (Nisbet 1967). However, it does provide an initially useful paradigm for considering the argument that sociology embodies a tension between a global science of humanity and a 'local' discipline in the service of the nation-state. The problem is that, while sociology may have been a response to the universalistic implications of both revolutions, it became institutional-
ized, often within the context of the exponential growth of national higher education systems in the post-war period, under the auspices of the state. Is it a global science of humanity or implicitly the study of local structures of the national community? W. E. Moore (1966) deplored the decline of a tradition of European sociology which originally regarded the discipline as the study of humanity, and noted that the development of the world into a global system might bring about a revival of sociology with a global perspective. Moore identified a number of classical sociologists who clearly had a vision of global science (Ibn Khaldun, Comte, Durkheim and Spencer), but curiously enough neglected to discuss Claude-Henri de Saint-Simon (1760-1825). From the vantage point of the emerging (re)unification of Europe and increasing awareness of modern globality (Turner 1987a; Robertson and Chirico 1985), Saint-Simon's commentary on the relationship between industrialism and human globalization has proved to be extraordinarily prescient.

While this observation is introduced as an 'optimistic' observation on the limitations and prospects of sociology as a global science of humanity, it has also to be recognised how frequently sociology and sociologists have served entirely local causes. In Germany, sociology adapted relatively successfully to Nazi conditions (Rammstedt 1986); American sociology has been frequently co-opted to service nationalist foreign-policy objectives, as in the project Camelot affair; major sociology textbooks tend to exhibit local views of the content of the discipline (Coulson and Riddell 1970); and very few major sociologists have written about sociological problems in an international, let alone a global context. For example, Parsons's sociology is overshadowed by the dilemma of his overt commitment to American democratic values (Holton and Turner 1986) and his clear intention to write a general theory of action which would be relevant to the human commitment as such. Or to take a very different example, despite the global character of the analytical questions of Habermas's social philosophy, his comments on actual societies (which are in any case rather rare) tend to be parochial in their focus on Western capitalist societies (Habermas 1979).

In conclusion, we can expect a deluge of publications in the 1990s on fin-de-siècle everything. Martin Jay has to some extent paved the way prematurely perhaps with Fin-de-siècle Socialism (1988). There are in any case certainly some interesting parallels between 1890 and 1990. There is our sense of impending doom, this time ecological rather than militaristic. It would however be foolhardy to preclude the possibility of an ecological disaster. The greenhouse effect, the destruction of the ozone layer, the break-up of Eastern Europe, the AIDS epidemic, fundamentalist revivals in the world-religions, the greying of the industrial societies and world-wide religio-ethnic conflicts and communal violence offer a daunting picture of global catastrophe. Many versions of nihilism and/or cultural decadence are now on offer. The notion of the crisis of values, the rise of the masses and the isolation of the individual which was common as a theme in the 1890s may find a resonance today. Similarly, recent studies of the 'end of organised capitalism' (Lash and Urry 1987) might be compared (not with reference to their contents but to the scale of social change which they addressed) with Rudolf Meyer's Der Capitalismus fin de siècle of 1894. In our period, anxiety about the future has been summarized under the prefix 'post' as in postmodernism, post-historicism, post-Marxism, post-Fordism. I am assuming that even this uncertainty will give way to greater doubts, involving a comparison of our end-of-century existence with an absolutist Baroque culture.
Perhaps the crisis which drove intellectuals at the end of the nineteenth century into sociology, socialism and internationalism might, however, also find an echo in our own epoch. Durkheim's reflections on Saint-Simon's vision of the necessity for European integration, an end to English aggression against the European continent and a new science of humanity might be a valuable point of departure for contemporary social sciences to begin to engage (once again) with the tensions between our local concerns with national issues and our vocation, albeit underdeveloped and ill-defined, for a global sociology of humanity. At the very least, it would be an intellectual tragedy if the nationalistic and parochial politics of the Anglo-American world were to obscure the real possibilities which were opening up in the late 1980s with the re-unification of Germany and the democratization of Eastern Europe - possibilities which were not only anticipated but actually described by Henri Saint-Simon in his observations on the need for a European parliament in 1814.
