

Jadwiga Królikowska

A Comment on the Review of the Book "The Sociology of Charity"

Kultura i Edukacja nr 5, 163-164

2008

Artykuł został opracowany do udostępnienia w internecie przez Muzeum Historii Polski w ramach prac podejmowanych na rzecz zapewnienia otwartego, powszechnego i trwałego dostępu do polskiego dorobku naukowego i kulturalnego. Artykuł jest umieszczony w kolekcji cyfrowej bazhum.muzhp.pl, gromadzącej zawartość polskich czasopism humanistycznych i społecznych.

Tekst jest udostępniony do wykorzystania w ramach dozwolonego użytku.

issue of charity has turned out to be very interesting, the way it has been presented is inapt.

Aleksandra Zienko

Jadwiga Królikowska: A Comment on the Review of the Book "The Sociology of Charity"

The review of the book 'The Sociology of Charity' has been written in a very efficient way; one may not find it difficult to believe the Reviewer that she has written it when being irritated, and at the same time, she does cope with keeping the proper review form, especially as for matching the language and text technique. As far as the formal side is concerned, the text could be also (or maybe above all) written by a professor, the reason being that it differs, to a high extent, from the ones written by IV year students.

One can notice that there are two comment levels outlined in the review. In the first one the Author makes an analysis of the substantial quality of the work, the methodology, the depth of the researched institutions analysis, etc.

The Reviewer's evaluation seems to be completely positive. As for the background, the work is analysed in the perspective that can be named 'the only right ideology of the correct moderation'. The student claims that the work has been written in an incorrect perspective, and, this is the reason why, in spite of 'the excellent empiric research, the author's involvement, and very valuable de-

scriptions of the help centres operations, it is not a good work'. Furthermore, the Reviewer accuses the work that 'it is not objective, which is, as for the research works which the text is supposed to be, unacceptable'. The student may not be aware of the fact that in the west science today there is no the only 'objective paradigm' in social sciences, and if anyone thinks there is, he or she is in the minority. The postulated by the student methodological 'gold centre' may be of a meaning for a young man who wants to make a career, especially in politics, but for sure not in science. Nota bene, if the young career maker could force his scientific thesis in the public life, a thesis on 'the only right' vision of the social development, it must have had an influence on the fundamental re-shaping of the democratic debate and the dawn of several public disagreements. The west science, from time to time, undergoes some crisis of 'paradigms' in single disciplines, however, one cannot talk about 'the only right perspective', of which acceptance would influence our understanding of the scientific research freedom.

The student may be unaware of what really is 'the safe introduction' to the work in the PRL state, a work written from an incorrect (in those days bourgeois) perspective. In such an introduction one could sometimes find some published work of a west policy supporter, work including several pages and written according to a form, toutes proportions gardées – one which was accepted by a Reviewer in an efficient and spontaneous way. One should also praise several detailed thesis, pay attention to the

fact that the work broadens our knowledge on the searched reality, is of a high methodological level, etc., otherwise, there would be no use in publishing the novel. Furthermore, a considerable part of 'the safe introduction' was written in a perspective, so-called, 'meta'- methodological one which was criticised, in spite of the fact that it was often justified, to a high extent for its being disagreeable with the Marxists thesis, or, at least with its applying in the countries of real socialism on the given transformation level (which was described as the level of socialism development).

One may be surprised by the form of the presented review to the concept of the given 'safe introductions.' If the review of the work 'The Sociology of Charity' was written with the aim of its contradiction to the social policy of Charles Murrey or others, then one can say that it is senseless. The theses depicted in his works have become a subject to numerous discussions; the same has happened with other writers' works, and fundamental criticism. Similarly, one can find very extreme evaluations of Margaret Thatcher's social politics in social sciences. The theses that in the sociology of charity one does not accept libertarianism, neo-conservatism, or the fact that neo-liberalism theses are not an accusation, but at least an information on the perspective of which the work has been written, a perspective which is close to Stanisław Ossowski's policy, a person second to Florian Znaniecki Polish sociologist that influenced the west sociology, and is still present in all important old-English encyclopaedia elaborations, a soci-

ologist who is thought to be the classic of the sociology policy. The student has the right to be irritated with the accepted by me perspective. If it is to help her start the scientific work so as to create some theoretical bases for generalisations of different directions than 'The Sociology of Charity', than I could be satisfied with the work results.

I cannot leave out the fundamental for science ethical issue. In spite of what the reader may think, the 'safe introductions' do play a very vital and positive role. Although they had to be written in the agreement with the present ideology, they helped neutralise the censorship. They enabled scientific perspectives pluralism to develop, and support, though in a limited scope, the publication of the most important elaborations, notwithstanding the ideological option they would be qualified to by a watchful censor. However, what is the aim, in the present times, of the student's professor review, one which warns us against the improper ideological understanding.

Jadwiga Królikowska

Piotr Skuza (rev.): Jerzy Dudala, Fani-Chuligani. Rzecz o polskich kibolach. Studium socjologiczne [Fans-Hooligans: On Polish 'Kibole' A Sociological Study], "Żak", Warszawa 2004, pp. 234.

When reading a book of a journalist and supporter, a graduate of the Political Sciences of Śląski University and the doctor of humanistic sciences in sociology on the sport spectacle, I was accompanied by one