Pitirim A. Sorokin advocated an “integral” system of truth which would incorporate religious ideas in the epistemology and ontology of the social sciences. Several foundational ideas for this integral perspective are in the thought of St. Thomas Aquinas: (1) the view that truth is derived from the three sources of faith, reason, and the senses; (2) the last end of human beings, which is happiness; (3) virtue and vice; (4) free will, through which individuals exercise the capacity to choose. These ideas can be incorporated within the existing frame of reference of the social sciences. When appropriate, they can be formulated as value premises, concepts, propositions, and operational definitions. The writings of Sorokin and Aquinas are considered as foundational sources for the development of a comprehensive integral tradition in the social sciences.

Pitirim A. Sorokin is the most prolific scholar in the history of sociology. In the span of his six decade career he authored thirty-seven books and over four hundred articles. There are more than forty-two translations of his major writings. He was the first chairperson of the newly founded sociology department at Harvard University in 1930 and later became director of the Harvard Center for Creative Altruism. In 1965 Sorokin was elected President of the American Sociological Association.

Integralism is the foundation of Sorokin’s system of thought. The essence of integralism is the idea that there are three fundamental components of the true and absolute reality: the empirical-sensory; the rational-meaningful; and the supersensory-superrational. Sorokin advocated the development of an integral ontology and epistemology in the social sciences, maintaining that integralism was necessary for the advance of knowledge and understanding. An integral social science would be based upon empirical, rational, and supersensory sources of truth. It would thus include mystical intuition and revelation, thereby incorporating religious truth. Sorokin believed integralism would end the divisions between religion, philosophy, ethics, and science,
uniting their efforts in a common cause: “the unfolding of the Absolute in the relative empirical world, to the greater nobility of Man and to the greater glory of God.”

Several foundational ideas for developing an integral perspective are contained in the thought of St. Thomas Aquinas. This paper will identify some of these ideas and relate them to aspects of Sorokin’s thought and to the task of developing an integral tradition in the social sciences. The ideas of Aquinas are of singular importance in developing a distinctively Catholic tradition of integralism. Maritain notes that Aquinas’s philosophy is the philosophy of the Church, its teaching has been included among the prescriptions of Canon Law, and numerous popes over the centuries have advocated the primacy of his ideas. St. Thomas is “…the Doctor par excellence, he occupies an absolutely unique place.”

Integral Truth

Sorokin was probably inspired in his formulation of integralism by his knowledge of the ideas of Aquinas. In his graduate seminars at Harvard Sorokin frequently lauded Aquinas and often mentioned him within the context of his integral theory of truth and reality. The historical example of integralism is idealistic rationalism, because it incorporates faith, reason, and the senses in a harmonious system of truth. This philosophical school was characteristic of the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. in Greece in the writings of Plato and Aristotle, and in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries in the Scholastic philosophy of St. Albertus Magnus and St. Thomas Aquinas. Sorokin notes the accomplishments of the system of thought of Scholasticism, which rests on a synthesis of the three modes of cognition: “The harmonious blending of all these truths of faith, of senses (empiricism) and of reason gave the idealistic rationalism of the great Scholastics of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries the dominant position in that period. In it suum cuique is given to all these sources and to all the criteria of truth and knowledge.”

The integral nature of St. Thomas’ system of truth and knowledge is described by Sorokin: “Its essential tenets are: there are practically the three kinds of knowledge—sensory, intellectual, and superintellectual or divine.” From this foundation stems his method of presentation: “… St. Thomas’ manner of writing shows that his theory embraces all three forms of truth: in his demonstration, he uses the testimony of the organs of senses, the logic of reason, and, as a final evidence he does not fail to quote this or that statement from the Scripture and the Church Fathers. In almost every problem this method is followed.”
Aquinas’ thought about truth and the sciences contains several ideas which provide a model for developing an integral tradition in the contemporary social sciences. First of these is the idea of three basic sources of truth and knowledge, which is the foundation of Aquinas’ ontology and epistemology. Aquinas believed that the senses are the basic starting point of knowledge: “Our knowledge, taking its start from things, proceeds in this order. First, it begins in sense; second, it is completed in the intellect.”

In Aquinas’ view reason is necessary to interpret and categorize the empirical world observed through the senses: “Sense and imagination know only external accidents, but the intellect alone penetrates to the interior and to the essence of a thing. But even beyond this, the intellect, having perceived essences, operates in different ways by reasoning and inquiring.” Reason is not without error however: “The investigation of the human reason for the most part has falsity present within it, and this is due partly to the weakness of our intellect in judgement, and partly to the admixture of images.” Because of the limitations of reason “with the many truths that are demonstrated, there sometimes is mingled something that is false, which is not demonstrated but rather asserted on the basis of some probable or sophistical argument, which yet has the credit of being a demonstration.”

The truth of faith is foundational in the tripartite system. Aquinas maintains this form of knowledge has “...unshakable certitude and pure truth....” This mode of truth “... takes on faith its principles revealed by God.” The knowledge from this source is “exclusive” because “...it is about truth which comes through revelation, not through natural reasoning.” Natural reason plays an important part in explicating revealed truth. In this reasoning from revelation “...it is impossible that the truth of faith should be opposed to those principles that the human reason knows naturally.” In the case of the truth of faith, argument from authority is appropriate, with the primary source being canonical Scripture. Because of this authority of revealed truth “whatever arguments are brought forward against the doctrines of faith are conclusions incorrectly derived from the the first and self-evident principles imbedded in nature.” In his discussion of the different ways of knowing employed by the different sciences Aquinas provides an inclusive and succinct statement of the senses, reason, and faith as three methods of cognition:

The diversification of the sciences is brought about by the diversity of aspects under which things can be known. Both an astronomer and a physical scientist may demonstrate the same conclusion, for instance that the earth is spherical; the first, however, works in a mathematical medium prescinding from material qualities, while for the second his medium is the observation of material bodies through the senses. Accordingly there is nothing to stop the same things from being treated by the philosophical sciences when they can be
looked at in the light of natural reason and by another science when they are looked at in the light of divine revelation. Consequently the theology of holy teaching differs in kind from that theology which is looked at as a part of philosophy.27

St. Thomas’ analysis of Christian theology and its relation to the other sciences provides a further basis for considering the nature of an integral tradition in the social sciences. Following St. Thomas’ principle of organization, the content of the truth of faith is foundational. The truth of faith gives a basic unity to the social sciences, because their unique subject matters can all be considered from the perspective this source of truth provides: “Likewise different classes of objects separately treated by the diverse philosophical sciences can be combined by Christian theology which keeps its unity when all of them are brought into the same focus and pictured in the field of divine revelation.”28 Further, Aquinas maintains ideas contained in the truth of faith can be related to diverse phenomena and to different scientific approaches: “...the holy teaching while remaining single nevertheless embraces things belonging to the different philosophical sciences because of the one formal meaning which is its interest in all manner of things, namely the truth they bear in the light of God. Whereas some among the philosophical sciences are theoretical and others are practical, sacred doctrine takes over both functions...”.29

Aquinas’ ideas suggest that through the truth of faith a common practical end for all of the social sciences is identified: “Now in so far as sacred doctrine is a practical science, its aim is eternal happiness, and this is the final end governing the ends of all the practical sciences.”30 For humans beings to be able to attain this end which God has ordained for them it is necessary “for our welfare that divine truths surpassing reason should be signified to us through revelation.”31 These truths are thus the source for identifying the practical ends of integral social science.

The concept of integralism found in the writings of Aquinas and Sorokin provides an ontology and epistemology which unites the social sciences in building a new theoretical and research tradition. Sorokin maintains that the combination of the three modes of cognition of faith, reason, and empiricism into one harmonious system gives the closest possible approximation to the absolute truth. This is because this integral system provides for a mutual verification which can contribute to a more valid and more adequately tested truth than can any one of the three modes by itself.32 Similarly, Furfey contends that the objective and quantitative methods of science, philosophical analysis, and divine revelation each make a unique contribution to knowledge and understanding.33 Hence, all three are regarded as necessary to most fully understand sociological phenomena. St. Thomas’s system of thought clearly
dictates that the truth of faith is foundational in an integral tradition. Through the use of reason revealed truth can be used as a source for formulating a series of assumptions which can be taken as certain. Ideas derived from these assumptions can be used to identify the purpose of integral social science, specify and give an order of priority to the topics to be studied, suggest propositions that can be tested, and provide the source for concepts which can be operationalized. As noted by Montes the grounding of social science in revealed truth provides a certitude and direction not otherwise possible. It also gives the foundation for developing an integrated social science which is consistent in its various aspects with these principles of faith, as advocated by Barilleaux. Important among these principles are those ideas which give a sense of direction and purpose to the scientific enterprise.

Last End of Universal Good

The social sciences advance knowledge and understanding by developing valid scientific generalizations. Cumulation of the findings of theoretically embedded research is necessary for this to proceed optimally. This end can most effectively be pursued through the concentration of scientific endeavor on a relatively small number of concepts and variables which have wide applicability in different disciplines and fields. In an integral tradition the truth of faith provides the rationale for concentration on particular topics and identifies central concepts and variables. It also provides justification for the criteria of good, thus basing value premises of the desirable and undesirable in the certainty of revealed truth.

The practice of social science involves operations within a continuum ranging from the metaphysical to the empirical. The metaphysical component of this continuum includes statements of the desirable or good. These value premises are instrumental in both the selection of problems for study and the evaluation of results. As noted by Varacalli such metaphysical assumptions are inevitable in social science, and the use of faith based ideas is no more methodologically problematic than ideas based on some other metaphysics. Barilleaux maintains that when value premises are derived from religious truth they provide the means for a more adequate and complete analysis of many problems because they provide definitive standards for judging the propriety of both means and ends.

St. Thomas’ conception of the last end of human beings and the realization of their universal good in this end provides a basic value premise in the integral tradition. In his view, there is a single last end for human activity and for the life of humans: “That in which a man rests as in his last end, is master of his affections, since he takes therefrom his entire rule of life... Now
according to Matth. vi 24, *no man can serve two masters*, such namely, as are not
ordained to one another. Therefore it is impossible for one man to have several
last ends not ordained to one another.*⁴⁰* In order for this end to be correctly
viewed as a final one, it must completely fulfill all longings and strivings: “It is
therefore necessary for the last end so to fill man's appetite, that nothing is left
besides it for man to desire. Which is not possible, if something else be required
for his perfection.” ⁴¹

St. Thomas maintains the last end is happiness, “which all men
desire...” ⁴² In terms of goal directed human activity “...happiness means the
acquisition of the last end.”⁴³ The happiness of human beings does not consist
of wealth, honors, fame or glory, power, some good of the body, pleasure, any
good of the soul, or any created good.⁴⁴ None of these ends are satisfactory,
because they provide at best only partial satisfactions. Something else is
necessary for the last end:

For happiness is the perfect good, which lulls the appetite altogether;
else it would not be the last end, if something yet remained to be
desired. Now the object of the will, i.e., of man's appetite, is the
universal good; just as the object of the intellect is the universal true.
Hence it is evident that naught can lull man's will, save the universal
good. This is to be found, not in any creature, but in God alone: because
every creature has goodness by participation. Wherefore God alone can
satisfy the will of man, according to the words of Ps. cii. 5: *Who satisfieth
thy desire with good things.* Therefore God alone constitutes man's
happiness.⁴⁵

Aquinas notes that human beings can progress toward this end by their
activities and the way they live their lives: “For man and other rational creatures
attain to their last end by knowing and loving God:...” ⁴⁶ Some happiness can
be achieved in this manner: “...but perfect and true happiness cannot be had in
this life.”⁴⁷ The last end can be fully realized only after death: “Final and perfect
happiness can consist in nothing else than the vision of the Divine Essence.”⁴⁸
In this state “...man's mind will be united to God by one, continual operation.”⁴⁹

The means to achieving the imperfect happiness of this life and the
state of humans in happiness in the next life are the same: “Rectitude of the will
is necessary for Happiness both antecedently and concomitantly. Antecedently,
because rectitude of the will consists in being duly ordered to the last end...Concomitantly, because...Final Happiness consists in the vision of the
Divine Essence, Which is the very essence of goodness. So that the will of him
who sees the Essence of God, of necessity, loves, whatever he loves, in
subordination to God;...”⁵⁰ Both the happiness of this life and the attainment
of the last end of eternal happiness are “...obtained through works”.⁵¹ The
imperfect happiness of this life “...can be acquired by man by his natural powers, in the same way as virtue, in whose operation it consists:...”. This happiness is regarded by Aquinas as an “operation” which is the “supreme perfection” for human beings. It is obtained through the rightness of will which is manifested in the practice of virtue: “The Philosopher says (Ethic i. 13) that happiness is an operation according to perfect virtue”.

**Virtue and Vice**

A frame of reference which defines the subject matter provides a basis for the scientific enterprise. The common frame of reference of the social sciences, originally articulated by Sorokin, is culture, society, and personality. All of the social sciences study the characteristics of the reality these concepts represent. They also study the interrelationships between these three systems and their components. Integralism interjects value premises, concepts, variables, and propositions regarding interrelationships which are derived from the truth of faith into this frame of reference at different levels of the scientific continuum.

There are two types of concepts which can be derived from the truth of faith in the integral system: “pure” faith concepts, which do not appear to have empirical referents, and other concepts which do have them. Pure faith concepts such as eternal happiness are on the metaphysical end of the scientific continuum. Some of them can serve as value premises of the desirable in the integral tradition of social science. While not within the scope of empirical science, such concepts can be related logically to other concepts which can be studied within the frame of reference of culture, society, and personality. For example, eternal happiness is linked to the practice of the virtues. While eternal happiness cannot be studied empirically, the means to attain it, the practice of virtue, can be. Thus through the study of the virtues social science can indirectly increase knowledge and understanding of how eternal happiness can be attained.

In Aquinas’ thought the virtues are directly related as cause to effect to the attainment of eternal happiness: “...the principle of the spiritual life, which is a life in accord with virtue, is the order to the last end...”. The virtues bear this relation to the last end and universal good of humans because “...virtue is that which makes its possessor good, and his work good likewise...”. This goodness in turn stems from the fact that “the goodness of a thing consists in its being well disposed according to the mode of its nature...”. The cause of virtue is “...the subordination of the appetite to reason, or to the immutable good which is God...”. Virtues are habits which produce acts which are “...nothing else than the good use of free-will”.
Aquinas’ classification of the virtues includes the cardinal virtues, which are moral virtues, and the theological virtues. The moral virtues are further classified into primary and secondary, with secondary virtues being more specific applications of the essence of a given primary virtue. Five virtues are particularly important for the social sciences: temperance, fortitude, justice, charity, and prudence. When these virtues are further specified by their secondary virtues they provide a comprehensive enumeration of potential variations in human behavior. In this sense the concept of virtue constitutes a potentially powerful addition to theoretical development and empirical research.

Turner and Turner note that since its earliest history there have been scientific, reform, and practical traditions within the discipline of sociology. Sorokin’s system of sociology is a comprehensive one which includes an emphasis on all three of these traditions. In his focus on social reform, its nature and the practical means of accomplishing it, Sorokin emphasized the importance of altruistic love. Altruistic love is benevolent love in more classical terminology. This benevolent love of true friendship is described by both Aristotle and Aquinas. This love can be conceptualized as virtue because the virtues enumerate the elements necessary for its fullest expression across diverse social situations. The systems of thought of both Aquinas and Sorokin thus converge on the importance of benevolent love both in human life and society and as a subject of systematic scientific investigation.

In both nature and effect “…vice is contrary to virtue. Now the virtue of a thing consists in its being well disposed in a manner befitting its nature…Hence the vice of a thing consists in it being disposed in a manner not befitting its nature…” Vice is a disposition contrary to the good of human nature, while “sin is nothing else than a bad human act.”

The capital vices are vainglory, envy, anger, sloth, covetousness, gluttony, and lust. St. Thomas further explains that pride is the beginning of every sin, because “pride regards sin as turning away from God, to whose commandment man refuses to be subject, for which reason it is called the beginning, because the beginning of evil consists in turning away from God.” Sin is a “wounding” of human nature: “…through sin, the reason is obscured, especially in practical matters, the will hardened to evil, good actions become more difficult, and concupiscence more impetuous.” Although all individuals desire the last end of happiness, because of the nature and effects of sin, “those who sin turn from that in which their last end really consists:…”

The truth of faith identifies and establishes the virtues and vices as fundamental typologies of attitudes and behaviors. Vitz maintains “an agreed upon and broadly relevant and comprehensive basic moral framework” which is systematically articulated is necessary for integrating religious ideas with the science of psychology. He further asserts that Catholic moral theology has
these characteristics and the specific content and internal consistency to provide this framework. Within the integral perspective, the virtues and vices are an important part of this framework for psychology and for all the other social sciences. By the choice between virtue and vice individuals essentially choose good or evil. Both are thus directly related to the ultimate end and good of human beings. The task of integral social science is thus to provide knowledge and understanding of both the causes and the effects of the virtues and the vices in relation to the lives of individuals and the characteristics of society and culture. A particular focus in this regard, expressed in the writings of Aquinas, is the relation of the virtues and vices to happiness.

Free Will

Another foundational idea for integral social science in the thought of St. Thomas is free will. Varacalli maintains the idea that human beings have free will is one of the fundamental first principles of a social science perspective based on faith. Aquinas notes that free will is a power by which “man acts from judgement, because by his apprehensive power he judges that something should be avoided or sought.” Free will inherently entails choice: “The proper act of free-will is choice: for we say that we have a free-will because we can take one thing while refusing another; and this is to choose.”

Individuals have the capacity to choose between good and evil, and this choice is a recurrent variable in the course of the life history of every individual. The idea of original sin places this choice in the context of a human nature which has tendencies to turn away from the good. In Aquinas’ view original sin “… is an inordinate disposition of nature…” It consists formally of “…the privation of original justice, whereby the will was made subject to God…” and of “…inordinateness of the other powers of the soul…” manifested in “…their turning inordinately to mutable good; which inordinateness may be called by the general name of concupiscence.”

These faith based perspectives focus social science theory and research on the choices individuals make in different situational contexts and on levels of analysis ranging from micro to macro. Faith also indicates the choice of virtue or vice is of primary concern, since it is linked with both earthly and eternal happiness. This focus on choice is consistent with a variety of perspectives in the social sciences such as symbolic interactionism, phenomenology, rational choice, and structuration theories. At the most general level, the basic research question is determining the psychological, social, and cultural sources and mechanisms of the choice of virtue and of the avoidance of vice.

This emphasis on choice as a subject of the scientific enterprise is also consistent with Sorokin’s views regarding reconstruction. He maintained the
“indivisible unity” of culture, society, and personality means all three must be changed to effect meaningful positive change. However, the change of society and culture to a more peaceful and equitable order must begin with the altruistic transformation of individuals. Only on this basis of higher levels of benevolent love on the part of individuals can effective social and cultural change be established and maintained. This is because social groups and their cultures are ultimately the product of “...millions of trifling individual deeds.” Sorokin’s perspective thus focuses attention on the importance of furthering knowledge and understanding of how individual choices and actions which manifest benevolent love cumulate to create social and cultural structures.

Conclusion

In a Catholic tradition of integralism the Old Testament, New Testament, and the traditions of the church as interpreted by the Magisterium are foundational sources for the truth of faith. The ideas contained in the writings of St. Thomas provide a set of concepts and assumptions which can be logically linked to these foundational sources. Ideas such as integral truth, the end of happiness, virtue, vice, original sin, and free will thus provide part of the “conceptual architecture” Varacalli has noted is necessary for developing a social science tradition grounded in religious truth. There are other ideas in St. Thomas writings which are potentially valuable additions to an integral perspective. Among these are evil, disposition, habit, and his analysis of law, including the nature of eternal law, natural law, and human law, and their interrelationships. Once such ideas are identified they can be appropriately formulated and incorporated within the existing frame of reference of the social sciences as value premises, concepts, propositions, and operational definitions.

The ideas of Sorokin provide an explicit formulation of integralism as a system of truth, place it within the context of contemporary science and this historical era, and provide a frame of reference within which it can be applied to all the social sciences. The ideas of St. Thomas provide the foundational ideas which give specific content to the truth of faith within this integral perspective. From these two sources a viable integral tradition can be developed in the social sciences.

The historical moment. Sorokin believed that the most basic characteristic of the contemporary historical era is the disintegration of the prevailing sensate culture. This culture is based on the idea that reality and value are centered in the empirical and material. Included in the disintegration of this culture is the system of truth and knowledge, that compartment of culture which includes the sciences. In the 1930’s Sorokin noted the growth of criticism and skepticism and the increasing lack of certitude in a sensate science which largely excludes any knowledge not verified through empirical
methods. This forecast has been increasingly realized in recent years. Numerous scholars have commented on problems in contemporary sociology such as lack of cumulation, social fragmentation and lack of common purpose, epistemological skepticism, lack of consensus on fundamental theoretical and methodological issues, and ideological advocacy. Similar concerns of scholars in the other social sciences are recounted by Levine.

The disintegration of sensate social science defines the present historical moment. Now is the time to develop and promulgate the different approach of integralism, rejecting the narrow and inadequate system of truth and knowledge of sensate ontology and epistemology. Aquila maintains that the state of dissatisfaction within contemporary social science and the lack of unity on either theoretical or methodological principles provides an opening for the development of an approach founded on religious truth. Sorokin’s description of what is likely to occur as a system of truth disintegrates to the crises point now reached in the social sciences supports this contention: “The boundary lines between knowledge and non-knowledge thus are bound to become less and less clear. When this situation approaches, man is likely to prefer out of two als obs the one which gives him firmer certitude and the one which happens to be more fascinating, more ennobling, more elevating, and more imaginative, or better adapted to the emotional status. In such circumstances the truth of the senses can easily give way to a truth of faith.”

Integral science and change. Krason has stressed the importance of reconstruction as an aim of social science. Sorokin’s theory of change provides insight on how social science contributes to this aim. Sorokin maintained that the foundation of any culture is the basic premise pertaining to the nature of reality. This aspect of culture is most centrally located in a culture’s system of truth and knowledge, which includes its predominant conceptions of science, philosophy, and religion. Because this compartment of culture is most important in defining the definition of reality, Sorokin believed that changing the system of truth and knowledge is the most effective way of changing the entire cultural system. On this basis the development of an integral tradition in the social sciences facilitates and contributes to more basic social and cultural change toward the establishment of an integral, or idealistic, culture. The characteristics of this culture are described by Sorokin:

A large proportion of human aspirations tend to be channeled in the direction of the rational and superrational perennial values of the Kingdom of God, of fuller truth, nobler goodness, and sublimed beauty. The very nature of these values is impersonal and universal, altruistic and ennobling. As these values are infinite and inexhaustible, the quest for them does not lead to egoistic conflicts. Hence, the replacement of the major premise of sensate culture by the fundamentally different one which I designate as the idealistic premise, is the most fundamental step toward the establishment of a creative, harmonious order.
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