ring in conjunction with social mobility, there are ready-made interpretative schemes that explain what has happened to all concerned *without* positing a total metamorphosis of the individual concerned. Thus the parents of such an upwardly mobile individual will accept certain changes in the latter's demeanour and attitudes as a necessary, possibly even desirable, accompaniment of his new station in life. 'Of course', they will agree, Irving has had to de-emphasize his Jewishness now that he has become a successful doctor in suburbia; 'of course' he dresses and speaks differently; 'of course' he now votes Republican; 'of course' he married a Vassar girl – and perhaps it will also become a matter of course that he only rarely comes to visit his parents. Such interpretative schemes, which are ready-made in a society with high upward mobility and already internalized by the individual before he himself is actually mobile, guarantee biographical continuity and smooth inconsistencies as they arise.[30]

Similar procedures take place in situations where transformations are fairly radical but defined as temporary in duration – for example, in training for short-term military service or in cases of short-term hospitalization.[31] Here the difference from full re-socialization is particularly easy to see – by comparing what happens with training for career military service or with the socialization of chronic patients. In the former instances, consistency with the previous reality and identity (existence as a civilian or as a healthy person) is already posited by the assumption that one will eventually return to these.

Broadly speaking, one may say that the procedures involved are of opposite character. In re-socialization the past is reinterpreted to conform to the present reality, with the tendency to retroject into the past various elements that were subjectively unavailable at the time. In secondary socialization the present is interpreted so as to stand in a continuous relationship with the past, with the tendency to minimize such transformations as have actually taken place. Put differently, the reality-base for re-socialization is the present, for secondary socialization the past.

2. Internalization and Social Structure

Socialization always takes place in the context of a specific social structure. Not only its contents but also its measure of 'success' have social-structural conditions and social-structural consequences. In other words, the micro-sociological or social-psychological analysis of phenomena of internalization must always have as its background a macro-sociological understanding of their structural aspects.[32]

On the level of theoretical analysis attempted here we cannot enter into a detailed discussion of the different empirical relationships between the contents of socialization and social-structural configurations.[33] Some general observations may, however, be made on the social-structural aspects of the 'success' of socialization. By 'successful socialization' we mean the establishment of a high degree of symmetry between objective and subjective reality (as well as identity, of course). Conversely, 'unsuccessful socialization' is to be understood in terms of asymmetry between objective and subjective reality. As we have seen, totally successful socialization is anthropologically impossible. Totally unsuccessful socialization is, at the very least, extremely rare, limited to cases of individuals with whom even minimal socialization fails because of extreme organic pathology. Our analysis must, therefore, be concerned with gradations on a continuum whose extreme poles are empirically unavailable. Such analysis is useful because it permits some general statements about the conditions and consequences of successful socialization.

Maximal success in socialization is likely to occur in societies with very simple division of labour and minimal distribution of knowledge. Socialization under such conditions produces identities that are socially predefined and profiled to a high degree. Since every individual is confronted with essentially

the same institutional programme for his life in the society, the total force of the institutional order is brought to bear with more or less equal weight on each individual, producing a compelling massivity for the objective reality to be internalized. Identity then is highly profiled in the sense of representing fully the objective reality within which it is located. Put simply, everyone pretty much *is* what he is supposed to be. In such a society identities are easily recognizable, objectively and subjectively. Everybody knows who everybody else is and who he is himself. A knight *is* a knight and a peasant *is* a peasant, to others as well as to themselves. There is, therefore, no *problem* of identity. The question, 'Who am I?' is unlikely to arise in consciousness, since the socially predefined answer is massively real subjectively and consistently confirmed in all significant social interaction. This by no means implies that the individual is happy with his identity. It was probably never very agreeable to be a peasant, for instance. To be a peasant entailed problems of all sorts, subjectively real, pressing and far from happiness-producing. It did *not* entail the problem of identity. One was a miserable, perhaps even a rebellious peasant. But one *was* a peasant. Persons formed under such conditions are unlikely to conceive of themselves in terms of 'hidden depths', in a psychological sense. 'Surface' and 'under-the-surface' selves are differentiated only in terms of the range of subjective reality present to consciousness in any given moment, not in terms of a permanent differentiation of 'layers' of the self. For example, the peasant apprehends himself in one role as he is beating his wife and in another as he cringes before his lord. In each case, the other role is 'under the surface', that is, not attended to in the peasant's consciousness. But neither role is posited as a 'deeper' or 'more real' self. In other words, the individual in such a society not only is what he is supposed to be, but he is that in a unified, 'unstratified' way.[34]

Under such conditions unsuccessful socialization occurs only as a result of biographical accidents, either biological or social. For example, a child's primary socialization may be impaired because of a physical deformity that is socially stigmatized or because of a stigma based on social definitions.[35] The cripple and the bastard are prototypes of these two cases.

There is also the possibility of socialization being intrinsically prevented by biological handicaps, as in the case of extreme mental deficiency. All these cases have the character of individual misfortune. They do not provide the ground for the institutionalization of counter-identities and counter-reality. Indeed, this fact provides the measure of misfortune present in such biographies. In a society of this kind, the individual cripple or bastard has virtually no subjective defence against the stigmatic identity assigned to him. He *is* what he is supposed to be, to himself as to his significant others and to the community as a whole. To be sure, he may react to this fate with resentment or rage, but it is *qua* inferior being that he is resentful or enraged. His resentment and rage may even serve as decisive ratifications of his socially defined identity as an inferior being, since his betters, by definition, are above these brutish emotions. He is imprisoned in the objective reality of his society, although that reality is subjectively present to him in an alien and truncated manner. Such an individual will be unsuccessfully socialized, that is, there will be a high degree of asymmetry between the socially defined reality in which he is *de facto* caught, as in an alien world, and his own subjective reality, which reflects that world only very poorly. The asymmetry will, however, have no cumulative structural consequences because it lacks a social base within which it could crystallize into a counter-world, with its own institutionalized cluster of counter-identities. The unsuccessfully socialized individual himself is socially predefined as a profiled type – the cripple, the bastard, the idiot, and so on. Consequently, whatever contrary self-identifications may at times arise in his own consciousness lack any plausibility structure that would transform them into something more than ephemeral fantasies.

Incipient counter-definitions of reality and identity are present as soon as any such individuals congregate in socially durable groups. This triggers a process of change that will introduce a more complex distribution of knowledge. A counter-reality may now begin to be objectivated in the marginal group of the unsuccessfully socialized. At this point, of course, the group will initiate its own socialization processes. For example, lepers and the offspring of lepers may be stigmatized in a society. Such stigmatization may be limited to

those physically afflicted with the disease, or it may include others by social definition – say, anyone born in an earthquake. Thus individuals may be defined as lepers from birth, and this definition may severely affect their primary socialization – say, under the auspices of a crazy old woman, who keeps them physically alive beyond the confines of the community and transmits to them a bare minimum of the community's institutional traditions. As long as such individuals, even if they number more than a handful, do not form a counter-community of their own, both their objective and subjective identities will be predefined in accordance with the community's institutional programme for them. They will *be* lepers, and nothing else.

The situation begins to change when there is a leper colony sufficiently large and durable to serve as a plausibility structure for counter-definitions of reality – and of the fate of being a leper. To be a leper, be it in terms of biological or social assignment, may now be known as the special mark of divine election. The individuals prevented from fully internalizing the reality of the community may now be socialized into the counter-reality of the lepers' colony; that is, unsuccessful socialization into one social world may be accompanied by successful socialization into another. At any early stage of such a process of change the crystallization of counter-reality and counter-identity may be hidden from the knowledge of the larger community, which still predefines and ongoingly identifies these individuals as lepers, and nothing else. It does not know that, 'really', they are the special sons of the gods. At this point an individual assigned to the leper category may discover 'hidden depths' within himself. The question 'Who am I?' becomes possible simply because two conflicting answers are socially available – the crazy old woman's ('You are a leper') and that of the colony's own socializing personnel ('You are a son of god'). As the individual accords a privileged status within his consciousness to the colony's definitions of reality and of himself, a rupture occurs between his 'visible' conduct in the larger community and his 'invisible' self-identification as someone quite different. In other words, a cleavage appears between 'appearance' and 'reality' in the individual's self-apprehension. He no longer is what he is supposed to be. He *acts* the leper – he *is* a son of god. If we are to push the example one step further, to the point when this cleavage becomes known to the non-leprous community, it is not difficult to see that the community's reality, too, will be affected by this change. Minimally, it will no longer be so easy to recognize the identity of those defined as lepers – one will no longer be sure whether an individual so defined identifies himself in the same way or not. Maximally, it will no longer be an easy matter to recognize anybody's identity – for if lepers can refuse to be what they are supposed to be, so can others; perhaps, so can oneself. If this process appears fanciful at first, it is beautifully illustrated by Gandhi's designation of *harijans*, that is, 'children of God', for the outcastes of Hinduism.

Once there is a more complex distribution of knowledge in a society, unsuccessful socialization may be the result of different significant others mediating different objective realities to the individual. Put differently, unsuccessful socialization may be the result of heterogeneity in the socializing personnel. This may occur in a number of ways. There may be situations in which all the significant others of primary socialization mediate a common reality, but from considerably different perspectives. To a degree, of course, every significant other has a different perspective on the common reality simply by virtue of being a specific individual with a specific biography. But the consequences we have in mind here occur only when the differences between the significant others pertain to their social types rather than their individual idiosyncrasies. For example, men and women may 'inhabit' considerably different social worlds in a society. If both men and women function as significant others in primary socialization, they mediate these discrepant realities to the child. This by itself does not raise the threat of unsuccessful socialization. The male and female versions of reality are socially recognized, and this recognition, too, is transmitted in primary socialization. Thus there is a predefined dominance of the male version for the male child and of the female version for the female. The child will *know* the version appertaining to the other sex, to the extent that it has been mediated to him by the significant others of the other sex, but he will not *identify* with this version. Even minimal distribution of knowledge posits specific jurisdictions for the different

versions of the common reality. In the above case the female version is socially defined as having no jurisdiction over the male child. Normally, this definition of the 'proper place' of the reality of the other sex is internalized by the child, who 'properly' identifies with the reality to which he has been assigned.

However, 'abnormality' becomes a biographical possibility if a certain competition exists between reality-definitions, raising the possibility of choosing between them. For a variety of biographical reasons the child may make the 'wrong choice'. For example, a male child may internalize 'improper' elements of the female world because his father is absent during the crucial period of primary socialization and it is administered exclusively by his mother and three older sisters. They may mediate the 'proper' jurisdictional definitions to the little boy so that he *knows* he is not supposed to live in the women's world. But he may nevertheless *identify* with it. His resulting 'effeminacy' may be either 'visible' or 'invisible'. In either case, there will be asymmetry between his social identity-assignment and his subjectively real identity.[36]

Obviously a society will supply therapeutic mechanisms to take care of such 'abnormal' cases. We need not reiterate here what has been said about therapy, except to stress that the need for therapeutic mechanisms increases in proportion to the structurally given potentiality for unsuccessful socialization. In the example just discussed, at the very least the successfully socialized children will put pressure on the 'wrong' ones. As long as there is no fundamental conflict between the mediated definitions of reality, but only differences between versions of the same common reality, the chances for successful therapy are good.

Unsuccessful socialization may also result from the mediation of acutely discrepant worlds by significant others during primary socialization. As the distribution of knowledge becomes more complex, discrepant worlds become available and may be mediated by different significant others in primary socialization. This happens less frequently than the situation just discussed, in which versions of the same common world are distributed among the socializing personnel, because individuals (say, a married couple) sufficiently cohesive as a

group to take on the task of primary socialization are likely to have concocted some sort of common world between them. It does occur, however, and is of considerable theoretical interest.

For example, a child may be raised not only by his parents but also by a nurse recruited from an ethnic or class subsociety. The parents mediate to the child the world of, say, a conquering aristocracy of one race; the nurse mediates the world of a subjugated peasantry of another race. It is even possible that the two mediations employ completely different languages, which the child learns simultaneously but which the parents and the nurse find mutually unintelligible. In such a case, of course, the parental world will have dominance by predefinition. The child will be recognized by all concerned and by himself as belonging to his parents' group and not his nurse's. All the same, the predefinition of the respective jurisdictions of the two realities may be upset by various biographical accidents, just as it may in the first situation discussed, except that now unsuccessful socialization entails the possibility of alternation internalized as a permanent feature of the individual's subjective self-apprehension. The choice potentially available to the child now is more profiled, involving different worlds rather than different versions of the same world. Needless to say, in practice there will be many gradations between the first and second situations.

When acutely discrepant worlds are mediated in primary socialization, the individual is presented with a choice of profiled identities apprehended by him as genuine biographical possibilities. He may become a man as understood by race *A* or as understood by race *B*. This is when the possibility of a truly hidden identity, not readily recognizable in accordance with the objectively available typifications, appears. In other words, there may be a socially concealed asymmetry between 'public' and 'private' biography. As far as the parents are concerned, the child is now ready for the preparatory phase of knighthood. Unknown to them, but sustained by the plausibility structure supplied by his nurse's sub-society, the child himself is 'only playing at' this process, while 'really' preparing himself for initiation into the higher religious mysteries of the subjugated group. Similar discrepancies occur in contemporary society between the socialization processes in the

family and in the peer group. As far as the family is concerned, the child is ready for graduation from junior high school. As far as the peer group is concerned, he is ready for his first serious test of courage by stealing an automobile. It goes without saying that such situations are fraught with possibilities of internal conflict and guilt.

Presumably all men, once socialized, are potential 'traitors to themselves'. The internal problem of such 'treason', however, becomes much more complicated if it entails the further problem of *which* 'self' is being betrayed at any particular moment, a problem posited as soon as identification with different significant others includes different generalized others. The child is betraying his parents as he prepares for the mysteries and his nurse as he trains for knighthood, just as he betrays his peer group by being a 'square' young scholar and his parents by stealing an automobile, with each betrayal concomitant with 'treason to himself' in so far as he has identified with the two discrepant worlds. We have discussed the various options open to him in our previous analysis of alternation, although it will be clear that these options have a different subjective reality when they are already internalized in primary socialization. It is safe to assume that alternation remains a lifelong threat to whatever subjective reality emerges from such conflict as the result of whatever options, a threat posited once and for all with the introduction of the alternating possibility into primary socialization itself.

The possibility of 'individualism' (that is, of individual choice between discrepant realities and identities) is directly linked to the possibility of unsuccessful socialization. We have argued that unsuccessful socialization opens up the question of 'Who am I?' In the social-structural context in which unsuccessful socialization becomes so recognized, the same question arises for the *successfully* socialized individual by virtue of his reflection about the unsuccessfully socialized. He will sooner or later encounter those with 'hidden selves', the 'traitors', those who have alternated or are alternating between discrepant worlds. By a kind of mirror effect the question may come to apply to himself, first according to the formula 'There, but for the grace of God, go I', eventually perhaps by the formula 'If they, why not I?' This opens a Pandora's box

of 'individualistic' choices, which eventually become generalized regardless of whether one's biographical course was determined by the 'right' or the 'wrong' choices. The 'individualist' emerges as a specific social type who has at least the potential to migrate between a number of available worlds and who has deliberately and awarely constructed a self out of the 'material' provided by a number of available identities.

A third important situation leading to unsuccessful socialization arises when there are discrepancies between primary and secondary socialization. The unity of primary socialization is maintained, but in secondary socialization, alternative realities and identities appear as subjective options. The options are, of course, limited by the social-structural context of the individual. For example, he may want to become a knight, but his social position makes this a foolish ambition. When secondary socialization has been differentiated to the point where subjective disidentification from one's 'proper place' in society becomes possible, and when at the same time the social structure does not permit the realization of the subjectively chosen identity, an interesting development occurs. The subjectively chosen identity becomes a fantasy identity, objectified within the individual's consciousness as his 'real self'. It may be assumed that people always have dreams of impossible wish-fulfilment, and the like. The peculiarity of this particular fantasy lies in the objectification, on the level of imagination, of an identity other than the one objectively assigned and previously internalized in primary socialization. It is obvious that any wider distribution of this phenomenon will introduce tensions and unrest into the social structure, threatening the institutional programmes and their taken-for-granted reality.

Another very important consequence when there is discrepancy between primary and secondary socialization is the possibility that the individual may have a relationship to discrepant worlds qualitatively different from the relationships in the previously discussed situations. If discrepant worlds appear in primary socialization, the individual has the option of identifying with one of them as against the others, a process that, because it occurs in primary socialization, will be affectively charged to a high degree. Identification, disidentification and alternation will all be accompanied by affective crises, since

they will invariably depend upon the mediation of significant others. The appresentation of discrepant worlds in secondary socialization produces an entirely different configuration. In secondary socialization, internalization need *not* be accompanied by affectively charged identification with significant others; the individual may internalize different realities *without* identifying with them. Therefore, if an alternative world appears in secondary socialization, the individual may opt for it in a manipulative manner. One could speak here of 'cool' alternation. The individual internalizes the new reality, but instead of its being *his* reality, it is a reality to be used by him for specific purposes. In so far as this involves the performance of certain roles, he retains subjective detachment *vis-à-vis* them – he 'puts them on' deliberately and purposefully. If this phenomenon becomes widely distributed, the institutional order as a whole begins to take on the character of a network of reciprocal manipulations.[37]

A society in which discrepant worlds are generally available on a market basis entails specific constellations of subjective reality and identity. There will be an increasingly general consciousness of the relativity of *all* worlds, including one's own, which is now subjectively apprehended as '*a* world', rather than '*the* world'. It follows that one's own institutionalized conduct may be apprehended as 'a role' from which one may detach oneself in one's own consciousness, and which one may 'act out' with manipulative control. For example, the aristocrat no longer simply *is* an aristocrat, but he *plays at being* an aristocrat, and so forth. The situation, then, has a much more far-reaching consequence than the possibility of individuals playing at being what they are *not* supposed to be. They also play at being what they *are* supposed to be – a quite different matter. This situation is increasingly typical of contemporary industrial society, but it would obviously transcend the scope of our present considerations to enter further into a sociology-of-knowledge and social-psychological analysis of this constellation.[38] What should be stressed is that such a situation cannot be understood unless it is ongoingly related to its social-structural context, which follows logically from the necessary relationship between the social division of labour (with its consequences for social structure) and the social distribution of knowledge (with its consequences for the social objectivation of reality). In the contemporary situation this entails the analysis of both reality and identity pluralism with reference to the structural dynamics of industrialism, particularly the dynamics of the social stratification patterns produced by industrialism.[39]