ilizational process is characterized by its preponderantly linear development. Within this realm Alfred Weber, in opposition to Spengler or Sorokin, recognizes the existence of the kind of "progress" which has made such overwhelming impression upon all the optimistic ideologists of progress from the seventeenth-century Frenchman Perrault onwards down to our contemporary H.G. Wells, and which constitutes the basis for Hegel's and Marx's theodicies. In spite of all interruptions and retrogressions, Weber's civilizational process advances through the whole of mankind's history. It traverses the prehistoric stages (Palaeolithic age, Neolithic age, Bronze age, etc.) as well as the hitherto existing Historic Civilizations and will, in all probability, continue to grow in the near future. It consists of the whole range of technical achievements, scientific discoveries and rational forms of life and organization of humanity. In detail, it includes three processes: First, an inner intellectual clarification of the human mind, a process of growth and aging starting with primitive totemism, myth and empiricism, and advancing towards reflection, intellectual and scientific construction, and rationality; further, a growing intellectual accumulation of scientific knowledge and insight into nature; finally, the materialization of this "intellectual cosmos", its transformation into an apparatus of tools and instruments, methods and principles of organization [54].

side of human activity. - We do not know whether in his three-fold distinction Alfred Weber was influenced by H.St.Chamberlain. At any rate, Chamberlain in much the same manner distinguished between "Knowledge" (including discovery, science, and even industry) (Weber's civilizational process), "Civilization" (including economy, politics, and church) (Weber's societal process), and "Culture" (including Weltanschauung, religion, ethics, and art) (Weber's cultural process). (Chamberlain, Foundations of the Nineteenth Century, tr.by J.Less, 1914, Vol.2, p.234 ff.; cf. also A.Niceforo, "Maßstäbe der Überlegenheit des Fortschritts einer Zivilisation", Jahrbuch für Soziologie, Vol.1, 1925, p.249). J.W.Woodward's classification (quoted by Reuter, "Race and Culture", An Outline of the Principles of Sociology, ed.by Robert E.Park, 1939, p.197) of what he calls a culture into the three categories: inductive, control, and aesthetic culture, and Ralph Turner's (The Great Cultural Traditions, 1941, Vol.2, p.1242 ff.) division of a culture into the three major elements, namely the technological, or the integration of the carrying group with its environment, the institutional, or the organization of social relations within the carrying group, and the intellectual, or the interpretation of the experience of the carrying group, come both rather close to Alfred Weber's trinity. On the other hand, R.M. MacIver's "utilitarian or instrumental systems" combine Weber's civilizational and societal processes; MacIver's concept of "culture" is broader than Weber's cultural process; MacIver's third element, the material (biological and environmental) factors, have no counterpart in Weber's trinity (MacIver, "The Historical Pattern of Social Change", Journal of Social Philosophy, Vol.2, 1936, p.35 ff.).

54) Alfred Weber, "Prinzipielles zur Kultursoziologie (Gesellschaftsprozeß, Zivilisationsprozeß und Kulturbewegung)", Archiv für Sozialwissenschaft und Sozialpolitik, Vol.47, 1920-21, pp.149, especially p.9 ff. A short but good summary of Weber's theory in English is to be found in Barnes and Becker, ibid., pp.771-777, and their Contemporary Social Theory, pp.522-524.