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**ABSTRACT**

Charles Wright Mills, some thinkers consider as one of the most creative and daring sociologists. And he himself wrote: "I opted for objectivity, so do not regret that I was dropped. "

In his short life he made a huge contribution to sociology, especially in works such as "Sociological imagination" (1959), "White Collar: The American Middle classes" (1951) "The Power Elite" (1956) and others.

This paper analyzes its most significant considerations (views) on social science, education (especially university), intellectuals and their role in society. Many of these considerations (views) are very topical today.
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**Introduction**

1. - C. W. Mills (1916-1962) was an open, radical sociologist from the mid-twentieth century, for whom some authors emphasize that he belonged to the left (Plummer and Macionis, 2012: 21; Ritzer, 1997: 63); others emphasize his criticism of the abstract empiricism in sociology (whose most eminent representative at the time was Paul Lazarsfeld), and so called access to major theories (whose most famous representative was Talcot Parsons), which were the embodiment of the abstract theoretical approach in sociology, but also colleagues of the Mills of the Columbia University in New York (Lukić, 1964: 269-272; Fulcher & Scott, 2011: 6; Koenen-Iter, 2005: 68).

C. W. Mills succeed to arouse interest in almost everything he did, both scientifically and intellectually, both socially and humanly. Among other things, he gained his fame because of the fact that he was different from most of the then sociologists in the United States (Lukić, 1964: 259) Even his arrival at the Columbia University in New York - dressed in jeans and boots, on his motorcycle - has affected turning around to some people. During the conservative 50s, Mills was not only dressed differently than the usual way of dressing at that time, but he also wrote and published a number of books that confronted numerous beliefs that most of the intellectuals accepted "take for granted" (Macionis & Plummer, 2012: 21; Ritzer, 1997: 63-64)

One of the reasons for Mills's reluctance can be highlighted by his uncompromising criticism of the most famous American sociologists, representatives of abstract empiricism and structural functionalism (Ritzer, 1997: 106-108).

As far as against Mills's impatience was concerned, as well as the various inventions and distortions of the facts about him, the case of the mistake made by Alvin Gouldner shows, because of the intolerance toward C. W. Mills, that is, who criticized his favourite professors and him. Fortunately, Robert K. Merton pointed out to him that he was wrong (regarding Alvin Gouldner believed in the rumors that Mills was not at all elected professor at Columbia University in New York), and when he learned it, he removed that part of the text from the next brochure of the book "The Comming Crisis of Western Sociology" (Gouldner, 1980:131). But to Gouldner did not mind to accept and develop further some of Wright Mill's ideas, such as his criticism of "value-neutral sociology"(sic!?). In doing so, Gouldner implicitly acknowledges Mills for his assertion that value-neutral sociology is the only shelter for some sociologists who do not openly express their critical attitudes towards society, unlike those who openly criticize society and as a result they feel alienated, isolated and rejected by society (Gouldner, 1980: 20-23).

**The innfluences**

2. - When it comes to the influence of other authors and schools on the understandings of C. W. Mills one can talk about more of such influences. Many authors who are studying Mills’ work agree that pragmatism had a strong influence on his work. They emphasize the impact of the works of George Mead, John Dewey, Charles Sanders Pierce and William James (. . . ). Interestingly, there are authors who do not mention the influence of pragmatism, but only those of Max Weber and Karl Marx (Koenen-Iter, 2005: 68; Ritzer, 1997: 63). On the other hand, all aspects of Mills' works that are related to the social structure were created under the strong influence of the work of Max Weber (Lukić, 1964: 260).

Also, many authors emphasize the influence of Marxism on Mills' work and life (Macionis & Plummer, 2012: 21,53-54; Ritzer, 1997: 63-64), while others emphasize the influence of neo-froidism. Here we would like to point out that C. W. Mills intensively studied philosophy before becoming a sociologist, and his vision of a radical, egalitarian democracy was directly influenced by the ideas of Thorsten Veblen, John Dewey and George Mead. While at the University of Wisconsin, Mills was strongly influenced by Hans Gerth, a professor of sociology from Germany (Ritzer, 1997: 63). In fact, Mills gained a deeper insight into European doctrines and sociological theory with the help of Gerth, with whom they have published two books: the first edited "From Max Weber: Sociological Essays" (1948) and the second "Character and Social Structure" (1953 ).

While Mills' secondary literature often sees the influence of Marx and Veblen on his sociology - and these two theoreticians certainly have an influence - but the main influence on his overall worldview is most by Max Weber (. . . ). In all of his works, Mills interprets the world through a coherent theoretical perspective. He uses this theory more to explain social structures and processes, instead of blurring them (intentionally or unintentionally) through the data and jargon. Like the classical theory of sociology, Mills' vision is "a comprehensive view of the overall socio-cultural systems". According to him, these systems are mutually dependent, and have profound effects on human values, thoughts and behavior. As a result, his texts remain quite relevant and useful today in our efforts to understand social reality, in our efforts to understand what is happening "out there. "

3. - There are many different assertions about where Mills belonged: many considered him an extreme leftist, communist and Marxist. It was mostly due to his stay in Russia, where he was granted the recognition of the leading critic of American society. However, he criticized in the middle of Moscow for the lack of democracy in their society, and in the toothache of the recognition he said: "I am grateful for the day when all the works of Leo Trotsky will be published in the USSR" (stated according to Ritzer, 1997: 64) and in Cuba (his personal acquaintance with Castro, who was not yet in power at the time), as well as because of his very sharp criticism of the weaknesses of the then US society.

However, we think that it is best to state how C. W. Mills determines himself, that is, his position. It was very clearly written in the text "Who could I be and how to achieve this?" Published in "Letters to the Comrade" (autobiographical essay), which dates back to autumn 1957:

You asked me:" What could you be? "Now I can answer: I am Wobbly. I think this spiritually and politically. Saying this is less of a political orientation than a political ethos, I I accepted Wobbly to signify one thing: the opposite of the bureaucrat (. . . ) I am hesitant, personally, deeply and for good. I am out of the mainstream, and I got it through social isolation and self-help. But for to know what is Wobbly ? It is a kind of spiritual condition. Do not be afraid of the world, Comrade. Wobbly is not but a person who hears (receives) orders by himself.

He is also a person who is often in a situation where there are no regulations, to be re-examined because he himself did not. He does not want bosses - capitalist or communist - for him they are all the same. He wants to be, and he wants everyone else to be, bosses themselves for themselves forever, under all conditions and for any purposes that they may want to this kind of spiritual condition, and only that, is the Wobbly (Unreliable / Colossal) Freedom. "

**Main theoretical considerations**

4. - To date, several attempts have been made to summarize his theory in an understandable discussion. In the text that follows, Mills' considerations of the essence of social sciences, sociology, education (especially at universities), the intellectual community and intellectuals will be presented.

*5.* C.W. Mills did not have a very good opinion of the real position and role of science in general, and especially for the one in the United States. According to him, science in the United States "is an extremely rationalized and bureaucratic enterprise" (...). This Mills's opinion of science was due to the fact that the United States specializes in the application of science for militaristic and commercial purposes (projects) and in the marketing and mass production of inventions and discoveries. And according to Mills, it was in contradiction to the classical academic tradition of pure research, without the influence of practical needs or commercial interests.

And Mills goes even further and argues that the US has built a Scientific Machine whose essence is corporate organizing and rationalizing the processes of technological development and in a sense, even the very scientific discoveries (Mills, 1958:161). With this understanding, Mills approaches Louis Mumford's understanding of the "modern military-technological complex", that is, about the contemporary "Mega Machine", which he described in his capital work "The Myth of the Machine" - Volume 1: The Technique and Human Development and Volume 2: The Pentagon of Power (Mumford, 1986)

6. Mills argues that the key task for social scientists is to "turn private problems into public issues," something that is very difficult for ordinary citizens to do. The difference between problems and issues is that the problems apply to one person, while the questions relate to a group of people. For example, a person who can not find employment faces a problem, while there is a city with a huge unemployment rate, he faces a "question". Sociologists should then directly link their autobiographical, personal challenges to social institutions.

Social science scientists should link these institutions with the social structure (s) and locate them within a historical narrative. The most recent debates on Mills continue to focus on his social criticism (Elwell, 2002; Novack, 1960, 2005).

7.-Before exploring the mentioned sociological issues of C. W. Mills, there are two points for his sociology to be kept in mind:

First, he is one of several sociologists in the 20th century who wrote within the classical tradition of sociology. With this, we want to emphasize that Mills attempts to interpret the interpretative analysis of the entire socio-cultural systems, to base it on the analysis of the overall view of the world and the empirical evidence. In addition, he writes about issues and problems that are important to people, not just to other sociologists, and he writes about them in a way to deepen our understanding.

So from a neo-classical theoretical perspective, Mills writes about the growth of white-collar jobs, and how these jobs determine the values ​​and perceptions of people in those places, and how the growth of these jobs affects other sectors of society. He writes about the growth in size and scope of bureaucratic power in industrial society, as such a concentration of power affects those who own it and those who are subject to it, and how this growth affects traditional democratic institutions.

He writes about the Cold War and what is the essence of the conflict. He writes about the significance of communist revolutions around the world. He writes clearly about the ideology and material interests of the elites, and the rise of militarism and military solutions. Mills writes (albeit almost in passing) about the on-going automation of office work, as well as the impact of this automation on workers and institutions. Mills writes about the role of ideology and material interest in the new science of management, concluding that this new science is merely manipulation of workers. Even stronger, is that he writes about the true role of social science in exploring and clearing these and other central issues of our time, for all people.

The second thing that we want to mention in relation to the sociology of C. W. Mills, except for some thinkers, was a sociological genius is that Mills was also a very gifted writer. But really these two features are very rarely encountered together and / or almost always excluded. Mills really had the gift of understandable and direct expression.

This especially refers to his "later" years when he began to write more socially-critical than academic prose, with a little hypocrisy and jargon of a contemporary social scientist, as a rare one else. Despite some mistakes, the Mills' *White Collar* is a master piece of sociological analysis. Beginning with the "Elite of Power" Mills becomes much more polemic and more critical in language (remarks).

*8.* If you look at the work "Sociological Imagination", then as the starting point for Mills' understanding of social science, one can take the assumption, with which he begins, that "human nature" is formed in interaction of historical and social structure (Mills, 1959: 13; Mills, 1964: 15-17). According to him, the socio-cultural systems, and especially the modern state-nation determines the type of men and women who inhabit the system. Mills argues that human beings can not be understood aside from the social and historical structures in which they are created and in which they operate. (Mills, 1959: 162; Mills, 1964: 169-172).

The state-nation in the modern world has become a "history-generating unit," "a unit /cell produced by man" (Mills, 1959:158;). Throughout the socialization process, some aspects of the human character are released or suppressed. As a unit that creates history, a nation-state it selects and educates the character of human beings, opens opportunities and imposes boundaries for the diversity of men and women constituting society (Mills, 1964: 165-166, 169-170; 177).

According to Mills, the struggle between states or bloc-states - and the struggle between fascism and democracy, or between capitalism and communism - is more than a struggle for domination between two political or economic systems; it is a struggle for which type of human beings will become dominant. (Compare: Mills, 1959: 158; Mills, 1964: 177). Historical transformations within societies, such as the decline in agriculture and the growth of small businesses, also affect the predominant nature of human beings, their values ​​and ideologies, their beliefs and expectations, their true character. And again, men and women can be understood only in the context of the historical socio-cultural system in which they interact.

Since human beings are motivated by the norms, values, and systems of beliefs that dominate their society, structural change often puts / throws these "motivational vocabularies" into some confusion (Mills, 1959: 162; Mills, 1964: 181-183). The number and diversity of structural changes in society are growing as institutions become larger, more comprehensive, and more interconnected (Mills, 1964: 39-40; Mills, 1959: 20-21). As structural institutions become larger and more centralized, the circle of those controlling these organizations becomes more subtle - it overrides the "iron law of the oligarchy" (1956: 21). Consequently, the pace of change in the modern era is accelerating and the changes become more influential for all - for those who control these expanded organizations, and for those who are their subjects.

In the book "The White Collar" (1951), Mills writes that human characteristics, such as singularity and mood, have an increased role in the efficiency and productivity of bureaucratic and service agencies. Because of this, the management of interpersonal relationships increasingly focuses on morality (Mills, 1951: 233). Mills here makes a very clear and direct criticism and warns that: the goal of the school for interpersonal relationships is to give workers the illusion of personal autonomy and caring environment (which car for them) in order to increase loyalty and consent to the organization in which they are thrust into. With the School of Interpersonal Relations, management has become a manipulation of workers to maximize productivity (Mills, 1951: 235). How one can expect more directly than this!

9. – C.W. Mills is very close to Robert K Merton's medium-range theory. Merton, in his explanation of the so-called "Middle level of power" that lies between the masses and the elites. This middle level of government is composed of the leaders of the local opinion and the special interest groups, but they neither represent the masses nor have any real influence on the elite. According to Mills, the US (US) Congress and US political parties are a reflection of this intermediate level of power.

This is explained by Mills in the book "Causes of Third World War" (1958) in the analysis of the position of the US Congress and the political parties and their real position and role. According to him, while Congress and political parties debate and decide on some minor questions, the elite of power ensures that there is no serious challenge to its power and political control, as long as it is tolerated in the political arena (Mills, 1958: 36) . And Mills continues with the elaboration of the problem, that is, the conflict between the competing interests appears at the intermediate level of power, but it is mainly a clash to get a bigger piece of an existing cake. It is a clash that is written by commentators and political scientists, but is set aside from any debate and clash over the fundamental basic policy.

10. - Mills is most concerned about the growing militarism in the United States. Such militarism dominates, not only because of the existence of the elite of power, but because of the apathy and moral insensitivity of the masses and the political inactivity of the intellectuals, both in the communist and in the capitalist countries. The most disappointing for Mills is that most intellectuals, scientific and political leaders participate in the chorus of creating confusion in favor of the elite. They refuse to question the policies of the elite, refusing to offer alternatives. They abdicated (they left, abandoned) their role, allowing the elite to rule smoothly (Mills, 1958: 88-89).

11. One of the key questions to which scientists and especially sociologists, his contemporaries, were to answer is for Mills: What is at the root of the expansion and centralization of structural bureaucracy in the modern world? Mills responds clearly to this question and repeats: the rationalization of the world is a major trend of our time.

The key to power in the modern world is social organization and technological development. For them, except in his other works, Mills discusses both the "White Collar" (1951) and the "Elite of Power" (1956). There he points out that the means of production are now organized to maximize efficiency, and for that reason the bureaucracy becomes even more comprehensive, the work is even more solitary and the culture even more exploited. But behind the rise in power, the scope and breadth of bureaucracy is the new technology of coordination and control - the technology that Mills says is in her childhood (Mills, 1951: 195; Mills, 1956: 7).

Applied to labour in industrial-bureaucratic societies, rationalization leads to work that has been reduced to standardized (easily repetitive) movements and decisions in accordance with the written rules and regulations. Mills, on the one hand, clearly recognizes the benefits of rationalization (leading to an unpredictable increase in both production and distribution of goods and services), he perceived and emphasized the rationalization, ie the negative effects of it (it leads to depersonalization, loss of personal control over work assignments and oppressive routine).

In "Sociological Imagination" Mills points to the unstoppable process of spreading rationalization in all spheres of social life. Thus, the process of rationalization is not limited to offices; it covers all areas of social life (Mills, 1964: 187-189). "The training / rationalization training begins in the school system, because schools have become places to provide training for work, socialization in power and bureaucracy, specialization and targeted problem solving. Or, as C.W. Mills wrote: "Families as well as factories, idleness as well as work, neighbors as well as states - they have become part of the full functional rationality" (Mills, 1964: 189; Mills, 1959: 169).

12. - Mills wrote much about the role and tasks of the social sciences. According to him, in one place in the "Sociological Imagination", the first and central task of the social sciences is to develop an appropriate framework for understanding man and society. In doing so, such a framework should have been so simple that lay people can appropriately understand the wide range of human behavior (Mills, 1959: 133; Mills, 1964: 12-13, 150-151). In order to successfully accomplish this task, according to Mills, there should be an interdisciplinary approach, and this will not be possible if it does not firmly relate to (ie, if it is not "rooted" in) history. (Mills, 1959: 145-146)

Further, Mills points out that the two biggest problems of social sciences in his time are that they are atheoretical and ahistorical oriented. That is, they avoid being based more deeply in theory and integrating the results of their empirical research into a broader theoretical framework and missing the connection between different technologies, structures and ideas (thus creating the so-called abstract empiricism, which Mills is very acute criticized). Unhistority also leads scientists to be incapable of recognizing new trends, and can not distinguish which of them have greater and lesser meaning (Mills, 1964: 29-31; Mills, 1959: 21).

And further, in the same place, Mills points out that within the social sciences are existing three trends: abstract empiricism, great theory and the use of social science to improve bureaucratic efficiency by serving more to blur than to clarify and understand human social behavior (Lukić, 1964: 267-269).

13. - C.W.Mills makes a kind of anticipation of the criticism of the concept of value-neutral sociology, which nearly two decades later is thoroughly developed by the well-known sociologist Alvin Gouldner in his work "On sociology" (Gouldner, 1980). According to Mills, values ​​directly influence social research, starting with the choice of the research problem, by doing the same, to the conclusions of the research itself. Therefore, according to Mills, the scientist should be very clear and precise in terms of his values ​​and so he will have to try to avoid the dangers of falling into bias in his research (Mills, 1959: 78). It also applied Mills in therm of teaching. According to him, the professor should be very open and clear in terms of the assumptions and attitudes he has. He should clearly show his students a wide spectrum of moral alternatives and after making his choice (Mills, 1959: 79).

14. Above all, Mills understood sociology as an inherently political activity and servant of the democratic process. In the "Sociological Imagination," Mills wrote: "It is a political task of a social scientist-like any liberal educator-to constantly turn personal problems into public questions, and to singular questions in terms of their human meanings for different individuals and to show in his work - both as an educator, in his life, and - his kind of sociological imagination. His intention is to cultivate such habits of the mind between men and women who are publicly exposed to him.

15. - Sociology of Ch. R. Mills focuses on the essential problems of modern industrial societies. According to him, the most significant are the five dominant problems: 1. alienation; 2. moral insensitivity; 3. threats to democracy; 4. threats to human freedom and 5. the conflict between bureaucratic rationality and human thinking. Each of these problems is related to the process of bureaucratization. In such Mills' views, the influence of K. Marx's for the alienation learning, can be recognized..

For Mills it is problematic that in his time (and today, unfortunately, even more) the destruction of freedom and autonomy, capabilities and control over the work do not feel like a crisis of the modern man. As Mills writes further, they can feel it as a crisis only if they personally experience it, or if their parents survive it (Mills, 1951: 228).

16. -Mass society contributes to maintaining a "status quo" and even worsening of the situation. According to Mills, one of the most significant problems of mass society is that many people have lost their faith in the leaders and become very apathetic. These people pay little attention to politics. Such apathy as a "spiritual condition" is at the root of many of our contemporary problems (Mills, 1958: 81-82).

Such apathy, Mills continues (in the book "Causes of the Third World War"), leads to "moral insensitivity." Such people passively accept the crimes committed by their leaders. They do not have bitterness when confronted with moral horror; they have no capacity to morally react to the character, decisions and actions of their leaders (Mills, 1958: 82). Mass communication is also contributing to this state of affairs, and as Mills says, they help to consolidate the image in which the individual becomes "a spectator of everything, but a human witness to nothing" (Mills, 1958: 83). Horror images become a common thing. Mills directly associates such moral insensitivity with the process of rationalization. So many of our actions are inhuman, not because of the level of their unscrupulousness, but because they are impersonal, effective and represented without any real emotion (Mills, 1958: 83-84).

Everything written in advance, according to Mills' belief, is a serious threat to democracy. And she (democracy) defines it simply as "a system in which those who suffer the consequences of decisions have an effective voice on those decisions (solutions).

Consistent with his principles and concerned about democracy, Mills writes that there are six essential conditions for the establishment of a modern democratic state:

- A *public* that is well informed about these issues, but also is actively involved in debates about them;

- *National responsible parties* that discuss these problems clearly and openly;

- *Trained civil services*, which at the same time are independent of any private or corporate interest;

* *Intellectuals*, both inside and outside the academic environment, who care about things that are really important for public policy;
* *Mass communication media* that are informed and which inform about these discussions and who are able to present the problems of the wider audience;
* *Free associations* that are capable of connecting individuals, families, communities and the public with more formal organizations such as corporations, the military, and government agencies (1958: 121-123).

17. Mills points out that in the 1950s, labor-related processes were aimed at reducing the (underestimated) status of white-collar workers in the United States, so they quickly lost their common skills, autonomy and prestige. One of the trends to depreciate the status of "white strength" employees was the huge offer of such jobs. Such a rise in jobs was filled by lower-class representatives who completed secondary education. So when everyone joined the club (as Mills writes), then he is not more exclusive or prestigious. Although the monopoly of secondary (especially gymnasium) education of the middle class was demolished, the situation for equal access to educational opportunities was not achieved in the United States. There were still many who were incapable of completing their secondary (gymnasium) education for economic reasons (Mills, 1951: 267).

The increasing of "white collar" work, according to Mills, had far-reaching consequences on the education system, in such a way that education in the United States became the basis for training the vast bureaucracy in government and industry (Mills, 1951: 266).

At the time of Mills, the purpose of college education was to prepare young people for good work in large corporations or for service in government agencies. This included not only vocational training, but also education for appropriate social values ​​and bon-ton (Mills, 1951: 267). While the goal of education in the United States in the 19th century was to create "good citizens" for democracy, in the mid-20th century it was the creation of a successful person in a society of specialists.

In this context, we will briefly mention that Mills emphasizes the meaning of so called “symbols of legitimacy”, as a very important area for research for sociologists. These symbols serve to justify or oppose the arrangements of power and power within society (Mills, 1959: 37).

In "Sociological Imagination," Mills writes about the power to manage and manipulate the consent of people, and since such power is hidden, it prevents the oppressed from identifying the oppressors (Mills, 1959: 40-41).

As Mills asserts in the "Elite of Power", schools become pendants of corporations and the government, choosing and training young people for their corporate careers, and in that way include patriotism, respect for power, and the celebration of capitalism. However, families are still the biggest factor in the socialization of youth, but they now share that function with schools and the mass media (Mills, 1956: 6).

18. - Mills in his writings also writes about the university. In the "White Collar" he gives very precise analyzes and descriptions of the state of the universities in the United States in his day. Unfortunately, many of these analyzes are current in our country and in other countries of our region, and even beyond, although from the time it was written, Mills has been spent for more than six decades. Both the university and other institutions in society are becoming more bureaucratic.

Such an organization has a similar effect to the professor, other professionals and businessmen. They are all converted into bureaucratic executive specialists in accordance with the governing rules of the institution (Mills, 1951: 138). The bureaucratic nature of colleges and universities (including the hierarchy of power, the middle-class environment, the separation of intellectuals from social life and the narrow academic specialization) contributes to the conformity of thought.

The same trends that limit intellect in a wider society are also present in the university campus. The professor is employed as well as all employees and must respect the rules of work that apply to everyone else. Mills also writes about attempts to limit academic freedom, through political and business attacks on professors. Unfortunately, many did not see the purpose of such attacks as a real threat.

But in reality, blackmailing, intimidating and controlling the professors was done through choosing titles for full-time employment, promotion and rewarding procedures, which is a kind of control of "disobedient" by colleagues. Such manipulative control keeps the teachers in a state of conformity (and even some kind of apathy) through "consent to academic solidarity" (Mills, 1951: 151-152; Mills, 1964: 118,120).

This refined control of academic life is further enhanced by political and business influences on standardized curricula, then by the control of research funds by government agencies and foundations, which are significantly disadvantaged to university staff outside of the mainstream (from governing structures, officially accepted) flows (Mills, 1951: 151-152; Mills, 1964: 125-126).

19. One of the main conditions for modern democracy to exist, according to Mills, is a living intellectual community, which is intimately involved in providing knowledge and wisdom, which should help in the decision-making process of social policy. In the "intellectual community", Mills includes: scientists, ministers, professors and associates, artists and students, and those who are part of the great rationalist tradition, starting with the ancient Greeks (Mills, 1958: 129).

It is an intellectual community that, through art, speech and writing, creates and distributes ideas and images that focus public attention on relevant or irrelevant questions, justifies or criticizes the policies of those in power (Mills, 1958: 129).

The dissemination of publicly relevant ideas by the intellectual community is vital that private experience will enable every individual to "know only a small part of the social world, only a few of the decisions that now apply to them" (Mills, 1958: 173). The significant problems of modern society are complex, but they are not so complex that they can be solved only by professionals and experts. The central task of the intellectual is to confront these problems and make social issues accessible to public understanding, discussion and debate (Mills, 1958: 15). Democracy requires such a public that is affected by the decisions and familiar with such questions / problems, so democracy can be something more than just a shame / farce

How can a social scientist be considered part of the legacy of Western humanism, if, even though he knows that the world in which "freedom and reason" are attacked, retreats into a methodically sophisticated study of meaningless things? What is that minister who claims to believe in God, if he still approves of "immortality" and irresponsibility of our leaders? Unfortunately, according to Mills, for many people from the intellectual community this is the usual behavior (Mills, 1958: 130).

If, as intellectuals, we do not manage to deal with these issues, Mills has consistently argued, we are (become) captives of our intellectual heritage and have abandoned the duty we have as an obligation to our society (Mills, 1951: 158). Who (what kind) scientist can claim to be a part of the legacy of the great Western scientific tradition, yet to work for the military-industrial complex? Who (what kind of) social scientist can claim to be part of the heritage of Western humanism, if, besides knowing that the world in which "reason and freedom" has been attacked, it is still withdrawn in methodically sophisticated studies of trifles / trivia?

Who (what kind of) minister can know about God (to know him, to believe in Him), and yet to approve of "immortality" and irresponsibility of our leaders? Unfortunately, Mills concludes, many in the intellectual community behave in a common / mediocrity (Mills, 1958: 130)

If they are usually unable to speak as public figures, they contribute to the erosion of human freedom, dignity and democracy (Mills, 1958: 170). According to Mills, members of the intellectual community are even worse, giving false images to the elite as reasonable people acting in the interests of national as opposed to private interests. Such images serve to "soften political will," enabling people to accept irresponsibility and greed "without any sense of anger."Such apologists allow the elite to avoid any liability to the public, essentially renouncing the "main goal of Western humanism, which is so strongly felt in the American experience of the nineteenth century: the bold/brave control of human destiny" (Mills, 1958: 173 ).

20.- On the "White Collar" (1951), Mills openly condemned the professor's excessive specialization. Such a hyper-specialization leads to inability to think beyond a "specialized" area (Mills, 1951: 130-131). The prestige system in the academic sphere, of course, contributed to this trend. Thus, undesirable are books that attempt to capture, display and explain more than one specialty, such as general textbooks within the field. Instead, academic honor and reputation are given to a heap of volumes that process objects of narrow specialties.

This narrowing of knowledge is even more in the social and human sciences and the non-opposition of the methods of the natural sciences - methods that are particularly suitable for studying "microscopic fields of research, rather than expanding them, to accept man and society as a whole" (Mills, 1951: 131).

**Instead of a conclusion**

C.W. Mills was controversial and bigger than any living person. He was a vocal reader, a top writer - and was able to make a specific contribution to American sociological theory, especially in the area of ​​classes, power and social structure. He was an anti-authoritarian, extravagant and - an Individual. John Eldridge (1983: 112) concluded that C. W. Mills made a significant contribution in three areas:

First, he made a great innovative contribution to the field of sociology of knowledge, by synthesizing some parts of the European sociological tradition with key knowledge of American pragmatism.

Second, he completed a significant number of studies during his short working life. Each of these studies had its own strengths and weaknesses, but together they reflect the concerns of "understanding American society and its place in world affairs."

Last but not least, he provided a substantial and lasting intellectual impetus for others. We can see his influence in Thomas Bottomore's elite research (1966) and in the fruitful discussion of (power) power by Stephen Lukes (1973), for example - as in the work of Alvin Guldner. For informal educators and those working in the social professions, his critique of the professional ideology of social pathology is very significant. But perhaps the best way of remembering for his contribution is the advice he gives in the last / final passage of "Sociological Imagination": Do not allow public issues as formally formulated or problems, as they feel in private, to influence (on that) which problems will be taken for studying / researching. Above all, do not give up your moral and political autonomy by accepting someone else's non-liberal practicality of bureaucratic morality or the liberal practice of moral disorder. We know that the human sense of public issues must be resolved (overcome) by turning them into personal problems, or problems of individual life.

We know that the problems of social sciences, when properly formulated, must include problems and questions, biography and history, and the scope of their complex relationships. Within this scope, according to C.W.Mills, the lives of the individual and the creation of societies are encountered; and within that range, sociological imagination has a chance to make a difference in the quality of human life in our time (Mills, 1959: 226).

Despite social criticism in his texts, however, Mills was always consistent with his overall theory of socio-cultural systems and his vision of the role of social science within such a system. Writing as a critic of the society, Mills caused great controversy among his contemporaries.

And his texts on education (especially for universities) and intellectuals are incredibly current, although they have been written and published more than half a century ago. But they are a signpost on how social scientists (and in this context especially sociologists), as well as the intellectuals, who, above all, behave or should be: 1. people with incorporated stable positive value system, 2 security guards of a democratic society and 3. uncompromising freedom fighters.
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