
Theory

The Newsletter of the Research Committee on Sociological Theory
International Sociological Association
Spring/Summer 2013

Board

Chairs

Ronald N. Jacobs
Giuseppe Sciortino

Secretary/Treasurer

Agnes Ku
Division of Social Science, Hong Kong
University of Science and Technology.
Clear Water Bay, Hong Kong
Email: soagnes@ust.hk

Board Members

Jeffrey Alexander
Gianpaolo Baiocchi
Patrick Baert
Mabel Berezin
Fuyuki Kurasawa
Philip Smith
Frédéric Vandenberghe
Gilles Verpraet
Seung Kuk Kim
Kiyomitsu Yui

Associate Board Members

José Maurício Domingues
Brad West
Ken Thompson
Eduardo de la Fuente
Marcel Fournier
Sang-Jin Hang
Elisa P. Reis
Edmond Wright
Consuelo Corradi
Alexander Filipov
Homa Zanjanzadeh
Filipe Carreira da Silva
Margaret Archer

Editors of *Theory*

Craig Browne
E-mail: craig.browne@sydney.edu.au
Paul Jones
E-mail: p.jones@unsw.edu.au
Department of Sociology and Social Policy
A26, The University of Sydney, NSW, 2006,
Australia

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Craig Browne and Paul Jones: Editors' Introduction.....	1
From the RC Presidents.....	2
Pablo de Marinis and Alejandro Bialakowsky: Community: Five Dimensions of a Key Sociological Concept.....	2
Dominik Bartmanski: Sociological Theory as an Image and a Map.....	7
Gianluca Manzo: On the Distinctiveness of Analytical Sociology.....	13
Call for Papers.....	18

Editors' Introduction

This issue of *Theory* looks back to some highlights of the mid-term conference in Trento and forward to the next ISA World Congress to be held in Yokohama in 2014. After the Presidents' message, the issue opens with a paper on *Community: five dimensions of a key sociological concept* by two Argentinian sociological theorists: Pablo de Marinis and Alejandro Bialakowsky. Marinis and Bialakowsky show us how community is a concept with

different possibilities and applications. We then publish two pieces by members of our community who were honoured in Trento. *Sociological Theory as an Image and a Map* derives from the speech Dominik Bartmanski delivered on receiving the Junior Theorist Prize and *On the Distinctiveness of Analytical Sociology* is a revised version of the speech that Gianluca Manzo delivered on receiving the Special Mention by the jury award in the Junior Theorist prize. We look forward to the future work of these sociological theorists. Finally, the issue contains the *Call for Papers for the RC16 sessions in Yokohama*. Please keep in mind the submission deadline for the ISA World Congress.

Craig Browne & Paul Jones

From the Presidents

We are please to include in this issue of the newsletter our Call for Papers for the 2014 World Congress of Sociology, which will be held in Yokohama. The call for papers represents the theoretical and geographical diversity of our research committee. Our session organizers represent thirteen different nations, and span a vast array of topical areas including culture, media, cosmopolitanism, modernity, critical theory, Asian theory, visibility, intellectuals, urban space, sexuality, civil society, symbolic violence, globalization, and transnationalism. Particularly

noteworthy is the concentration of sessions on Japanese and Asian theorizing.

You will find contact details and descriptions for each of our 25 sessions. The official ISA Call for papers will go online in June, and we will accept submissions until September 30, 2013. All submissions should include a title and abstract, as well as contact details for all authors. If you have any questions about a particular session, please contact the session organizer(s) directly.

The Nominations Committee is continuing to prepare the slate of candidates for the election of officers, and we will provide more information about that process in a future issue of *Theory*. In the meantime, we look forward to receiving all of your paper submissions, and to organizing another exciting slate of sessions for the World Congress.

Ronald N. Jacobs & Guiseppe Sciortino

Co-Chairs, RC 16

Community: five dimensions of a key sociological concept

Community has always been a key concept, notion or idea for sociology and other social and human sciences, as well as for other kinds of discourses, such as politics, religion and ethnicity. The present communication aims to contribute to a "sociological theory of community" that is not one-dimensional, by identifying some

relevant dimensions that appear throughout the history of our discipline, from the classics to the present.

The debates on theoretical logic and metatheory, which among others have been carried out by authors such as Alexander and Ritzer, have enlightened our work. The multidimensionality of sociological reflection can only become meaningful in a historical-conceptual and comparative study, like the one we begun some years ago in our research group at the University of Buenos Aires, and that we wish to summarize here. In this context, a number of analytic dimensions of community have emerged, which we have called "registers", "uses" or "meanings" of community, and which we have applied for the interrogation of various authors and works, therefore continuously redefining our original scheme.

In the first place, we have gone over the acclaimed European classics such as Durkheim, Weber, Simmel and Marx, and some less well-known like Tönnies. We have also gone through the contributions of the Chicago School of Sociology and of Parsons. Among the contemporary authors, we have considered those who encouraged the rebirth of "grand theory" (Habermas, Luhmann and Giddens) and those who are still devoted to a kind of essayistic sociology (Maffesoli, Bauman and Sennett).

We will concentrate here on just five of the communitarian dimensions we have arrived at in these works. Because of a question of space, we will present them in an abstract fashion, without mentioning the textual evidence we have displayed in other publications.¹

Five dimensions of community in sociological theory

In each communitarian dimension, sociology presents different objectives, each articulating itself differently with other disciplines and social practices. In the same way, it relates in diverse manners with another concept, often considered as its opposite in an indivisible couple: society. In some of these authors it is possible to find the five dimensions, in others less than five, but always more than one.

1) Community as historical predecessor of modern society (Sociology as explanation of the emergence of modernity)

The studies in history of sociology tend to underline - with argument - that the classics of this discipline intended a complete comprehension of the capitalist and emerging modern social order. Even contemporary authors like Luhmann, Habermas, Giddens and Bauman could not abandon this preoccupation to explain a process that was already a part of a distant past.

In this way, discussing with Marx, some classical sociologists place community as starting point of the process of modernization. The works of Tönnies and Weber are filled with references of this kind, where modernization would be indicating the drawback of “communitarian bonds” and their replacement with “societal relationships”.

This historical register of community has been highlighted by historians like Nisbet, who insistently gave all sociological enterprise a conservative, romantic and nostalgic tone. In his view, the classics were not only in search of an aseptic description of a historical process, for they presented an entirely somber and negative judgment of its consequences as well.

The ways in which this sequential and historical scheme was developed have been varied (historicism, evolutionism, cybernetic theories, etc.), but in all of them the process is described as a "progress" from simple forms to complex forms, from mechanical groups to organic articulations, from undifferentiated aggregations to functional differentiation. Community, of course, is always placed in the first of the paired elements.

2) Community as ideal type opposed to society (Sociology as the science of social relationships)

Sociology always pretended to scientifically explain the attributes of the emergent social relationships, increasingly predominant in modern societies. In a conventional sense, doing science is nothing other than constructing concepts, typologies and models. Among the classics, the clearest example of this is Weber, and later, this exercise will be typical of authors so different such as Parsons, Habermas, Luhmann and Giddens.

The second dimension of community in sociology is presented as ideal-type of inter-individual relationships, of collective forms of aggregation. Thus, communitarian relationships are not only seen as entities proper to the pre-modern past, but also constitutive of the modern present.

The ideal-type of community implies attributes of stability, warmth, affection, localization, ancestry, tradition, status and co-presence. On the other hand, societal relationships appear as artificial, evanescent, cold, distant, territorially expandable, contractual, impersonal, and with typically acquired roles.

3) Community as utopian solution to the pathologies of the present (Sociology as propeller of political praxis)

In tension with the opposition between the remembrance of the past and the observation-description of the present, a third dimension of community emerges.

Here, community is what can solve the evils that modern rationalization has brought about (alienation, anomie, depersonalization, loss of meaning, etc.), but also a utopian project of a future that can transcend this present, or, at least, that may suppress its most painful consequences.

We are no longer confronted with a historical sociology or with a systematic sociology, and instead we are dealing with a discipline that is normatively “charged”, oriented to showing the ways that social practice (and above all political action) should follow, in order to overcome the present state of moral mediocrity. In this case, sociology appears as a discipline that does not respect the distinction between “affirmations on facts” and “value judgments”, or simply destroys it.

4) Community as technological device for the reconstitution of the social bond (Sociology as social engineering)

Sociology had from its inception a practical stance, oriented towards social intervention. A pioneer example of this was Le Play. Then, the sociologists of the Chicago School embodied this “interface” knowledge, developing between sociological discourses with scientific purposes and practical activities of social reform and social control. But the European classics had this "technological" side as well: apart from the "scientific" Weber of

Economy and Society, we find a “consultant” Weber, like the one who wrote about the peasants of Eastern Prussia. And besides from the Durkheim of the theorization of social bonds, there was a Durkheim committed to the reformation of the French national education system.

These communitarian devices, oriented towards the reconstitution of the broken bonds of social solidarity, are more humble and particularized, and less utopian and general than the ones last mentioned, and they tend to move populations’ energies in a positive sense, affirmative of the bonds in danger of dissolution. Good examples of this are the Durkheimian projects to revitalize the professional corporations and the Weberian suggestions around leader's plebiscitary democracy.

5) Community as the substrate of life in common (Sociology as social philosophy)

Despite the efforts that authors such as Durkheim made in order to free sociology from its philosophical “burden”, this work has never really been achieved, and sociology has therefore always moved along diverse "cultures", like science, literature and philosophy. Consciously or not, all sociological theories have brought along philosophical views of order, subjectivity, history, “good society”, etc.

Community often appears, then, as a concept that is not only philosophically

“charged”, but that is also an abbreviated expression of social life, or some sort of “zero degree” of every form of sociality. Each time community is mentioned, possibilities of life in common, illusions of collective life, and mentions of what could and should be shared, are working as background. Parsons is a good example of this point of view. His “societal community” is not only the integration subsystem, but also some kind of trans-historical invariant that appears in every form of society, guaranteeing that the members are essentially “under jurisdiction” of it. Thus, and breaking the sequential-historical sense that the pair community/society used to have in other sociological discourses, we arrive at a normative, philosophically “charged” base for “good society”, in which individuals can display their subjectivity without disrupting the social order.

Conclusions

The importance that community still has for sociological theory, and the "communitarian explosion" that seems to be taking place in contemporary societies, indicate to us that an exhaustive reflection about its foundations is a necessary task. Rather than looking for a one-dimensional theory of community, we aim to find certain dimensions that show different possibilities (both theoretical and practical): community as modernity's historical past;

as ideal-type of social relationships; as utopian background; as technological device; and as substrate of life in common. Thus, sociology is differently articulated with other disciplines and social practices: historical and anthropological studies; empirical-sociological analysis; diverse political options of modernity (conservative, radical); modes of “governmentality”; political and social philosophy. In this way, we offer not only certain interpretations of the past of our discipline, but we also see the emergence of an exuberant landscape of possibilities for the continuation of theoretical investigation. The alternatives that reduce community to one single definition often lose perspective of what makes sociology an indispensable project of modernity. The question of community may be able to make this situation strongly visible.

Notes

1. E.g. the articles published in *Papeles del CEIC*, march 2010: <http://www.identidadcolectiva.es/papeles/>. There is also a book in press with 11 contributions: Pablo de Marinis (ed.), *Comunidad: estudios de teoría sociológica*, Prometeo, Buenos Aires

Pablo de Marinis and Alejandro Bialakowsky

Sociological Theory as an Image and a Map

The ISA Junior Theorist Prize Speech delivered at the RC16 Midterm Conference, Trento, Italy, June 27, 2012

A theory should be made as simple as possible, but not simpler.

Albert Einstein (2005: 290)

Seek simplicity and distrust it.

Alfred Whitehead (cited in Geertz 1973: 34)

I would like to take this opportunity to briefly reflect on the disciplinary meaning and professional condition of sociological theory, especially in the context of cultural sociology. As a distinct academic field cultural sociology emerged roughly a quarter of a century ago from the contentious debates about the explanatory status of meaning. Today it is viewed as an “important and intellectually rich subfield in a discipline in which *culture* had not been a founding concept” (Jacobs and Spillman 2005: 2). Although remarkably successful, this incessantly growing subfield remains somewhat fragmented. There are different schools and paradigms. Fault lines, rival positions and conflicts between them abound, although they need not to (Santoro 2008: 20). And yet, as its practitioners noted, “there has been very little framing of these intellectual conflicts in terms of the sociology of ideas or knowledge” (de la Fuente 2007: 115). What

does this situation tell us about the subfield and sociological theory more generally?

Sociological theory does not just provide an objective system of understanding; it is a cultural performance with irreducible subjective and historical entanglements. Cultural sociology is no different. We can judge not only the logical cohesion and explanatory power of its statements, but also its social authenticity, engagement with intellectual traditions, sensitivity to a given *Zeitgeist*, interpretive skills, aesthetic appeal, and above all its self-reflexivity. I intended to show in my article on Malinowski and Foucault (Bartmanski 2012) that the transformative research agendas must be highly efficient on all those levels of performance at once, and when they are then conflicts and disputes seem unavoidable. What do I mean by performative “efficiency” here?

One way of approaching it is to assess how a given agenda deals with a fundamental sociological paradox, namely with the task of being sufficiently detailed, or *thick* in its empirical description, *and at the same time* skillfully reducing social complexity in the conceptual realm. The balance is very hard to grasp, indeed. We can say that a powerful research agenda is one that does this tricky job well. What I call the iconic agenda is believed to do it not just well, but profoundly, irresistibly, provocatively, often disturbingly. It is at once intricate and simple, careful and dramatic. It attains a

striking complexity reduction without compromising too much of its empirical acumen. Malinowski was one of the most vocal, classical exponents of this stance. Pioneering extremely meticulous “field research,” he also used to confess that his true calling was a sociological art of conceptual generalization. In one of the letters to his mentor Charles Seligman he provocatively wrote that “to a really scientific mind facts do not matter a bit“ (Malinowski 1919). To him it was *what* one could squeeze out of facts theoretically that mattered, and *how* one went about it. It is telling that someone with such a mindset became the “founding father“ of a separate, empirically driven academic discipline – anthropology.

Thus, among other things, successful social theorizing is a matter of intellectual style, and style is far more consequential than sociologists have traditionally thought. Style is an individual, often idiosyncratic combination of form and content. Think about writings of Heidegger or Baudrillard in this respect. It involves specific linguistic choices of a writer, evokes particular textual and sensuous references, and implies a series of intellectual dilemmas for the readers. Being confronted with an iconic style means becoming *passionate* about it even if it *painfully* challenges us. This is the case because beyond the more or less cool surface of theories there lies a more or less unacknowledged passion and

pain. Perhaps the German word *Leidenschaft* can express this paradoxical phenomenon most concisely.

From Karl Marx to Edward Said, from Friedrich Nietzsche to Slavoj Žižek, the iconic social and cultural theorists have inspired great sentiments in this sense. They all generated a series of ideas and phrases that became public ownership of the intelligentsia of their times and divided the academic audiences. In short, original intellectual styles are hard to ignore, they impose on us a particular way of articulating reality, they appear as something to be reckoned with. They are not just analytic tools but also metaphorical expressions of deeper existential outlook that inspire correspondingly deep contentions. As Wittgenstein (1984: 20e) once remarked, “a preference for certain similes could be called a matter of temperament and it underlines far more disagreement than you might think.“ In short, sociological theory is a field of contention because it is a performative enterprise in which cultural preferences manifest in style matter and have epistemic consequences.

Each so conceived style has its assets, new value added, and each incurs specific intellectual costs. It is part and parcel of the way a given theory reduces complexity to master it. Social life is a maze, and so is our language. For this reason, at least since William of Ockham sciences operate

according to the principle of parsimony. A sharp “razor“ needs to be applied to our theoretical efforts at all times. In sociology too, complexity of the world should be boiled down to a fundamental scaffolding. But if Occam’s razor is an indispensable tool of thinkers, it may also be like a double-edged sword when used simply for the principle’s sake. It is worth remembering that in the process of complexity reduction something is always gained but certain things are inexorably lost too. In this sense we can talk about *conceptual economy of sociological theories*. This economy consists not simply in attempts at objectively weighing the arguments but belongs instead to a dramatic genre of intellectual performance.

What do we see when we subject contemporary cultural sociological theory to this kind of interpretation? Even a cursory look reveals that especially in the so called “strong“ versions it is remarkably economical. For instance, drawing on Ricoeur and Geertz, the Yale style cultural sociology treats social action as a text and sees individuals and collectivities as “suspended in the patterned web of meanings.“ This enables it to understand both action and order as linguistically constituted phenomena. Following French structuralists, it also posits that meanings are arbitrary but stable relations between signifiers and signifieds, and that the logic of meaning-making is reducible to the

binary coding of purity and impurity, or what Durkheim called the opposition of the sacred and profane.

A great part of cultural sociology’s appeal is precisely this analytic parsimony. We have here very few basic principles whose *latent* character can be discerned via thick description in the multiplicity of *manifest* structural variations. There is also few derivative principles, such as relative autonomy of culture. If culture is a kind of independent variable we should take it on its own terms. We need to first of all decode meanings to depict human life. Ontological questions get suspended, sociology becomes a social epistemology. Therefore, discursive interpretation is seen as both indispensable and sufficient technique of explanation. One can but does not have to transcend the confines of such an interpretive reconstruction because it discloses a bottom line of meaningful social life.

I would analogize this style of complexity reduction to drawing. Think about graphic elegance of a drawing as a parallel to the analytic parsimony I have just described. Consider its principle of black and white contrast as basic binarism of representation, its capacity for rendering shades as descriptive sophistication, the finesse of line as clarity of structuralist decoding. A good cultural sociologist is a master of the sociological “drawing.“

But there are distinctive “costs“ to this kind of representation. Certain qualities may be simply beyond reach. Even if such a key aspect as representational verisimilitude can perfectly be achieved, the chromatic nuance is lost, or only hinted at. Likewise, even if perspective may provide a remarkable sense of depth, the deep play of life’s movements cannot be grasped within the static frame of a drawing. This predicament has been realized within the strong program. Jeffrey Alexander (2003: 92) admitted in his flagship book “The Meanings of Social Life“ that he is concerned “only with how and under what conditions the claims are made, and with what results.“ Later he and his collaborators emphasized that “the pure hermeneut like Ricoeur tends to ignore the material problem of instantiating ideals in the real world“ (Alexander and Mast 2006: 1). In other words, the “strong program“ itself referred to some of the intellectual “costs“ of its original vantage point.

This example shows that – in general sociological terms – interpretive theories are devices of humanistic approximation rather than scientific exactitude. This circumstance does not automatically make them “less adequate.“ For instance, accounting for “unresolvable“ ambiguity of human condition (Smelser 1998) can be more or less sophisticated but it can hardly ever be “exact.“ Rather, we face here the distinct difficulty of dealing with variegated meanings, i.e. entities whose susceptibility

to positivistically construed measurement is limited. Already Weber defined sociology as a discipline whose task consists in providing “meaningful understanding of intentional social action“ (*deutend verstehen*)(Weber 2010: 3). If every action of that kind may be represented by means of interpretive methods, each particular form of resulting representation is incomplete, i.e. each implies specific epistemic balance that cannot be transcended, just like a hermeneut cannot escape the circle of linguistic interpretation. Each representation of meanings presupposes bounded plausibility and formal constraints that cannot be altered without violating its internal consistency. To be sure, these are relational, contextual designations. As cultural sociology itself teaches us, collective representations are rarely, if ever inherently dysfunctional or efficient, good or bad. Their utility varies, its marginal efficiency is subject to many contextual factors.

What seems to remain constant is the burden of qualification that weighs on theorists, i.e. a duty to realize and clearly indicate what kind of theoretical economy is involved in a given work. One must ask: what do I gain and lose by means of my complexity reduction? This duty gains significance if we agree that sociological theory can never be like a photograph, i.e. a message without a code, as Roland Barthes put it. It is always a performatively enacted

coding of an already coded, meaningful social reality. There are, of course, various kinds of sociological codings that could be understood with reference to metaphors other than drawing. Regardless of the differences that would separate them, they all seem to share the aim of being an orienting device. Interpretive theory of culture is no exception.

To elucidate this point further, I would say that if a strongly cultural sociological theory is a kind of intellectual drawing generating particular kind of synchronic image of reality, it is also a map. Maps are intellectual images created first of all for the sake of finding one's way in reality. They are sophisticated technical drawings. The cartographic reduction of topographic complexity is truly outstanding, one that effected whole-sale civilizational transformations. But every map is a scheme with its own representational distortion, specific scale, focus, purpose, orientation, and, yes, an aesthetic approach as well. Even the most accurate maps sacrifice a certain amount of representational accuracy to increase representational practicality and conform to certain notions of harmony prevalent in a given time and place. Unless this is acknowledged and systematized, a map cannot be used properly, it can even mislead instead of directing. What follows is this: There are no perfect maps and there cannot be. There are only well and poorly annotated ones. There is no single complete

map, only more or less efficient ones relative to tasks at hand. Here Occam's razor meets pragmatism. Speaking about iconic scientists as examples we may again evoke Wittgenstein who pointed out that "what a Copernicus or a Darwin really achieved was not the discovery of a *true* theory but of a *fertile* point of view" (Wittgenstein 1984: 18e, emphasis mine).

My own point is that it is worth reflecting on the fact that in important respects sociological theories are like maps: no more but also no less than that. They may come to us as diachronic narratives but they also conjure up synchronic intellectual images. They are representations that stem from experiences, not only pure ratiocination. When we as sociologists construct our theories, we draw on certain social imaginaries and aim at creating new ones. What is especially crucial is to keep in mind that representing a given "social terrain" is only half of the good sociological job; one should carefully provide the parameters of the employed calibration, including a full bill of the involved intellectual "costs," an exhaustive exposition of a given complexity reduction. Only then sociological debates can decisively shift from occasionally lavish but invariably "pricy" virtuoso games to more operational performances (see DiMaggio 1997: 263). This is one way of understanding Jeffrey Alexander's now classic call for checking one's

presuppositions and laying them bare in critical debates. This is also what is meant by *postpositivism* as distinct from *postmodernism*. Nowadays, the luxury of positivist parsimony is denied to us but so is the simple freedom of the postmodern dream.

As a sociologist of knowledge I have come to realize that these things are not always realized in the actual sociological practice, or at least not sufficiently from the vantage point adopted here. Instead of getting clarified in the course of transparent exchange, conceptual economies of our theories often remain hidden, implicit, or emerge out of what Randall Collins (2002) called “acrimonious struggles for attention space,” ridden with contradictions and residual categories, often full of denials, tensions and repressed data. Some of our high profile debates are still apparently structured by the positivist/postmodern divide (Sztompka 2011; Burawoy 2011). Some would say “it’s all natural,” but, again, cultural sociology of knowledge would sceptically asked: is it really? And if yes, then in what sense?

At the very least, an enhanced explicit reflexivity regarding these issues seems to be needed. But it’s not only pragmatically beneficial or normatively required. It is also a truly fascinating part of our intellectual work. For example, it is not only helpful but also compelling to recognize that much of what still passes for *analytic* in our

theories is *figurative* without being acknowledged as such and dealt with accordingly. It is not only responsible and research-friendly but also theoretically powerful to delineate the character of the epistemic reduction we engage in when we produce sociological knowledge. I am inclined to think that in order for post-positivist social theories to be robust, they have to direct this control mechanism not mostly to other, often competing theories, but first of all to themselves, in a self-reflexive manner. If, as theorists, we focus on the latter, we will make a more efficient use of time and concepts possible, for others and for ourselves, an important thing in the periods of scarcity like ours.

Some of you may say that thinking about social and cultural theorizing as an enterprise of “mapping” societies and their meaning-systems is itself an old metaphor we all know. Three quick points can be made in response to that. First, knowing and implementing are two different things. Second, as I tried to suggest, the self-consciously heuristic value of this metaphor is considerable, specifically when used for the sake of introducing the problem of the conceptual economy of intellectual performance. Third, age of the metaphor does not have to be detrimental to fulfilling this task. In fact, we know that it is precisely vintage stuff that can and does refresh the late modern perception more than anything else.

References

Alexander, Jeffrey C. 2003. *The Meanings of Social Life. A Cultural Sociology*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Alexander, Jeffrey C. and Jason Mast. 2006. Introduction: symbolic action in theory and practice: the cultural pragmatics of symbolic action. In: Alexander, J.C., Giesen, B. and Mast, J. (eds.) *Social Performance. Symbolic Action, Cultural Pragmatics and Ritual*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bartmanski, Dominik. 2012. How to Become an Iconic Social Thinker: The Intellectual Pursuits of Malinowski and Foucault. *European Journal of Social Theory* 15(3): 1–27.

Burawoy, Michael. 2011. The Last Positivist. *Contemporary Sociology* 40(4): 396–404.

Collins, Randall. 2002. On the Acrimoniousness of Intellectual Disputes. *Common Knowledge* 8: 47–70.

de la Fuente, Eduardo. 2007. The Place of Culture in Sociology: Romanticism and

Debates About the ‘Cultural Turn.’ *Journal of Sociology* 43(2): 115–130.

DiMaggio, Paul. 1997. Culture and Cognition. *Annual Review of Sociology* 23: 263–287.

Einstein, Albert. 2005. *The New Quotable Einstein*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Geertz, Clifford. 1973. *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books.

Jacobs, Mark D. and Lyn Spillman. 2005. Cultural Sociology at the Crossroads of the Discipline. *Poetics* 33: 1–14.

Malinowski, Bronislaw. 1919. A letter to Charles Seligman from January 21, 1919. Retrieved from the Sterling Memorial Library archives at Yale University.

Santoro, Marco. 2008. Culture as (and After) Production. *Cultural Sociology* 2(1): 7–31.

Smelser, Neil. 1998. The Rational and the Ambivalent in the Social Sciences. In: Smelser, N. *The Social Edges of Psychoanalysis*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Sztompka, Piotr. 2011. Another Sociological Utopia. *Contemporary Sociology* 40(4): 388–396.

Weber, Max. 2010. *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft. Grundriss der Verstehenden Soziologie*. Frankfurt am Main: Wunderkammer Verlag.

Wittgenstein, Ludwig. 1984. *Culture and Value*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Dominik Bartmanski

On the Distinctiveness of Analytical Sociology*

*This is a revised version of the speech delivered on the occasion of the acceptance of the Special Mention by the jury award of the ISA prize for the Best Junior Theorist paper at the Mid-term conference of the ISA RC 16 held in Trento in June 2012. I would like to thank the conference participants as well as Marco Santoro for their useful reactions to the first draft of the speech text. I am also grateful to Adrian Belton for revising my English.

My first words go to the prize committee, which has decided to award a special mention to my article “Analytical Sociology and Its Critics”. It is indeed a singular honor to receive the critical

attention of one of the most prestigious ISA research committees. It is also a great pleasure to see that the prize committee has had the intellectual openness to acknowledge the quality of an article that endorses theoretical and methodological positions that many of the members of the research committee are likely to dispute.

The present speech has a modest goal. It only provides a concise description of the basic elements composing the analytical sociology research program. It then employs this description to suggest that scholars who deny the originality of analytical sociology within the panorama of contemporary sociology rely on a selective, hence inaccurate, reading of analytical sociology. To avoid misunderstandings, let me state explicitly that this argument is not intended to contest that analytical sociology has its limitations and that it must be further improved. The sense of my remarks is that critics can contribute to this improvement only if they make the effort to understand all the facets of the analytical sociology research program.

In fact, this is not the case. Analytical sociology is often reduced to a new brand name for the doctrine of methodological individualism (see, for instance, Little, 2012), or, more radically, to nothing more than a new label for sociology based on rational-choice theory (see, for instance, Abbott, 2007; Gross, 2009). If one considers that the quest for micro-

foundations is largely shared among sociologists, then analytical sociology would not lack originality because it would simply amount to existing specific approaches but, on the contrary, because it simply equates to the “mainstream core of practices in contemporary (American-dominated) sociology” (Lizardo, 2012, p. 9).

I regard these assessments as factually wrong because they do not take into due account all the elements that make up the analytical sociology program. My argument is that the distinctiveness of analytical sociology within contemporary sociology evaporates as soon as one isolates one or a few elements from the entire set of elements that the programmatic manifestos of analytical sociology propose in order to define the approach.

The analysis of the literature contained in Manzo (2010) suggests that analytical sociology should be primarily understood as a complex, multi-faceted research strategy combining two sets of general principles. In the most parsimonious form, four of them concern the construction of a theoretical model, whereas four others refer to the empirical validation of the model. When these principles are introduced incrementally (from the most general to the most specific), it becomes apparent that, as the number of principles considered increases, their combination makes it less and less easy to find one sociological

perspective that shares the same combination of elements. The initial apparent overlap between analytical sociology and the rest of sociology (in its current state) thus tends progressively to disappear.

Let me introduce these principles one by one (note that the order in which I introduce them is not intended to parallel the step order of a concrete research design). As regards the model building stage, the quest for clarity and for precision in the definition of concepts and in the writing style is a key requirement for analytical sociology (principle 1). Clarity and precision are at the service of explanation. While rigorous empirical description (of regularities to be explained) and understanding (of actors' reasons, hence of actions' meanings) are central tasks for analytical sociologists, the latter regard explanation as the ultimate goal of sociological analysis for analytical sociology (principle 2). Within analytical sociology, *explananda* of primary interest are cross-sectional population-level patterns and their temporal trends. Explanation is conceived in a very specific way by analytical sociologists. Explaining a (set of) social outcome(s) amounts to figuring out the concatenations of mechanisms that bring about the outcome(s) (principle 3). Analytical sociology conceives social mechanisms as chains of socially constrained micro-level events (principle 4).

In this regard, it is important to stress that, on a programmatic level, analytical sociology does not limit individual actions to instrumental actions. On the contrary, a very open conception of purposive action, which in its extreme variant equates rationality to acting with subjectively defensible reasons, is defended; emotions and heuristics are also crucial actor-level elements that are often postulated by analytical sociologists. The latter also pay attention to the articulation of these elements with structural and relational aspects of social life so that, in the end, from the analytical perspective, a social mechanism always consists of more or less complex bundles of structure-, network-, and action-level elements.

Once a theoretical model has been devised, one enters the model testing stage. Here, analytical sociology first requires that the macro-*patterns* to be explained with the model are precisely delimited and described on the basis of empirical data (principle 5). It is recommended that the theoretical representation of the explanatory mechanism postulated be translated into a formal model (principle 6). Analytical sociology suggests that, among formal models, computational models incorporating the theoretical mechanism of interest constitute the most flexible tools with which to study its population-level consequences (principle 7). Even more specifically, analytical sociology suggests

that one specific form of simulation is especially powerful in designing and in studying theoretical models of social mechanisms, namely agent-based, or, more precisely, object-oriented modelling (principle 7a). This simulation technique, indeed, imposes virtually no constraint on the sets of socially-constrained mechanisms that one wishes/needs to represent, thereby making it possible to determine *in silico* the extent to which the mechanisms postulated can reproduce the macro-level patterns of interest. The last general principle guiding the research strategy proposed by analytical sociology has to do with the fact that the potential overlap between the aggregate consequences generated by the computational model and the empirical data describing the population-level outcomes of interest does not necessarily prove that the postulated mechanism is at work in the real world because, in principle, alternative theoretical mechanisms can equally well reproduce the outcome. To overcome this difficulty, analytical sociology advises injecting survey, qualitative and/or experimental data into the agent-based model so that its micro- and network-level assumptions are empirically-grounded (principle 8).

Thus, programmatically, these eight principles suggest that analytical sociology is a complex web of theoretical and methodological guidelines that tend to crystallize into an empirically-oriented,

experimentally and computationally-based, macro-sociology with clearly explicated and empirically-grounded dynamic micro- and network-level foundations.

Is this set of elements really reducible to a re-statement of the doctrine of methodological individualism or of rational-choice theory, as some commentators claim? Can one reasonably state that this multi-faceted research strategy equates to the mainstream of American sociology, as others have recently argued? My impression is that critics of analytical sociology systematically endorse a wrong line of reasoning when they pick up and/or overweight this or that piece of the research program instead of considering it in its entirety. The complexity of this program implies that the more numerous the parts taken into account, the less easy it is to argue that analytical sociology lacks any intellectual distinctiveness.

In my view, there is an empirical fact that supports the argument according to which the combination of elements that I have summarized substantiates a truly original research program within contemporary sociology. This fact simply consists in the difficulty of finding sociological analyses that combine *at the same time* all the elements defining analytical sociology on a programmatic level. How often, one may indeed wonder, do we see articles published in the best sociological journals in which, *at*

the same time, (1) advanced statistical techniques and/or rigorous qualitative research protocols are used specifically to figure out the *explananda*, (2) formal models are devised to formulate hypotheses about the mechanisms responsible for the observed (robust) correlations, (3) simulation is used to go from the postulated mechanisms back to the patterns to be explained, and, (4) survey, experimental, and/or ethnographic observations are in turn used to discard alternative specifications of the substantive content of the formal model?

My impression is that the right answer is “very rarely”. It is certainly possible to point out an array of empirical studies that have started making the effort to approximate all the requirements of the analytical research program. Macro-patterns and diffusion processes related to sexual networks (Bearman et al., 2004), to unemployment (Hedström, 2005, ch. 6), to residential segregation (Bruch and Mare, 2006), to unpopular norms (Willer et al., 2009), to new technologies (Di Maggio and Garip, 2011), to fertility decisions (Gonzalez-Bailon and Murphy, 2013), or to educational inequalities (Manzo, 2013), for instance, have recently been investigated by means of a complex mix of statistical methods, social network analysis, agent-based simulations, and experiments, the aim being to uncover the reason- and network-

based mechanisms that have brought these patterns about.

These multi-method empirical analyses are still infrequent, however. This signals that the analytical sociology research program is not particularly common within contemporary sociology, that this research program has a clear specificity, and that there is room for its further development. In my opinion, this is precisely the very next step to be undertaken. It is now time to diversify the types of social phenomena brought under scrutiny in order to prove empirically that the analytical sociology research strategy, no matter how demanding it may appear at first, is workable in practice, and that it can help reinforce the explanatory side of our discipline.

References

- Abbott A. (2007), “Mechanisms and Relations”, *Sociologica*, 2/2007, doi: 10.2383/24750.
- Bearman P. S, Moody J., Stovel K. (2004), “Chains of Affection: The Structure of Adolescent Romantic and Sexual Networks”, *American Journal of Sociology*, 110, 1, pp. 44-91.
- Bruch E., Mare R. (2006), “Neighborhood Choice and Neighborhood Change”, *American journal of sociology*, 112, 3, pp. 667–709.
- Gonzalez-Bailon S., Murphy T. E. (2012, forthcoming), “Social Interactions and Long-Term Fertility Dynamics. A Simulation Experiment in the Context of the French Fertility Decline”, *Population Studies*.

Gross N. (2009), "A Pragmatist Theory of Social Mechanisms", *American Sociological Review*, 74, pp. 358-379.

Hedström P. (2005), *Dissecting the Social: On principles of Analytical Sociology*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Little D. (2012), "Analytical Sociology and The Rest of Sociology", *Sociologica*, 1/2012, doi: 10.2383/36894.

Lizardo O. (2012), "Analytical Sociology's Superfluous Revolution", *Sociologica*, 1/2012, doi: 10.2383/36902.

Manzo G. (2010), "Analytical Sociology and Its Critics", *European Journal of Sociology*, 51, 1, pp. 129-170.

Manzo, G. (2013, forthcoming), "Educational Choices and Social Interactions: A Formal Model and a Computational Test", *Comparative Social Research*, 30.

DiMaggio P., Garip F. (2011), "How Network Externalities Can Exacerbate Intergroup Inequality", *American Journal of Sociology*, 116, 6, pp. 1887-1933.

Willer R., Kuwabara K., Macy M. W. (2009), "The False Enforcement of Unpopular Norms", *American Journal of Sociology*, 115, 2, pp. 451-90.

Gianluca Manzo

Call for Papers for the 2014 World Congress of Sociology

1. Jeff Alexander. **Cultural Pragmatics and Social Theory: The Implications of Performance Theory for the Study of Society.** Over the last decade, macro-sociological theory has made significant strides in conceptualizing groups, individuals, and institutions in terms of social performance. Earlier, the concept of perfor-

mance related principally to the micro-sociological, Goffmanian tradition. The new development, by contrast, links classical and modern traditions of social theory with aesthetic theories of theatre, drama, and film. Contributors to this session are asked either to reflect on this recent performative turn in cultural sociology, providing new interpretations, or to advance this turn, demonstrating how cultural pragmatics, or other performative theories, can bring new perspectives to bear on social problems and/or on particular sociological fields.

Email: jeffrey.alexander@yale.edu

2. Gilles Verpraet. **Cosmopolitanism, Nationalism and Political Space.** The notions of cosmopolitanism exceed the nationalist positionings (Beck, Delanty), so to recognize the different cultures (Jullien), and to promote a reciprocity of perspectives (Schutz). The first step intends to question the conditions of intersubjectivity inside the transnational spaces when exist some cosmopolitan stages (Saito). It invites to develop the pragmatic studies of cosmopolitan relations (N Anderson). In a second stance, the sociological elaboration on the reciprocity of perspectives may enlighten the conditions of reciprocity inside international relations. At this level, can be considered the Asian debates between monologic universalism and dialogic universalism (Shijun). How to elaborate a culture-focused universalism? The session is concerned with thick descriptions of the cosmopolitan encounters considering their symbolic performances (Alexander, 2006) It questions the new styles of action that are developed in the micro/ macro links (Giesen), the political subjects who are connecting the global and the local issues. In this framework can be specified the new conditions for transnational solidarities, the connections of public spheres between Polis, nation and cos-

mopolitism. the new relations between center and periphery, the north / south solidarities.

Email: gilles.verpraet@ehess.fr

3. Craig Browne. **Modernity and Critique.**

This session considers whether there have been significant changes in the relationship between modernity and critique. It could be argued that critique is a core dimension of modernity, since it differentiated modernist perspectives from traditional justifications and critique could be related to the modern normative ideals of autonomy and progress. At the same time, modernity has been viewed as the precondition for the actualization of critique and it has been suggested that critique must be consistent with the rationality that is a basic stipulate of modernity. Of course, these visions of an interconnection between modernity and critique have been subjected to a multitude of challenges, like those from feminist perspectives, postmodernist approaches, and post-colonial positions. There have been various redefinitions of each of the categories of modernity and critique in recent sociological theory, particularly in response to historically significant social changes and uncertainties concerning the trajectories of modernized and modernizing societies. These theoretical innovations have included arguments about the premodern sources of critique in the antinomian strands of world religions and popular culture, the elaboration of the contrast between critical sociology and the sociology of critique, and the debates within Critical Social Theory over the normative and political bases of critique in recognition and redistribution. Similarly, different emphases have been given in recent sociological theory to the notion of modernity, with the accentuation of the institution of social imaginaries and distinctive cultural understandings of the world,

the global character of modern institutions and the idea of variations within a common civilization that produces multiple modernities, and the highlighting of the crises and paradoxes that have ensued from preceding critiques and the transformation of capitalism in light of the social struggles attendant on critique. Papers are invited that address the conjunction between modifications in the conception of modernity and redefinitions of critique.

Email: craig.browne@sydney.edu.au

4. Anthony Elliott, Atsushi Sawai, Masataka Katagiri. **Japanese Contemporary Social Theory seen from the Inside and Outside.** Organizers have published Routledge Companion to Contemporary Japanese Social Theory in 2012. The book introduces, contextualizes and critiques social theories in the broader context of Japanese society, culture and politics with particular emphasis upon Japanese engagements and revision of major traditions of social thoughts. Divided into two parts, the book survey traditions of social thoughts in Japanese social science and presents the major social issues facing contemporary Japan. On the bases of the book, organizers collect presenters including contributors of the book and hold session to examine the possibilities and difficulties of the development of Japanese contemporary social thought seen from inside and outside.

Email: anthony.elliott@unisa.edu.au

5. Kiyomitso Yui. **Visual Turn and Popular Cultures ; Anime, Manga and Comics in Japan, Korea and China.** In approaching to the phenomenon of visual popular cultures such as animation, manga and comics, in terms of theoretical framework of visual turn in sociology and W.J.T. Mitchell's conception of 'What pictures

want?’ the session will be organized. While the presence of those popular cultures of ‘Anime and Manga’ in the world especially that of pivoting around the phenomenon of costume play called ‘cosplay’ is gaining more worldwide popularity, the scholarly investigation into the phenomenon has been limited to a shallow, journalistic and impressionistic scope. The session will invite those studies in deepening the theoretical insights into the phenomenon basically from the viewpoint of the visual turn of sociology. Especially welcome will be papers that compare the phenomena in Asian countries with that of the USA and Europe.

Email: yui@lit.kobe-u.ac.jp

6. Patrick Baert. **Intellectuals and Politics.**

Email: pjnb100@cam.ac.uk

7. Frederic Vandenberghe and Margaret Archer. **What’s a collective? The ontology of groups, crowds and crews.** Half a century ago, we talked about the Proletariat, but without examining too closely the ontological status of collectives as distinct from collectivities: Does a collective exist? Is it just a name? Can it think as a group? Can it act, and if so, how? These questions remain and have re-surfaced in analytical philosophy and social theory. However, their conceptions are diverse and often represent incompatible ontologies of collectives and collective phenomena. Recent theoretical developments in systems theory, network analysis, actor-network theory, critical realism, pragmatism, phenomenology and analytic philosophy allow for a reconsideration of the question of collective agency and reconceptualisation of collective intentionality, collective subjectivity, collective reflexivity, plural subjects, intentional communi-

ties, coordination of action, etc. There is an upswing in ‘Relational Sociology’ but as I not always clear whether it is persons, groups, things or even relations that are related, this term covers the same spectrum of ontological differences. There are some ‘relationists’ who want to keep their ontology flat and others who endorse a stratified ontology of relationships and their emergent properties and powers. Papers are sought that address these central issues thematically.

Email: frederic@iesp.uerj.br

8. Ron Jacobs. **Entertainment, Leisure, Sport, and Civil Society.** Theories of civil society generally take as their object political discourse, social crisis, cultural trauma, and other events that typically get covered in the front pages of the newspaper. For many individuals, groups, and communities, however, their most significant civic investments are directed toward sport, leisure activities, and other forms of entertainment. This session invites papers that consider the roles that these kinds of entertainment practices play in organizing civic life and public sphere communications.

Email: rjacobs@albany.edu

9. Seung Kuk Kim. **Asian Values or East Asianism Revisited.** This session starts from the critical reflection that the Asian values debate in 1990s is not finished but an ongoing civilizational question raised already in the late 19th and early 20th century in East Asia when the “modern” West (& Japan as an early adapter) and the “un-modern” East clashed. With the rise of East Asia in post-modern context, East Asian values do matter again. The session invites papers that consider the following issues: 1.

the historical legacy of East Asianism as a reaction to the imperialist Westernization/modernization in the past and also currently as a (post-modern) global trend of Easternization; 2. the identity project of East Asia in transformation which may contribute to the diffusion of new global value orientations in line with Takeuchi Yoshimi in particular; 3. the contested vision for East Asian Community through which alternative social formations are imagined and built (in contrast to European Union).

Email: skkim21@pusan.ac.kr

10. Seung Kuk Kim and Kiyomitsu Yui. **Jeffrey Alexander in East Asia.** East Asianizing (e.g. Japanizing, Chinizing, Taiwanizing or Koreanizing) the Western sociological theories and developing theories of East Asian style has been an urgent task for East Asian sociological theorists. We invite papers that critically consider, in the context of East Asian theory building, the sociological theories of Jeffrey Alexander such as neo-functionalism, civil society, cultural sociology, etc. The theoretical quest for “provincializing Alexander” or “from Alexander to East Asian way of theorizing” is of particular interest. Papers dealing with the ways in which Alexander is specifically employed or modified in theory construction are also welcomed. (In our session, any individual country in East Asia may represent East Asia as a symbolic whole. East Asia is both an invention and a method.)

Email: skkim21@pusan.ac.kr

Email: yui@lit.kobe-u.ac.jp

11. Gianpaolo Baiocchi. **Theorizing Circulation: Revisiting the metaphors for the travel of culture, ideas, and symbols.** There has been renewed attention across the social sciences and humanities to the issue

of the circulation of culture, broadly conceived. This has come under many guises and has animated many a debate across disciplines - from the "diffusion of policy ideas" in political science, to the translation of scientific standards in STS, to the travel of culture in anthropology, among many others. At heart of each is a metaphor for the movement of ideas from place to place. This session invites papers that critically consider the theoretical problem of understanding that movement from a variety of perspectives.

Email: gianpaolo_baiocchi@brown.edu

12. Josuke Amada and Kiyomitsu Yui. **Sociological Inquiry into the Theory of Modernization in Japan.** How the theory of modernization has been developed and shaped as a social theory in a certain society is a question to be discussed sociologically. In particular, various developed countries experienced significant changes in norms and social systems after the 1960s, and sociologists in the latter half of the 20th century have struggled with how to theorize these changes. “Reflexive modernization” and “risk societies” have been discussed as examples of such theorizations, and within these theories modern society has been positioned as “late modernity.”

Looking back at history, however, reveals that modernization of this kind, especially the reflexive dynamism which is spoken of as a characteristic of late modernity, is not that simple. The theory of modernization is especially complicated in the case of Japan, a country which began modernization later than its Western counterparts. The approach based on “overcoming modernity,” for example, which emerged out of the “Kyoto school” of philosophers prior to the Second World War, held that Japan enjoyed a privi-

leged position from which to respond to Western modernization because it is an Asian country and was a latecomer to modernization. There was also an attempt to construct a social theory based on the “self-application of modernization” which would “reflect on” the modernization that had arisen as “reflection on tradition” during a period of turmoil in the 1930s and 1940s, but at the same time the irony of the fact that this easy “self-application of modernization” was itself intertwined with tradition was also discussed. In this way theories of modernization in East Asia were in a sense developed in the form of piled-up “excessive refraction.” This resulted in a unique posture of “distance” or “refraction” regarding socialism and “the social.”

This session examines how social theory in modern Japan, in particular the theory of modernization, has been discussed within the context of historical dynamism, and how this discourse has been developed in relation to “the social.” This discussion should clarify the distinctiveness of the theories of modernization that were developed in Japan and East Asia, and this XVIII ISA World Congress of Sociology held in Yokohama presents an especially suitable opportunity to examine this topic.

Email: josuke.amada@nifty.com

Email: yui@lit.kobe-u.ac.jp

13. Agnes Ku. **Urban Space and Global Cities.** Cities can be seen as nodes within a global economy. The question of how the global and the local intersect in local economic development has received increasing attention in recent years from academics and policy thinkers alike. This panel welcomes submissions that address issues related to the changing urban forms in the context of globalization, including but not confining to the following:

- how the cities seek to position, project or refashion their cultures in the global space through a project of urban entrepreneurialism;
- how the socio-economic, political and cultural processes take place whereby the “global city” project is shaped and contested in particular local contexts;
- how civil society creates spaces for cultural participation from below in the process of cultural globalization and urban development.

Email: soagnes@ust.hk

14. Vikki Bell and Fuyuki Kurasawa. **Framing Suffering: On Critically Theorizing and Reading Images.** In recent years, the intersection of visual analysis and the topic of social suffering has been particularly fertile terrain for scholarly work across the human sciences. Two broad tendencies can be distinguished, namely, empirically-based documentation or descriptions of the ways in which certain situations or modes of suffering have been represented, and normatively-derived critiques of these forms of representation. While both developments are significant, the session is interested in papers that push sociological theory in the direction of new conceptual frameworks for critical engagement with images of suffering, in order to understand how the condition of suffering, and subjects who suffer, are framed, constituted, and presented to audiences and, in turn, how such representations themselves frame popular understandings of what constitutes suffering.

Email: v.bell@gold.ac.uk

Email: kurasawa@yorku.ca

15. Giuseppe Sciortino and Martina Cvajner. **Theorizing Sexuality.**

Email: sciortino.peppino@gmail.com

Email: martina.cvajner@unitn.it

16. San-Jin Han. **Second-Modern Transformation in non-Western countries.** Central for the session is a self-conscious examination of the non-Western developmental experiences to open up a space in which the possibility of constructing an alternative social theory of second modernity can be jointly explored while constructively pursuing dialogue with the dominant Western social theories today. Particular attention will be paid to East Asia where a catch-up modernization has taken place successfully at the cost of the unanticipated consequences of complex risks, thereby producing enormous public demands for a new development. Against this background attempts will be made to examine why and how such themes as risk governance, individualization, family solidarity, cosmopolitan urban development, new media and citizens' participation, tradition and identity, human rights, and so on, have evolved in multiple historical trajectories while converging into an overall direction of second modernity.

Email: hansjin@snu.ac.kr

17. Mabel Berezin. **Theorizing Legacy: Does the Past Have Power Over Political Events?** Analysts sometimes speak of legacies as if they were simple repetitions of the past in the present. In contrast to this static position, this panel argues that legacies represent the intersection of history and culture. Legacies are dynamic and ever re-combining. Legacies are sometimes dormant; they sometimes re-emerge in unexpected ways. This panel seeks papers that takes this dynamic view of legacies to examine how the past may or may not influence the shape and trajectory of political events.

Email: mabel.berezin@cornell.edu

18. Phil Smith. **Pollution, Defilement and Disgust.** It is a commonplace in cultural theory to suggest that arbitrary meanings establish

boundaries. What is less often noticed is that some boundaries are stronger than others. Not merely cognitive, these evoke responses far more powerful than the raised eyebrows and rolled eyes that accompany, to note two recent examples, 'poor' music choices or 'profligate' lunch spending. The most powerful boundaries mark out visceral reservoirs of hatred horror and abjection. They also provide unique performative opportunities for ritual defilement and pleasurable transgression. Over the years theorists such as Douglas, Durkheim, Kristeva, Elias, Freud and Bataille have provided amazing insight into the world of the forbidden and revolting. The session is interested in work informed by their legacy, and in particular in studies that surpass and augment rather than merely deploy such familiar resources.

Email: philip.smith@yale.edu

19. Jason Mast. **Civil Societies in Comparative Perspective.** Much recent theorizing and empirical research has placed civil society back into the center of social scientific discourse. Civil societies increasingly address issues global in scale, such as climate change, economic crises, and intra- and international armed conflicts and humanitarian efforts. This session is particularly focused on how public opinion formations within civil societies either shape or fail to shape state actions on international issues, and on how differences between civil societies direct international relations toward conflict or cooperation. The session is also open to research that examines differences between civil societies, either across nations or over time, in terms of their varying cultural and discursive structures, their institutional logics, their paths to formation, or their modes of inclusion and exclusion.

Email: j.l.mast@warwick.ac.uk

20. Mustafa Emirbayer and Eric Schneiderhan. **Issues, Problems, and Potential in the Study of Symbolic Violence.** Weber observed that domination cannot sustain itself indefinitely through sheer force alone, while Bourdieu spoke extensively of “symbolic violence,” the perpetuation of domination through the active complicity of the dominated. This panel examines closely the processes and mechanisms of symbolic violence—and also reflects critically on the concept itself, its strengths and weaknesses, and its place in the tradition of sociological theorizing. Papers of both theoretical and substantive nature are welcomed.

Email: emirbaye@ssc.wisc.edu

Email: e.schneiderhan@utoronto.ca

21. Dominik Bartmanski. **Theories of Materiality and Material Culture.** One of the key challenges of meaning-centered cultural sociology is to face the findings of material culture studies and to come to terms with the implications of the iconic turn. The structuralist assumption of arbitrariness of cultural sign is of limited service in explaining the power of complex representational economies and its variability. There is ample evidence that most social signifiers are not just “the garb of meaning,” to use the insightful phrase of the American anthropologist Webb Keane. Rather, the actual signifiatory structures and their material/aesthetic properties co-constitute meanings. Therefore more integrative and multidimensional models of culture in action are nowadays both needed and made possible by emergence of the systematic research agendas organized around such master categories as performativity, iconicity and materiality. This session is devoted to new explorations in these overlapping cutting-edge domains. The goal is to discuss their sociological promise and challenges, and ascertain how they transform cultural scholarship today.

Email: dbartmanski@gmail.com

22. Isaac Reed. **Contested Modernities in Theory and Practice.** “Modernity” is both a central organizing concept in abstract social theory and an inflamed point of disputation. The “multiple modernities” rendering of the concept has been both hailed as a new paradigm for our age and criticized as a retreat of modernization theory. Sociological theories of globalization often contain within them a notion of spreading or diffusing modernity or postmodernity, while other accounts of the contemporary globe argue that diffusionist models are insufficient to understand the history, power politics, and violence of “modernity.” Simultaneous to all of this theorizing, discourses of modernity are a central feature of the postcolonial era, mobilized by all sorts of individual and corporate actors for various political, economic, and cultural purposes. This session will explore how careful theorizing about modernity can enable better analysis of its uses and abuses.

Email: isaac.reed@colorado.edu

23. Matthias Revers. **Theorizing Online/Offline Identity, Performativity and Expertise.** We have witnessed an increasing digitization of public communication and expansion of online spheres of action for the last two decades. In scholarly time, this is still fairly recent and, despite tremendous research efforts in this area, there is still a high demand for theories and analytical tools beyond science and technology studies approaches to characterize associated transformations and processes: Does the multiplicity of possible venues for self-expression facilitate or complicate the formation of identities? Are performances of coherent selves still possible in this increasingly complex augmented reality? What does knowledge and expertise mean in an environment where “crowd intelligence” diffuses horizontally? These are just some of the questions that could be addressed in this session,

which invites purely theoretical/conceptual as well as theoretically-minded empirical papers.

Email: mrevers@albany.edu

24. Brad West. **National Futures.** This session invites papers that examine the future of the nation and the establishment of interconnections between the global and national. Where once there was a general consensus that the nation is an out-dated source of identity with little role to play in a 'global' future, an emerging literature is considering the possibilities of national re-enchantment, the significance of national entities in addressing global problems and broadly the different ways national traditions interact with postmodern forces. This works fills an important gap in the literature on global transformations. Despite most globalization scholars no longer assuming that cultural influences across state boundaries result in a mono-culture, the nation is frequently lost within the local/global binary. The theme also addresses key failings within sociological theory that while long acknowledging the adaptive powers of capitalism, has conceived of the nation in terms of its inherent qualities that either endure or disintegrate in the face of contemporary socio-political change. This session thus invites papers that seek to consider the ways in which the nation might have a viable future. Possible themes for papers are how national traditions withstand or incorporate global influences; the role of ritual in national collective memory being reimaged in culturally relevant ways and the constructive role the nation can play in addressing global issues such as climate change, humanitarian aid and terrorism.

Email: brad.west@unisa.edu.au

25. Takashi Okumura. **Discovering and Locating the Legacies of Japanese Sociological Theories.** Sociological theories in Japan have been developing under vast and profound influences of Western sociology. We can count, however, some very productive and original sociologists, whose theories would have had possibilities to give strong impacts to the rest of the world if their works had been translated into English on publication. For example, works of Munesuke Mita (1937-) about social consciousness (including "The Hell of Others' Eyes" (1973) and *Comparative Sociology of Time* (1981)), those of Keiichi Sakuta (1922-) on the deep structure of society (*The Destiny of Individualism* (1981) and *Towards the Sociology of Becoming* (1993)), and system theory of Tamito Yoshida (1931-2009) about information and possession (*Theory of Information and Self-organization* (1990) and *Theory of Possession and Subjectivity* (1991)) would be among them. Supposing Japanese sociologists now represent their (or some other important theorists') original ideas properly after a few decades (in English, of course!), how will sociologists from the world react to them and locate them into their theoretical frameworks? This session is welcoming papers dealing with these legacies of Japanese sociology by members from Japan mainly (but not exclusively), with a hope to have stimulating discussions with participants from the world at the venue.

Email: t-oku@rikkyo.ac.jp

26. Business Meeting