

**AUTUM / WINTER 2014**

### **Co-chairs**

Patrick Baert

Cambridge University, United Kingdom  
[pjb100@cam.ac.uk](mailto:pjb100@cam.ac.uk)

Agnes Ku

Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, Hong Kong  
[soagnes@ust.hk](mailto:soagnes@ust.hk)

### **Secretary / Treasurer**

Bradley West

University of South Australia, Australia  
[brad.west@unisa.edu.au](mailto:brad.west@unisa.edu.au)

### **Newsletter Editors**

Erik Schneiderhan

University of Toronto, Canada  
[e.schneiderhan@utoronto.ca](mailto:e.schneiderhan@utoronto.ca)

Daniel Silver

University of Toronto, Canada  
[dsilver@utsc.utoronto.ca](mailto:dsilver@utsc.utoronto.ca)

### **Board**

Jeffrey Alexander, Yale University, USA

Craig Browne, Sidney University, Australia

Fuyuki Kurasawa, York University Canada

Martina Loew, Free University, Berlin, Germany

Hans-Peter Mueller, Humbolt University Berlin, Germany

Philip Smith, Yale University, USA

Lynette Spillman, University of Notre Dame, USA

Frederic Vandenberghe, Universidade Estadual de Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

Gilles Verpraet, Ecole de Hautes etudes en Sciences Sociales, France

Ronald Jacobs, ex-officio

Guiseppe Sciortino, ex-officio

# Table of Contents

- 3**      **Editor's Introduction**  
Erik Schneiderhan and Daniel Silver
- 4**      **New Co-chairs Statement**  
Patrick Baert and Agnes Ku
- 5**      **Past Co-chairs Statement**  
Ron Jacobs and Giuseppe Sciortino
- 6**      **Teaching Theory**  
Daniel Silver
- 12**     **Graduate Student Workshop**  
Christopher Graziul and Athena Engman
- 19**     **Theoretical Spotlight**  
Takeshi Degman
- 25**     **Announcements**

# Editor's Introduction

**W**e are very excited to take over as co-editors of *Theory*.

Craig Browne and Paul Jones have been excellent stewards of the newsletter the past four years, and our goal is to build on their success. We plan to publish two issues of *Theory* each year for the four years of our term. With the support of the RC-16 Board, we have taken the newsletter completely on-line and will share it by email and on our section website. We have also given the newsletter a new look, which we hope you all enjoy. Thank you to Tiffany Baker for her work on the design and layout.

The pages of the newsletter are opportunities to share information and start conversations. To that end, we have inaugurated several recurrent thematic sections that we hope will foster robust discussion. These include: a) graduate student workshops; b) spotlights on how theoretical education is practiced around the world; and c) features on new research. In this first issue of our term, we offer a brief introduction to each section and share our hopes for how it might be used by section members.

**-Erik Schneiderhan and Daniel Silver**

# Remarks from new Co-chairs

As the newly elected co-chairs of RC16, we are very thankful for the opportunity of working with other members of the executive board during the next four years. Founded in the 1980s, RC16 has grown to become one of the largest sections in the ISA. We believe that the continued growth of the Research Committee testifies to the sociological interest in theorizing - theorizing in the broadest sense of the word. Thanks to the endeavor of our predecessors, the Research Committee has achieved its goal of internationalizing its leadership with success, with board members coming from six continents over the years. This has brought both diversity and vigor to the Research Committee, and we will endeavor to work in this spirit. We are beginning to plan our interim conference, which will most likely be held in the Summer of 2016 in Cambridge (UK). The mid-term conferences have always provided an intimate setting for in-depth discussions and intellectual exchange. In recent years we have had wonderful conferences in Rio de Janeiro (2004), Pusan, South Korea (2008), and Trento, Italy (2012). Regarding the conference in Cambridge, we will provide more concrete details in a later issue of the newsletter. Last but not least, we would like to express our gratitude to the members of the previous executive board for their excellent work. Special thanks go to Giuseppe Sciortino and Ron Jacobs, co-chairs from 2010-14; to Craig Browne and Paul Jones, the newsletter editors; and many other members for organizing the panels in past conferences. We look forward to working with you all.

**-Co-chairs of Research Committee 16**

**Patrick Baert and Agnes Ku**

# Remarks from outgoing Co-chairs

As we turn over the leadership of RC 16 to Patrick Baert and Agnes Ku, we wish to thank all of our members for their help in maintaining the spirit of intellectual dialogue and solidarity that has become the hallmark of our Research Committee. We are particularly grateful to the former RC co-chairs, Fuyuki Kurasawa and Phil Smith, and to the members of the Executive Board for their help and support. RC 16 continues to be one of the largest and most vibrant research committees in the ISA, and this was in full display during the World Congress in Yokohama. We enjoyed listening to a wide range of high quality papers from scholars around the globe, engaging with the most pressing theoretical questions of the day. Of particular interest were the many special sessions focused on East Asia. Yokohama was a wonderful venue for the conference, with state-of-the-art conference space, a beautiful port city, and easy access to Tokyo. We enjoyed the conversations we had with all of you, during the sessions and late into the evenings.

In consultation with the Executive Board, we made several organizational changes to RC 16 during the last four years. We have switched to an online election of officers, and our initial online election had a good turnout, yielding an effective and diverse group of officers. We have also decided to move the presentation of the Distinguished Contribution to Social Theory Award to coincide with the mid-term meeting, as we have done with the Junior Theorist Award. Finally, we have decided to move completely to digital communications. Newsletters will be emailed to members, and also posted to the RC 16 website. Additional communication will take place through the email list-serve. We look forward to seeing all of you at the mid-term meeting in 2016.

**-Ron Jacobs and Giuseppe Sciortino**

# Theory around the world

This section has two purposes. The first is to give sociologists from various countries a chance to articulate how they teach theory, and to promote dialogue about the strengths and weakness of various approaches to that task. The second is to report on and encourage international collaborative research into how theory is in fact taught, and by whom.

This issue includes a piece devoted to the first. Future issues will tackle the second. Specifically, our hope is to build an international database of theory syllabi and theory teachers. We have already gathered most syllabi for all theory courses taught in Canada in the last three years, and have begun to turn up some intriguing patterns, which we will report in the next issue. A German team, led by Wolfgang Knöbl, is doing the same for Germany. We encourage others to do so as well for their home countries, and welcome discussions and inquiries from potential collaborators.

We hope in this way use the newsletter as an occasion to produce some worthwhile knowledge about the state of social-theoretical education around the world.

## Teaching Theory

**Daniel Silver, University of Toronto**

Theorizing is a practical skill. Like any skill, it can be improved with training. Novices begin with some latent abilities, and teachers help them to cultivate those abilities. Successful teaching and learning culminates in people who can exercise their theoretical capacities excellently.

Simple as this notion of theory-as-practice sounds, it cuts against many preconceptions about social theory, held by students and professionals alike.

Most beginning undergraduates who enter my lecture course in classical sociological theory have no idea what social theory could possibly mean. Maybe they have heard it involves reading some old and dense books. Mostly they are scared, or bored. Or both.

The graduate students who take my seminar in contemporary theory come with different preconceptions. Some come in thinking “I am [not] a theory person.” They associate theory with a fixed personality type; they have it or they don’t. Others come in thinking

that theory is only to be read and interpreted. It is a finished canon for them to assimilate and understand but not a living tradition to themselves develop. Others take a more active attitude, thinking that theory is to be “used.” Here theory is a repository of “approaches” or “frames” that provide interpretative lenses for guiding research. In practice, this often means appending some summary statements about a given theorist’s ideas to the introduction of an empirical study. Few think of themselves as potential theoretical producers or equal participants in a lively ongoing theoretical conversation.

Nor do most professional sociological theorists treat theory in this pragmatic way. At least their practice does not suggest they do. My graduate students’ ideas don’t come from nowhere. Our preliminary research on the content of Canadian sociological theory syllabi (some of which we will report in the next issue of *Theory*) bears this idea out. Very few theory courses include assignments that require active theoretical production. A further indication is the recent appearance of two important books, Don Levine’s *Social Theory as a Vocation*, and Richard Swedberg’s *Theorizing in Social Science*. Each argues in its own way for a more active and practical approach to theorizing and teaching theory. Setting aside their different emphases, that they both have appeared now and similarly set themselves against a more passive or receptive mode of doing and teaching theory is another indicator of the direction in which the main current against which they are trying to swim is flowing.

Those are the attitudes I have to work with. I try to engage students where they are, and move them somewhere else. For the second-year students in my lecture courses, I begin by persuading them that they are all already amateur theorists, whether or not they know it. For they have all almost certainly asked themselves such questions as:

- Is so-and-so just “in it for the money” or perhaps “fronting”?
- Is some way of thinking a “Canadian thing” or an “Chinese thing”?
- Why do “city folk” and “country folk” behave differently?
- Why do people wait for hours outside of hotels during the Toronto International Film Festival to get a glimpse of a star?
- Why are people working in bureaucracies so often obsessed with rules?
- Why don’t more people take the money out of their neighbor’s wallet, even though nobody would notice?

These are the everyday questions out of which the systems and concepts of social theory are built. From there, the structure of the course is utterly conventional.<sup>1</sup> I lecture; they take notes, answer questions on exams, and write essays. Yet maintaining constant reference to the pragmatic significance of the ideas transforms them, from dead words to elaborations of a living reality. My own lecturing is meant to model and embody that for them.

My upper-division course in contemporary social theory is smaller, and students are more experienced. This permits a more hands-on approach to theoretical education. To this end, students are assigned “theory-work” exercises.

I initially developed these exercises for my graduate seminar, so it may be easier to explain how they work in that context. I shamelessly adapted the idea from one of Don Levine’s old Chicago courses, which he called a “practicum in social theory.” I never took that course, but heard about it, and Don was kind enough to share his records with me and discuss his practice. This kind of adaptive reuse is of course itself an instance of the pragmatic attitude toward social theory.

The keynote of theory work exercises is that they are “work” and “exercises.” Theorizing is not just an accompaniment to something else, whether that “else” be the particularities about which we generalize, the concrete phenomena from which we develop abstractions, or the policy issues the nature of which we contemplate.<sup>2</sup> Theorizing is and can be an accomplice to these and more, but it need not be. If it is pursued in a disjunctive mode, then it becomes a work unto itself. A theory work exercise trains up the ability to perform that kind of work well.

My version of the seminar proceeds along two tracks. One is about gaining facility in critically discussing major theoretical traditions with which any self-respecting member of the sociological profession should have a passing familiarity. I let Hans Joas and Wolfgang

1 This is not entirely correct. I integrate an intensive writing component into tutorial sessions led by graduate students. These employ pragmatic principles of writing instruction, adapted from the University of Chicago’s “Little Red Schoolhouse” and summarized in our piece, “Writing is a skill, you can teach it,” available here: <https://www.dropbox.com/s/wqw6y2uyt6nddh5/Writing%20is%20a%20Skill.%20%20You%20can%20teach%20it.docx?dl=0>.

The lectures and the writing instruction mutually support one another, in that they cultivate mutually supportive skills.

2 These oppositions are abbreviations of the various contraries to theory Don developed in his Social Theory as a Vocation

Knöbl's *Social Theory* be our guide for that.<sup>3</sup> The other track is the theory work exercises, which are about learning how to theorize in practice.

Here is how it works. The graduate seminar in contemporary theory is required of all University of Toronto PhD students. All are expected to come in with their own research agendas in some empirical field. In the first week, each seminar participant chooses some seminal text in their research area. Book or article, recent or old, anything is fine as long as it is a point of critical discussion within some intellectual discourse with which the student is familiar. That text provides the material content for the subsequent exercises.

The seminar is 12 weeks, one session per week. Time is limited, and I have found that four exercises is about the limit that students can reasonably handle. The first exercise is in exegesis. Here is the exercise:

Select some sociological work that in your judgment deserves exegetical explication. The work should come from a field with which you are familiar. Justify your selection and present a short (3-page) explication of part or all of the work. Focus your discussion on articulating what is potentially puzzling or confusing in the work or some particularly challenging section and how that might be clarified.

They are supposed to approach the text as a sympathetic interlocutor, discerning passages or ideas with which an intelligent reader might be confused, and then intervening to help clarify the matter for the reader. The exercise usually serves to loosen up the students' relationship to the text; they find that many passages that might seem clear or obvious on quick reading become opaque under close scrutiny, and call out for some clarifying interpretation. Exegesis becomes an integral component of the research process rather than a gratuitous addition, reserved for Marx, Durkheim, and Weber.

Next we turn to critical conceptual analysis. After the first exercise, students have articulated some of the texts' core components. Now they tackle them in a critical mode. The task is to take a key concept, and lay bare its ambiguities.

If the goal of the first exercise is to sympathetically introduce a reader to a potentially confusing text, the second exercise is supposed to isolate the underlying causes of the text's ambiguities. Perhaps the concept is used in multiple senses without distinguishing them. Perhaps multiple

<sup>3</sup> Incidentally, Knöbl will be writing a piece on how he teaches theory for the next issue of *Theory*.

terms are used to cover the same concept. Perhaps the concept is used at different levels of analysis.

Having identified the cause of an ambiguity, the student is then to disambiguate the concept. That could mean breaking it down into component meanings, sharpening distinctions among multiple overlapping categories, or distinguishing its import at different levels of analysis. The result is that the conceptual apparatus that defines a student's field becomes unfixed. It is no longer a wall to conform to or a resource to be mined; it is a conceptual tool to be shaped and worked on, refined and re-designed.

Third is synthetic reconstruction. This is an exercise in constructing new concepts, building on the critical analysis and exegesis in previous assignments. There is no single correct way to do this. Some are tried and true implements in the theorist's tool kit, and I encourage student's to try these. Here is some text from the assignment:

You might take two concepts that you disambiguated in assignment #2 and cross them via a four-fold (or more) table. Or you might take two (or more) concepts and demonstrate that they are both sub- components of a more general or unitary concept that joins them. Or you could take multiple concepts and arrange them in a typology. Or you could introduce a new concept that withstands the criticisms you made in the previous exercise but does the main analytical work of the old concepts.

Now the concepts begin to become the students' own. They have to make something new, and the "things" they are making are ideas. And not just any ideas – ideas that can do a job, and ideally do it better than when the students' initially found them.

Last is explanatory propositions. I adapt this exercise in part from Stinchcombe's *Constructing Social Theories*, and join it with relevant sections of that book. Students at this point have built up an array of concepts. Now instead of articulating logical relations among them, they are to elaborate potential causal processes between them. That is, they transform them from concepts to variables.

Choose any relation between two or more variables that you are interested in; invent at least three theories, not now known to be false, which might explain these relations; choosing appropriate indicators, derive at least three empirical consequences from each theory, such that these factual consequences distinguish among the theories. You may wish to develop at least one complex proposition, whether of the demographic or functional type, or of some other type of your choosing.

This exercise takes us close to the edge of the theoretical side of what Jeffrey Alexander calls the “scientific continuum and its components” (*Twenty Lectures*, p. 7). It is where the “metaphysical environment” shades into “the empirical environment,” “theories” meet “facts,” and “complex and simple propositions” guide the interpretation and formulation of observations, correlations, and methods.

The theory exercises are an iterative process. Students are free to rewrite them as many times as they like throughout the term, and I actively assist them in multiple revisions. The final essay for the course is simply a compilation and integration of the four exercises into a single coherent text. When that is complete, they have produced an essay in pure theory -- but behind their own backs, as it were. This can be quite an epiphany; many have never done anything like that before.

This is not always an easy or pleasant process for many students. But neither is learning to play basketball or the violin. The reward is in discovering in oneself creative abilities one may not have thought one had, in learning how to cultivate them at a high level, and to take one’s place among others dedicated to doing so. More than one student has told me that the course has had a transformative effect for them, in that they learned to do something of which they previously thought themselves incapable. I do not know how many have had this experience, statistically. But if it happens at all, it is worth the effort, since it is only through this sort of pragmatic theoretical education that the great tradition of social theory will continue to exist as something more than required courses and half-hearted introductory sections

# Graduate student workshop

This is a space for graduate students. Students working on their dissertations can provide a précis with questions or provocations that might engender future conversation. Students have the opportunity to present their work and RC-16 members have the opportunity to offer them support and advice. Faculty, please encourage your graduate students to contact us and share their work.

## Theorizing Social Constraint Through Venues

**Christopher Graziul, University of Chicago**

Social theory has many uses that are often unappreciated by researchers. One such use is the synthesis of seemingly unrelated ideas into novel frameworks for studying complex social systems. The imaginative capacity this move requires is rarely necessary for the production of sophisticated empirical analysis, but its absence often obscures social mechanisms of interest. In this piece, I will make the case that social theorists could make significant contributions to an area of research often called transport geography. After describing this research area in broad terms, I will list some of the theoretical questions it raises concerning micro-social interaction. Then I will briefly present a framework for answering these questions by featuring the physical spaces where these interactions take place. My broader goal is to catalyze an ongoing conversation regarding the intersection of geography, physical venues for social interaction, and networks/network domains.

Transport geographers are primarily concerned with the travel patterns of individuals within a geographic region. Part of this concern is implicitly practical. For example, understanding these patterns can aid in urban planning, in particular traffic management. More recently, however, this concern has extended to encompass questions of public health, segregation, recreation, and other social phenomena (Richardson et al. 2013; Farber and Páez 2009; Van Acker, Van Wee, and Witlox 2010; Wong and Shaw 2011). One of the more innovative recent developments in this field is a modeling technique that allows researchers to simulate individuals' exposure to each other over the course of a typical day (Fang et al. 2011; Farber et al. 2013). Researchers study these phenomena using both simulated and actual data, applying or inventing increasingly sophisticated methodological approaches to increase the realism of their models.

As these studies further explore sociality within a geographic region, questions emerge regarding typical assumptions about the social interactions being modeled. I suggest that these questions fall into two broad categories: (1) how individuals come to co-locate, and thus create

the potential to interact, and (2) how individuals interact once they co-locate. It is easy to assume that random chance will eventually lead two residents to enter the same social venue at the same time, but the tendency toward homophily challenges this assumption. The same can be said of the likelihood that co-present individuals will interact. Decisions about where to go and with whom to interact are not random, and this non-randomness must be incorporated into modeling efforts.

While sociological questions thus become pressing for geographers, sociologists for their part must be willing to revisit difficult questions about the relationship between individuals and their communities. For example, it remains unclear how exactly the physical structure of a community shapes, and is shaped by, individual behavior. Research on urban development often suggests larger mechanisms that imply groups of individuals are behaving in a certain way. For example, (Florida, Mellander, and Stolarick 2008, 621) claim that “Greater concentrations of artists and gays thus reflect regional mechanisms that accelerate human capital externalities and knowledge spillovers.” Yet these accounts are necessarily limited in scope and employ a top-down framework for understanding this relationship. A bottom-up account is rare, though some have attempted to translate macro-social urban structure into micro-social terms (Wellman and Leighton 1979). Answering the questions raised by transport geographers regarding how individuals co-locate, and how co-located individuals interact, would provide new life to these efforts within urban sociology. One approach to tackling these issues is to employ a theoretical framework based explicitly on micro-social interaction and its relationship to the built environment.

It is the physicality of social interaction that often leads social researchers to highlight features of the built environment. While not all interaction occurs in the physical world, much of it does, and the capacity for individuals to co-locate represents a real constraint on their personal and collective behavior (Neutens et al. 2007). This capacity in part depends on the mere existence of meeting spaces: Individuals face constrained opportunities to interact when they have nowhere to interact. A small rural town with few public spaces is a simple example of this form of constraint, but we may imagine similar forms of constraint arising in urban areas.

The principle of homophily suggests that potential meeting spaces may be segregated according to the characteristics of typical patrons. For example, drinking establishments often serve a particular clientele. A businesswoman is less likely to enter an establishment primarily frequented by construction workers. If no other drinking establishments exist (or are quite far from home) then this businesswoman is constrained in her ability to meet others like herself. In this sense, the types of spaces available and the patrons of those spaces are

Social venues also shape norms for social interaction. The ostensible purpose of a physical space often entails a number of expectations for social behavior. For example, diners at a restaurant are expected to refrain from approaching other dining parties. At the same time, particular spaces have distinct histories and operate in distinct social contexts, which may alter traditional behavioral norms. In other words, individuals within these spaces constitute network domains that can collectively reenact or challenge conventional behavior. These contextual dynamics make it difficult for researchers to capture the unique meanings that become associated with particular places within a community without understanding how these spaces have been constituted and reconstituted by their patrons.

The opportunity for constructive theory-building in the realm of transport geography is vast. Studying travel patterns and their implications for social phenomena necessitates a conceptual framework capable of addressing the complex role of venues in social life. This is not merely a division of labor that demands social theorists “fill in the blanks” for empiric researchers. Rather, it provides an opportunity to explore deeper questions about how individuals cope with constrained choice sets and the fluidity of social identity across multiple interaction domains. My hope is that both academic communities will take full advantage of each other’s insights to open up new frontiers in community studies.

- Fang, Zhixiang, Wei Tu, Qingquan Li, and Qiuping Li. 2011. “A Multi-Objective Approach to Scheduling Joint Participation with Variable Space and Time Preferences and Opportunities.” *Journal of Transport Geography* 19 (4): 623–34. doi:10.1016/j.jtrangeo.2010.06.019.
- Farber, Steven, Tijs Neutens, Harvey J. Miller, and Xiao Li. 2013. “The Social Interaction Potential of Metropolitan Regions: A Time-Geographic Measurement Approach Using Joint Accessibility.” *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 103 (3): 483–504. doi:10.1080/00045608.2012.689238.
- Farber, Steven, and Antonio Páez. 2009. “My Car, My Friends, and Me: A Preliminary Analysis of Automobility and Social Activity Participation.” *Journal of Transport Geography* 17 (3): 216–25. doi:10.1016/j.jtrangeo.2008.07.008.
- Farber, Steven, and Antonio Páez. 2009. “My Car, My Friends, and Me: A Preliminary Florida, Richard, Charlotta Mellander, and Kevin Stolarick. 2008. “Inside the Black Box of Regional Development—Human Capital, the Creative Class and Tolerance.” *Journal of Economic Geography* 8 (5): 615–49. doi:10.1093/jeg/lbn023.

- Neutens, T., F. Witlox, N. Van De Weghe, and P. H. De Maeyer. 2007. "Space-time Opportunities for Multiple Agents: A Constraint based Approach." *International Journal of Geographical Information Science* 21 (10): 1061–76. doi:10.1080/13658810601169873.
- Richardson, Douglas B., Nora D. Volkow, Mei-Po Kwan, Robert M. Kaplan, Michael F. Goodchild, and Robert T. Croyle. 2013. "Spatial Turn in Health Research." *Science* 339 (6126): 1390–92. doi:10.1126/science.1232257.
- Van Acker, Veronique, Bert Van Wee, and Frank Witlox. 2010. "When Transport Geography Meets Social Psychology: Toward a Conceptual Model of Travel Behaviour." *Transport Reviews* 30 (2): 219–40. doi:10.1080/01441640902943453.
- Wellman, Barry, and Barry Leighton. 1979. "Networks, Neighborhoods, and Communities Approaches to the Study of the Community Question." *Urban Affairs Review* 14 (3): 363–90. doi:10.1177/107808747901400305.
- Wong, David W. S., and Shih-Lung Shaw. 2011. "Measuring Segregation: An Activity Space Approach." *Journal of Geographical Systems* 13 (2): 127–45. doi:10.1007/s10109-010-0112-x.

# Duality of embodiment

**Athena Engman, University of Toronto**

The concept of embodied schemas has been invaluable for furthering our theoretical understanding of human action. In particular, embodiment and the notion of the deployment of embodied schemas have been understood as preconditions for the articulation of social categories such as class (Bourdieu, 1990) and gender (Butler, 1990), and also human capacities such as expertise (Wacquant, 2004) and creativity (Joas, 1996). Viewed this way, the concept of embodiment provides a useful tool for addressing the perennial question of how abstract social logics are concretized in the lives of actual living people. Bourdieu (2005) gives a beautiful illustration of this in a study of 1960s Béarn and its peasant inhabitants. He describes how a changing economic and social reality (characterized by the simultaneous abandonment of tradition and uptake of modern fashions) has erased the social standing once afforded to the peasant habitus, and how young peasant men come to realize this precisely in the moment when their bodies are called on to participate in a local (modern) dance. Their inability to dance in accordance with fashion serves as a demonstration of their social position, and they come to recognize themselves as the capacities of their bodies. “It is no longer an exaggeration to assert that the peasant’s coming to awareness of his body is for him the privileged occasion of his coming to awareness of the peasant condition” (Bourdieu, 2005: 585). Here, Bourdieu emphasizes that one’s social location and the particular embodiment of that social location that one enacts are in fact two faces of the same phenomenon.

The concept of embodiment thus provides a theoretical mechanism that explains precisely how abstract social logics are taken up and reproduced by individuals. What goes unsaid, however, is that this kind of embodiment is essentially precarious, as it relies not solely on a history of embodied schemas, but also on a real flesh and blood body, available in the here and now, that is physically capable of enacting those schemas. While many of us might go through our lives without experiencing ruptures in the relationship between these two discrete facets of embodiment, the potential for rupture is abundantly clear for people who have undergone abrupt physical or physiological changes.

These issues were not at the forefront of my thinking when I began my own research with solid organ transplant recipients. Interested in people’s subjective understandings of their relationship to their bodies, I expected organ recipients to comment on and emphasize their experience having “someone else’s” organ. What actually emerged from conversations with transplant recipients were stories about the experience of illness and the loss of bodily functioning. Recipients noted that prior to transplant, the progressive loss of bodily functioning characteristic of organ failure was met with a disjuncture between their *expectations* of their bodies and their bodies’ *actual physical capacities*. By expectations, I do not mean consciously held beliefs about what their bodies could and/or would do, but

rather a kind of orientation towards situations that was only recognized in moments where they went unfulfilled. As one participant related, “What I was was this active mind stuck in this body that was completely useless to me.” Recounting the experience of progressive illness while waiting for a lifesaving organ to become available, organ recipients highlighted the difficulty of springing into activity, only to be met with the physical limitation of their own changing bodies. “So your mind is thinking that you can do this, this and this, and your body is not able to do that. It’s a betrayal.” The experienced “betrayal” does not result from the objective condition of the physical body. As disability studies scholars have long known, people with atypical bodies experience embodiment in precisely the same way as able bodied people (Dreger, 2004). Rather, the feeling of being betrayed by one’s own body results from a relatively sudden disjuncture between (a) the unconscious embodied schemas that result from a lifetime of their successful enactment and (b) the physiological capacities of what Merleau-Ponty termed the “body in this moment.”

Such experiences indicate the duality of embodiment. On the one hand, there are embodied schemas (or embodied knowledge) – all of those ways of being in the world that result from socialization and that come so effortlessly into existence when they are called forth by a situation. On the other hand, there is the physical body – blood, flesh, and guts. If embodied schemas provide the animation that the concept of embodiment implies, the physical body is the thing that is animated by them. It is this second aspect of our essential carnality (Crossley, 1995) that is often left implicit in sociological theories of embodiment. Many theories posit habitual and unconscious relationship to the body as a precondition for action, but neglect the fact that a certain continuity of the capacities of the physical body are themselves preconditions for the development of this relationship. When those capacities disappear because of illness, injury, or other bodily transformation, what was once a history of socialization “inscribed in the dispositions of the body” can no longer be enacted (Bourdieu, 2001: 27). And yet those dispositions do not entirely disappear. They remain phantasmal since they continue to orient the subjectivity of the people experiencing them towards courses of action that are impossible to concretize. The experiences of people with organ failure separate the orientations that embodiment gives rise to from their material articulation.

This separation raises some questions for theorists of embodiment. The flexibility of embodied schemas is often emphasized (Bourdieu, 1990: 55; Joas, 1996: 197); indeed it is precisely the ability of actors to enact embodied schemas in different situations that gives embodied schemas much of their explanatory power. But when the preconditions for this enactment are not met, when the physical body is incapable of manifesting the behavior that a subject automatically orients towards, the extent to which embodied schemas are inflexible

come to the fore. The subject who experiences a rupture between their set of embodied schemas and the capacities of their actual physical body find that they are, in a sense, living inside or even as a set of impossible expectations. They cannot simply engage in unconscious habitual behavior, but neither can they escape from the habitual impulse to do so that is characteristic of embodiment. Clarifying the distinction between embodied schemas and their manifestation in living breathing bodies is a theoretical task that will ultimately benefit our understanding of such experiences.

Bourdieu, P. (1990). *The logic of practice*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (2005). The peasant and his body. *Ethnography*, 5, 579-599.

Butler, J. (1990). *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*. New York: Routledge.

Crossley, N. (1995). Merleau-Ponty, the elusive body and carnal sociology. *Body & Society*, 1, 43-63.

Dreger, A. C. (2004). *One of us: Conjoined twins and the future of normal*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Joas, H. (1996). *The creativity of action*. Malden, MA: Polity Press.

Wacquant, L. (2004). *Body & soul: Notebooks of an apprentice boxer*. New York: Oxford University Press.

# Theoretical spotlight

The purpose of this section is to highlight the ideas of theorists who might not be known to many of our section members. Given that our most recent meeting was in Japan, it seems fitting to begin with a presentation by Professor Takeshi Deguchi on the work of Japanese theorist Keiichi Sakuta.

## Beyond Shame and Guilt Culture to Globalised Solidarity: Reappraising Keiichi Sakuta's Sociology of Values as a Galapagosized Sociology

**Takeshi Deguchi, The University of Tokyo**

[deguchi@l.u-tokyo.ac.jp](mailto:deguchi@l.u-tokyo.ac.jp)

Keiichi Sakuta (1922- ) is a professor emeritus at Kyoto University. He is one of the most influential personalities in the field of cultural sociology and is well known for his excellent translations of Erich Fromm and Talcott Parsons. His body of sociological work can be classified into three categories: sociology of values, examining the values of Japanese society; sociology of literature, illuminating individualism in modern Western and Japanese societies by analysing literary works; and sociological anthropology, elucidating human existence and its deepest desires. Here I will focus on his early work in the sociology of values (in the 1960s), especially on research developed from a magnum opus of Japanese studies in the United States: *The Chrysanthemum and the Sword*, by cultural anthropologist Ruth Benedict. I will also review Sakuta's theory of solidarity in the context of neoliberal principles of competition and personal responsibility.

To introduce my discussion, I would like to describe my methodological approach. My purpose here is to carry out historical or philological research in Japanese sociology, not only for a Japanese readership but also to introduce it to non-Japanese sociologists across the world. Accordingly, I wish to shed some light on the domestic context in which Japanese sociological theory has developed, as well as the content of the theory itself.

It may be helpful here to explain the term 'galapagosization', derived from English, in the title. The term is used to refer to a Japanese product that is too local and non-standard to be available outside Japan. It is derived from the Galapagos Islands, which are inhabited by rare and endemic species of flora and fauna because the islands have

been isolated from other lands and consequently have experienced unique processes of evolution. In daily conversation, this term is used for Japanese mobile phones (*Gala-kei* or *Galapagos-keitai*) that have various precision-made but unnecessary functions. Therefore, this term carries a negative and disparaging implication. In contrast, I would like to transform 'galapagosization' into a methodological and heuristic concept in order to rediscover and reappraise Japan-localized sociology with due regard to its relevant context.

Japanese sociology has been protected so far by a strong language barrier and a large Japanese readership and market. This is why sociologists did not need to discuss issues or write in other languages. However, it can be said that sociologists could focus on daily Japanese terms or adopt them into sociological concepts to get a deeper understanding of their own society on one hand, and on the other, reflect on the same society with the help of Western social theories made available through the advanced translation culture in Japan. Having completed this brief methodological preface, I will now move on to my real subject. I will begin by investigating how Sakuta critiques Benedict's concepts of shame and guilt. Next, I will explore Japanese terms adopted by Sakuta as sociological concepts, including *kouchi* (public shame), *shichi* (private shame) and *shuchi* (shyness). Finally, I will argue that Sakuta's unique sociology provides us with a key to the quest for solidarity in the age of globalisation.

### **1. Sociological critique of the culture of shame and guilt**

In *The Chrysanthemum and the Sword*, Ruth Benedict says that in anthropological studies of different cultures, it is important to distinguish between those that rely heavily on shame and those on guilt. Guilt cultures are societies that inculcate an absolute standard of morality and expect their members to develop a conscience. On the other hand, shame cultures are societies that rely on external sanctions to establish what good behaviour is. Members of guilt cultures rely on an internalised conviction of sin, whereas those of shame cultures shape their behaviour as a reaction to other people's criticism. On the basis of such definitions, Benedict concludes that Japan relies on the importance of shame rather than of guilt; in other words, Japanese society is a shame culture.

Reviewing Sakuta's assessment of Benedict, we must notice that he does not directly criticise Benedict's classification of Japan. Rather, he casts doubt upon her notions in two ways. Firstly, Sakuta disagrees with Benedict's consideration of guilt as an inner sanction based on absolute morality and of shame as a reaction to criticism by one's peers. Sakuta argues, on the basis of the findings of developmental psychology,

that guilt is also internalised through the process of external sanctions given by peers when a person violates a taboo. Secondly, Sakuta posits that the concept of *haji* (shame) should be categorised into two types: *kouchi* (public shame) and *shichi* (private shame). Sakuta contends that *kouchi* can be generally observed not only in Japan but also in the West, and that the concept of *shichi* offers a key insight into the characteristic features of Japanese culture.

To clarify the difference between shame and guilt, and *kouchi* and *shichi*, Sakuta employs the concepts of 'membership group' and 'reference group' in such a way as to shift his perspective from anthropology to sociology. In general, a reference group is defined as a group that sets normative standards for individual actions and circumstances and also evaluates individuals by comparison to those standards. On the other hand, a membership group is a group to which people actually belong. A reference group may or may not be a membership group, moreover, it could be just an 'imaginary' group to which someone wants to belong. In contrast to how these concepts are generally understood in sociology or social psychology, Sakuta, first of all, distinguishes between the functions of 'normative discipline' and 'comparative evaluation'. Then, he describes a reference group as one that provides people with ideal and normative standards of behaviour in various situations, regardless of whether people actually belong to it or not. And he refers to a membership group as one in which the members evaluate themselves and those around them; in other words, they not only belong to it but are also evaluated and ranked relative to this group.

Following those newly defined concepts, we can say that guilt is something that people feel when they have accepted the normative standards of their reference group but then violate those standards; on the other hand, shame is something that people experience if they occupy a comparatively low position in the group to which they actually belong.

## **2. Reusing Japanese terms as sociological concepts**

Having introduced and redefined the differing concepts of reference group and membership group, Sakuta goes on to distinguish further between *kouchi* and *shichi*. In Sakuta's view, *kouchi* is the equivalent of Benedict's shame. Sociologically, it does not assume the difference between reference group and membership group. As I have just noted, this *kouchi* is what people feel when they have a low ranking in their membership group. In contrast, *shichi* is an entirely different kind of emotion. People feel it when they belong to a membership group but also have, in reality or in their minds, another group as a reference group. As a result of this combination, people are

exposed to inconsistent regards from two groups at the same time. In other words, people who experience *shichi* regard themselves from two different perspectives: one drawn from their membership group and the other from their reference group. As an example, Sakuta cites Dmitri Karamazov from Fyodor Dostoyevsky's *The Brothers Karamazov*. Dmitri misapplied money entrusted to him by his friends and felt ashamed, not because he had violated the norms of the society of good citizens to which he belonged, but because he had left half of his friends' money unspent. That is to say, he was ashamed of himself for the reason that he was unable to devote himself completely to his privately held, ideal conception of an immoral world.<sup>1</sup>

The concept of *shichi* is key to exploring a unique sense of shame that characterises Japanese culture and to which Sakuta refers as *shuchi*, although it is difficult to find an equivalent for *shuchi* in English. It is similar to *shichi* in one sense, in that those who feel either *shichi* or *shuchi* are exposed to and suffer from two kinds of regards at the same time: one from their reference group and one from their membership group. The difference between *shichi* and *shuchi* is that one can feel the latter even if she or he has an advantage over others who belong to the reference group.

Here, Sakuta takes as an example a university student from a rich family in David Riesman's *The Lonely Crowd* who wants to be part of a student group. The student's membership group is a very rich family; while he wants to belong to a reference group composed of students, he cannot do so because he is rich and the group's members are poor<sup>2</sup>. As a result, he suffers from *shuchi*.

### 3. Discussions, conclusions and further suggestions

Those who have no place to call their own, in either their membership group or their reference group, remain always rootless and seek solidarity with others who also have no stable place in society. Sakuta explores the model of those who suffer from *shuchi* in modern Japanese literary works. Unfortunately, we cannot discuss those illustrations here due to lack of space. Therefore, I will focus exclusively on Sakuta's sociological description of the social structure that creates this dualism of regards and evokes *shuchi* in people's minds.

1 In this case, the reference group case of Dmitri is his own thinking. In Sakuta's view, the reference group includes not only real entity but also imaginary existence.

2 Being different from the case of Dmitri, the reference group is really existent but the student cannot devote himself completely to it.

Sakuta finds causes of the gap between multiple regards in the permeability of intermediate groups in Japan. According to Sakuta, in Western countries, traditional intermediate groups such as churches, family systems and village communities have been relatively strong and less permeable. As a result, each member was protected from outside regards. In contrast, although Japan is a country surrounded by the sea, its intermediate groups are weak and it is easy for outside values and norms to permeate. Sakuta applies this proposition to the modernisation process that occurred in Japan after the Meiji Restoration in 1868, and clarifies why Japan paradoxically succeeded in adopting values of modern society that originated in the West.

In contrast, I would like to reappraise Sakuta's proposition in view of the recent waves of globalisation and neoliberal capitalism. Neoliberal reforms and principles of competition, and self-realisation or personal responsibility have permeated Japanese social structures since the 1990s, and these neoliberal ideologies have destroyed social bonds and solidarity. Consequently, increasing numbers of those to whom Zygmunt Bauman refers as 'wasted lives' will be excluded entirely from society. Actually, Sakuta concludes his consideration of *shuchi* with the hope that those suffering from *shuchi* grope for solidarity. Solidarity, in general, could eventually be categorised into strong collective egoism and a focal point for aggression and violence; In contrast, people who continue to have *shuchi* in their minds do not commit or devote themselves to any kind of stable collectives and do not have any advantages in them, since they are always exposed to multiple regards from other groups. Accordingly, for the solidarity of such people, suffering from *shuchi* is necessary in going beyond borders between groups. Needless to say, there is room for further historical and sociological investigation, but we can perceive a possibility for those who experiencing *shuchi* to find solidarity.

Let me summarize the main points. Firstly, Sakuta reuses and adopts Japanese daily terms, such as *kouchi*, *shichi* and *shuchi*, as sociological concepts and attempts a more persuasive and convincing explanation of Japanese society compared to the simplistic distinction offered by Ruth Benedict. Secondly, he re-evaluates and critiques foreign perspectives on Japan that tend to consider Japanese culture as special; in addition, he seeks more general and sociological determinants for Japanese patterns of behaviour and thinking. Thirdly, he clarifies the possibility of social solidarity in a so-called 'liquid modernity' under the waves of globalisation, which is observed by Zygmunt Bauman.

I wish to place particular importance on this third point. Sakuta's theory is

constructed in line with experiences specific to Japanese society. Today, however, every country in the world is experiencing new pressures due to the fluidity of modern society and the loss of social solidarity. Thus, a sociological investigation of globalisation and its effects on sociocultural structures is the need of the hour. To discuss Sakuta's early sociology of values as a whole is beyond the scope of today's presentation, but from what we have briefly discussed, we can suggest that his proposition concerning solidarity provides us with a first and remarkable step towards sociology of values and solidarity in an age of globalisation.

Finally, we must remember the fact that Sakuta is himself an excellent translator of Western sociological theory and that he considers Japanese society as neither closed nor special. Furthermore, he always identifies general determinants for particular cultural phenomenon. In this sense, I must finally expand the meaning of 'galapagosization.' The most galapagosized theory has a small window on the world, and the most general theory develops, paradoxically, in theoretical diversity. Therefore, rediscovering and reappraising galapagosized and localized sociology in each country does contribute to the development of a globalized sociology in the future<sup>3</sup>

Bauman, Z. (2000) *Liquid Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bauman, Z. (2004) *Wasted Lives: Modernity and its Outcasts*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Benedict, R. (1946) *The Chrysanthemum and the Sword: Patterns of Japanese Culture*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Deguchi, T. (2013) Critical theory and its development in post-war Japanese sociology: pursuing true democracy in rapid capitalist modernization, with Axel Honneth's introduction. In A. Elliot, M. Katagiri, and A. Sawai, *Routledge companion to contemporary Japanese social theory: from individualization to globalization in Japan today*. London: Routledge.

Sakuta, K. (1972) *Kachi no shakaigaku* [Sociology of Values]. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.

Sakuta, K. (1964[1967]) 'Haji no bunka saiko' [Shame culture reconsidered]. Tokyo: Chikuma Shoten.

<sup>3</sup> See for example *Routledge companion to contemporary Japanese social theory: from individualization to globalization in Japan today*. See in particular my article, *Critical theory and its development in post-war Japanese sociology: pursuing true democracy in rapid capitalist modernization, with Axel Honneth's introduction*.

# Announcements

## **The Project *Homo Sociologicus Revisited***

A team of sociologists from the Faculty of Humanities of Charles University in Prague plans to deal with the theoretical project with the title *Homo Sociologicus Revisited* in the years 2015 – 2017 (project No. 15-14478S is supported by the Czech science foundation GAR). In this context, we would like to introduce this project to all who might be interested, inviting such people to establish professional contacts, or some form of cooperation.

When the study *Homo Sociologicus* was first published by Ralf Dahrendorf in *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Socialpsychologie* in 1958, he asserted that at the very core of sociological thought is a simplified idea of human nature. In this idea, the human individual is seen merely as subject to social forces and unilaterally subordinate to the social order. To convey this, Dahrendorf coined the term „homo sociologicus“, and in the context of his era, he related it to the conception of socialrole.

The intention of our project is to revisit the issues formulated by Dahrendorf a half-century ago, and address them with regard to the more recent development of sociology. The project's aims arise from the fact that in the past 50 years the sociological image of man has undergone certain shifts and changes. This has had an influence on the choice of research orientation, theoretical approaches and conceptual apparatus. New problems and issues have emerged. Apart from the notion of social role, there is the increasing importance of such conceptions as actor, agent, habitus, self, identity and individualization. The basic hypothesis of this research project is that, in spite of these changes, Dahrendorf's idea of a simplified sociological understanding of the individual retains its importance and relevance. The aim of the project is to examine the image of man in sociology at the beginning of the 21st century, to reveal its strengths and weaknesses, and seek ways to overcome the conceptual difficulties which persist.

Sociological thought approaches the topic of the human individual quite broadly, ranging from attempts to develop the “sociology of personality“ to tendencies to eliminate the individual from reflection on social structures and systems – the position of theoretical or methodological „anti-humanism“. The notion of social roles gained ground in sociology from the 1930's, developed by G. H. Mead and R. Linton; later in the 1950's and 1960's it was used by T. Parsons. It is precisely this conception which is discussed in Dahrendorf's book *Homo Sociologicus*. He assumes that the individual behaves according to the expectations related to the roles assigned to him or her. If an individual's behaviour fulfils these expectations, they are rewarded and receive social approval. On the other hand, if an individual does not live up to expectation, they are punished and penalized with social sanctions. Dahrendorf understands this approach as a reductionism, and shows that it is related to certain problems

both for the real world of roles, and their theoretical reflection.

As for the criticism of reductionism, this is based on the implicit assumption that the social aspect of human personality, consisting of accepted and performed roles, is just one dimension of a human self. The personality is understood as a whole which cannot be reduced to this aspect, because there is always some contradictory dimension. Prior to Dahrendorf, many other scholars formulated this assumption as well. In particular, we should point out Emile Durkheim and his notion of „homo duplex“. He states that every person possesses two kinds of consciousness, two aspects of psychic life: personal and non-personal. Our physical body on the one hand is a source of unceasing wishes and desires – of our egoism. Our socialized being, on the other hand, is a product of society living and acting through us, and also monitoring and restricting the expressions of our egoism through internalized social requirements. Similar approaches are present in the works of other authors as well: Georg Simmel, William I. Thomas and Florian Znaniecki, George Herbert Mead.

Durkheim was also aware of the fact that during historical development it is not only the way people live together (in Durkheim’s terms “solidarity”) that changes, but also the personality of human individuals, with the increase of individualization. According to Norbert Elias, the process of individualization is related to the shifting proportions of the We- and I- Identities. Contemporary scholars (Beck, Bauman) presume that in the postmodern world individualization is increasing further, and can even lead to a formation of a narcissist character (Lasch, Lipovetsky).

The construction of homo sociologicus is – according to Dahrendorf – problematic especially because it leaves no space for human freedom, creativity and autonomy. In this perspective, the individual has no other dimension than as an actor who plays prescribed roles. Therefore Dahrendorf asks what place freedom has in the world of roles. Peter L. Berger later reaches a similar conclusion: his conception of social reality evokes the image of a strict determinism that connotes the idea of the world as a prison. On the question of freedom, he argues, paradoxically, that this freedom can be realized and shown only in the world of roles. Berger, inspired by Helmuth Plessner, finds (right in this world) ways for people to prove that the external coercive power of society is not all-powerful and they are not powerless as players of forced roles. Berger argues that there exists the transformation of roles, role distance, handling roles or, finally, rejection of roles.

Freedom – meaning the freedom of choice – is particularly emphasized in research programs which are based on methodological individualism (e.g. rational choice theory). They assume that an individual in a specific social position does not have only one direction, but a variety

(sometimes wider, sometimes very limited) of options, and they can choose according to personal preferences and calculations. Actors in these theories, however, usually choose from the options that are already socially given and, moreover, usually decide according to criteria that are already socially formed and thereby arbitrate what is considered desirable, convenient, rational, ethical, beneficial etc. Therefore freedom is freedom to choose from the options offered by society, maybe even to reject these options, but this usually means leaving the sphere of what is accepted and exploring a path forsaking reputable values and standards that leads to behavior of an anomalous character: the second form of action – called “innovation” by Robert K. Merton.

The issue of creativity and innovation is reflected in the theory of Hans Joas, who argues that human behavior does not start with firmly set goals, but with rather vague notions that are continuously revised. Creativity manifests itself in the readiness to think, speak and act unusually, to take a greater risk of failure and not to look back to responses of the others.

However, until now it has been typical for all these theoretical considerations for the effect of actors on the formation of social reality to be granted only on the micro-social level. There remains a significant and neglected question of whether and how actors are able to manifest their influence on the macro-social level. The issue of individuals with influence on the whole of society is quite common and legitimate in the context of historical sciences; sociology, by contrast, ignores it, one could say “out of principle”. For many years, we have had a situation where historiography tends to see social processes as the work of major historical figures and sociology, on the contrary, tends to view these processes as the manifestation of supra-individual social units, structures and powers, or social systems and their functions. Sociology lacks adequate theoretical and methodological armaments for grasping the issue of individual “macro actors”. The main research question of our project concerns ways of opening up the conceptual apparatus of contemporary theoretical sociology to enable such insight into the human individual as may be able to overcome the reductionism that Dahrendorf analyzed in his work several decades ago. From this basic research question then, five specific research questions follow:

Q1: What heuristic importance can be attributed to the concept of social role today? Does this concept still have the ability to intellectually stimulate the sociological imagination? Is it able to adequately reflect the problem of the human individual in society in the context of contemporary sociology, or has it been superseded by other concepts and approaches? If the second hypothesis holds, what concepts are substituting the concept of social role in sociology?

Q2: Does the concept of “homo duplex” (Durkheim and others) offer the potential for solving the problems indicated by Dahrendorf in his book *Homo sociologicus*? Is it possible to overcome the reductionism about which Dahrendorf spoke with a conception of the human individual that respects the dual nature (duplex) of the human self, or is it an outdated model which needs to be replaced with a new approach?

Q3: Is it possible to satisfactorily clarify the historical-social process of individuation using the approach of Norbert Elias, i.e. as a process of transformation of proportions (or “balance”) between the “I”-identity and the “we”-identity, or does this developmental process require a different model of interpretation?

Q4: How is contemporary sociology equipped for capturing in descriptive and theoretical analysis the innovative actions of human individuals, and for the overall explanation of innovative social processes? How could possible approaches be developed and elaborated?

Q5: How is contemporary sociology equipped for capturing in descriptive and theoretical analysis the achievements in society of individuals who are able to influence the macrostructures of social reality? How is it possible to develop such an approach for the needs of historical sociology?

This project is conceived as theoretical research. Due to the nature of the research questions we assume that the research activities will be associated with certain interdisciplinary overlaps (towards philosophy, psychology, historiography and anthropology).

In this regard our team of sociologists from the Faculty of Humanities of Charles University in Prague appeals to all those for whom the issues raised in this project are attractive and in accordance with their professional interests to establish professional contacts with the Prague researchers through contacting the following e-mail address: [jiri.subrt@fhs.cuni.cz](mailto:jiri.subrt@fhs.cuni.cz). We would like to organize an international debate (colloquium or specialized section of an international conference) on this subject, and would also like to prepare an international collective book publication, to be released in the publishing house of Charles University in English.

**-Jiri Subrt**

**Department of Historical Sociology, Faculty of Humanities  
Charles University in Prague**

# New Articles and Books:

- **Chernilo, Daniel. 2014. "The idea of philosophical sociology." *The British journal of sociology*. 65 (2): 338-357.**
- **Connell, Raewyn. 2014. Rethinking gender from the South. *Feminist Studies*, vol. 40 no. 3, 518-539.**
- **Connell, Raewyn and Nour Dados. 2014. Where in the world does neoliberalism come from? The market agenda in southern perspective. *Theory and Society*, vol 43 no. 2, 117-138.**

Neoliberalism is generally understood as a system of ideas circulated by a network of right-wing intellectuals, or as an economic system mutation resulting from crises of profitability in capitalism. Both interpretations prioritize the global North. We propose an approach to neoliberalism that prioritizes the experience of the global South, and sees neoliberalism gaining its main political strength as a development strategy displacing those hegemonic before the 1970s. From Southern perspectives, a distinct set of issues about neoliberalism becomes central: the formative role of the state, including the military; the expansion of world commodity trade, including minerals; agriculture, informality, and the transformation of rural society. Thinkers from the global South who have foregrounded these issues need close attention from the North and exemplify a new architecture of knowledge in critical social science.

- **Jean-François Côté, *George Herbert Mead's Concept of Society: A Critical Reconstruction*, Boulder, Co., Paradigm Publishers, 2015, 256 pages.**

This book offers a new look at Mead's concept of society, in an attempt to reconstruct its significance for sociological theory. Chapter 1 offers a critical genealogical reading of writings, from early articles to the latest books, where Mead articulates his views on social reform, social psychology, and the gradual theorization of self and society. Chapter 2 pays attention to the phylogenetic and ontogenetic processes at work in both the self and society, by comparing Mead's social psychology with Freudian and Lacanian psychoanalysis. Chapter 3 brings together all the elements that are part of the structures of self and society within a topological and dialectical schematization of their respective and mutual relations. Chapter 4 is devoted to the passage of Mead's views from social psychology to sociology, with a critical look at Herbert Blumer's developments in symbolic interactionism as the presumed main legitimate heir of Mead's social psychology. Chapter 5 examines how Mead's general philosophical views fit within the

new epistemological context of contemporary society based on communication and debates on postmodernity.

- **Colin Cremin. *Totalled: Salvaging the Future from the Wreckage of Capitalism***

In this book, Colin Cremin tackles the overbearing truth that capitalism encompasses the totality of our societal relations, weaving deep into the fabric of all that it means to be human. He shows how it is a system that totalises and which has upended the modernity project by industrialised warfare, surveillance, commodification and control. With ever deepening crises and ecological catastrophes it threatens the total destruction of human civilisation. But in amongst this wreckage there are still functioning parts, machines to be salvaged through the collective force of the human imagination and the total mobilisation of the peoples of this earth. We must realise a different future to the apocalypticism forewarned by scientists, prescribed by economists, accommodated by politicians and made spectacle by the entertainment industry.

- **2014 G. Manzo (ed.), *Analytical Sociology: Actions and Networks*, Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons (Wiley Series in Computational and Quantitative Social Science), 448 p. 8**

- **Hans-Peter Mueller, *Pierre Bourdieu. Eine systematische Einfuehrung*. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp 2014 (372 pp.):**

This book gives a comprehensive overview over and systematic introduction into the complex and complicated oeuvre of Pierre Bourdieu. The first part develops his analytical toolkit. The second part deals with his empirical studies on education and social inequality, social class and the style of life, the literary, economic and political field as well as his sociology of intellectuals and critique.

- **Hans-Peter Mueller/Steffen Sigmund (eds): *Max Weber - Handbuch. Leben - Werk - Wirkung*. Stuttgart: Metzler 2014:**

This year we celebrated the 150th anniversary of Max Weber. The Handbook sets out with a biographical section, followed by a section on 41 basic concepts of Weber. A third section presents his major works and studies. A fourth section discusses in ten seminal essays the actuality of Max Weber today. The Handbook is a useful tool for students of and researchers on Max Weber.

- **Possamai, Adam, James T. Richardson, and Bryan S. Turner. *The Sociology of Shari'a: Case Studies from around the World*. 2015 Springer.**

<http://www.springer.com/new+%26+forthcoming+titles+%28default%29/book/978-3-319-09604-9>

- **Erik Schneiderhan, *The Size of Others' Burdens: Jane Addams, Barack Obama, and the Politics of Helping Others*. 2015. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press. <http://www.sup.org/books/title/?id=23353>**
- **Possamai, Adam, James T. Richardson, and Bryan S. Turner. *The Sociology of Shari'a: Case Studies from around the World*.**
- **Simon Susen (2015) 'Emancipation', in Michael T. Gibbons, Diana Coole, Elisabeth Ellis, and Kennan Ferguson (eds.) *The Encyclopedia of Political Thought*, Oxford: Wiley Blackwell, pp. 1024-1038.**
- **Armando Rodriguez Rojas. *Fundamentos de Sociología*. ECOE ediciones. 2011 ISBN 9789586487382 . Ed. Español. PDF with Adobe DRM.**
- **Simon Susen (2014) 'Reflections on Ideology: Lessons from Pierre Bourdieu and Luc Boltanski', *Thesis Eleven*, 124(1), pp. 90-113.**
- **Simon Susen (2014) '15 Theses on Power', *Philosophy and Society*, 25(3), pp. 7-28.**
- **Simon Susen and Bryan S. Turner (eds.) (2014) *The Spirit of Luc Boltanski: Essays on the 'Pragmatic Sociology of Critique'*, London: Anthem Press, 850 pp.**
- **Singh, Parlo, Martsin, M., Glasswell, K. (2014). "Dilemmatic spaces: High-stakes testing and the possibilities of collaborative knowledge work to generate learning innovations" in *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice. Volume 21, Number 6*. To link to this article: <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/13540602.2014.976853>**
- **Singh, Parlo (2014): Performativity and pedagogising knowledge: globalising educational policy formation, dissemination and enactment, *Journal of Education Policy*, DOI:10.1080/02680939.2014.961968 To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02680939.2014.961968>**
- **Singh, Parlo, Heimans, Stephen & Glasswell, Kathryn (2014): Policy enactment, context and performativity: ontological politics and**

**researching Australian National Partnership policies, *Journal of Education Policy***, DOI: 10.1080/02680939.2014.891763 To link to this article:

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02680939.2014.891763>

- **Liyanage, Indika, Walker, Tony & Singh, Parlo (2014). TESOL professional standards in the “Asian century”: dilemmas facing Australian TESOL teacher education, *Asia Pacific Journal of Education***, DOI: 10.1080/02188791.2013.876388

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2013.876388>

- **Satnam Virdee, *Racism, Class and the Racialized Outsider*** by (Palgrave Macmillan 2014) <http://www.palgrave.com/page/detail/racism,-class-and-the-racialized-outsider-satnamvirdee/?K=9780230551640>

*Racism, Class and the Racialized Outsider* offers an original perspective on the significance of both racism and anti-racism in the making of the English working class. While racism became a powerful structuring force within this social class from as early as the mid-Victorian period, this book also traces the episodic emergence of currents of working class anti-racism. Through an insistence that race is central to the way class works, this insightful text demonstrates not only that the English working class was a multi-ethnic formation from the moment of its inception but that racialized outsiders – Irish Catholics, Jews, Asians and the African diaspora – often played a catalytic role in the collective action that helped fashion a more inclusive and democratic society.

### **Professor Edward Tiryakian calls our attention to the following recent pieces:**

Review of *Durkheim. The Durkheimians and the Arts*. Edited by Alexander Riley, W.S.F. Pickering and William Watts Miller. Durkheim Press/Berghahn Books. New York and Oxford 2013. 309p.

Riley in his editorial introduction: “contemporary sociology” has, by and large, failed to take the task of the intellectual analysis of art seriously enough. (p.3). Yet, (p.5) it is precisely in the Durkheimian tradition..that we find one of the most compelling intersctions between sociological thought and art to date.(p.5). It is precisely insofar as art leads not to integration and social solidarity, which we guiding principles in [Durkheim’s]life and thought but to alienation and individualism that Durkheim was something less than an obvious partisan of this variety of human action.

William Watts Miller, *Total Aesthetics. Art and The Elemental Forms*, chapter 1.

(p. 31) the sketch of a general theory of art in *The Elemental Forms* involves a basic criterion of aesthetics. It is just that it (p.33) is not beauty, which is never mentioned. It is about power and energy.

Marcel Fournier, Durkheim, *L'Année Sociologique, and Art* chapter 6

Michèle Richman, *Marcel Mauss on Art and Aesthetics. The Politics of Division, Isolation and Totality*, Chapter 7.pp. 133-153

## News

Natàlia Cantó Milà and Ramon Ribera Fumaz have been awarded as principal researchers a project financed by the Spanish Ministry of Competitiveness and Economy. This project, “Quotidian Futures: Urban Lives in Times of Austerity and Change” brings together geographers (UOC, King’s College) and sociologists (UOC, University of Leipzig, University of Halle), and builds on the theoretical foundations of Georg Simmel, Karl Marx, Pierre Bourdieu and David Harvey in order to answer one of the most relevant topics today. Is and if yes how is society in times of crisis possible? Building on Simmel’s digression ‘How is society possible?’ the project looks at imaginaries of the future of different actors in urban space (Barcelona and Leipzig) and tries to show whether and how we imagine our place in (future) society, a very condition for society to be possible. Building on these classical theories, the research project will work with a variety of different data reaching from interviews, over media and film analysis, to maps and policy documents.

---

The Canadian Sociological Association (CSA) annual meeting will be held in conjunction with the Canadian Federation of Humanities and Social Sciences Congress 2015 at the University of Ottawa, in Ottawa, Ontario, Canada’s capital city, from June 1 – 5, 2015.

# Call for papers

## **Symposium for Early Career Theorists (SECT)**

The Social Theory Research Cluster invites paper proposals for its first Symposium for Early Career Theorists. SECT is a special one-day group of sessions at the Canadian Sociological Association that spotlights the work of emerging social theorists at a relatively early stage in their careers (PhD Candidates who are ABD status and those who are no more than five years beyond completion of their doctorate). Social theory is an open and dynamic field, and so in that spirit we seek papers that reflect, expand and/or critique the array of social phenomena that can be theorized. The Social Theory Research Cluster aspires to make SECT a flagship for social theory in Canada, and aims to renew and consolidate the place of theorizing in the Canadian sociological imagination. All proposals will be given serious attention, with session themes and topics reflecting the scope of submissions rather than vice versa. Papers will be circulated in advance to facilitate dialogue, and senior scholars will act as discussants.

We welcome extended abstract submissions of 600-800 words. Abstracts can be submitted online here: [www.csa-scs.ca/files/webapps/ocs/index.php/csaconferences/ottawa](http://www.csa-scs.ca/files/webapps/ocs/index.php/csaconferences/ottawa) Abstracts will be accepted until 11:55 pm on February 2, 2015 (Eastern Time). Complete papers will be due no later than April 30, 2015 to ensure that discussants have adequate time to prepare.

## **American Journal of Cultural Sociology**

Special issue on Inequality

The American Journal of Cultural Sociology plans a special issue devoted to inequality. Inequality has come roaring back onto the public agenda, punctuated by Barack Obama's December 2013 claim that income inequality is "a defining challenge of our time". But if the new object of civil concern is economic, the nature of that concern remains centrally cultural. What is the new culture structure that informs contemporary discussions about inequality? Can the new focus on inequality be conceived as a discourse? What are its narratives, codes, metaphors, and iconic representations? What is the meaning of polluted inequality that emerges? What historical narratives about equality and inequality inspire it, what myths of a gold age, what analogies to earlier dark periods? How are the new elites symbolically constructed? How do they construct themselves, their worthiness, and those on the other, less fortunate side? Is there a new "culture of inequality" that justifies contemporary stratification? How do disenfranchised economic groups narrate their own situations, as well as those on the other side? If the old working class has been decimated, are new counter-publics forming out of these dominated economic groups? The editors of

AJCS would welcome papers on any of these concerns. The deadline for paper submissions is September 1, 2015. Papers will be subject to peer review. Authors are requested to consult the instructions for authors on the journal website and to submit their contributions through our online submission system: [http://www.palgravejournals.com/ajcs/author\\_instructions.html](http://www.palgravejournals.com/ajcs/author_instructions.html) We welcome short email queries about the appropriateness of contributions to this special issue at [ajcs@yale.edu](mailto:ajcs@yale.edu). For further information on the journal and to explore its existing and scope, please visit [www.palgrave-journals.com/ajcsial](http://www.palgrave-journals.com/ajcsial).

# THEORY

**INTERNATIONAL SOCIOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION**

The Newsletter of the Research Committee on  
Sociological Theory