

Newcastle University
School of Geography, Politics and Sociology

SOCIOLOGY

UNDERSTANDING SOCIAL CHANGE AND TRANSFORMATION

SOC 2058

40 credits (20 in each semester)

Semester 2 Handbook

Module Leader Prof. Peter Phillimore
Email. Peter.phillimore@ncl.ac.uk

Lecturing team

Semester 2:
Dr Jackie Leach Scully
Prof. William Outhwaite

Seminar team Edmund Coleman-Fountain
 Judy Richards

Timetable Details:

Lectures (there are two x 1 hr lectures in each semester)

Both semesters: Mondays 1-2.
 Wednesday 12-1.
 All in King George VI Building, Lecture Theatre 6.

Seminars (there are five x 1 hr seminars each semester)

Both semesters:
 Thursdays 11-12
 Thursday 12-1
 Friday 11-12
 Friday 1-2

Seminar groups 1 and 2 are in Agriculture Building 305
Seminar groups 3 and 4 in Daysh Building Room 4.13

Semester 2, lectures 1-10: Knowledge and Belief

Jackie Leach Scully

Overall this module provides your main introduction to social theory and to thinking sociologically. It aims to look at social theory “in terms of questions posed by changing circumstances, changes in public attitudes and expectations, and recognition of the limitations of previous approaches to sociology.” In the first semester, Prof Peter Phillimore and Dr Stephanie Lawler focused on questions of modernity. In this part of the module, I will be following a different (but as we will see, closely related) set of social transitions: changes in our ideas about knowledge and belief. This is a very large sociological (and philosophical) area; I won’t be able to address all of it, but will be basing my comments and discussion around how societies (and mostly western European societies) have dealt with *changes* in ideas about the sources of authoritative knowledge. One key aspect here, although it is not the only one, is the contested relationship between scientific knowledge and religious belief.

In the first lectures we examine “knowledge” from a philosophical and sociological perspective, asking fundamental questions such as: what is knowledge? What does it consist of? Are there different kinds of knowledge? How do societies decide whether knowledge is true or false? Does knowledge differ from belief and if so, how? After a very brief look at historical shifts in our notions of knowledge and sources of authoritative knowledge, we will consider some of the early sociological thinkers who tackled these questions. We take a particular look at sociological ideas about the difference between scientific and non-scientific knowledge, Marxist and post-Marxist ideas about ideology, and the relationship between knowledge and power. We then examine how positivist ideas about knowledge were unsettled by a growing unease about the limits to human objectivity, drawing on the psychoanalytic theories of Freud (not normally considered a sociologist) and how they influenced the development of the Frankfurt School and of critical theory.

From the middle of the twentieth century onwards, further challenges to normative ideas about knowledge were presented by postmodernism and the theory of the social construction (rather than objective, transcendent existence) of knowledge. What relationship is there between what we know and the social organisations within which we live? We will look at these debates about the social construction of reality and at the so-called “science wars”. Another angle on the link between knowledge, power and social organisation is given by “political epistemologies”, such as feminist and postcolonial arguments about knowledge, including supposedly objective scientific knowledge.

The last 3 lectures of Knowledge and Belief take a closer look at the relationship between religious belief and knowledge. As a generalization, classical sociology of religion is interested more in a faith group’s *practices* than the content of what it believes. In these lectures, however, we will consider how modernist and postmodernist ideas about authoritative knowledge have influenced the way we both conceptualise religion and identify faith groups, and how these theoretical concepts have interacted with demographic and political changes to shape our understanding of contemporary religious life.

Semester 2, lectures 11-20: Diagnoses of the Times

William Outhwaite

In the final part of the module, I shall discuss the ways in which some leading social theorists, from Tocqueville in the mid-nineteenth century to Michael Burawoy in the twenty-first, have analysed the current state of their own or other societies, the contribution of sociology to the understanding of the present and the ways in which sociologists may operate as public intellectuals addressing a wider audience outside the academy.

The term ‘diagnosis of the times’ was popularised in the UK by the exiled Hungarian sociologist Karl Mannheim, in his ‘wartime essays’ published in 1943. Ten years earlier, the philosopher Karl

Jaspers' book of 1931 on the 'spiritual situation of the time' was published in English as *Man in the Modern Age*. But as you saw in the previous semester, sociology has been concerned from the beginning with the nature of 'modern times'. Even when sociologists or anthropologists looked at history, or at 'non-modern' societies, they were constantly drawing implications for European or American modernity.

Sometimes these formed the theoretical core concerns of sociology, as with theories of industrial society in the 1950s and 1960s: sometimes they take the form of more speculative reflections by thinkers better known for major theoretical or historical works. Jaspers is known for his work in psychology and phenomenological philosophy, but he also played a major public role in Western Germany after the Second World War. Sometimes it's the other way round: Tocqueville wrote a history of the French Revolution and a memoir of the 1848 revolution in which he played a prominent part, but is better known for his analysis of democracy in America.

Sometimes the two aspects are thoroughly intertwined: Mannheim is known as the leading exponent of the 'sociology of knowledge', the attempt to give social explanations for forms of thought, but he grounded this research programme solidly in a diagnosis of a world in which the clash of ideologies and value systems had become a universal predicament. Of contemporary sociologists, Jürgen Habermas and, a generation younger, Axel Honneth, who succeeded him as Professor of Sociology and Philosophy at Frankfurt, are known for major theoretical works but also devote a good deal of time to discussion of contemporary issues. Whereas Habermas has tended to keep these two areas of activity apart, distinguishing between his theoretical and political writings, Honneth has explicitly theorised the diagnosis of social pathologies.

Looking at these thinkers' analyses of their times provides a way into their theories as a whole and an illustration of how social theories can inform analyses of 'the present time'.

The seminars will relate to the material in the first two lectures.

Learning outcomes

- To introduce students to some of the main concerns explored by social theory, now and in the past.
- To examine classic themes and historical developments in theory in the light of their continuing relevance for the understanding of culture and society.
- To introduce students to the varied ways in which sociology has theorised social change and also transformations of a more systemic kind.
- To develop understanding of the connections between theoretical concerns in anthropology and sociology.
- To develop understanding of the relationship between 'social theory' and more grounded forms of theorising.
- To ensure that students grasp the epistemological and methodological aspects of theoretical work of all kinds.
- To promote students' competence in working with historical and comparative examples.

Assessment & Your Participation

Form of assessment

This module is assessed by four pieces of work: two x 2000 word essays, and two x 90 minute unseen exams. You will have to do one essay and one exam in each semester.

Semester 1 essay deadlines are: 12th December 2007 (semester 1) & 7th May 2008 (semester 2)

Return of assessed work

The provisional marks for any assessed component of a module are distributed with comments using a standard form. The standard practice is for marks and feedback sheets to be distributed through the GPS office within 4 term time weeks of submission deadlines. You will be emailed by the GPS Office when marks for the specific components are available.

Attendance

Attendance at lectures is expected; attendance at seminars is compulsory. Registers are taken in seminars. If you miss seminars without adequate explanation to your seminar tutor, you will be required to discuss your attendance with the Module Leader.

Blackboard

Please remember to keep using the Blackboard site for this module. All module documentation will be there, and in addition further updates to readings and other module information will be placed there.

Module Outline: Semester 2

Lecture	Date	Topic	Lecturer
1	Mon 28/1/08	Knowing and believing: sources of epistemic authority. Early modern knowledge, the Enlightenment, and the rise of scientific inquiry.	JLS
2	Weds 30/1/08	The sociology of knowledge as a discipline. The <i>Methodenstreit</i> and the contributions of key thinkers including Mannheim, Scheler, and Durkheim.	JLS
3	Mon 4/2/08	Ideology: knowledge and power: Marxist and post-Marxist theories.	JLS
4	Weds 6/2/08	The limits to knowledge: Freud, the Frankfurt school and critical theory.	JLS
5	Mon 11/2/08	Everything made up: postmodernist and social constructionist theories.	JLS
6	Weds 13/2/08	Politics of knowledge: feminist and postcolonial epistemologies.	JLS
7	Mon 18/2/08	Science in conflict: the "science wars"	
8	Weds 20/2/08	Classical sociology of religion: belief and practices. Authority of religious knowledge.	JLS
9	Mon 25/2/08	Measuring changes in religious identity: demographics and politics	Guest lecturer
10	Weds 27/2/08	Faith trajectories in the C20 and C21: ideologies, re-enchantment, and epistemic authority	JLS
11	Mon 3/3/08	Introduction: What is meant by diagnosis of the time(s)?	WO
12	Weds 5/3/08	Public sociology in the twenty-first century	WO
13	Mon 10/3/08	Fascism, Nazism and social theory	WO
14	Weds 12/3/08	Is modern society industrial, post-industrial or capitalist?	WO
15	Mon 14/4/08	1968	WO
16	Weds 16/4/08	Nazism revisited, 1950s-1980s	WO
17	Mon 21/4/08	1989	WO
18	Weds 23/4/08	Risk society	WO
19	Mon 28/4/08	Globalisation	WO
20	Weds 30/4/08	After postmodernity, modernity again?	WO

Detailed Seminar Guidance: Semester 2

Please note:

Seminar attendance is compulsory.

You should prepare well for all seminars, and come to them prepared to talk and to listen.

Use the questions to guide your reading and note any other work your seminar tutor asks you to do in preparation.

We expect you to read a couple of articles or chapters in preparation for each seminar, and to make notes that help you address the questions set. This reading is not an optional extra, but a central part of your engagement with this module. But as you'll see, these seminars require you to address particular questions which may well require you to look at a number of sources, not just two pieces.

Seminar 1 (week beginning 11/2/08): How sociologists think: sociological epistemology and methodology.

Questions for discussion

1. *How does the view of epistemology affect methodology in sociology?*
2. *What was the Methodenstreit all about?*
3. *How plausible do you find the possibility of objective knowledge? What would the classical theorists have thought?*

Seminar 2 (week beginning 18/2/08): The authority of memory

Readings will be provided prior to the seminar on the theme of the authority of (a) individual and (b) social memory. Taking one or both of these, consider the following questions:

Questions for discussion

1. *How does this fit with the theoretical discussion of objective and subjective knowledge?*
2. *To what extent does it bear out Freud's theories of consciousness (unconscious thought processes, repressed knowledge, repetition compulsion...)?*
3. *Is there a relationship between ideology and social memory?*
4. *What implications does it have for sociological methodology?*

Seminar 3 (week beginning 25/2/08): Science vs religion? A sociological exploration

Questions for discussion

1. *To what extent do science or religion, or both, constitute an ideology? Why?*
2. *How would early social theorists such as Mannheim and Marx differ from "strong programmers" in their view of science? What about their view of religion?*
3. *How could sociologists measure religious belief?*

Seminar 4 (week beginning 3/3/08): A comparative exploration of some classic 'diagnoses'

Questions for discussion

1. *How do sociologists' values shape their social diagnoses? Can a social scientific diagnosis be objective?*
2. *How defensible is the notion of social pathology?*

Seminar 5 (week beginning 14/4/08): Public sociology and the intellectual

Questions for discussion

1. *Compare the public roles taken by two or more social theorists.*
2. *What, if anything, does the notion of public sociology add to earlier discussions of the role of intellectuals?*

INDICATIVE CONTENT AND READING

Lectures 1-10, Knowledge and Belief

Indicated first are some *background* readings for this series of lectures. Most of these are available in the library. Other recommendations for reading are given below, and will be given in lectures or placed on Blackboard throughout; some additional material will be provided on Blackboard or as photocopies.

Tim May and Malcolm Williams (eds), *Knowing the Social World*. OUP 1998

Ted Benton and Ian Craib, *Philosophy of Social Science: The philosophical foundations of social thought*. Palgrave, 2001

Alvin I Goldman, *Knowledge in a Social World*. Oxford, 1999

Steven Seidman, *Contested Knowledge: Social Theory Today*. Blackwell, 2004

Lecture 1: Knowing and believing.

What does it mean to say "I know this" or "I believe that"? While philosophical epistemology has tried to articulate what constitutes real or true knowledge, sociology is interested in why certain groups of people hold particular kinds of belief to be true knowledge; nevertheless, this still requires sociologists to think about the validity and reliability of their *own* professional knowledge. Often the ground for conviction can be traced back to the sources of epistemic authority: who or what you trust to provide true knowledge. In this lecture we look both at the philosophy of knowledge, and at historical shifts in where we locate authoritative knowledge, with a particular focus on the extraordinary changes that took place around the time of the Enlightenment.

Peter Klein, Epistemology. In E Craig (ed) *Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Routledge, 1998, 2005. Retrieved from <http://www.rep.routledge.com/article/P059>

Keith de Rose, What is Epistemology? <http://pantheon.yale.edu/%7Ekd47/What-Is-Epistemology.htm>

Susan Haack, *Evidence and Inquiry: towards reconstruction in epistemology*. Blackwell, 1993

Lecture 2: The sociology of knowledge as a discipline.

Many of the major figures in early sociology made implicit or explicit statements about knowledge and belief processes, among them Weber, Durkheim and Marx. However, it was not until the time of Scheler and Mannheim that the sociology of knowledge began to emerge as a distinct discipline – and some of its less obvious complexities and pitfalls became apparent.

Karl Mannheim, *Ideology and Utopia: an introduction to the sociology of knowledge*. Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1960

Karl Mannheim, *Essays on the Sociology of Knowledge* (ed Paul Kecskemeti). Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1968

Dan Maclsaac, The Critical Theory of Jürgen Habermas. <http://physicsed.buffalostate.edu/danowner/habcritthy.html>

Jürgen Habermas, *Knowledge and Human Interests*. Heinemann, 1978

Lecture 3: Ideology: knowledge and power

'Ideology' or 'ideological' tend to be used pejoratively: to mean a form of knowledge that is false or misleading. There has been substantial theoretical debate, however, over the precise definition of an ideology and what actually distinguishes ideological thought from any other meaning-making conceptual framework. In this lecture we consider developments in sociological thought about the connections between knowledge and power, focusing on what might be seen as two extremes: Marx and Foucault.

Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *The German Ideology*: Chapter One is available at <http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1845/german-ideology/abstract.htm>

Terry Eagleton, *Ideology: an introduction*. Verso, 1991 (new edition 2007)

Michel Foucault, *Power/knowledge: selected interviews and other writings 1972-1977*. Ed Colin Gordon, Pantheon Books 1980

Some basics of Foucault's thinking on power can be found in the Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/foucault/>

Then see:

M Foucault, *Discipline and Punish*, 1975 (Vintage 1995)

M Foucault, *The Birth of the Clinic*, 1963 (Vintage 1994)

One aspect of the interconnection of knowledge and power can be found in Brian Turner, *Medical Power and Social Knowledge*, Sage 1995

Lecture 4: The limits to knowledge: Freud, the Frankfurt school, and critical theory

At the heart of the Enlightenment project lies the conviction that rationality and reason are key to the acquisition of true knowledge and to social progress. Around the turn of the C19/C20, the work of Sigmund Freud began radically to unsettle western society's faith in the reliability of human cognition. Freud was and is a controversial figure, but his theories have been immensely important to the development of contemporary theories of knowledge and of subjectivity. Through its influence on the Frankfurt School of philosophers and sociologists, psychoanalytic thought was crucial to the development of critical theory.

For basic information on Freudian psychoanalytic theory: <http://www.iep.utm.edu/f/freud.htm>

And more detail from another course:

<http://www.cla.purdue.edu/english/theory/psychoanalysis/psychmodules.html>

Antony Storr, *Freud: a very short introduction*. Oxford, 2001

J Brown, *Freud and the Post-Freudians*. Pelican, 1964

Rolf Wiggershaus, *The Frankfurt School: its history, theories and political significance*. Translated by Michael Roberston, MIT Press, 1995

Tom Bottomore, *The Frankfurt School and its Critics*. Routledge, 2002

Some websites on the Frankfurt School:

<http://filer.case.edu/~ngb2/Pages/Intro.html>: The Frankfurt School

<http://www.marxists.org/subject/frankfurt-school/index.htm>

and on critical theory:

Tim Dant, *Critical Social Theory: Culture, Society and Critique*. Sage, 2003

Alan How, *Critical Theory*. Palgrave, 2003

<http://www.uta.edu/huma/illuminations/>: The critical theory website

Lecture 5: Everything made up: postmodernist and social constructionist theories

Postmodernism and social constructivism take very different approaches to the authority of knowledge. Both in their own way question the positivist belief in the possibility of “knowing the objective truth” of the world. Contemporary sociological thought has been strongly influenced by, and influential on, these strands – influences that were to lead to the academic row known as “the science wars” of the 1980s and 1990s, and which continues the long tradition of sociological debate about the status of objective and subjective knowledge.

Paul Boghossian, What is social construction? <http://as.nyu.edu/docs/IO/1153/socialconstruction.pdf>

Peter L Berger and Thomas Luckman, *The Social Construction of Reality*. Anchor, 1967

Vivien Burr, *Social Constructionism*. Routledge, 2007

Ian Hacking, *The Social Construction of What?* Harvard University Press, 2000

JT Checkel, Social constructivisms in global and European politics: a review essay. *Review International Studies* 2004; 30: 229-244

Steven Seidman, Postmodern anxiety: the politics of epistemology. *Sociological Theory* 1991; 9: 180-190

Lecture 6: Politics of knowledge: feminist and postcolonial epistemologies

In direct contrast to the universalising drive of Enlightenment and liberal epistemology, the second half of the C20 saw a number of authors claiming that specific social groups – especially those who were politically marginalised or oppressed – have distinctive perspectives on reality that are not shared with other, dominant social groups. Feminist theory was the first to develop this line of thought, closely followed by postcolonial theory and more recently by queer and disability theory. But standpoint epistemology raises a number of severe theoretical and political problems for its advocates.

Linda Alcoff and Elizabeth Potter (eds), *Feminist Epistemologies*. Routledge, 1993

Sandra Harding, *Whose Science? Whose Knowledge?: thinking from women’s lives*. Cornell University Press, 1991

Mark Owen Webb. Feminist epistemology and the extent of the social. *Hypatia* 1995; 10: 85-98

Abigail Brooks, Feminist standpoint epistemology. http://www.sagepub.com/upm-data/12936_Chapter3.pdf

Sandra Harding, Comment on Hekman's 'Truth and Method: feminist standpoint theory revisited'. *Signs* 1997; 22: 382-391

Nancy Hartsock, Comment on Hekman's 'Truth and Method: feminist standpoint theory revisited'. *Signs* 1997; 22: 367-374

Donna Haraway. 1988. Situated knowledges: The science question in feminism and the privilege of partial perspective. *Feminist Studies* 1988; 14: 575-599.

Satya P Mohanty. The Epistemic Status of Cultural Identity: On "Beloved" and the Postcolonial Condition. *Cultural Critique*, 1993; 24: 41-80

Sanjay Seth, Postcolonial studies: a beginning. Available at <http://www.ipcs.org.au/beginning.pdf>

Lecture 7: Science in conflict: the science wars and the new atheism

In the 1980s and 90s the rumbling disagreement between the postmodern/social constructivist viewpoint and the positivist/realist view broke out into open conflict around the epistemic authority of the natural sciences (and in particular, the supposed postmodern co-opting of scientific authority). The "science wars" have led to a hardening of positions at the start of the C21. As a case study, and as a prologue to our consideration of the study of religion, we will look at disputes over the teaching of evolutionary theory/intelligent design in the US and UK.

A comprehensive background (but biased!) site on the "science wars": <http://members.tripod.com/ScienceWars/>

Bruno Latour, *Science in Action: how to follow scientists and engineers through society*. Harvard University Press, 1997

Andrew Ross (ed), *Science Wars*. Duke University Press, 1996

Evans M Harrell, A report from the front of the "Science wars": <http://www.math.gatech.edu/~harrell/cult.html>

Gordy Slack, When science and religion collide: <http://www.motherjones.com/news/feature/1997/11/slack.html?welcome=true>

Gordy Slack, The Battle Over the Meaning of Everything: Evolution, Intelligent Design, and a School Board in Dover, PA, review available at <http://gordyslack.blogspot.com/2007/08/new-scientist-review-of-battle.html>

B Clark, JB Foster and R York. The critique of intelligent design: Epicurus, Marx, Darwin, and Freud and the materialist defense of science. *Theory and Society* 2007; 36: 515-536

Lecture 8: Classical sociology of religion

Although several classic social theorists showed an interest in religious belief and practices, classic social theory was being developed at a time when the epistemic authority of religion was in decline. The sociology of religion focuses primarily on the practices and behaviours of faith groups rather than the content of their truth claims. In this brief overview we will look at twentieth century research on what was considered to be unstoppable social processes of secularization. We will also consider

how sociologists explore the “knowledge negotiations” of faith groups as minorities in secular societies.

Read one of the following *introductory* texts (NB note that these are all very basic!):

A Giddens, Religion in modern society (chapter 14 of *Sociology*, 5th edition, Polity 2006 or chapter 17 of 4th edition. Polity 2001)

J Fulcher and J Scott, Religion, belief and meaning (chapter 11 of *Sociology*, 2nd edition, Oxford 2006)

K Browne, Religion (chapter 13 in *An Introduction to Sociology*, 3rd edition, Polity 2007)

Tracey McIntosh, Believing: religion (chapter 13 of *Being Sociological*, ed. Steve Matthewman, Catherine Lane West-Newman and Bruce Curtis, Palgrave 2007)

G Davie, New approaches in the sociology of religion: a western perspective. *Social Compass* 2004; 51: 73-84

R Menezes, Marcel Mauss and the sociology of religion. *Social Compass* 2005; 52: 255-271

K McPhillips, Feminist narratives and the sociology of religion. *Contemporary Sociology* 2003; 32: 469-470

Grace Davie, *The Sociology of Religion*. Sage 2007

Inger Furseth and Pal Repstad, *An Introduction to the Sociology of Religion: Classical and Contemporary Perspectives*. Ashgate 2006

Brian Turner, Talcott Parson's sociology of religion and the expressive revolution. *Journal of Classical Sociology*, 2005

David Voas and Alasdair Crockett, Religion in Britain: neither believing nor belonging. *Sociology* 2005; 39: 11-28

Michael Symonds, Jason Pudsey, The forms of brotherly love in Max Weber's sociology of religion, *Sociological Theory* 2006; 24: 133-149

Lecture 9: Guest lecture by Alison Peacock, Manchester

Alison Peacock is an expert on changes in the demographic and geographic patterns of religious groups in the UK today. This lecture will discuss these changes, but will also concentrate on the practical difficulties of researching religious identity quantitatively.

Lecture 10: Faith trajectories in the C20 and C21: ideologies, re-enchantment, and epistemic authority

It turned out that the processes of secularization identified by sociologists in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries were not as unstoppable as they seemed. The rise of “fundamentalism” (whatever that means), the entanglement of religious and political ideologies, and the emergence of the “new atheism”, suggest that the struggle between different sites of epistemic authority is far from over, either for sociologists or societies.

MO Emerson and D Hartman, The rise of religious fundamentalism. *Ann Rev Sociol* 2006; 32: 127-144

Gary Wolf, The church of the non-believers: <http://www.wired.com/wired/archive/14.11/atheism.html> (Nov 2006)

Madeleine Bunting, The new atheists. The Guardian, May 2007: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/story/0,,2074076,00.html>:

P Mandaville, Globalization and the politics of religious knowledge: pluralizing authority in the Muslim world. *Theory Culture and Society* 2007; 24: 101-

P Froese and S Pfaff, Explaining a religious anomaly: a historical analysis of secularization in eastern Germany. *J Scientific Study of Religion* 2005; 44: 397-422

A Gill, Religion and comparative politics. *Ann Rev Political Sci* 2001; 4: 117-138

Lectures 11-20, Diagnoses of the times

Lecture 11: Introduction: What is meant by diagnosis of the time(s)?

Questions to think about:

Should social scientists attempt to analyse their own times as a whole? If they do, can/should such a diagnosis of the times be objective?

For reading, see seminar materials

Lecture 12: Public Sociology in the Twenty-First Century

Michael Burawoy used his presidential address to the American Sociological Association in 2004 to argue for a conception of public sociology, drawing on the notion of the 'public intellectual' which has emerged over the past ten years or so. The theme has been taken up in the UK and elsewhere.

Questions to think about

What is meant by 'public sociology'? What, if anything, does this add to earlier conceptions of the public role of sociologists?

Has sociology fulfilled its promise?

John Scott (2005) 'Sociology and Its Others: Reflections on Disciplinary Specialisation and Fragmentation', [Sociological Research Online](http://www.socresonline.org.uk/10/1/scott.html), Volume 10, Issue 1, <<http://www.socresonline.org.uk/10/1/scott.html>>.

Michael Burawoy and Erik Olin Wright (2000) 'Sociological Marxism', <http://www.ssc.wisc.edu/~wright/Soc/Marx.pdf>

Michael Burawoy (2005) '2004 American Sociological Association Presidential Address: For Public Sociology', [British Journal of Sociology](#) 56, 2: 259-94.

Special issue on Sociology and its Public Face(s), [Sociology](#) 41, 5, October 2007.

Eder, Klaus (2005) 'Making sense of the public sphere', in Gerard Delanty (ed) *Handbook of Contemporary European Social Theory*. London: Routledge, pp. 333-46.

William Outhwaite (2005) 'European Civil Society and the European Intellectual.' (conference paper; published version to be circulated)

Lecture 13: Fascism, Nazism and Social Theory

What had gone wrong with the democratic new world order established in much of Western Europe after World War One? Was it a set of political accidents, or were there also more fundamental social pathologies in European modernity?

'Anyone who does not wish to speak about capitalism should be silent about fascism', wrote the Frankfurt neo-Marxist Max Horkheimer. But both fascism and capitalism, for him and for Marcuse and Adorno, involved crucial psychological as well as economic processes. More was needed to explain why some European states became fascist and others did not. They were also sensitive to the parallels between fascism and Soviet communism, and for that matter liberal democratic capitalism.

Questions to think about

Which of the accounts of fascism presented here do you find most convincing and why? Should explanations of fascism be 'state-centred' or 'society-centred'? Or both?

Max Horkheimer 'The Authoritarian State' (1941), in A. Arato and E. Gebhardt (eds), *The Essential Frankfurt School Reader* (1978).

David Beetham (ed) (1983) *Marxists in the Face of Fascism*

Anson Rabinbach 'Marxist Theory of Fascism and National Socialism', *New German Critique No. 3, Fall 1974*

Stephen P. Turner and Dirk Käsler (eds) (1992) *Sociology Responds to Fascism*, chs 1 & 8.

C. Lefort 'The Concept of Totalitarianism', *Warwick/Sussex Papers in Social Theory 2*, 1998

Lecture 14: Is modern society industrial, post-industrial or capitalist?

The theories of post-industrialism which were developed in the 1960s and subsequently must be understood against the background of earlier theories of industrialism or industrial society, as well as the rise of social and economic forecasting and 'futurology'. The theorists of post-industrialism, notably Daniel Bell in the USA and Alain Touraine in France, stress its distinctiveness as a new form of society, in which industrial production is increasingly displaced from the central position in modern societies and replaced by the production, consumption and monopolisation of theoretical knowledge and its technological application. For Bell, this occurs against the background of what he had earlier called 'the end of ideology' and the displacement of the class conflicts characteristic of industrialism, though he anticipates that 'counter-cultural' opposition to capitalism will continue. Touraine continues to operate within a more European tradition of class theory, but sees the main division in post-industrial or 'programmed' societies as lying between technocratic elites and those subject to planning processes; the university becomes a central focus of conflict, as the factory was in industrialism.

Critics of the concept of post-industrialism, such as Krishan Kumar in the UK and Boris Frankel in Australia, argued that these theories are actually focussing on long-term continuities within industrialism itself, and share many of the limitations of earlier theories of industrial society. One has to look elsewhere to more imaginative models of a genuinely post-industrial future, such as the theories of Rudolf Bahro, André Gorz, Barry Jones and Alvin Toffler with which Frankel's book is concerned.

In these and other ways, an examination of the concept of post-industrialism helps us to reflect critically on industrialism itself, on related conceptions such as Claus Offe's 'disorganised capitalism'

and Ulrich Beck's 'risk society', and on how far sociologists can and should construct large-scale models of society and social change.

Questions to think about

Do these accounts exclude one another, or can they be combined? If so, how?
Is 'post-industrialism' anything more than a continuation of industrialism?

Krishan Kumar Prophecy and Progress: The Sociology of Industrial and Post-Industrial Societies (1978)

Theodor Adorno 'Late Capitalism or Industrial Society?', in V.Meja et al (eds), Modern German Sociology (1987)

Axel Honneth 'A Physiognomy of the Capitalist Form of Life: A Sketch of Adorno's Social Theory', Constellations 12, 1, 2005.

Boris Frankel The Post-Industrial Utopians (1987)

Claus Offe 'Toward a Theory of Late Capitalism' (1971), in V.Meja et al (eds), Modern German Sociology (1987)

Disorganized Capitalism (1985)

Lecture 15 1968

The protest movements by students and (sometimes) workers in and around 1968 led many social theorists to rethink their models of modern society and of the role of social science. In this session we look at some contemporary responses and more recent analyses of the movements and the effects of 1968 on the political culture of Western democracies.

Questions to think about

What explanation of the May events and related protest movements do you find most convincing?
When did 1968 end?

Gareth Stedman Jones 'The Meaning of the Student Revolt', in A.Cockburn and R.Blackburn (eds), Student Power (1969)

Daniel Cohn-Bendit et al, (1968) 'Why Sociologists?', in A.Cockburn and R.Blackburn (eds), Student Power (1969)

Alain Touraine (1968) The May Movement (tr. 1971)

Jürgen Habermas (1969) Toward a Rational Society (tr. 1971), esp. chs 2 and 3.

R.F. Inglehart (1977) The Silent Revolution. Changing Values and Political Styles among the Western Mass Publics.

R.F. Inglehart (1990) Culture Shift in Advanced Industrial Society.

Alan Sica and Stephen P. Turner (eds) (2005) The Disobedient Generation: '68ers and the Transformation of Social Theory; Chicago U.P.

Lecture 16: Nazism Revisited, 1950s-1980s

When Adorno and Horkheimer returned to Germany from exile in 1950, they were concerned to counter what they saw as a deliberate attempt to forget the country's recent history. Adorno addressed this theme in his radio broadcasts and elsewhere, asserting provocatively that to write poetry after Auschwitz is 'barbaric'. Habermas, who had grown up during the Nazi regime, devoted one of his first articles (1953) to an indignant critique of the philosopher Martin Heidegger, who had for a time enthusiastically supported Nazism, for republishing without comment a 1935 lecture which referred to the 'inner truth and greatness of the [Nazi] movement'. Habermas' thought was substantially shaped by the experience and memory of Nazism, and he sprang into action in the 1980s when he felt that some historians were deliberately or thoughtlessly whitewashing the German past. The text below dates from this 'historians' debate', which raises broader questions about historical memory (especially in relation to the holocaust) and political responsibility.

Questions to think about

Should the Holocaust be seen as one genocide among others?

Which of the available ways of thinking in Germany about the country's past seems most adequate? 'Who controls the past, controls the future.' (George Orwell)

Theodor Adorno (1966) 'Education after Auschwitz', in Adorno, Critical Models (1998).

Jürgen Habermas (1986) 'On the Public Use of History', in Habermas, The New Conservatism: Cultural Criticism and the Historians' Debate.

Martin Broszat/Saul Friedländer 'The Historicization of National Socialism', New German Critique 44, Spring/Summer 1988.

Müller-Doohm, Stefan (2005) 'Theodor W. Adorno and Jürgen Habermas - Two Ways of Being a Public Intellectual: Sociological Observations Concerning the Transformation of a Social Figure of Modernity', *European Journal of Social Theory* 8: 269-280.

Lecture 17: 1989

Many social scientists had analysed the pathologies of state socialism, but hardly anyone anticipated its sudden collapse in the autumn of 1989. Dahrendorf, from the liberal right, and Habermas, from the left, responded rapidly.

Questions to think about:

Should sociologists have been surprised by the 1989 revolutions in communist Europe?

Did the communist elites fall or were they pushed?

What are the implications of the revolutions for debates over 1) structure/agency 2) 'state-centred' versus 'society-centred' perspectives?

'The forgetting of society'. Is this a good description of the response of social scientists and state elites to post-communism?

Ralf Dahrendorf (1990) Reflections on the Revolution in Europe: in a letter intended to have been sent to a gentleman in Warsaw.

Ralf Dahrendorf (1997) After 1989: Morals, Revolution and Civil Society.

Jürgen Habermas (1990) 'What Does Socialism Mean Today? The Rectifying Revolution and the Need for New Thinking on the Left', New Left Review 183.
(1991) The Past as Future, tr. 1994.

Krishan Kumar (2001) 1989 Revolutionary Ideas and Ideals.

William Outhwaite and Larry Ray (2005) Social Theory and Postcommunism, ch. 1.

Lecture 18: Risk Society

The theme of ecological crisis had been on the agenda since the 'Club of Rome' report (Meadows, 1972), and Habermas referred to it in his Legitimation Crisis of 1983. Beck's book was published in 1986, the year of the Chernobyl nuclear accident, and was immediately extremely influential in West Germany, where there was a strong Green movement. Yet twenty years later the world was only gradually moving towards concerted action to deal with the crisis.

Questions to think about:

What are the differences, in Beck's view, between industrial society and risk society? How useful is the latter concept?

Why did it take so long for social scientists to address issues of environmental risk?

Meadows, D.H. et al (1972) The Limits to Growth

Beck, U (1992) Risk Society: towards a new modernity London: Sage, 1992

Beck, U (1995) Ecological Politics in the Age of Risk Atlantic Highlands, N.J. : Humanities Press

Luke Martell (1994) Ecology and Society

Lecture 19 Globalisation

Marx and others had anticipated much of what is now familiar as globalisation theory, yet the term only came into general use in the early 1990s. Habermas, Giddens, Held and others rethought democratic theory in 'cosmopolitan' terms, while Bourdieu stressed the negative consequences of globalisation.

Questions to think about

What, if anything is new and what is true in globalisation theory?
Is 'globalisation' an alibi for neoliberalism?

Martin Albrow (1997) The Global Age

Anthony Giddens (1999) A Runaway World

Jonathan Rosenberg (2000) The Follies of Globalisation Theory

Habermas, J. (2001) The Postnational Constellation Cambridge: Polity

Habermas, J. (1994) The Past as Future Cambridge: Polity

David Held (1995) Prospects for Democracy.

Bourdieu P. and Wacquant L (1999) 'On the cunning of imperialist reason' Theory, Culture and Society 16, 1:41-58

Larry Ray (2007) Globalization and Everyday Life

Lecture 20: After Postmodernity, Modernity again?

Questions to think about

How useful do you find the notions of reflexive and liquid modernity?
Are conceptions of modernity inevitably Eurocentric?

Lyotard, J.- F. (1979) La Condition postmoderne: rapport sur le savoir. Paris: Minit. Tr as The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge.,. Minneapolis: Univesity of Minnesota Press, 1984.

Bauman Z (1992) Intimations of Postmodernity London: Routledge

Bauman, Z (2001) Liquid Modernity Oxford: Polity

U. Beck, A. Giddens and S. Lash (1994) Reflexive Modernization – politics, tradition and aesthetics in the modern social order.

Peter Wagner (2008) Modernity as Experience and Interpretation

Gurminder K. Bhambra (2007) Rethinking Modernity. Postcolonialism and the Sociological Imagination