

Culture

Section of the American Sociological Association

Volume 8, No. 1 (Fall 1993)

1993-1994 Culture Section Officers

Chair

Paul DiMaggio
Dept. of Sociology
Princeton University
Princeton, NJ 08544

Chair-Elect

Michèle Lamont
Dept. of Sociology
Princeton University
Princeton, NJ 08544

Secretary-Treasurer

Karen Cerulo
Rutgers University
44 St. Lukes Place
Montclair, NJ 07042

Council

Nicole Beisel
Wendy Griswold
David Halle
Arlie Hochschild
Chandra Mukerji
Michael Schudson

Nominations Committee

Wendy Espeland, Chair
Dept. of Sociology
Northwestern University
Evanston, IL 60208-1330

Paul Lichterman
Jeff Halley
Bernice Pescosolido
George Thomas

Program Committee

Michèle Lamont, Chair
Karen Cerulo
Sarah Corse
Wendy Griswold
John Hall
Mark Schneider

Membership Committee

John Ryan, Chair
Dept. of Sociology
Clemson University
Clemson, SC 29634

Publications Committee

Richard A. Peterson, Chair
Dept. of Sociology
Vanderbilt University
Nashville, TN 37235

FROM THE CHAIR

Paul DiMaggio

The vibrancy and vitality of sociological interest in and work on culture was palpable at the ASA meetings in Miami this past August. And so was the health and excitement of the Culture Section itself. Let me briefly report on just a few of the many high points of the program, and provide a little further news of the Section. Perhaps the major headline is that the Culture Section seems poised to break into the enchanted circle of ASA Sections with 800 or more members. (Our count as of August was 773 and I am aware of at least 20 new members who have joined since then. Special thanks are due to Membership Chair John Ryan, and to ace recruiters Nicki Beisel, David Halle, and Michèle Lamont.) This threshold has significance both sacred (as evidence of the extent to which culture has captured our discipline's imagination, and of the Section's effectiveness in serving the field) and profane (if we reach 800, we earn a fifth session—the maximum available to ASA Sections—at the 1994-95 meetings). The Section's health was also evident in attendance at the sessions and roundtables presented on Section Day at the Meetings. (The representation of papers employing cultural approaches in the programs of other Sections and in the sessions organized by the ASA Program Committee was equally striking evidence of the extent to which sociologists are exploring cultural themes.) An open papers session organized by the 'UCSB-3' (Jon Cruz, John Mohr, and Connie McNeely) dealt with themes as diverse as world political culture, art under fascism, Americanization rituals in the Progressive Era, elite philanthropy, and why Americans participate in politics so sporadically. The refereed and informal discussion roundtable session, organized by David Swartz, disclosed an even broader palette, from addiction to youth culture. (Perhaps next

year a roundtable on zydeco music will take us from A to Z.) Three sessions initiated emphases that will continue at least throughout the 1993-94 year and, if they generate enough momentum, beyond. Pete Peterson's session on the comparative analysis of cultural institutions underscored the parallels and differences between, and the analytic rewards to comparative consideration of, the fields of art, law, religion and science. The Section has from its inception provided a home for sociologists of art. In the coming year, three working groups will explore ways in which the Section can better serve members interested in the three latter subfields, and stimulate comparative thinking within the Section and cooperation with our colleagues outside it.

Kim Scheppele, an active member of our Section and the first Chair of the ASA's new Sociology of Law Section, will chair the working group on Law and Culture. In Miami, Kim presented a paper on the topic at Pete Peterson's Section, and Robert Rosen organized a well-attended roundtable session on the same topic.

Section Council Member Chandra Mukerji will head a working group on Science and Culture. Chandra and Peter Whalley, the latter a Culture Section member who has chaired the ASA Section on Science and Technology, organized a roundtable, also very well-attended. Elsewhere in this newsletter, our Chair-Elect, Michèle Lamont, describes a session that we will co-sponsor with the Science and Technology Section at next year's meetings.

A working group on Religion and Culture will be led by Rhys Williams. Rhys led off the effort with two successful and complementary activities in

(continued to page 2)

CONTENTS

| | |
|---|----------|
| From the Chair | 1 |
| From the Editors..... | 4 |
| Announcing New Editor..... | 4 |
| 1994 ASA Culture Section Program | 5 |
| 92-93 Section Award Winners .. | 6 |
| Wilkinson..... | 7 |
| Dissertation Abstract —Dawson | 9 |
| Alexander, Smith, Sherwood .. | 10 |
| Ennis | 15 |
| Books of Note..... | 18 |
| Announcements..... | 3, 9, 19 |

CULTURE, published quarterly, is the official newsletter for the Sociology of Culture Section of the American Sociological Association. Culture is copyrighted by the American Sociological Association. "Book of Notes" is copyrighted by Richard A. Peterson, 1993.

Editors:

Cheryl Zollars & Muriel Cantor

Production Designer:

Marolyn Caldwell
The Front Desk

MANUSCRIPT SUBMISSION

(1) Abstracts of Section members' dissertations or other research in progress, (2) queries about article proposals, and (3) letters of comment on earlier articles are welcome. All are needed in advance of the relevant issue deadline, the latter to give the original authors reasonable time to respond. The **DEADLINE for the Winter 1993-94 issue is 15 December 1993**. All submissions should be made either by e-mail or by diskette in either [IBM] WordPerfect or ASCII. ASR citation format requested. Hardcopies are not acceptable substitutes for diskettes. Please scan your diskettes before submitting files.

NEW EDITOR! NEW MAILING ADDRESS!! Stephen A. Hart, 169 Mariner St., Apt. 6, Buffalo, N.Y. 14201. Phone and Fax: (716) 886-5592. (Since this is both a voice and fax line, please call before submitting.) E-mail: SAHART@ubvms.cc.buffalo.edu.

CHAIR

(continued from page 1)

Miami: a panel at the Association for the Study of Religion (which meets just before ASA) on what the Sociology of Culture can contribute to the study of religion; and a roundtable on Section Day on what the Sociology of Religion can contribute to the study of culture. (The fact that both groups answered their questions the same way—"a lot"—sets the stage for an invigorating process of inquiry and interaction, in which we plan to cooperate with the proposed ASA Section on the Sociology of Religion, as the latter takes shape.)

On another front, Matt Hamabata organized an excellent session on New Research on Multiculturalism. The session's focus reflected Matt's convictions, which I share, first, that the "culture wars" are being waged upon a discursive terrain overpopulated with pronouncements that evolve untested into pseudo-facts; and, second, that we sociologists have the research tools and theoretical sophistication to separate fact from fiction. A case in point from the session was Katherine McClelland's finding, based on careful multi-method research on three college campuses, that required courses in cultural diversity—much maligned by the right—apparently do accomplish their goal of improving racial sensitivity and enhancing intergroup relations. McClelland's work, which may be the first empirical research on a topic about which much has been written and said, demonstrates the capacity of sociologists to intervene constructively in this most significant debate. Indeed, the participation of staff from several foundations and nonprofit organizations from across the East Coast at a stimulating roundtable that Matt organized to follow up the session demonstrated that those at the forefront of designing programs and policies to encourage multiculturalism are hungry for research to assist in that goal. Matt Hamabata is heading up a Working Group on Research on Multi-

culturalism and Cultural Diversity that will explore what further measures the Culture Section can take to encourage and disseminate serious scholarly inquiry on these matters. In keeping with this emphasis, Chair-Elect Michèle Lamont is organizing a joint session with the ASA Section on Race and Ethnicity for the Los Angeles Meetings.

Last but not least, Ann Swidler organized a remarkable session on "Meaning and Measurement in the Sociology of Culture," which featured several papers discussing new approaches and new resources—surveys, videotape, archives, linguistic modeling—for measuring cultures, cultural differences, and culture change. As Ann and Ron Jepperson wrote in their own contribution to the session, it is not at all obvious that the problems of measuring culture are any more intractable than problems of measuring social structure (which was at one time at least as ineffable an abstraction as "culture" sometimes appears to be today). Moreover, if we do not address these issues, other survey researchers will, without the benefit of theoretical breakthroughs in the study of culture that could make survey research an increasingly useful tool. The session, which played to a full house, generated as much intellectual electricity as I have ever encountered at an academic panel—as well as several new Culture Section members who signed up on the spot. Ann is organizing a Working Group on Meaning and Measurement that will explore additional ways in which the Culture Section can contribute to the development and dissemination to our membership of new and more sophisticated approaches to measurement.

Each of these Special Working Groups has a clear mandate, but none has yet developed a clear-cut or narrow agenda. The Chairs of each of these groups are eager to receive the ideas and advice of a broad range of Section members as they pursue their goals. Please contact each of them at the addresses listed elsewhere in this issue.

(continued to page 3)

CHAIR
(continued from page 2)

Before signing off, a brief report on Section news:

If the good news is the rise in membership, the bad news was that the Section was in the red. "How," you might ask, "could that happen?" First, many of the Section's members are graduate students. This is a great prognostic sign for the future of the Section and the field, but in cash terms all graduate student Section dues go to ASA. And, because our regular membership dues have been relatively low, so do most of those payments. Elizabeth Long, who discovered the problem early in her year as Chair, worked hard, long, and successfully to overcome it. Alas, however, because it is to some extent structural, Section Council concluded that to prevent a recurrence, we must raise the dues for regular members. (Graduate memberships remain at the \$5 minimum permitted by ASA.) At \$12 for regular members, Section membership is still a bargain, and typical of the fee for the more active Sections. Barring unexpected elasticities or hyperinflation, the new dues structure will keep the Section solvent for the foreseeable future.

This is the last newsletter that will be edited by the team of Muriel Cantor and Cheryl Zollars, who after several years service have hung up their red pencils (or, in any case, redirected them to other projects). Under their editorship,

the newsletter, which has always been one of the longest and best, became even longer and even better, supplementing Section news, book notes, and announcements with brief but meaty essays on central topics in the study of culture. The contribution of the newsletter to the Section's success in retaining members and adding membership, and, perhaps even more profoundly, to the emergence of the Section as an intellectual community, has been incalculably great. We all owe Muriel and Cheryl our deep thanks for their unstinting service.

The good news is that the editorship has been accepted by Stephen Hart of SUNY/Buffalo. Steve, who will edit the next issue, is a sociologist of religion and culture, who has written extensively on Christian social activism. Under his stewardship, the newsletter will retain the quality and excitement that has characterized it up to now. Please contact him with your ideas for future articles or features.

More good news: John Ryan, Membership Chair extraordinaire, has agreed to serve for another year, and to take us to the 800 mark. Magali Sarfatti Larson has agreed to lead a revived committee on Teaching and Curriculum: Please contact her with ideas and suggestions. Pete Peterson has agreed to continue as Chair of the publications committee.

Members who attended the Membership Meeting in Miami voted to bestow three awards each

year: one for the best graduate student paper, one for the best book published during the previous two years, and one for the best paper published during the previous two years. (Up to now, the two latter prizes alternated, with one given each year.) Graduate students, please send your papers to the Chair for the graduate prize. Book and post-graduate paper authors: Please send nominations to the Chairs of these committees. And don't be diffident: If you can't stand nominating your own work yourself, then make sure your best friend does it for you! (And whatever you do, don't wait for your publisher to do it.) Otherwise excellent work may simply not be considered.

Finally, Council agreed that the outgoing Chair should remain on Council to provide a soupcon of institutional memory. Ordinarily this decision might not be of sufficient weight to warrant reporting here; but it gives me an opportunity to pay tribute to our Past-Chair Elizabeth Long for valiant service above and beyond the usual expectations. Dealing with financial crises and replacing superb newsletter editors may be the two hardest things Chairs have to do, and no one ought to have to do both in the same year. Elizabeth expertly guided the Section through these shoals (as well as carrying out all the normal chairperson duties). She has my special gratitude for passing on such a healthy Section, and deserves the thanks of all the rest of us as well.

CALL FOR MANUSCRIPTS

Manuscripts are invited for *The Gender Lens*, a new Sage Publications and Pine Forge Press book series, first volumes to be available in August 1995. Types of books to be included: (1) "invitation" style treatments of general fields; (2) the importance of gender for understanding specific subfields of sociology; (3) the gendered character of the conceptual organization of substantive subfields. Contact: Submit manuscript proposals to the Series Editors: Judith A. Howard, Dept. Sociology DK-40, U. Washington, Seattle, WA 98195; Barbara Risman, Dept. Sociology, North Carolina State U., Raleigh, NC 27695-8107; and Joey Sprague, Dept. Sociology, U. Kansas, 716 Fraser Hall, Lawrence, KS 66045.

ANNOUNCEMENTS—FELLOWSHIPS

The New Ethnic and Immigrant Congregations Project, U. of Illinois at Chicago, invites applications for a special training and fellowship program promoting ethnographic studies of new ethnic and immigrant congregations. Directed by R. Stephen Warner, the NEICP will provide intensive training in field research methods and one year of fellowship support—open to doctoral candidates and recent postdoctorates in all social science and humanities fields. Contact (for information and applications): Office of Social Science Research (M/C 307), 1007 West Harrison Street, Chicago, Illinois 60607-7136. (312) 996-1801. Deadlines: Information packets and application forms for fellowships will be available from the NEICP office between August 1 and December 1, 1993. **Deadline for Completed applications: postmarked no later than 2 January 1994.**

FROM THE OUTGOING EDITORS

MURIEL G. CANTOR This issue of the newsletter is the last that Cheryl and I are editing. The next issue of the volume will be edited by Stephen Hart. I am pleased to have had the opportunity to work with two different former chairs of the Culture Section, Diana Crane and Elizabeth Long and am sorry that I will not be able to continue to work with our present chair, Paul DiMaggio, and our chair-elect, Michèle Lamont, who both contributed to this issue in such a timely fashion.

I am especially grateful to Pete Peterson for his "Books of Notes." Readers who look forward to that section will be pleased to know that he will continue to inform us about new and fascinating books in our field in subsequent newsletters. Many important and busy scholars contributed articles to the newsletter. It is because of them that the newsletter attracted attention both inside and outside of the ASA and helped enliven the debates about how to define and study culture. From our conversations with Steve, we know that he will bring a new and fresh perspective as well as continue the high standards traditional to the newsletter.

I am truly thankful for the experience of editing the newsletter and for all the compliments we received. I am not sure that I personally deserve them. The person who really deserves the kudos is Cheryl whose editing skill and knowledge of the field made the newsletter the publication it is.

& CHERYL ZOLLARS First, I just wish to briefly thank Muriel for a felicitous two years of co-editorship, as well as the following for their various forms of generous support: the Sociology Department at American University under Chair Samih Farsoun; Helen Koustenis; past and present Culture Section Chairs with whom we have worked; previous editors for the gift of an already wonderful newsletter; many generous authors and especially Pete Peterson; and Marolyn Caldwell (a published mystery writer!) for her patience and talent in doing layout design.

Second, in this issue: Chair-Elect Michèle Lamont announces her planned Section Program for the 1994 ASA. Lamont joins JoEllen Shively in announcing the winners of the 1992-93 awards. Paul DiMaggio, in his debut "From the Chair", reviews the 1993 ASA Culture Day and announces working groups to continue exploring intersections of affinity between cultural sociology and other ASA sections. In different ways and degrees, DiMaggio's column and two of this issue's articles each address the positive functional roles cultural sociology can fulfill for sociology as a discipline. Doris Wilkinson identifies several factors contributing to the 'resurgence' of cultural sociology as a subfield and praises "culture's" promise as a general organizing concept in sociology—i.e., organizing not only sociological analysis but sociologists themselves, an analytic remedy to some centrifugal tendencies within the discipline. Jeffrey Alexander, Philip Smith & Steven Jay Sherwood argue the value of qualitative and interpretive methodological approaches—making an explicit argument for "go[ing] beyond the 'sociology of' culture to a cultural sociology." An example of a work of interpretive sociology is provided here by Philip Ennis, who summarizes the theoretical schema he has developed for apprehending the structure of the "organized 'arts'" in society.

Steve Hart, the incoming editor, is extremely enthusiastic and committed to the Section as well as the newsletter. And from his rich background in cultural sociology, described following, I am sure you will join us in looking forward to the insights and new directions he will bring to *Culture*.

ANNOUNCING CULTURE'S NEW EDITOR (Winter 1993-94):

STEPHEN A. HART Our incoming newsletter editor is currently working on a book on the culture-making process and the use of cultural and religious resources within social movements. His previous book, *What does the Lord Require? How American Christians Think about Economic Justice*, was published by Oxford University Press in 1992. It disentangles the way Christians use the resources of religious faith to ground views on economic issues ranging from staunchly conservative to radical; it explores the statements of grass-roots Americans as a form of participation in public discourse, as a cultural rather than psychological process. This year Steve is Adjunct Assistant Professor of Sociology at SUNY-Buffalo; last year he was Visiting Associate Professor at University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee. He has also taught at Wesleyan University, Connecticut, worked as an applied sociologist for the Lutheran national offices, and conducted a free-lance contract research business. His Ph.D. is from UC-Berkeley, where he also belonged to a semi-trashy novels and movies as well as blues and jazz. Steve is a member of the Theory, Marxist, and Social Movements sections in addition to the Culture Section. He says that he is looking forward to editing what he regards as "by far the best" of the four!

ASA 1994
SESSIONS ORGANIZED BY THE CULTURE SECTION

Los Angeles Meetings, August 5-9

Michèle Lamont, Chair-Elect

The 1994 program committee for the Culture Section is composed of Karen Cerulo (Rutgers U.), Sarah Corse (U. Virginia and U. Pennsylvania), Wendy Griswold (U. Chicago), John Hall (U. California-Davis), Mark Schneider (U. Michigan), and myself (Princeton U.).

With the L.A. meetings, the Culture Section is entering a new phase. For the first time, we are organizing joint sessions with other ASA Sections. We are also organizing an "Author Meets the Critics" session as well as a public discussion of the relationship between cultural sociology and cultural analysis as practiced in other fields. I invite all of you to submit papers.

Three joint sessions are organized with other ASA Sections:

First, the Culture Section is sponsoring a joint session with the Theory Section on **"Culture and Theory"**. Like cultural sociologists, social theorists have given much thought to issues of structure, culture, and agency in the context of their research and teaching. The session that I am co-organizing with Theda Skocpol (Harvard U.) will bring together individuals who share interests yet have few opportunities to discuss the topic of cultural theory. Incidentally, cultural sociologists will be invited to pursue this exchange at the Conference on *Practicing Theory* organized by the Theory Section in San Diego right after the ASA meetings.

Second, the Culture Section will organize jointly with the Section on Racial and Ethnic Minorities a session on **"Race, Class and Culture"**. After having rejected the Culture of Poverty thesis twenty years ago to focus on the structural determinants of poverty, sociologists are now calling for more attention to cultural variables (witness the session on Jencks's recent book at the last ASA meetings) while others are already producing fascinating work on the cultural dimension of inequality. This session, which I am co-organizing with Joe Feagin (U. Florida), will hopefully foster a stronger dialogue between specialists of inequality and cultural sociologists.

Third, Karin Knorr-Cetina, Chair-Elect of the Science, Knowledge and Technology Section, has suggested a joint session on **"Scientific and Interpretive Knowledge as Practice and Culture"**. This suggestion is particularly tantalizing given the large number of sociologists of science studying the cultural dimension of knowledge production and the growing interest of cultural sociologists in the conditions of production of their own knowledge. We have asked Mark Schneider (whose related, and provocative, book *Culture and Enchantment* will be available shortly) to join Peter Whalley in organizing this session. Some of the topics that could be addressed here include: Do the practices by which knowledge of culture is constructed differ significantly from those by which knowledge of nature

is constructed? Does the organization and culture of knowledge production differ between the cultural and natural sciences? How does the general absence of technologies flowing from the cultural sciences affect them?

Since 1991, the Council of the Section has been discussing ways of stimulating more intellectual debate at the meetings. A first approach consists in organizing invited sessions that bring together people known for having well identified positions on controversial topics—as did the Section on Comparative and Historical Sociology by organizing sessions on "Events vs. Process" a few years ago. To inaugurate what I hope will become a new series of sessions called *"Debates around Culture"*, I will organize an invited session on **"Cultural Analysis across Disciplinary Boundaries."** Andrew Ross (American Studies, New York U.) and Michael Schudson (Communications and Sociology, UC-San Diego) have agreed to participate in the session.

A second approach to stimulating intellectual debates in the Section is to organize an **"Author Meet the Critics"** session, which will, I hope, be possible if our membership hits the magical 800 mark in the next few weeks. I have asked John Hall to take the responsibility for this session. Suggestions for possible victims are welcome.

We will also have a session on **"Strategies for Identity Construction"** organized by Karen Cerulo. This session could include discussion of identity building, maintenance and transmission that occur among individuals and group that are traditionally defined as outside the norms. It could also include discussion of the role played by symbolic boundaries in the construction of identity, and of the relative salience of various dimensions of identity across groups—the possibilities are many.

Finally, Sarah Corse has agreed to organize the Culture Roundtables. She will consider papers on all possible topics.

It should be noted that the Program Committee of the ASA has scheduled a number of sessions of particular interest to the members of the Culture Section. These include: Culture, Arts, and Literature (Vicky Alexander, Harvard), Knowledge and Discourse (Jorge Ardit, UC-Berkeley), Mass Media (David Croteau, Boston College), Political Culture (Andrea Press, Michigan, and Paul Lichterman, Wisconsin), Popular Culture (Herman Gray, UC-Santa Cruz), Public Opinion (John Robinson, Maryland), Qualitative Methodology (Marjorie De Vault, Syracuse), Religion (George Thomas, Arizona State), Science (Joan Fujimura, Stanford), and Sports and Leisure (Sharon Cole, Colorado).

(continued to page 6)

LAMONT

(continued from page 5)

1. Race, Class and Culture.

Organizers: Joe Feagin, Sociology, U. Florida, 3219 Turlington Hall, Gainesville FL 32611-2036; and Michèle Lamont, Sociology, Princeton U., Princeton NJ 08544.

(Session organized jointly with the Section on Racial and Ethnic Minorities.)

2. Strategies of Identity Construction.

Organizer: Karen Cerulo, Sociology, Rutgers U., New Brunswick NJ 08903-5072.

3. Scientific and Interpretive Knowledge as Practice and Culture.

Organizers: Mark Schneider, Sociology, U. Michigan, 3012 LSA Bldg. Ann Arbor MI 48109-1382; and Peter Whalley, Sociology, Loyola U., 6525 North Sheridan Road, Chicago IL 60626.

(Session organized jointly with the Science, Knowledge and Technology Section.)

4. Culture and Theory.

Organizers: Theda Skocpol, Sociology, Harvard U., William James Hall, Cambridge MA 02138; and Michèle Lamont, Sociology, Princeton U., Princeton NJ 08544.

(Session organized jointly with the Theory Section.)

5. Roundtables.

Organizer: Sarah Corse, Visiting Professor, Department of Sociology, U. Pennsylvania, 3718 Locust Walk, Philadelphia PA 19104-6299.

THE WINNER OF THE CULTURE SECTION ARTICLE AWARD, 1993

Michèle Lamont, Chair
Article Award Selection Committee
and Committee Members

Howard Becker, Barry Schwartz, Yasemin Soysal, and Sharon Zukin

The members of the Committee for the 1993 Culture Prize unanimously voted to award the prize to **William H. Sewell, Jr.**, (U. Chicago) for his article "A Theory of Structure: Duality, Agency, and Transformation," *American Journal of Sociology* 98,1 (July 1992). This excellent contribution provides a very impressive and persuasive description of the role played by culture and agency in the constitution of the social structure and the distribution of power. More specifically, after defining structures as mutually sustaining cultural schemas and structures of resources that empower and constrain social action, this article argues that structure is a profoundly cultural phenomena continually deriving from the character and distribution of resources in the everyday world. It also illustrates in an exemplary way the importance of recent developments in cultural sociology for the field of sociology as a whole.

In addition, the committee voted to award an honorable mention to **Bruce G. Carruthers** and **Wendy Nelson Espeland** (Northwestern U.) for their article "Accounting for Rationality: Double-Entry Bookkeeping and the Rhetoric of Economic Rationality," *American Journal of Sociology* 97,1 (July 1991). According to Alan Sica who nominated this paper for the Culture Prize, "The importance of this article . . . lies in its precise explanation of how rationalization took place during a period of history and within a particular social practice that were dear to Weber. By studying carefully *histories of accounting* and the practices that flowed from them, the authors have documented how double-entry bookkeeping . . . became *rhetorically* essential to the look of modern business enterprise."

THE WINNER OF THE GRADUATE STUDENT PAPER PRIZE, 1993

JoEllen Shively, Chair
Graduate Student Paper Award Committee
and Committee Members

Victoria Alexander, Sarah M. Corse, and Christina Nippert-Eng

The 1993 Student Paper Prize was awarded to **Timothy Jon Dowd**, Princeton University, for his paper: "The Song Remains the Same?: The Musical Diversity and Industry Context of Number One Songs, 1955-1988." Of all the entries submitted to the Committee, Timothy Dowd's paper stood out both for its interesting approach to analyzing 'number one' songs between 1955-1988 and for its interesting use of the songs to test various production of culture theories.

prod
cult

The 1992-93 recipient of a University of Kentucky "Distinguished Professorship" award,
Doris Wilkinson is the immediate past president of the Eastern Sociological Society.

THE RECLAIMING OF CULTURE: IN SEARCH OF SOCIOLOGY

Doris Y. Wilkinson
University of Kentucky

This brief essay offers tentative reflections and a personal appraisal of the recrystallization of interest in the cultural theme in American sociological discourse. The central question for discussion is: *why has there been an apparent upsurge of interest by sociologists in the form, content and cycle of culture?* My responses to this question resonate with the input from other scholars about the possible explanations for the renewed emphasis. Throughout the argument, I convey some biases in pointing to the limits of traditional structural analysis and its variant forms. In spite of what may appear to be criticisms of a *sociology without culture*, the intrinsic and enduring value of sociology along with its enhancement are foremost among my concerns.

Although sociologists have studied culture since the founding of the discipline, the substantive *raison d'être* of the field in this country, at least, has not been the systematic analysis of culture but rather the documentation, description and interpretation of more abstract constructs such as social organization, social forces, social order and social structure. Nevertheless, for the past several years, a measureable resurgence of intellectual interest in the clarification, re-definition, and the interpretation of culture has ensued. This has been evident in the numerous scholarly works and critiques that have explored and appraised the multifaceted cultural terrain. (For recent works addressing issues relevant to those discussed here, see Alexander & Seidman 1990, Goldfarb 1991, Heiskala 1990, Rossi 1990, Sica 1990, and Wrong 1990.)

Recently, I discussed with colleagues from the East Coast and the New England area some persuasive motives for an apparent explosion of interest in the culture construct and the ramifications of these reasons. The responses have been quite similar. They allude to the following: (1) misgivings about the pace and form of change in the discipline, (2) the quest for disciplinary symmetry, (3) the sense of an intellectual void, (4) the rise of relativism and post-modernism, (5) the impact of multiculturalism, (6) the threat of political correctness, (7) rejection of the quantitative ethic, (8) feelings of dislocation, (9) fragmentation of the field, and (10) the stimulating prospect of a sociology of culture.

Initially the concentration on culture—with its multiple dimensions of values, beliefs, philosophies, behavioral expectations, and hidden assumptions—denotes a response to a plethora of events. Hence, explanations for the revitalization of sociological interest in culture are not hypothetical but real. They suggest perceptions and apprehensions about the rapidly changing character of American sociology, the academic climate in which it is taught, and the trans-

formation of the nation's political culture. These external events have impinged on the boundaries, orientation, theoretical paradigms, methodologies and the direction of the field.

Every discipline aims for symmetry or centering, a process that frames and maps the foundation for a cohesive intellectual dialogue and a shared professional identity. The phenomenon of dissonance reduction can only occur if there is some modicum of balance among the internal aspects of a discipline. Substantive balance gives rise to a sense of stability, field validity, leverage, regularity and a composite image. Centering establishes a domain for intellectual exchange and links multiple and diverse perspectives with associated pedagogical and analytical techniques. It is debatable whether basic sociological concepts such as *structure*, social dynamics, and social forces introduce the kind of disciplinary continuity that a focus on culture provides. The *study of culture* appears to function in a variety of discipline enhancing ways.

Many of our colleagues voice concern that a mood of intellectual vacuity has seemingly characterized American sociology for decades. This sentiment connotes a salient and plausible underlying reason for the renewed study of culture. Beginning with its substantive roots and evolution in Europe, sociology has passed through dramatic periods in American history wherein the field's content has been significantly molded by the socio-cultural transitions and political events that have surrounded it. Yet, in the late twentieth century, American sociology became transfixed with quantitative methodology, mathematical modeling, and the quest for statistical significance as *content* rather than as *technique*. That is, in the attempt to gain *scientific* credibility for the discipline, sociologists concentrated on *method as substance* rather than as a tool or a means for *analysis*. The pursuit of objectivity and ethical neutrality via mathematical reasoning and formal structural analysis may have contributed to the contemporary sense of intellectual vacuity and ennui. A prominent indicator of this has been the apparent sustained lack of congruence between theoretical postulates and empirical realities. This remains a constant even as this country seeks answers to the paradoxes and contradictions permeating its social history cycle and cultural fabric (e.g., escalating violence, an erosion of racial understanding and compromise). However, sustained examination and dissection of the country's cultural styles and ethos could lead to value relevant resolutions that are necessary to delineate and interpret the ideological dilemmas and social incongruities of our time.

Another probable impetus for the resurgence of the dialogue on culture in sociological inquiry might be

(continued to page 8)

WILKINSON
(continued from page 7)

PM
linked to the rise of ultra-relativism, deconstructionism and post-modernism. Given a milieu of unfolding nebulous and imprecise "movements" perceived as targeting fundamental cultural, intellectual, literary and scientific anchors, the language and essence of culture may embody convincing answers. In this context, among the social sciences, sociology remains the most vulnerable discipline to unique conceptual movements and philosophies, especially those that challenge fundamental principles and premises as well as the traditional norms and belief codes of the society. The rise and threat of modernistic postulates, seemingly parallel to the existentialist notions of a previous era yet lacking their depth, and the introduction of unanticipated normative and value relativism disclose external provocations and internal contradictions in sociological reasoning.

Gender
In addition, it is not a chance occurrence that the resurgence of interest in culture as a central unit of analysis is occurring in sociology simultaneously with the advent of the gendering of the professions and the evolving of multiculturalism in universities and other work settings. Unexpectedly, the rapidly expanding phenomenon of multiculturalism juxtaposed with "political correctness" has accented and polarized differences in beliefs and placed those in "right" and "left" ideological camps against one another.

MC
Furthermore, the focus on culture as an entity for scholarly discourse and scientific inquiry underscores the components of the multicultural ethic. Multiculturalism, which assumes a definite political character, extends what the concept is all about—the coexistence and receptivity to differing values, philosophies, ideologies, hidden assumptions, and behavioral expectations. However, the context for this coexistence is far from neutral. In the academic world, for example, rapid modifications in pedagogy and in curricula, such as the focus on integrating class, race and gender, are having an impact on the scope and course of contemporary American sociology. Understandably, there is resistance to particular innovations. Hence, the re-introduction of culture as a central unit of examination in theory, research and in the teaching of sociology provides an entry point for synthesizing revisions of curricula and instructional techniques.

With the evolution of normative and value transitions in the present historical moment, and the reconfiguration of political incorrectness to refer to any perceived or personally felt shame, embarrassment or humiliation or even a spoken or written word with which one disagrees, a state of intellectual anomie may have become entrenched in American sociology. Thus, the study of culture represents a legitimate rejoinder to the current mood of substantive normlessness being experienced by those sociologists who sense that there is normative disintegration in the profession. Whereas one segment of the academic and campus population has concentrated on the rejection of the canon as the criterion by which to judge the quality of literary productions, another division of the academic setting

is preoccupied with changing the moral terrain. These transformations have far-reaching ramifications for the larger society—the labyrinth for sociological investigation. The escalating orientation to reject universal criteria for truth, beauty, morality and scholarship appears to some as an anti-culture—almost anarchical—reaction emanating from personal and particularistic wants, preferences and feelings. As such, only individualized convictions are articulated in the insistence on having no standards. Thus, the systematic exploration of culture serves as substantively restorative. It provides an anchor for a discipline and a social world that seem in disarray.

Within sociology, the rise in the study of culture as a central unit of analysis is directly correlated with the social and political dynamics of the present age. For example, the current politicization of the field via various ideological alignments cannot be explained solely from a structural perspective nor from a model that relies on variant forms of structuralism which interfuse standard sociological frames of reference. The renewal of emphasis on the concept of culture clearly serves as an indicator of a discipline in search of itself. The potential for restoration symbolizes a positive trend.

Moreover, with the proliferation of minutely focused areas of study and specialized sections, the fragmentation of the discipline and the profession stands in contrast to the growth encountered in more cohesively defined fields. In the present era, the segmenting of sociology seems to have created a condition of substantive normlessness. While its boundaries and content reflect its history, conceivably the heretofore inability of the field to transcend linguistic ambiguity and its preoccupation with the mystique of the scientific imagination have fostered a state of anomie. The mid-twentieth century reliance of sociologists on quasi-mathematical models appears to have generated a virtual rebellion against all forms of quantitative analysis. This rebuking of sociology's claims to scientific legitimacy via measurement and quantitative reasoning is evident in the perspectives and style of post-modern sociological discourse.

The pursuit of the cultural domain may also represent a response to the feeling of displacement experienced by sociologists and sociology departments within the past two decades. With the advent of interdisciplinary programs and departments such as Ethnic Studies, Women's Studies, African American Studies, and Urban Studies, following the campus revolts of the 1960s and the early 1970s, the field began to encounter structural and substantive dislocation and in some instances devaluation. For the array of multidisciplinary specialties, developed in response to the intellectual, philosophical and identity-seeking demands of a heterogeneous student population, appropriated a considerable portion of sociology. Faculty, students and resources, previously entrenched in the sociological enterprise, inevitably became attached to emerging programs. Thus, it is also possible that this displacement has impinged

(continued to page 9)

agree for disagree esp

WILKINSON
(continued from page 8)

on the cohesiveness and the centering of the field. Given this, it is likely that the cultural framework offers a rebirth for the discipline. Whatever the reasons, the concept of culture is an enriching one.

For sociology, the study of culture furnishes an essential foundation that links its disparate subject areas and individualistic interests into a more coherent whole. This is a feat that some feel has not been accomplished with concepts such as social order, social system, or social facts. In contrast, the potential for cultivating a sociology that juxtaposes culture with its existing vocabulary and systems of explanation introduces an imaginative way of articulating the complexities of behavior. Culture provides a constructive nucleus and a way to integrate the customary elements of sociological analysis. At the 1993 ASA annual meeting, a colleague from the West Coast remarked that the importance of culture was vividly demonstrated in the recent revolutionary transitions that occurred in Eastern Europe, adding that we cannot "explain rationally what occurred except via

culture." Thus, in spite of what may appear to be non-positive reasons for the present modernistic revival of culture in sociology, the concept is enlightening and informative. It expands the interpretive and predictive potency of our useful theories and contributes to the substance of the field.

REFERENCES

- Alexander, J.C. & S. Seidman, eds. 1990. *Culture and Society: Contemporary Debates*. NY: Cambridge.
- Goldfarb, J.C. 1991. *The Cynical Society: The Culture of Politics and the Politics of Culture*. U. Chicago.
- Heiskala, R. 1990. "Sociology as a Discursive Space—the Coming Age of a New Orthodoxy?" *Acta Sociologica* 33 (Winter): 305-339.
- Rossi, P. 1990. "Review of *The Future of Sociology*." *Contemporary Sociology* 19 (July): 623-624.
- Sica, A. 1990. "Review of Meaning and Authenticity: Further Essays on the Sociology of Art." *American Journal of Sociology* 95 (May) 1630-1632.
- Wrong, D.H. 1990. "Review of Durkheimian Sociology: Cultural Studies." *American Journal of Sociology* 95 (March): 1358-60.

DISSERTATION ABSTRACT:

THE MANAGED CONSUMER: BUSINESS ENTERPRISE AND EVERYDAY LIFE IN THE UNITED STATES SINCE 1945

Michael Dawson
University of Oregon

While American society remains the model for "consumer society," sociologists have fixed attention almost exclusively on the ideology of "consumer culture." In most studies of "consumerism," the institutional aspects of consumption appear only in terms that are at once narrow and diffuse, as themes of "fragmentation" obscure social structure and order. In contrast, this dissertation argues that everyday life in the United States has been increasingly organized through the interaction of marketing and household institutions, with marketers' ability to shape culture tending to dominate the process. The central thesis is that the nature of business power in the post-WWII era compels businesses to constantly expand their marketing efforts, i.e., to constantly reorganize key foundations of culture in order to ensure that consumer demand for their products remains insatiable over time. The second major thesis is that while no single unit of business enterprise is powerful enough to shape the overall cultural process, the "group effect" produced by the cultural interventions of major marketers has profoundly altered cultural development in the United States since 1945. Major consequences of such change include a trend toward "personal deskilling;" a strong cultural tendency toward systematic isolation of the social individual akin to the process that Anthony Giddens terms "the sequestration of experience" and Raymond Williams termed "mobile privatization;" the consequent spread of what M.P. Baumgartner calls "moral minimalism;" as well as a host of problems associated with inequality and commercialism.

Marketing institutions and practices are closely examined using both primary historical data collected from the Smithsonian Institution's Center for Advertising History and in-depth interviews with marketing executives. Consumers' experiences are evaluated using participant observation and in-depth interview research strategies.

CALLS FOR PAPERS—PUBLICATION

Critical Matrix: The Princeton Journal of Women, Gender and Culture invites submissions for an upcoming special issue: **Sexualities, Reproduction and the Politics of Coalition**. This biannual journal publishes scholarly articles as well as interdisciplinary creative and experimental work in Women's Studies. The special issue topic concerns redefining the terms of debate and goals for

action in a neo-liberal era re: technologies, policies, services, access, popular and youth cultural representations. Contact: *Critical Matrix*, Program in Women's Studies, Princeton U., 113 Dickinson Hall, Princeton, NJ 08544. Deadlines: submission to general issues is ongoing; **deadline for special issue: 15 December 1993**.

RISKING ENCHANTMENT: THEORY AND METHOD IN CULTURAL STUDIES

Jeffrey C. Alexander, University of California Los Angeles

Philip Smith, University of Queensland

and Steven Jay Sherwood, University of California Los Angeles

Early in this century, in his masterwork *The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life*, Emile Durkheim called for the creation of a "religious sociology" that would "open a new way to the science of man." Yet, as the century comes to an end, such a "religious" understanding of society does not exist. Nor has our discipline been able to create a new science of men and women. Two reasons suggest themselves. One is that Durkheim's secular readers were unable to understand what he had in mind. The other is that they were able to, and did not like it.

Durkheim's idea was to put meaning and culturally-mediated sentiment at the center of the social studies. While he never gave up on the idea of a social science, in his later work he increasingly wished to change it in a fundamental way. He wanted social science to give up on what we will call the "project of demystification."

Certainly disciplinary rationality must be maintained: our intellectual theories and methods allow a critical, decentered relationship to the world. Social science is rational, too, in the sense that its moral goal is rooted in the Enlightenment project of bringing to conscious attention the subjective and objective structures that lie outside the largely tacit understandings of everyday life.

Yet, the rationality of the social scientific method must not be conflated with the rationality of the society to which it applies. Our own work is guided, in fact, by the very opposite supposition. As we see it, society will never shed its mysteries—its irrationality, its "thick-ness," its transcendent beatitudes, its demonic black magic, its cathartic rituals, its fierce and incomprehensible emotionality, and its dense, sometimes splendid, often tortured solidarities.

These mysteries have generally been avoided by rational social science. Insofar as they have been addressed, moreover, our classics and our contemporaries have sought to explain such irrationalities by the method of reduction. Insisting that subjectivities are caused by objectivities, they have tried (and, we would argue, invariably failed) to demonstrate that these irrationalities are merely reflections of "real" structures, such as organizations, stratificational systems, and political groupings.

Sociologists pride themselves on such exercises in the "sociology of"—in this case, of culture—and in the demystification of the actor's world that is both premise and result. But this reduction is fundamentally mistaken. The world has an irremediably mystical dimension. To explore it, we must go beyond the "sociology of" culture to a cultural sociology, one that gets inside the mysteries of social life without reducing them or wishing them away, even while it interprets them in a

rational way that expands the realm of criticism, responsibility, and conscience.

The promise of a cultural sociology (Alexander 1993) is to do just that. For, as Clifford Geertz insisted some twenty years ago, "the study of symbolic action is no less a sociological discipline than the study of small groups, bureaucracies, or the changing role of the American woman; it is only a good deal less developed" (Geertz 1973). Since he wrote these words, cultural sociology has, in fact, become an independent field that is one of the discipline's most vibrant and dynamic places to work. We have come a long way in the exploration of the codes, narratives, and symbols that underlie, and underwrite, society. But we still have a long way to go.

C. Wright Mills once extolled the sociological imagination as the intersection of biography and history, defining the latter largely in objectivist terms. Today, we must open ourselves up to the excitement of the social imagination. We must study how people make their lives and their societies meaningful, the ways in which social actors invest their worlds with sentiment and significance. If we are to pursue this rich and elusive goal, we will have to make our theories and methods consistent with this animating spirit.

We begin by rejecting the proposition that methodologies for investigating society can be theory neutral. If scientific work is to be understood as meaningful, we must recognize that it, too, is informed by culture. The culture of science is theory. We insist, then, that objects deemed worthy of investigation are selected according to theoretically driven choices. Fundamental categories for understanding society—class, state, institution, self, even culture—are made available by scientific decisions that have little to do with the canons of positivist science. It is metatheoretical assumptions about the nature of action and order that shape methodology and inference in the empirical sciences, pushing social analysts either toward or away from "culture" and, indeed, determining just what kind of interpretation of culture will ultimately prevail.

In explicitly acknowledging that theory, method, and inference are inextricably intertwined, we differentiate ourselves (see Griswold 1992) from the increasingly popular poststructuralist approach to the study of culture. Contrary to the work of Michel Foucault (e.g., *The Archaeology of Knowledge*) and the sociological extrapolation Robert Wuthnow has made from it (Wuthnow 1987; Rambo & Chan 1990), we deny the very possibility of a genealogical method which can map the contours of discourse without first devising a scale. In this sense, we argue, contra Wuthnow, that

(continued to page 11)

there can be no methodological improvement without theoretical renewal. Indeed, we contend that it is primarily by developing improved theoretical insights into the nature of the cultural order that new tools for its analysis can be forged.

While arguing in this postpositivist vein, we do not deny the power or the facticity of the empirical "world." Through a process of "resistance" the social world demands the constant re-tuning of theory and what Durkheim called "social facts." Time and time again, our own data-intensive inquiries (Alexander 1988b; Smith 1991; Alexander *et al* forthcoming) have produced unexpected results that force not merely theoretical refinement but fundamental revision.

To illuminate this complex relationship between fact and theory in cultural studies, we turn towards a more concrete discussion of our theoretical approach and the empirical studies of culture it has induced.

To speak of "our" inquiries may perhaps seem rather peculiar in a disputation on cultural method. Yet, one important implication of a theory-driven perspective on cultural social science is its particularity. There is no universal method that produces social science as such; there are only investigations guided by the search for empirical typifications of particular world views, which can be understood as theoretical sign systems promising researchers they will find certain phenomenon "already there" in the empirical world. Because particularity can be communicated only culturally, in the lifeworld, theoretical meaning systems can be carried only by particular intellectual traditions, which have the power to organize lifeworlds of their own. In a sense, then, theory, like meaning, is the product of a collective conscience.

We will focus our own discussion of cultural methods on the "culture group" that has developed at UCLA, which might be thought of as constituting a kind of little tradition within the great tradition of Durkheimian thought. This focus has the advantage of illuminating cultural studies not only in principle but *in situ*.

In light of what we have said so far, it should come as no surprise that the work of this group rests broadly upon what has been called the late-Durkheimian tradition (Alexander 1988a), even while the specific studies undertaken by those associated with this group have taken a variety of forms, from linguistic and historical to neofunctionalist.

At the heart of our shared vision is a commitment to the "relative autonomy of culture" (Alexander 1990; Kane 1991). This general orienting position is specified by a model that insists that preoccupation with the sacred and profane continues to organize cultural life, a position that has been enriched by thinkers like Mircea Eliade, Edward Shils, Rogers Callois and, more recently, by the cultural economics of Viviana Zelizer. We emphasize as well the centrality of solidary sentiments and ritual process, and more broadly, following Parsons and Habermas, the importance of civil society and communication in contemporary social life. It is the openness of the civil sphere that allows communi-

cative processes to address metaphysics and morality, public sentiment and personal significance, and which allows cultural processes to become central features of contemporary political life.

Drawing upon Paul Ricoeur's interpretation of the hermeneutical method, our approach constructs the object of empirical investigations as the meaningful world of the "social text." Via the act of interpretation, we attempt to read this text for evidence of "culture structures," insisting that without the prior reconstruction of meaning any attempt at explanation is bound to fail. We do not maintain, of course, that explanation itself consists only of tracing the effects of cultural structures; while the latter have analytic autonomy, in any concrete historical situation they interact with other kinds of structures in an open-ended, multi-dimensional way. We would insist, however, that these "other structures"—whether they be economic, political, or even demographic—cannot themselves be viewed merely as external to the actors upon whom they exert their force. Attention must always be paid to the dimension of meaning.

If, qua cultural analysts, our core method is interpretive, our goal to recover meaning from the social text, it is important to keep the adjective *social* in mind. For our aim is to reconstruct the collective conscience from its documentary fragments and from the constraining structures it implies. In eliciting the structures that compose the *conscience collective*—which in French, we must recall, implies both cognitive "consciousness" and emotional and moral "conscience"—we bring to our interpretive effort an ecumenical sensibility that seeks insight from a variety of disciplines.

Our studies have drawn in fundamental ways, not only from the sociological writings of Durkheim, Max Weber, and Parsons, and from their elaboration in the work of such influential contemporaries as Bellah, Shils, and Eisenstadt, but also from the semiotics of Roland Barthes, Umberto Eco and Marshall Sahlins; the post-structuralism of Foucault; the symbolic anthropology of Geertz, Victor Turner and Mary Douglas; the narrative theories of Northrup Frye and his literary followers like Hayden White and Fredric Jameson; and from the existential theology of Ricoeur. Within contemporary sociology, studies that we see as being informed by the same theoretical lifeworld and similar guiding particularities as our own include those of Zelizer, Steven Seidman, Robin Wagner-Pacifici, Wendy Griswold, Eviatar Zerubavel, Barry Schwartz, Elihu Katz and Daniel Dayan. Moreover, we find parallel concerns evidenced in the recent work of Craig Calhoun on civil society and social identity, and in that of Margaret Somers on narrative.

Insofar as our approach recognizes the "causal" authenticity and efficacy of collective sentiments and their symbolic patterning in the web of social life, our theoretical disagreements with neo-Marxist, post-structuralist, and ethnomethodological approaches to meaning entail methodological departures as well. Even in the best examples of these approaches, interpretation is seen as something that happens "behind the backs"

(continued to page 12)

ALEXANDER, ET AL.
(continued from page 11)

of actors, who are described, in turn, as employing meaning strategically in order to gain their ends vis-a-vis other actors and overarching institutions. These approaches also bracket the analyst's own existential sentiments. Just as actors' emotional responses are treated as residues of some strategic interest, so the analyst's emotions are viewed as a polluting category that threatens to contaminate the purity of rational scientific insight.

Neo-Marxists, for example, have always been uneasy with emotions, viewing them as vulnerable to capitalist manipulation, as exemplified in the Frankfurt School studies of the so-called "culture industry." This distrust has been compounded by the lingering self-conception of Marxism as a science of historical materialism. Such a theoretical commitment to the causal primacy of the material sphere makes the recovery of structured sentiment seem merely "formalist"—a redundant, regressive, activity vis-a-vis the progressively unfolding project of social explanation.

In Foucaultian post-structuralism, one finds a different theory and method but, from our cultural point of view, similar results. There is the effort to attain a dispassionate ironic gaze that objectifies without evaluating and maps without involvement. At the metatheoretical level, a commitment to the "will to power" as the causal motive of human action once again reduces sentiment to the category of a superfluous variable.

"Practice theories," in our view, are similarly debilitated. Despite his nods at *habitus* and his interest in the codes of art and fashion, Bourdieu relentlessly strategizes action, displacing experience from emotions to body and shifting theoretical attention from the power of collective symbols to their objective determinants. Giddens' "reflexivity" effectively reduces culture to situational rules, sentiments to interactional negotiation, and structures of meaning to the exigencies of time and space. Neo-institutional theory puts this practical emphasis on strategy, reflexivity and adaptation in the service of organizational control, promoting an instrumental view of symbolic legitimacy that gives the impression of thematizing myth and ritual while emptying them of any meaning-induced form.

With the possible exception of certain strands of symbolic interactionist work (e.g., Erving Goffman's *Asylums*), micro-sociological approaches have, for their part, also stressed cognition over morality and sentiment, and neglected meaning as a result. Moral and emotional involvement by the analyst is precluded by adherence to the principle of "ethnomethodological indifference," a skeptical American reformulation of Edmund Husserl's formalistic concept of the *epoché*. Faced with the taken-for-granted nature of the actor's relation to reality, Husserl argued that, in order to describe the actual procedures of intuitive cognition, the analyst must step outside of intuition altogether by the process of "phenomenological reduction."

But about the nature of the reality to which the lay actor's intuitive procedures provide access—the moral,

emotional, and cognitive structures that give to reality an internal organization of its own—Husserl and his latter day followers have little to say. What they tend to suggest, rather, is that such a reality emerges from the procedures themselves. Consider, for example, "conversation analysis," one of the vanguard parties of contemporary micro-sociology. Ethnomethodology's only surviving research program, conversation analysis (CA), offers a kind of *pragmatis giganticus*, a method that, while powerfully illuminating the technique of verbal interaction, provides little insight into what speakers actually mean by what they say. Influenced by a narrow reading of Wittgenstein's ambiguous dictum "use = meaning," these studies in conversation often exhibit a mind-numbing positivism that is almost clinical in its detachment from the passion and fury of speakers in real life.

In contrast to such a dehumanizing gaze we recognize not only the existence but the causal efficacy of sentiment, belief, and emotion in social life. As interpreters we look upon our own emotional responses as a resource, not as a burden, as we encounter the social text. Examining contemporary events, we feel the intense passion and heat of human action that is too often lost in the cool rigor of scientific controls. For this is the crucial point: rituals, pollution, and purification can be understood only if the profound affects that make these primordial categories so compelling are openly acknowledged by the interpreter. Only by remaining engaged in the world can we have access to the emotions and metaphysics that alter social action; and only these can we interpret in a hermeneutically satisfying way.

We employ an approach that can be termed a "reflexive hermeneutics." Following the teachings of 18th and 19th century romantics such as Wordsworth and Goethe, and the meaning-oriented hermeneuticians like Dilthey, Heidegger and Gadamer, we see our own emotional and moral reflexes as a basis for establishing intersubjectivity. Because our emphasis is not on objectification but on understanding, our own subjective responses provide the basis for a *Bildungsprozess*. At the same time, it is only because of the decentered nature of the theoretical tradition within which we work and think that we gain access to our emotions and allow for the possibility of moral and cognitive reflexivity. Because we work within a theoretical tradition, we can gain distance from our own experience and the experiences of others, even as we open ourselves to their emotions and ours, and make experience itself the basis of our interpretive turn.

Our studies of political life can be used to briefly exemplify this approach. In understanding the astonishing cultural shifts that brought about the end of the Cold War (Alexander & Sherwood forthcoming-b) we began to obtain insight by drawing upon our own experiences of euphoria and hope. Through casual conversations and our own exposure to global media, it became apparent that others around us shared these feelings—not only we, but many others seemed to like the Soviet leader Gorbachev. For the first time in years

(continued on page 13)

but
also -
we found ourselves avidly reading articles about the fiendish complexities of Kremlin politics and for the first time we actually "took sides" in struggles for power within the Politburo. Clearly, something was going on here; not only in the Soviet Union, but also within America's national consciousness. As cultural sociologists, we responded by trying to understand these sentiments in the context of social and cultural theory. We began with Durkheim's religious sociology and Weber's charisma theory. However, as the data revealed the complexity and subtlety of the issue, we moved on, employing our theory of the binary codes of civil society as well as an evolving theory of social narrative. We discovered that we, and most Americans, had "fallen in love" with Gorbachev because he fit the cultural archetype and symbolic imagery of the democratic "American hero" (Sherwood 1993).

During times of profound international conflict, especially war (Smith 1993, 1991; Alexander & Sherwood forthcoming-a), we experienced emotions that ranged from disturbingly childish visceral excitement to unease and disgust. We also noticed behavioral changes, e.g., that we watched CNN late into the night and engaged in heated arguments with people with whom we were otherwise in agreement. Stepping out of the waters of the lifeworld we reflected on this as evidence of what Durkheim would call "collective effervescence." We looked in a more decentered way at the aspects of the fighting, the war coverage, the efforts at legitimation and dissent with which we approved and those with which we disapproved. Why, we asked, did we love, hate or admire George Bush, Margaret Thatcher or Saddam Hussein, feel pity for the victims of the Amiriya bunker bombing, the sinking of the *General Belgrano* or the massacres in Kurdistan, or feel horrified by the power of modern weaponry? It soon became apparent that there were continuities and patterns relating these feelings to the symbols that were being used to understand events both in the media and by friends and neighbors and by ourselves. Subsequent interpretations of the social text were disciplined not only by theoretical concerns (semiotic and narrative theory, mass media theory, Durkheimian theory, etc.), but by controlled comparisons between wars, opinion groupings and also between different periods of the same longitudinal event. The results showed that sacred and profane symbolics and their incorporation into narratives of events as heroic, tragic and apocalyptic had created these emotional responses.

Studies of Watergate and computer technology—the initiating investigations in this program of research and theory—began in similar ways. Emotional and moral involvement in collective processes prompted an inquiry into the patterning forces at work. If we felt ourselves revolted and purified during the upheavals that marked Watergate (Alexander 1988b; cf., Alexander & Sherwood 1991, and Alexander & Smith 1993), we wondered whether these feelings were shared outside of small and isolated groups. If we felt horrified by Reagan's "Star Wars" project, we wondered why many

Americans apparently felt exactly the opposite way. In each case, we set out to check whether "others" in our immediate experience, as well as those outside our intersubjective world, demonstrated similar or related reactions. If these checks confirmed our experiences of moral upheaval, we found that the mass media materials that documented the social reality of our own experiences could provide a concrete resource for the investigation of the supra-individual code and narrative frames that empowered these collective representations in turn. The inner world of emotion and meaning, clarified self-reflexively via social theory, told us where to begin to look in order to see the social imagination at work. Through this mediation between the personal and the impersonal, we could make the invisible parameters of the ideal visible and clear.

"Not a word of all that I have said or tried to indicate, came out of alien, cool, objective knowledge; it is all within me, I have been through it all." Speaking as a novelist in the German tradition, Thomas Mann was able to make this a legitimate methodological statement. As sociologists we cannot. Our scientific commitments require that we step out of the lifeworld before we write. It is necessary to compare data to theory, to test hypotheses and to consider evidence in an even-handed way.

Yet, by the same token, we would argue that it is a mistake to deny the reality of our own inner experiences of meaning, emotion and morality in illuminating the social imagination through which the world is remystified. We use the word "deny" advisedly, for how else, if not by such denial, can sociologists be committed to the objectivistic project and continue to exist as spiritual and sensible beings? Surely, it cannot be the case that more objectivising "cultural sociologists" feel themselves to be simply pushed willy-nilly by material forces, to be the dumb victims of a dominant theology, or the perpetrators of only selfish, strategic actions. To experience life in this way would be to have experience without meaning, and it would be an invitation to suicide. We conclude, therefore, that objectivising sociologists, too, live and love and experience the heat generated by the ardent symbols, emotions and relationships to be found in the social world. who
does

This conclusion makes the question even more compelling. Why, do these analysts impose objectifying and degrading forms of explanation on others? They can impose this double-standard only because they deny the value of personal experience as a methodological resource. This denial results in an illegitimate squaring of the hermeneutical circle, a rupture that permits the objectification of meaning into the passionless categories, boxes and formulae of a "social science." We would prefer a *Geisteswissenschaft*, a science of the spirit.

We believe in the un-squaring of the hermeneutical circle. It is only through immersing the self in the sometimes fragrant, sometimes repulsive, but always febrile waters of the lifeworld, and by studying reflections in the clear pools of the soul, that a truly cultural sociology can be constructed: one that takes meaning

(continued to page 14)

ALEXANDER, ET AL.
(continued from page 13)

to be the *fons et origo* of human communion and social life. In this way, we must ever be, in the words of T.S. Eliot, "risking enchantment." Thus, we argue that the coin of good sociology—at least, good cultural sociology—must bear the stamp of a method that cherishes both sense and sensibility.

REFERENCES

- Alexander, J.C. 1988a. *Durkheimian Sociology: Cultural Studies*. NY: Cambridge.
- Alexander, J.C. 1988b. *Action and its Environments*. NY: Cambridge.
- Alexander, J.C. 1990. "Analytic Debates: On Understanding the Relative Autonomy of Culture." In *Culture and Society*, ed. by J.C. Alexander & S. Seidman. NY: Cambridge.
- Alexander, J.C. 1993. "The Return of Civil Society." *Contemporary Sociology* (Fall).
- Alexander, J.C. & S.J. Sherwood. Forthcoming-a. "Bush, Hussein and the Cultural Preparation for War." In *The Discourse of Civil Society in War and Peace*, ed. by J.C. Alexander et al. London: Basil Blackwell.
- Alexander, J.C. & S.J. Sherwood. Forthcoming-b. "The Making, Unmaking and Resurrection of an American Hero: Gorbachev and the Discourse of the Good." In Alexander et al., *op cit*.
- Alexander, J.C. & S.J. Sherwood. 1991. "American Dream at a Turning Point." *Los Angeles Times*, 15 September.
- Alexander, J.C. & P. Smith. 1993. "The Discourse of Civil Society: A New Proposal for Cultural Studies." *Theory and Society* 22: 151-207.
- Alexander, J.C., et al. Forthcoming. *The Discourse of Civil Society in War and Peace*. London: Basil Blackwell.
- Calhoun, C., ed. 1993. *From Persons to Nations: The Social Constitution of Identities*. London: Basil Blackwell.
- Dayan, D. & E. Katz. 1988. "Articulating Consensus: The Ritual and Rhetoric of Media Events." In Alexander 1988a, *op cit*.
- Durkheim, E. 1965. *The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
- Foucault, M. 1969. *The Archaeology of Knowledge and the Discourse on Language*. NY: Harper Colophon.
- Frye, N. 1957. *Anatomy of Criticism*. NJ: Princeton.
- Geertz, C. 1973. *The Interpretation of Cultures*. NY: Basic Books.
- Goffman, E. 1961. *Asylums: Essays on the Social Situation of Mental Patients and Other Inmates*. NY: Doubleday & Co.
- Griswold, W. 1992. "The Sociology of Culture: Four Good Arguments (and One Bad One)." *Acta Sociologica* 35: 323-328.
- Kane, A. 1991. "Cultural Analysis in Historical Sociology: The Analytic and Concrete Forms of the Autonomy of Culture." *Sociological Theory* 9: 53-69.
- Rambo, E. & E. Chan. 1990. "Text, Structure and Action in Cultural Sociology." *Theory and Society* 19: 635-48.
- Ricoeur, P. 1984/88. *Time and Narrative*. 3 volumes. IL: U. Chicago.
- Sherwood, S.J. 1993. "Narrating the Social: Post-modernism and the Drama of Democracy." Forthcoming in *Dramatizing Facts: The Narratives of Journalism*, ed. by T. Liebes. Special issue of *Journal of Narratives and Life Stories*.
- Smith, P. 1991. "Codes and Conflict: Towards a Theory of War as Ritual." *Theory and Society* 21: 103-138.
- Smith, P. 1993. "The Semiological Foundations of Media Narratives: Hussein and Nasser." Forthcoming in Liebes 1993, *op cit*.
- Somers, M. 1993. "Reclaiming the Epistemological Other: Narrative and the Social Constitution of Identity." In Calhoun 1993, *op cit*.
- Wagner-Pacifici, R. 1986. *The Moro Morality Play: Terrorism as Social Drama*. IL: U. Chicago.
- Wuthnow, R. 1987. *Meaning and Moral Order: Explorations in Cultural Analysis*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: U. California.
- Zelizer, V. 1985. *Pricing the Priceless Child*. NY: Basic Books.

big deal

Culture Section Committees

(continued)

Article Award Committee

Thomas Gieryn
Dept. of Sociology
Indiana University
Bloomington, IN 47405

Book Award Prize Committee

Judith Blau, Chair
Dept. of Sociology
U. North Carolina, Chapel Hill
Chapel Hill, NC 27599

Graduate Student Award Committee

Francie Ostrower
Dept. of Sociology
Harvard University
Cambridge, MA 01238

Teaching and Curriculum

Magali Sarfatti Larson
Dept. of Sociology
Temple University
Philadelphia, PA 19122

Culture and Law:

Kim Scheppele, Chair
School of Law
U. Michigan Ann Arbor
Ann Arbor, MI 48109

Culture and Religion:

Rhys Williams, Chair
Program on Non-Profit Organizations
Yale University
New Haven, CT 06520

Culture and Science:

Chandra Mukerji, Chair
Dept. of Communication
U. California San Diego
La Jolla, CA 92093

Research on Cultural Diversity:

Matthews Hamabata, Chair
The Fielding Institute
Santa Barbara, CA

Meaning and Measurement:

Ann Swidler, Chair
Dept. of Sociology
U. California Berkeley
Berkeley, CA 94720

BACK TO BASICS: THE DIAMOND, THE STREAM, AND THE PARADE

Philip H. Ennis
Wesleyan University, CT

Arts cult prod

In 1977 the Research Division of the National Endowment for the Arts called its first conference on policy related research. Grant recipients presented to each other and to the nation the results of their labors. Each presentation was bare-bones—no theory, no discussion of implications. The one exception was my paper which compressed a report of the complicated mission I had been assigned (tracking the measurement of employment and unemployment among actors) in favor of an extended rationale and plea for basic research within the Research Division. The paper met with applause; "he's a humanist, not just a technician", was the overheard remark.

I was shortly relieved of any connection to the NEA, and soon after the Research Division added a basic research component. In the sixteen years that have elapsed, I have seen precious little basic research emanating from that place. Perhaps no basic social science fares well under Federal sponsorship. Further, with the growth of the arts management industry, the increased demand for applied research has pushed basic work into hands that have increasingly woven post-modern fabrics—tissues far too gossamer and opaque to carry a durable theory of the arts.

So in search for such, I again put my oar in the water, restating some parts of a theory of expressive symbolism dealing with the organized "arts". I leave out, therefore, the rest of "culture" (everyday and extraordinary) even though vernacular material is the great reservoir of the arts.

The Four Premises

I work from four premises that are closer to the levels of observation and theorizing than to more general ideological positions and philosophical thickets. (But I'll meet anybody after hours to have a go at such matters.)

cult prod
app
etc
no

1. Each of the arts in any society has a determinable social structure consisting of four positions: the artist, the audience, the distributor, and the critic. "The Diamond" as I have called it, is the basic social molecule of all the arts. It is a "loose" structure consisting of (more or less) organized nodes around each position with interconnecting networks radiating to all the other positions within its own art form and reaching beyond into others. At any time in an art form's life history, each position can be enfolded into another, or become swollen, driving the entire diamond (e.g. "superstars" dominate movies and some popular musics). The diamond is also a "loose" structure in that, compared to other occupational systems, its terms of entry (for each position) are less specified and regulated, and the criteria of evaluation for its products are an unresolving mix of incommensurable standards.

The diamond's configurations are as diverse and complex as that of "the family". Indeed, there is a strong resemblance between the family as a universal social structure and the diamond. Both reproduce themselves; their basic process is to make new ones out of old ones. For the diamond, the task is double—to replicate itself as social structure, and to make new pieces of art. As in the family, the diamond has a division of tasks; there is also growth and change along with misunderstanding and contention.

2. Each of the arts produces a decipherable stream of pieces. This entails two things. One is that every poem, play, painting, etc, can be meaningfully experienced, even the most obscure. That "readability" takes place within limits set by each art form's specific conventions of "hiding and revealing". All symbol streams—from the telephone book and the Caballah to a nation's songs, dances, stories, and pictures—hide and reveal meanings (and things beyond meaning). Such literacy is largely in the hands of the diamond's personnel, who guide its members through a journey of expanding consciousness. Individuals vary, of course, in how far they want to go on that trip.

A stream is also decipherable in that its pieces are interrelated. Within an art form they constitute a chained sequence of kindred works, each owing something to its predecessors. New pieces are some combination of current life experience and previous art. The last poem, the one composed today, is a cousin of the very first poem. And that last one illuminates not just its contemporary audience, but re-ignites the first one. Artists, that is, are always talking to their colleagues, living and dead—who answer back.

3. It is not a mistake to say that all art is mixed media. The poet reading out loud to an audience is in league with the theatrical arts. When the poem is on a page, the alliance is with the printing arts. All the arts in any society—constituting its local Parade of the Muses—so share and exchange personnel, ideas, and resources that their clear separation and ranking is difficult. Each of the arts has a "purity party" (asserting its premier place and unmixable nature) and a "boundary" party (seeking encounters with other arts in the Parade). The resultant hurly-burly prevents the Parade from ever assembling, so that no one knows how many arts there are at any given moment or their rank ordering.

4. No piece enters and moves through its stream without being either pulled or pushed by some mixture of love and money. The inner economy of each art form includes some aspects of a gift exchange system, some parts of a market structure and some elements of "third party" allocation (e.g. a community hires a

(continued to page 16)

librarian to select books in addition to, or in place of, each reader's choices at a book store).

The Operative Codes in the Diamond

Each position in the diamond has a specific set of master norms that guides the conduct of its occupants. These codes, though taught glancingly in the schools and specified sporadically in the law, are no more written down than those of the family. They have to be teased out from the knotted flow of everyday life, discerned from the doing and talking of the diamond's participants, or intuited from their artistic output.

The Artist

As best I can distill this matter, the artist's normative map is laid out on several levels. At the greatest remove from every day commerce is the artist's central challenge—the presence of the "gift". Societies, worldwide, have a belief that artists are visited by the "gift" of art. Artistic creation, it is believed, comes from a visiting and in-dwelling presence of powers beyond that of the ordinary. The fruits of that gift are therefore the treasure of an external entity, be it the gods, the king, society as a whole, or, more modestly, the audience—even when signed by the artists as an individual or a collective achievement. (It is precisely here that eponymous rewards as part of a bundle of property rights intersect with the gift economy.)

This belief in the immanent presence of the Muse protects and legitimates the artists' explorations of the ways of humankind, their telling the secrets of the heart, their portrayal of nature, and, most importantly, their giving it all to an audience. They do so in languages that are different from everyday communication, and thus require specially learned skills. Societies invent stories to render intelligible this shadowy business. A familiar one is about Leonardo da Vinci, who, as a child, was observed by Verrocchio making birds of clay so realistic they flew away. The youngster, so evidently gifted, was taken into apprenticeship by the older painter and taught the skills through which he became the premier artist of his day. It is the combination of the gift and the skill that makes the artist. Gift only yields frustration or tragedy; skill only yields the artisan/craftsman.

The appearance and disappearance of the gift is a perplexing, perilous, and unending business, generating what I have called "the five crises of the artist" (see David Leisner, *To Create or Not to Create*, Senior Thesis, Wesleyan U., Dept. of Sociology, 1975). These are intensely personal moments that, as a whole, have a quality of sequenced inevitability, although each can suddenly appear at any time. The first is the question "Do I have it?" This is the inner problem that permeates much of the early life of an artist. It generates the sociological task of identifying the social nets which initially fish out promising artists and designate them as carriers of the gift. The second crisis is: "Can I do it?" Can the artists' hands, voice, body, etc., master the requisite skills which concretize the gift into pieces,

into works of art. "Can I show it?" is the third crisis. This is the essential and difficult step of bringing the work to an audience. The challenge is to enter the public world of poetry, painting, etc., which is at least indifferent if not hostile to those knocking at the door. Many are called; few are chosen.

The fourth crisis is "Can I do it again?" The fear here is that of repetition without inspiration. Ned Rorem quotes Picasso as saying, "the artist who repeats himself has been an artist only once". Rorem's rejoinder is that the great painter "is wrong, and for himself as well. We all have but one obsession, though it can show itself in different ways". Nevertheless, the high value the West places on gift-drenched innovation puts a heavy burden on the artist to produce something fresh in each presentation. "When do I quit?" is the fifth crisis. Getting off stage is always a delicate thing, and when implicated in the final stage of the artist's life cycle is especially daunting. Not all artists can summon up the words of the dying 99 year old Titian; "More light," he allegedly cried, refusing to let even death stop his hand. It must be remembered that these five crises are focused on the gift; they do not exhaust the artist's workaday problems.

It is in the handling of such problems that the two master norms guide the artists' actualization of their gift. The first, to paraphrase the words of I.A. Richards, is: "The artist's job is to get it right" (*Principles of Literary Criticism*, Harcourt Brace, 1928, p.26). This highly freighted injunction refers to the combination of "creativity" and "integrity" that must shape the artistic act, the inner command as to what the piece should be. While getting it right, the artist must confront the second norm—communicate the work to someone, somehow. Narcissism and solipsism may have their place in personal life and philosophical stance, but in an artistic system, a would-be artist simply has to present the work to an audience. That's all there is to it.

These two imperatives obviously have a zone of incompatibility. In obedience to the (pleasurable) command of "getting it right", an artist may render him/herself totally masked to everyone else. At the extreme, Jean Dubuffet (contemporary French painter) is quoted as holding that:

...art is only authentic if created for oneself: "We firmly believe that there is an irreducible antagonism between the creation of art and the desire for communication with the public" (*L'Art Brut*, No.6, 1966).

The tension between these two norms is resolved in many ways. At one extreme are the artists out on the limb of their own making—either an avant garde or the "crazies". At the other is the familiar "selling out"—artists succumbing to the exigencies of communicating to an audience that "likes what it knows" rather than "knowing what it likes".

The Audience

Audiences for all the arts operate on one main norm—enact your preferences by saying "yea" or "nay" to each show, each piece offered. In repeated choices,

(continued to page 17)

the audience inches the stream forward in the direction of its net preferences. Yet these expressions are but the surface manifestation of a deeper and more powerful encounter. With each choice, the audience gives something beyond the price of admission; it gives its loyalty and commitment. This passion extends beyond the pieces themselves to the artist's person, and beyond that to the whole art form, and ultimately to the larger ethos that stands behind it. Such identification is modulated by the statistical variation in audience participation. Every art form has, that is, its own Gini curve, a shorthand formula for its unique concentration of use pattern.

Each art form provides not only the banners of self identity, but paradoxically the very transcendence of that identity. The audience wants from the arts not only an enlivened sense of self, but at some level wants to get beyond that self into an ecstatic transcendence. When this happens, "when the assembled people give themselves a helluva show", a powerful slab of social wealth is created. No wonder politicians and marketers, preachers and teachers spin out endless strategies to entice, enfold, or conquer the arts. But audiences are fickle, even in their search for the radiance of the artist's gift.

The Distributor

In the middle of that slippery situation, the distributors' marching orders, their main normative directive, is this: Select some pieces from some artists, organize and present them as a show to an audience in a safe place, in order to make a steady living. This prescription involves a hatful of difficult tasks and choices. Beginning with the "steady living" part, the distributors seek to accumulate and husband artistic capital and personnel for an extended period, being enjoined, therefore, to pay attention less to the single piece, no matter how compelling. Their eyes are on the artists' oeuvre as a whole selecting those with promise of long term productivity.

The distributors' game plan includes, if need be, the invention or creation of a genius, or, preferably, more than one with a distinctive name and style, ultimately making a new place in the Parade of the Muses. Such impresarios, from Leonardo to Diaghilev to Bill Graham, have always identified themselves primarily with the art form and their artists' interests. They flamboyantly carve out a stable set of venues within which they shepherd an audience into steady patronage, thus insuring a steady living.

The distributor's code requires giving the audience a show "in a safe place". This pregnant command includes not just meeting the fire and police regulations guaranteeing the audience's health and safety. It involves the more dangerous task of persuading the king's minions that there is no threat to the king's life or rule in presenting *Macbeth*. The current free speech controversies hinge precisely on the ability of an art form's persuasion that it doesn't provoke action, that it offers only escape in make-believe, food for thought, or

catharsis—draining off all that undesirable energy. Such arguments may protect freedom of expression; they also signal the unresolving tension between word and deed.

This issue leads to the most difficult and least appreciated aspect of a "safe place". It is the establishment of a social distance between the audience and the art (Thomas Scheff, *Catharsis in Healing, Ritual, and Drama*, U. of California Press, 1979). The cushioned space which envelops the audience within the artist's ambiance, must, however, separate it from the full blast of the piece. The reason is that the artist as maestro of the senses commands the royal road to the emotions, which are major engines of social motivation. Given that each emotion-laden piece also carries cognitive elements, the distributors erect a set of protective devices to prevent the pieces from overwhelming the audience—protecting themselves, thereby. Within the theater, for example, the proscenium provides a clear boundary which both facilitates the audience's "willing suspension of disbelief" and insures (by separation) its emotional safety. The endless theatrical tactics penetrating that proscenium attest its power to do the latter—as when some contemporary rock performers throw themselves off the stage into the arms of their fans. The distributors' assertion that their presentations are "safe" rests upon the assurance that they have been defanged by the distance-making machinery.

The Critic

The critic's main normative imperative is to lay down the criteria of evaluation used in judging a work of art, and then to apply those criteria, piece by piece. The critics' claim to exclusive ownership of this vital and public aspect of artistic life rests upon the others in the diamond being disqualified. Distributors are discounted because of their self-serving motives in "criticizing" their artists. Artists' critical action is private and self referential—generally swept away in cleaning up the studio, or left in the rehearsal hall, so it too is not countenanced. Artists criticizing other artists, however, provides some of the most informative commentary on the arts. The audience's critical contribution counts little because it is personal and individual (Why do I like or hate this piece?), even though such individual views do aggregate to become the final verdict of the show. Some audience members—"opinion leaders", "leading audiences", and collectors—do have more influence than others.

So there is considerable merit in the critics' claim they are the only ones to do the job; first, to judge the works day by day, second, to keep afresh the history of the art form in the face of the amnesia generated by the relentless pressure of current production, and third, to tell the news—who is showing what, when, and where. Their normative imperative is also to avoid becoming the servant of the distributors, the publicist of the artists, or the panderer to the audience. Against these perennial cooptations, the critics' refuge is an independent platform, one that legitimates their pronun-

(continued to page 18)

ciamentos. That independence is made more plausible either by the depth of their scholarly wisdom, or by the persuasion that they speak for Everyman, or by being the artists' special messenger from the gods.

So, that's the diamond at the "atomic" level. It is embedded, of course, in successively wider social contexts. These begin with the interactional patterns among the four positions (comprising 24 primary situ-

ations—six dyads, four triads, etc). Next are the relations between the different art forms as they mill about in the Parade of the Muses. Beyond that is the realm of "leisure", the envelope that is part of the institutions of release which, in turn, confront the institutions of commitment. Cross cutting, the arts lay within the phalanx of the Word party at one side of the great divide separating the formations of the Deed, a permanent line of cleavage in society.

BOOKS OF NOTE

RICHARD A. PETERSON

Crane, Diana, ed. *Sociology of Culture: Emerging Themes and Perspectives*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell—published in collaboration with the Culture Section of the ASA. This pathbreaking anthology brings together some of the leading scholars in the field to map out the themes and perspectives which conjoin in the sociology of culture. In addition to Crane, the authors include Michael Schudson, Mabel Berezin, Michele Lamont, Frank Dobbin, Richard Peterson, Ewa Morawska, Andrea Press, Chandra Mukerji, Steve Derne, Anne Bowler, and David Brain.

Blau, Judith R. *Social Contracts and Economic Markets*. NY: Plenum Publishing. Focusing on such social problems as economic inequality, poverty, declining job quality, and racism, Blau emphasizes the need for organizations to override narrow market considerations and to forge social contracts grounded in cooperation and the recognition of social and cultural differences.

Mestrovic, Stjepan G. *Emile Durkheim and the Reformation of Sociology*. Lanham, MD: U. Press of America. Will the masters never rest! Mestrovic highlights Durkheim's vision of sociology as the "science" of morality that will eventually replace moralities based on religions.

Kavolis, Vytautas. *Moralizing Cultures*. Lanham, MD: U. Press of America. Kavolis, known for works showing that artistic development is a correlate of economic conditions, here turns to a focus on morality. He proposes a cross-civilizational framework to facilitate the systematic comparison of all traditions seeking social responsibility.

Dillon, Michele. *Debating Divorce: Moral Conflict in Ireland*. The debate on the divorce referendum in Ireland provides an excellent stage for examining how societies decide questions of public values.

Moore, Joan & Raquel Pinderhughes, eds. *In the Barrios: Latinos and the Underclass Debate*. The authors focus on the questions of the cultural vs. structural origins of "underclass", status and the "culture of poverty."

Frankenberg, Ruth. *White Women, Race Matters*. The focus is on the social construction of female whiteness, or rather how being female for white women is structured in racial terms. Tanning anyone?

Messerschmidt, James W. *Masculinities and Crime: Critique and Reconceptualization of Theory*. Lanham, MD: U. Press of America. Men develop masculinity through social acts many of which are criminal, and this male crime, according to Messerschmidt, has been "normalized" by criminological theory. But how much of this is gender, and how much is class and race? Don't the upper strata define the expropriative acts of the lower orders as crime while largely defocalizing their own?

Kooistra, Paul. *Criminals as Heroes: Structure, Power, and Identity*. Bowling Green, OH: Bowling Green State U. Popular Press. Kooistra explores the politics of culture that served the interests of creating the Western frontier bandit as hero and then of pulling him down as notions of individualism, freedom, collective responsibility, and law and order changed in the late nineteenth century.

Leinen, Stephen. *Gay Cops*. In richly detailed interviews, Leinen shows the deeply conflicted lives played by our numerous gay and lesbian police.

Bufwack, Mary A. & Robert K. Oermann. *Finding Her Voice: The Saga of Women in Country Music*. NY: Crown Publishers. A thoroughly researched and well written account of the important yet evolving place of women performers in country music from its earliest days in the nineteenth century to the present. The many pictures are very instructive since "country" is as much image as it is music. Significantly, the gender-images have now switched since today men are the sex objects, while women sing most of the songs of significance.

Foran, John. *Fragile Resistance: Social Transformation in Iran from 1500 to the Revolution*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press. Rooted in development and world system theory, Foran nonetheless shows the evolution of Iranian/Western cul-

tural symbols that made intelligible the 1979 Islamic Revolution.

Nagata, Donna K. *Legacy of Injustice: Exploring the Cross-Generational Impact of the Japanese-American Internment*. NY: Plenum Publishing. More than ninety percent of the Japanese-American citizens living in the U.S. were interned during WWII, totally disrupting the businesses, communities and lives of these U.S. citizens. Using extensive interviews and a systematic survey as well as her own personal observations, Nagata shows how the memory of this historic injustice is passed on to the second and third generations and the effects it has on their lives.

Just Six This Time From Sage

Bourdieu, Pierre. *Sociology in Question*. With the field filling with others' interpretations of his work, Bourdieu here offers his own accessible introduction to his wide ranging theories and insights in the form of a series of discussions, lectures, and interviews. The topics developed include: the sociology of culture, cultural capital, leisure and taste, the role of language in structuring society, music appreciation, the sociology of sociologists, and the intrinsic reflexivity of social science. Along the way we learn how "free floating" intellectuals can be set free, and that public opinion does not exist.

Eder, Klaus. *The New Politics of Class: Social Movements and Cultural Dynamics in Advanced Societies*. Ever mindful of Weber, and drawing on Bourdieu, Touraine, and Habermas, Eder outlines a thoroughly culture-based conception of class, and shows how this cultural class view of power and cultural capital forms the basis for understanding the dynamics of contemporary societies.

Shilling, Chris. *The Body and Social Theory*. Working through the writings of Giddens, Turner, Goffman, Foucault, Bourdieu, and Elias, Shilling shows how the body's symbolic capital is employed to invest class, ethnicity, gender and race with their distinctive symbolic meanings.

Stanfield, John H., ed. *A History of Race Relations Research: First Generation Recollections*. In remarkably candid personal accounts Stanley Lieberman, Lewis Killian, Bob Blauner, Daniel Fusfield, Milton Gordon, Harry Kitano, Thomas Pettigrew, Richard Robbins, Peter Rose, Pierre van den Berge, Frank Westy, and John Stanfield himself tell of how they were moved to research race relations in the decades following WWII. Stanfield also notes that several other whites were invited but declined because of their bitterness over feeling forced from their chosen field by the tide of 1970s Black self-consciousness.

Baudrillard, Jean. *Symbolic Exchange and Death*. In this newly translated book on fashion, the body, and death, which first appeared in 1976, the author gives his critical appraisal of Marxism, cybernetics, ethnography, psychoanalysis, and feminist thought and offers the most complete elaboration of his concept of simulacrum.

Woodiwiss, Anthony. *Postmodernity USA: The Crisis of Modernism in Postwar America*. Reviewing the political, economic, and cultural life of the U.S. over the past sixty years, Woodiwiss shows the triumph of modernism and its displacement by postmodernity.

Eight From Blackwell

Weedon, Chris & Glenn Jordan. *Cultural Politics*. The authors show the role of culture in reproducing and contesting class, gender, and race distinctions, using case studies from Britain, North America, Eastern Europe, and Australia.

Goldberg, David. *Racist Culture: Philosophy and the Politics of Meaning*. Goldberg suggests that racial thinking is fundamental to the transforming categories and conceptions of modernist social subjectivity and not an aberration. These thoughtways are currently being carried in the use of the terms, "the West," "the underclass," and "the primitive."

Zukin, Sharon. *The Culture of Cities*. Zukin argues that the city is not a material base of land, labor, and capital but is also a projection of cultural representations including buildings and language, art and decay.

Denzin, Norman K. *Symbolic Interactionism and Cultural Studies: The Politics of Interpretation*. Denzin develops a research agenda for interactionism that incorporates elements of postmodernist and feminist theory.

Norris, Christopher. *The Truth about Postmodernism*. Do you really want to

know? It is mostly folly, we are told, based on a mis-reading of Kant.

Morris, Pam. *Literature and Feminism: An Introduction*. A lucid introduction to feminist literary criticism complete with teaching aids such as chapter summaries and structured exercises.

Callaghan, Dymna, Lorraine Helms, & Jyotsna Singh. *The Wayward Sisters Go on Tour: Feminist Politics and Shakespeare*. The authors provide a feminist politics reading of the bard. Hamlet way cool? Like get real.

Harrison, Charles & Paul Wood, eds. *Art in Theory: 1900 - 1990: An Anthology of Changing Ideas*. With contextualizing introductions, the editors bring together more than 300 brief pieces by artists and art critics representing each of the visual art movements of the 20th century.

Morality And Disorder From The Free Press

Wilson, James Q. *The Moral Sense*. Wilson argues that the daily discourse of ordinary people is permeated with moral references stemming out of the inherently social human condition.

Hunter, James Davidson. *Before the Shooting Begins: The Rise of Irreconcilable Differences in American Public Life*. Abortion, homosexuality, family values are debated as hotly, Hunter contends, as was slavery before the American Civil War. He shows ways that civil institutions can be revived to calm the debate before the shooting begins.

Wuthnow, Robert. *Sharing the Journey: Support Groups and America's New Quest for Community*. Wuthnow shows that these small groups in their millions provide a sense of warmth and security and now help hold U.S. society together. They also pose significant dangers, he says, in encouraging unhealthy self-absorption and trivializing what is sacred.

Skolnick, Jerome & James J. Fyfe. *Above the Law: Police and the Excessive Use of Force*. These experts show what cops do and why they do it. "Serve and protect" whom?

Three From Twayne

Blanchard, Dallas A. *The Anti-Abortion Movement*. Blanchard traces the evolution of the medical, moral, and legal issues relating to abortion from the early nineteenth century to the present. He analyses the cultural and ideological foundations, as well as the strategies of anti-abortion groups.

Klehr, Harvey & John E. Haynes. *The American Communist Movement: Storm-*

ing Heaven Itself. The authors trace the development of the American Communist party from its founding in 1919. They show its troubled relationship with the Soviet Union and detail the many splinter groups that it spawned.

Chatfield, Charles. *The American Peace Movement: Ideals and Activism*. Chatfield traces the many elements of the peace movement from its first appearance in the U.S. in 1817 through the Nuclear Freeze campaign of 1987 showing how the movement affected public attitudes over the years.

CALLS FOR PAPERS —PUBLICATION

Communication Research invites submissions for an upcoming special issue, to be published in Fall 1994, focusing on how social scientists study popular culture. Since the 1970s, social scientists have become increasingly interested in the creation and dissemination of popular culture through mass communication media; researchers and scholars have used a variety of methods to observe how popular culture is created, disseminated, and received by audiences. Guest editors Muriel G. Cantor (Prof. Emerita, Sociology, American U.) and J. Gerard Power (Asst. Prof., Communication Science, Universidad de las Americas, Puebla, Mexico) seek articles by social scientists which examine methodological issues in relation to how popular culture products are created, disseminated, and received. Two kinds of articles about ways of knowing will be considered: empirical studies that contain new, innovative or unconventional methodologies, and essays in which the methods of others are evaluated or constructively criticized. Theoretical essays that do not focus on research methodologies will not be considered. Articles should be no longer than 20 double spaced pages (~ 5,000 words). Contact: Send articles to *Communication Research*, Annenberg School for Communication, U. of Southern California, 3502 So. Hoover St., Los Angeles, CA 90089-0281. **Deadline: 1 February 1994.**

American Sociological Association
1722 N Street NW
Washington, DC 20036

NON-PROFIT ORG.
U.S. POSTAGE PAID
WASHINGTON, D.C.
PERMIT NO. 504

W0000016740 10/07/93 S26
LYN SPILLMAN
DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY
UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME
NOTRE DAME, IN 46556