Click here for Perrin (2004)

A Message from the Chair
Robin Wagner-Pacifici
Swarthmore College

Aesthetics in the Interstices

(Web link to see Velazquez paintings:
http://museoprado.mcu.es/ivisitas.html
The Surrender of Breda is the 25th on the list of paintings on this page, *Las Meninas* is the last painting on the list.)

In his famous essay on the even more famous Diego Velazquez painting, *Las Meninas*, Michel Foucault reflects on the painting's representational ricochet. This network of sight-lines and reflections is set up by the several mirrors, canvases, windows, and doorways in the painting - all of which manage to instigate, but not accomplish, a clear rendering of the capital S Sovereigns of this scene, King Philip IV and Queen Marianna of Spain. These sovereign presences seem to hover over the scene, watching it from its margins, and they may indeed be the actual subjects of Velazquez's reversed canvas within the painting. Their royal heads are glimpsed floating in a mirror's reflection at the back of the room, but their sovereign presence is dispersed and indirect. It is this recognition that brings Foucault to a consideration of Classical Age representational space and the active but elusive *authorizing foundations* of this representational space. He writes:

> But there, in the midst of this dispersion which it is simultaneously grouping together and spreading out before us, indicated compellingly from every side, is an *essential void*: the necessary disappearance of that which is its foundation – of the person it resembles and the person in whose eyes it is only a resemblance.

The sovereign subjects, dispersed as they are into different subject positions, King, Queen, spectator, even artist (peering out from behind the canvas) activate and legitimate this representational field. Yet they elude representation themselves. I want to consider the Foucauldian concept of the

Editor's Note

Please let me know your ideas for submissions!

Mark D. Jacobs, Dept. of Sociology, George Mason Univ.
Fairfax, VA 22030
mjacobs@gmu.edu; 703/993-1434

Jumping Off the Shoulders of Giants? Cultural and Arts Sociology in German-Speaking Countries
Volker Kirchberg
William Paterson University
Ulf Weggenig
University of Lueneburg

Trying to concentrate the long and vivid history of German cultural sociology into a few columns is at best an ambitious and at worst a biased enterprise. Fortunately, there are organizations and publications, as well as accumulated proceedings and conference papers and comprehensive Web sites that were liberally browsed and utilized for this survey. Volker Kirchberg, a German sociologist teaching in the United States, looks at contemporary German cultural sociology from an at least geographically peripheral perspective. More from an inside perspective, Ulf Wuggenig, who is teaching arts and cultural sciences at the North German University of Lueneburg, reports especially on Austrian cultural and arts sociology.

Who's Afraid of General Linear Regression?
Andrew J. Perrin
UNC, Chapel Hill

A welcome recent development in the sociology of culture is the attempt to systematize and formalize the field. This includes the use of culture both as an "independent" and a "dependent" variable—that is, as cause and effect of other social processes—as well as the attempt to model culture's internal structures. In this exploration, though, I want to suggest that culturalists should privilege standard techniques of quantitative sociology—generally, linear regression and its cousins—in our quest to evaluate and demonstrate culture's empirical role.

I am aware of the controversies surrounding the decision to engage in such systematization. Critics have charged, for example, that understanding culture as either causal of or re-

elusive but generative "essential void," this necessary disappearance of the person that representations seek to resemble and re-assemble. And I want to consider this concept as it operates in a very specific transaction, one that aims to navigate the limen between worlds and to transform spaces of violence into spaces of memory by declaring the triumph of one sovereign over another. This is the act of surrender that ends a battle or a war. For just as *Las Meninas* illustrates how the *foundational sovereign subject* eludes its own representation, so, I would argue, the *foundational **violence** of the displacement of one sovereign by another* is dispersed and diffused in the transformed space of surrender. Violence, now monopolized, goes underground in this vacant space of multiple disappearances .

The political theorist, Thomas Dumm has written about resignations (close analogues of surrenders) as "attempts to mark the site of a trauma, to contain it, and to remove its effects." But what does the site of trauma look like? And what form does its containment take – where trauma has once been and now is no longer, even as it still casts its shadow? The space of containment can be simply a white piece of paper, blank and expectant, waiting for the words "I resign" or "I surrender" to be written on it. Whatever form it takes, it must provide some kind of emptiness, an "essential void" because it functions as a medium, a host for actions that are undertaken in the interstices, in extremis, and under duress. This is not to deny the bellicose nature of some surrender sites. The main deck of the battleship *USS Missouri*, with its powerful guns was the site of the surrender of the Japanese at the end of World War II., And it hardly seems vacant, packed as it was with sailors, soldiers, journalists and photographers. Nevertheless, the American soldiers and sailors casually draped themselves over these guns to get a better look at the proceedings and perhaps to impress the watching world and the extremely formal Japanese delegation with their informality and apparent equality. These transformations reveal a temporary domestication of the space of the battleship precisely in the service of establishing it as a site of surrender, momentarily emptying it out of its violent essence which nevertheless subtends the proceedings.

With its dramatic halting of violence and its reconfiguration of identities and loyalties, military surrender calls attention to itself as an incisive act. But its incision relies upon its wider recognition and up-take. And this is where explicit mechanisms of representation, orientation, and exchange come into play. Surrenders require specific performative speech acts, such as the explicit stating of "I surrender." They require demonstrative acts that mark the limits of the conflict, both the limits of its violence and the boundaries of its contested territories. These limits serve to reorient all combatants and thus create a *field* (of positions and relations) that is no longer a battle-field

And surrenders require representational acts, as a variety of cultural objects emerge at these points to chart the new world - including, letters, maps, paintings, poems and the landscape itself. It is thus critical to develop an apparatus of analysis that is capable of "reading" these various modalities of action and capable of capturing their aesthetic elements. Scrutinizing this threshold of war and peace, what do we find?

It should not be surprising that another painting by Velazquez, one commissioned by King Philip IV of Spain after a military victory, provides an exemplary analytic object. This painting *The Surrender of Breda*, is less obviously philosophical and less self-referential than *Las Meninas*. But it shares with that painting the diffuse presence and absence of the sovereign, represented here by proxy. Philip's great general Ambrogio Spinola, accepts the surrender of the key of Breda from the Dutch general Justin of Nassau. *The Surrender of Breda* participates in the genre of history painting and represents a scene of military surrender. Victor and vanquished meet on a field that is no longer, but just barely no longer, a field of battle (a kind of split temporal screen is established in the painting as the just-finished battle is projected, still raging, onto the background of the canvas). A space is carved out of the bellicose mouth of the siege, a space that aims to become one of memory and history, rather than one of violence. So there is the space *envisioned by* the painting. There is also the space *of* the painting, that pictorial space of the canvas demarcated by the frame. And finally, there is the architectural and political space of the edifice in which the painting is hung. First, a bit of background.

In the 16th century, the Spanish crown came to possess all of the Burgundian Netherlands through a series of dynastic alliances. Late in the century, Holland and the northern provinces fought for independence from Spain and successfully formed the Dutch Republic. Spain, a Catholic power impelled by religious as well as dynastic imperatives, intermittently persisted in trying to recapture this Protestant territory through the first half of the 17th century.

After a twelve years truce broke in 1621, the war in the Netherlands resumed and in August 1624, the Spanish general, Ambrogio Spinola encircled Breda, on the border of the southern, securely Spanish Netherlands. Breda, strategically important for its location on the main route to Utrecht and Antwerp, was a heavily fortified town and a long and militarily complex siege began.

In the late Spring of 1625, General Spinola, victorious, but exhausted and with depleted forces, negotiated with Justin of Nassau to effect a surrender of the starved Dutch town to the Spanish forces. The terms of the surrender were generous: Justin was allowed to leave the city with his officers and survivors of the garrison and, according to a witness's account, left the city "after the accustomed manner of war with their colors displayed, the drums beating, after the accustomed sound." Historical opinion is mixed on the practical impact of the victory of Spinola at Breda. It was a massively expensive undertaking, stretching the resources of the Spanish crown. Spinola's own troops suffered from food shortages. It was an unmitigated symbolic triumph. Nevertheless, it is important to know that by the time Velazquez came to paint his painting, some ten years later in 1634-35, the town was on the verge of being retaken by the Dutch and Spinola's prestige and power had dissolved.

The Jesuit priest Hermannus Hugo, Spinola's personal chaplain, wrote a detailed eye-witness journal of the siege and surrender called *Obsidio Bredana*. Its title page was designed by the artist and diplomat Rubens and consisted of an allegorical scene of Breda as a maiden being strangled into submission by Famine. It also contained etchings of maps and

diagrams of the siege works and battlements by the brothers Galle. The famous map and printmaker, Jacques Callot gleaned information from the *Obsidio Bredana* to create his well-known "Map of the Siege of Breda." Three years after Justin's surrender to Spinola, in 1628, the renowned playwright Pedro Calderon de la Barca wrote a play titled "El Sitio de Breda." Finally, six years later, Diego Velazquez, court painter for Philip IV, was commissioned to paint *The Surrender of Breda* for the Hall of Realms in the Palace of the Buen Retiro in Madrid. It was to be one of 12 paintings of victories won during the reign of Philip IV, hung together to symbolically reconstitute the Spanish Habsburg empire in a room, a room in which the Sovereign could thus survey his realm. Velazquez's painting thus comes at the end of a line of renderings of the Breda surrender scene, gathering the themes of these renderings together in a classically pictorial mode.

In his painting, Velazaquez incorporates Northern and Southern styles of painting and builds his "Surrender of Breda" as if the scene of the surrender with its main protagonists were actually standing in front of a map of the siege that had been hung up on an imaginary wall behind them. The classically figural foreground is set in the present, the cartographic background in the past. Perhaps one thing revealed by this hybrid aesthetic is that in spite of stylistic, religious, and political differences, the world-views of the victorious Spaniards and the defeated Dutch were not necessarily incompatible, and, at least for this one unique historical moment, could be reconciled in a work of transcendent political and aesthetic daring.

Why daring? The two central figures in the painting, the generals Ambrogio Spinola and Justin of Nassau, convey magnanimity and gratitude respectively. And yet clearly being grateful to one's victorious enemy is at best an ambivalent attitude. There is a keen sense of dignified humiliation here that gives the scene its particular poignancy. Scholars have interpreted the gestures of Spinola and Justin as indicating that as Justin goes to kneel before Spinola, Spinola puts his arm out onto Justin's shoulder to prevent him from doing so. Hierarchy, as expressed through mutual bodily alignment, is muted (though not altogether erased) as the vanquished is saved the humiliation of kneeling before the victor. In this forestalling, the exchange of keys to the city is *also* deferred, and thus the frame of magnanimity inserts itself into the gap, rerouting the conventional, if humiliating, performative and demonstrative operations of the act of surrender. It literally interrupts the surrender, interposing a new normative framework of conventions as the gestures seek to carry out the action. It is important to note that Velazquez's portrayal of the surrender at Breda is unusual in its placement of the victor and the vanquished on the same plane. Typically, paintings of surrender demonstrated a visually exaggerated asymmetry between former foes. Art historians note that "it was almost always represented as a pageant of triumph and humiliation, in which the victor was shown as standing or seated on a throne or horseback and accepting tribute from the kneeling and submissive general."

Several reasons might account for Velazquez's unconventional representation, including the explicit turn away from the 16th century Spanish "legenda nera" which referred to Spanish cruelty toward foes, and, more proximally in 1635, toward the emphasis on the humanity of Spinola, a close friend of Velazquez.

Two groups of individuals stand on either side of the painting, flanking and buttressing the two generals. On the right stand the victorious Spaniards, nobles in the foreground, looking back and out from their congested ensemble, soldiers massed in the middleground with their army of lances straight up all across, exemplifying the strength, resolve, and solidarity of the Spanish troops. On the left, the Dutch have their pikes and halberds tilted, staggered and akimbo, reflecting the disorganization and disorientation of the defeated. Even with all these lances and pikes clearly evident in the foreground and the middleground of the painting, we do not see this scene as one dominated by the weaponry and artifacts of war, especially of siege warfare. In fact, only two muskets are visible – one held by a Dutch soldier looking out at us on the far left side of the painting and one held by a Spanish soldier behind Spinola. What is interesting about these muskets is that they are both held in the same manner, over the shoulder and pointing away from the center where the former enemies are involved in the act of surrender and exchange. Conventions of war carefully calibrated the manners in which the defeated could carry weapons out of a siege, with the "at carry" position (sabers and muskets resting on the shoulder pointing upward) as the most honorable. In this case, the symmetry and lack of aggression of the position of the muskets held by both the Dutch and the Spanish soldiers reiterates the mutual recognition of the ceremony, the magnanimity of the terms and of Spinola himself.

Meanwhile, many of the soldiers seem distracted. They look about, talk to each other, peer back, towards the recent past, as if still viewing the scene of the (un)finished conflict. From one vantage point, this apparent distraction simply participates in what I want to call the network of cross-witnessing, setting up an intricate series of literal and metaphorical sightlines and visual contacts. And yet, it is hard not to feel that many of these witnesses somehow resist their total involvement and alignment toward that neutralizing, flat, center space where the two generals meet. So it is precisely here, in the noticing of all this distraction and dis-alignment, that it is necessary not to look away ourselves, to actually dwell on the distraction that Velazquez inscribes, rather than minimizing it.

What does it mean to dwell on a distraction that shows itself in the critical gap between the space of violence and the space of memory? I've mentioned that all witnesses (both designated and accidental) variably figure into a networked compositional matrix or field. Wherever selves are undergoing transformational processes, like surrenders, that can be understood as undoings or abnegations, the task of the witness becomes doubly complicated. In such events, it is not unreasonable to claim that witnesses are asked to bear witness to a disappearance, even as is here the case for the Dutch soldiers, to their *own* undoings.

Undoing war, undoing conflict, undoing sovereignty, all of this is surrender's project.

In surrender, the vanquished sovereign undergoes an alchemical reaction of *disappearance and reappearance*. He is revealed as base metal, that aspect of the "king's two bodies" that is mortal, imperfect. Clearly subordinate to the victor, no longer exceptional or divine, he is 'just' a person. That is the true disgrace of surrender, no matter how magnanimous the victor. The sovereign is simply human. This is most explicitly relevant to the defeated and undone sovereign, but it is implic-

itly relevant also to the victor. The ceremony of surrender is dangerous for all attendant sovereigns because it reminds the *witnesses* of what can happen to a sovereign, that he is just human and can be stripped of power, that he, and therefore they, as his subjects, can be dis-placed. As always, these dangers play themselves out as variations on a theme of pre-sentation and representation. Recalling the "essential void and necessary disappearance" of Foucault's analysis of sovereign representation, we shouldn't be surprised by the use of prox-ies and subordinates. There are dangers in simply showing up. The victorious sovereign (or his representative) might be caught off-guard at the scene of a surrender, not by a resump-tion of battle, but by an errant foe, one who chooses simply not to appear. Perhaps, like General Cornwallis, in the American war of independence, the foe will send a stand-in subordinate to surrender to General Washington and thus dramatically tilt the conventional asymmetry of the situation. In these absences and deflections, away from the first-line representatives and drawing their own subordinates into the action, the exchanges of the surrender scene thus reposition the threshold even as they attempt to cross it.

Whenever and wherever certain types of action are to commence or to halt, whenever, in other words, the world changes, the attention of those involved must be focalized. Gazes must be drawn, names must be announced, spaces must be mapped. A clearing, literal and figurative, emerges and acts as a gravitational field. Those who have viewed *The Surrender of Breda*, from Philip IV in his Palace of the Buen Retiro, to those who now view it in a national art museum (the Prado in Madrid) to us here today, must somehow follow the 'istoria' of the painting and the memory of victory (however short-lived) it seeks to inscribe.

And what about the artist himself? What does he view? Some have claimed that the man directly behind the horse, on the far right of the canvas is actually Velazquez. In a configu-ration that is similar to the giant reversed canvas in *Las Meninas*, the horse has its back to us the viewer and the painter looks out at us from behind this shield (horse or canvas in the re-spective paintings), this view we cannot see. Thus, in this complex rendering, the monarch, the general, the aristocrat, the soldier, and the artist all participate in a kind of claiming and handing off of the responsibility for forcing, accepting, and effecting the surrender of the vanquished. Protagonists and witnesses all, they do so by appearing in or controlling repre-sentations of the moment of transfer. In any event, representa-tion aims at reiteration, pressing home the configurations and compositions that have been performatively accomplished. But gaps - in politics and in memory - remain.

The proffered key lives forever in this painting in a state of suspense and suspension, on its way to Spinola's hand. And if one follows the line of the key as if it were a pointing arrow, one arrives at a blank piece of paper in the bottom right corner, blown in, as it were, from a world outside the canvas. A strange intruder (though not without painterly precedent), there is no message, no signature on the unfolded piece of paper.

In several of his other paintings, Velazquez carries for-ward the convention, introduced in the late 15th century, of paint-ing his signature onto some ornamental accessory to the scene, a piece of masonry, a stray book laying on the ground, a paper held by a portrait's subject. But in only two of Velazquez's other paintings, both of them imperial equestrian portraits, does a similarly detached and blank piece of paper appear in the lower corner of the canvas, the fairly new traditional space of the artist's signature.

How are we to conceptualize these blank, white sheets of paper that flutter into scenes of empire, force, and sover-eignty? Despite their apparent conventionality, there is an un-canniness in their appearance. Like all things uncanny, they are familiar and strange at the same time. Paper of the 17th century suggests authority, literacy and developing bureaucra-cies, but it also suggests something fragile, something the wind might blow away. The uncanniness of the emblematic paper is perhaps most marked in *The Surrender of Breda*, a scene that, with all of its triumph and magnanimity, is still one of distress, distraction, and echoes of violence.

To my mind, the paper is our own point of entry, to this painting and to the challenge of tracking the displacement of violence. I *pause* to consider this blank piece of paper, this blank, expectant space on the canvas, as a representational conundrum, a grace note of uncertainty about how, exactly, to represent violence in the midst of its redirection. Thus, *even*, one might say *especially*, Velazquez, court painter to Philip IV, aspirant to the noble Order of Santiago himself, official witness to sovereignty, empire and victory and imminent defeat on the verge of the Dutch retaking of Breda, communicates his preoc-cupation about representation. In painting the piece of paper, he inserts a crucial question about genres and their displace-ment. What genre is adequate to the task of representing the space of violence? Does he (do we) need to consider the differ-ent visions of maps, of history paintings, of statues, of military codes, of bureaucratic forms? Does the after-image of violence (violence that leaves its mark here in the rising smoke of the painting's background) in the space of memory demand that we interrogate genre? As you might see from my own work, I am inclined to respond "yes." But this still does not answer the more compelling question that follows: Are the spaces of memory primarily in the business of *generic displacement*?

The paper in the corner is matter out of place and out of time. I'll hazard an anachronism here and suggest we view it as a kind of hypertext link, not only a point of entry but of exit as well, one that serves as a portal from a space of siege warfare with its bombardments and privations, to a paper-driven royal power back in Madrid - a portal from war to bureaucracy to art, suggesting displacement in time, in space, and in genre, and reminding us that all of this is made.

Which brings me to my final claim. Why must we look at paintings so seriously? We fix our analytic gaze on paint-ings not only to report on their artfactual communications and conveyances. We look at *paintings* because the persistence of violence demands new thinking, new vantage points on its transformations and redirections.

Representations of surrender (at least those rendered by the victorious parties) seek to capture and extend the out-comes of conflict in space and in time. We experience their normative force, even as the earth moves away from their claims. They hold a space in memory that declares: The way things appear here and now are as they shall always be. In this way, for however brief a moment, we live in the pause.

ENDNOTES

This analysis is greatly expanded and elaborated in my forthcoming book, _The Art of Surrender: Decomposing Sovereignty at Conflict's End?_ (University of Chicago Press).

1 Thomas Dumm, _A Politics of the Ordinary_, New York: New York University Press, 1999, p.54.

2 The general director of all pictorial coverage of the surrender, Colonel Bertram Kalisch of the U.S. Army, notes how the photographers re-ordered the space for their own, representational, imperatives: "The surrender table was centered with Navy exactness right in the middle of the deck…we relocated the table by pushing it up within eight feet of our platform, an ideal spot for our lenses." Bertram Kalisch, "Photographing the Surrender Aboard the USS Missouri," op.cit. p. 868.

3 Discussing the evolution of knighthood and its relation to the economic and political autonomy and dependency of cities and towns, Michael Harney notes that; "Both epic and chivalric romance are preoccupied with sieges. However, while in the former genre the protagonist is the besieger, in the romance the hero sides with the besieged." Page 179 Michael Harney, "Siege Warfare in Medieval Hispanic Epic and Romance," in _The Medieval City Under Siege_, Eds. Ivy Corfis and Michael Wolfe. Woodbridge, UK: The Boydell Press, 1995.

4 Gerrat Barry quoted in Brown and Elliot, op.cit. p. 179.

5 Geoffrey Parker dates this Dutch re-taking of Breda in 1637 (though there is some disagreement on this date). Cf. _The Thirty Years War_, 2nd Edition, Ed., Geoffrey Parker, London and New York: Rutledge, 1997.

6 I thank T. Kaori Kitao for this apt and poignant phrase.

7 Brown and Elliot, _A Palace for a King_, p. 180.

8 Undisturbed by the distraction are the authors of the book, _A Palace for a King_. They note the disaligned witnesses and conclude: "For the onlookers, the ceremony seems to be one of those important but fleeting moments of history that come and go before you can take it in. A few of the soldiers turn toward the two main figures, but most of them seem to be caught by inner or outer distractions." _A Palace for a King_, op.cit., p.184.

9 Onlookers and eavesdroppers can become witnesses, but only if their observations of the scene are drawn up into its sedimenting meaning. Barbie Zelizer writes about the varieties of witnesses witnessing the liberation of the concentration camps and the mechanisms of their inclusion: "The most common way of representing the act of witnessing was in layers: liberated inmates watched German civilians, reporters watched officials, and everyone watched the corpses. One reporter watched a US soldier who in turn watched a group of German civilians. The horror of it caused many women to faint. Others sobbed and put their hands to their eyes…An American MP ordered them to take their hands down. He told them to have a good look and never forget what they had seen." _Remembering to Forget_, p. 72.

10 In fact, it was only in the 15th century that signatures on paintings and etchings actually migrated from their previous position outside the actual work (often on the sculptural frames) to being incorporated within the work itself: "A la meme epoque, la localisation de la phrase entiere se modifie et le registre de al signature abandonne se cadre sculpte pour se situer dans l'espace interne de l'oeuvre, celui du champ iconique." Charles Sala, "La signature a la lettre et au figure," _Poetique_, Vol 18, 1987, pp.119-127. p.121.

Jumping Off the Shoulders of Giants?, continued

Theoretical clusters and research areas

The section of cultural sociology of the German Society for Sociology (Deutsche Gesellschaft für Soziologie) established a comprehensive and current Web site in 2001. A very useful feature of this Web site is the discussion forum for programmatic issues. At this site, Winfried Gebhardt (University of Koblenz) published his dense report of the "state of the art of cultural sociological research in German speaking regions". We will copiously use his main thoughts about the past and present of German cultural sociology and add our own interpretations, trying to link major research lines with current theoretical clusters. A review of newsletters of the cultural sociology section from 1996 on will provide additional images of developments and structures.

Gebhardt's text starts with an assessment of the past. Relying especially on the works of Max Weber, Georg Simmel and Ferdinand Tönnies, tradition has an undeniable impact on contemporary cultural sociology in Germany. However, none of these 'giants' dwelled explicitly on the notion of cultural sociology because sociology of culture was considered identical with basic sociology, structure and meaning being indispensable macroscopic parts of the same. Marking the demise of a value-free sociology, the 1920's sociology (especially Alfred Weber, Karl Mannheim) regarded culture in a fairly romantic way, following Tönnies' concept of Gemeinschaft as a necessary counterweight to the decadence of modern civilization. In its own way, the emerging Frankfurt School shared this paradigmatic view, honoring the auratic values of an authentic high culture compared to the artificial mass culture of the cultural industries. The exiled sociologists maintained this view over the Nazi years. However, a re-import of these thoughts did not happen after World War II. Instead, (West) German sociology fervently followed Talcott Parsons's American lead. The notion of a mutual and balanced relationship of society and culture did not endure and thus, German sociology lost its interest in culture as a field worth of sociological analysis for about 30 years.

A new cultural turn occurred in the middle of the 1980s. According to Gebhardt, four main sociological thoughts are responsible for the revival in this time. First, the concept of agency implies that people act according to their cultural environment. Second, society provides necessary conditions for the materialization of (everyday) aesthetics. Third, culture is expressed in a multitude of styles; the burgeoning of cultural manifestations cannot solely be reduced to high and popular

culture. Fourth, culture cannot be canonized; categories and magnitudes change over time. Gebhardt classifies contemporary cultural sociology with a taxonomy of seven "schools" and twelve "research lines". Changing Gebhard's vocabulary, we replace "schools" with "clusters" since several of the scholars Gebhardt mentions as belonging to one "school" argue from opposite viewpoints when discussing the same issue. The following theoretical clusters are listed in a much-abbreviated and simplified manner:

(1) A "Weber cluster" revitalizes the balanced view of society being determined by culture and vice versa.

(2) A "phenomenology cluster" applies this phenomenological approach to interpretative sociology, recognizing culture and society mainly as "experiencing" worlds.

(3) A "Bielefeld cluster" likewise derives its perspective on culture in society from a phenomenological angle but also includes structuralist elements.

(4) A "philosophical cluster" continues the paradigmatic statements of the Frankfurt school.

(5) A "Bourdieu cluster" constitutes and interprets his understanding of culture as expression of socio-economic and political stratification.

(6) An "Elias cluster" links his theoretical and historical analysis of civilization to contemporary phenomena in culture and society.

(7) A "cultural studies cluster" applies the ideas of the Birmingham School to German realities.

Main research areas are:

(1) Comparative analyses of European and American findings in cultural sociology, with a concentration in French-German and U.S.-German comparisons.

(2) Analysis of dissemination and distribution, including factors of funding and gatekeeping, and culture as a tool for heritage creation and maintenance.

(3) Qualitative methods: Especially hermeneutic and ethnographic applications following Geertz' method of thick description.

(4) Quantitative methods: Especially surveys and an analysis of culture and the arts as determinants of stratification, including an analysis of lifestyles and the use of cultural (everyday) aesthetics for social figurations.

(5) Analyses of cultural changes: Changes of aesthetics, museum studies, cultural event creation, life as experiential social construction.

(6) Analyses of traditional values: Rituals, ceremonies, cultural heritage, and concepts like 'honor' and demeanors and misdemeanors.

(7) Analyses of the high and popular culture continuum, including cultural expressions between these poles.

(8) Religion, especially with respect to new age and mystic practices, less so related to established religion(s) and the traditional institutionalization of the church.

(9) New social movements: Cultural background, including an analysis of subcultural and fundamentalist values.

(10) Technology and communication: Media and new communication technology, especially the Internet.

Table 1: Concentration of research in theoretical clusters

	Weber	Phenomenology	Bielefeld	Philosoph.	Bourdieu	Elias	Cult. stud.
Cross-national comparison	✘				✘		✘
Dissemination of arts & culture				✘	✘		✘
Qualitative studies	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘	✘
Quantitative studies			✘		✘		
Cultural changes	✘	✘				✘	
Traditional values	✘	✘				✘	
High versus popular culture				✘	✘		✘
Religion and cults	✘			✘		✘	
Social movements		✘	✘				
Technology and communication			✘				✘
Art and music sociology				✘	✘		✘
Art policies and funding				✘	✘		

Year	Spring meeting	Fall meeting
1996	Art and religion	Transformation of medial culture in modernity
1997	Culture of organizations, art of organizing	Modernity between aesthetics and social sciences
1998	Cultural borders - limits of the cultural	Borders between cultures and systems - arts management etc.
1999	Promises and failures in the culture of techn.	Drama culture - sociology and anthropology of the senses
2000	The social constitution of the 'good society'	Cultivating violence
2001	Popular culture as representative culture - the challenge of cultural studies	
		Potsdamer Platz: The cultural sociology of a locus of modernity
2002	Theory of mass culture	Knowledge, education and entertainment in times of the retreat of the state
2003	Consumption, culture, society	Education, canon, literality
2004	Limits of freedom or the paradox of museum presentation	Materialism of cult. - cultural sociology after the 'linguistic turn'

Table 2: Main topics[1] of the annual meetings of the German section for cultural sociology

[1] This is not a complete list of all meetings. The authors translated the original German titles of these meetings for this compilation.

(11) Art and music sociology, especially the production and globalization of cultural industries.

(12) Cultural and art policies: Political legitimacy and legitimatization of arts organizations and (public) arts funding.

Table 1 is a proposal to link the "theoretical clusters" to these twelve "research areas".

Current organized cultural sociology in Germany

We have accumulated the newsletters of the German cultural sociology section since 1996. These newsletters include programs and proceedings of meetings that give a realistic image of the structure and development of this important part of German cultural sociology. The annual activities are commonly arranged around two meetings, one in spring and one in fall. Every other year the fall meeting coincides with the biannual congress of the German Society for Sociology.

Structure and development of the meetings can be distinguished along three 'dimensions'.

First, and already noticeable before 2000, the dichotomy of theory and research has been established in the annual meeting schedule. It is certainly too simple to define the poles of this dichotomy only as theory and research. Nevertheless, the meetings of the theory pole concentrate more on hermeneutic, philosophical, structural and macroscopic topics, whereas the meetings of the research pole are more focused on applied, empirical, pragmatic, phenomenological and microscopic topics.

The theory meetings emphasize

+ theoretical discussions of broader concepts or specific notions of culture,

+ theoretical challenges, and

+ links to other important theoretical issues.

The research meetings discuss topics

+ of applied interests, and

+ of empirical interests.

However, this polarity is not as resilient as it appears — neither theory and research nor macro- and microscopic observations are rigorously divided; there is a considerable overlap between the fractions and the working interests. Nevertheless, we can observe a cultural turn in German sociology in the last ten years that allowed the strong input of a pragmatic and empirically oriented new wave of ideas into traditionally oriented German cultural sociology. For instance, the call for papers for the 2001 "Potsdamer Platz" meeting (discussing the cultural significance of the newly constructed "center of Berlin") emphasized that from now on cultural sociology will be audited on how it interprets e.g., new socio-cultural artifacts, and how it empirically tests its scientific potential at specific cases of everyday experiences. A quote from a discussion on mass culture illustrates this point: "The… debate revealed a distinct dissent regarding methodology. How are theory and empirical research linked to each other? Different opinions became obvious not only with respect to the concept of theory, but also, and even more, with respect to the significance of empirical research."

Second, following the historical mêlée between Adorno and Benjamin, another dispute exists about the dividing line between high culture and popular culture. At several meetings, scholars try either to defend or to eradicate this polarity (e.g., "Popular culture as representative culture" in 2001, or "Theory of mass culture" in 2002). A 2001 call for papers starts with the statement that the once clearly constituted fields of (bourgeois or intellectual) high culture and (mass) popular culture are now dissolving and losing their hierarchical functions, or are at least now charged with new meanings due to emerging cultural and aesthetic synchretisms. In an extreme position, the new (German) Cultural Studies cluster posits that the older German cultural sociology is just not capable of understanding hegemonic cultural structures because the traditional field was never able to look beyond the horizon of their subject, which is primarily the bourgeois and national high culture.

Third, and probably the most vague dichotomy of these three polarities, is the one between "young" and "old." German cultural sociology experiences a "changing of the guards." Most of the founding "fathers" (very rarely "mothers") of the new German cultural sociology from the 1980s are now retiring, and a younger generation of sociologists is stepping forward. These younger sociologists do not depend as much on the theoretical background of a "national" and "bourgeois" cultural sociology in the tradition of the 1920s and before, anymore. Specific applied issues (case studies) and topics of contemporary political significance like "culture and consumption", "promises and failures of a culture of technology" or "culture and entertainment in times of decreasing public subsidies" are pushed forward and mostly presented by younger scholars.

On the other hand, we can also see signs of a German revival of a theoretically based cultural sociology under the banner of "cultural theory." One of the main representatives is

Andreas Reckwitz, who uses epistemological and paradigmatic aspects to explain the transformation of cultural theories from "old" to "new cultural sociology" since the 1960s. For him, the new cultural sociology is based primarily on (post) structuralism, interpretative and phenomenological traditions, among them the school of "objective hermeneutics", developed by Ulrich Oevermann, a former Frankfurt School member.

Classical German (cultural) sociology took its main conceptual resources from German Idealism, with Neo-Kantianism, Neo-Hegelianism and Neo-Historicism being of special importance. However, with the recent cultural turn, four theoretical revolutions of the 20th century are now implemented in the "new" German cultural sociology: 1) phenomenology and modern hermeneutics, 2) structuralism and semiotics, including neo- and post-structuralism, 3) the late Wittgenstein's philosophy centered on life forms and language games, and 4) American pragmatism and its version of sign-based practices of action.

Our perusal of contemporary German cultural sociology also revealed a significant difference from Lamont and Wuthnow's 1990 comparison of European and US-American cultural sociology. Whereas Lamont and Wuthnow have stressed strong accentuations of aspects of power in European cultural sociology, we did not discover these aspects in German cultural sociology. In Germany, this academic field hardly presents itself as a critical sociology or as a materialist theory, even in sub-fields or paradigms that apply Bourdieu, Foucault or the Neo-Gramscian Cultural Studies. Regarding Bourdieu, life-style theory, descriptive social space and field theory are by far more important than his critical theory of symbolic power. In the reception of British cultural studies the semiotic and culturalist wings represented by John Fiske and Raymond Williams are more popular than the more radical approaches of Stuart Hall or Paul Gilroy.

On the one hand, the new German cultural sociology is based on contemporary theoretical schools such as interpretative sociology and objective hermeneutics. On the other hand, it is looking for useful applications for analyzing cultural phenomena from everyday consumption patterns to the significance of lifestyles in stratifying (post)modern societies. However, probably due to the traditional overlap of cultural sociology and a sociology of culture, a specific institutionalized interest in a sociology of arts does not exist separately from the organized sociology of culture. In Germany, a sociology of art does not play the same important role as it does in France, the United States, or even, as we will show, in Austria.

Cultural sociology and sociology of art in Austria

The Swiss Society for Sociology (SGS) has not yet implemented a cultural sociology section with that title. Related sections are the research committees "Sociology of Religion" (mainly francophone) and (in the past) "Symbols, Images and Ideologies".

In general, Austrian sociology lacks a strong philosophical branch similar to German Idealism. Due to religious reasons (German Protestantism vs. Austrian Catholicism) and political causes (Prussia's victory over Austria at Koeniggraetz 1866, which prepared the foundation of the German Reich excluding Austria), the Hapsburg Empire contested Protestant German Idealism. Instead, Austrian humanities were dominated by Catholic philosophy (Bolzano, Brentano) and, in the liberal Vienna of the late 19th century, by scientific paradigms influenced by French positivism and British utilitarianism (Ernst Mach). The anti-Hegelian and anti-Kantian context facilitated three specific Austrian contributions to 20th century philosophy. Two of them are part of the theoretical revolutions that, according to Reckwitz, prepared the cultural turn of sociology. The first Austrian achievement was Wittgenstein's philosophy; the second achievement was the philosophy of Alfred Schütz, who inspired ethnomethodology and phenomenological sociology. The third achievement was the anti-Kantian, logical positivism of the Vienna Circle, which was, from an epistemological point of view, clearly an anti-culturalist program. The neo-positivist and critical rationalist circles in Vienna included some well-known Austrian like Paul Lazarsfeld, Marie Jahoda and Karl R. Popper. None of them are necessarily remembered for their cultural sociological work. This is different for Vienna circle member Otto Neurath, who made important contributions to the Austrian sociology of art and culture. His rejection of "humanities" (i.e., in the German sense "Geisteswissenschaften," sciences of the spirit) implied by no means a lack of interest in art or culture. In Vienna, Neurath was even closer to modernist artistic tendencies than Simmel in Berlin. In an early anticipation of the "pictorial turn" - already in the 1920s Neurath spoke of a "century of the eye" - he tried to develop a new visual language in cooperation with avant-garde artists and architects for communicating social and economic facts. The collaboration between scientists and artists at the "museum of society and economy" in Vienna, founded in the mid-1920s by Neurath, was perhaps the first historical model for an interdisciplinary exchange of sociology and visual art, still inspiring sociologists and artists in Austria and Germany today.

Due to a different historical background, the Austrian Society for Sociology (ÖGS) has now a section of "cultural sociology" and a section of "sociology of art and music". The institutionalization of a section for "cultural sociology and cultural research" in the Austrian Society for Sociology occurred in the years 1986 and 1987, being a joint initiative by Ingo Moerth (a sociologist at that time working in the Schütz and Luckmann tradition) and by Alfred Smudits (who had affinities to the Frankfurt School). Already in 1988, there was a joint meeting of the German, Austrian and Swiss Sociological Societies in Zurich. With its title "Culture and Society," this conference communicated the manifestation of the cultural turn in the entirety of German speaking sociology.

Since then, the work of the Austrian cultural sociology section has proceeded through national and international symposia, publications by Austrian, Swiss and German authors, and the construction of comprehensive databanks. The University of Linz became the central institutional base of the section, with Ingo Moerth and Gerhard Froehlich acting as speakers and influential scholars. The continuous meetings gravitate to the discussion of different pragmatic aspects of everyday culture as well as to the theory of modernity. The section is internationally known for the "Linz Cultural Theory Symposia" which are dedicated to authors of special theoretical importance like Norbert Elias, Pierre Bourdieu, Clifford Geertz and Villem Flusser. These symposia resulted in several publications, mostly edited by Ingo Moerth and Gerhard Froehlich, and in very comprehensive contextual and referential biblio- and mediagraphies.

In 1995 the section experienced an interdisciplinary reorientation and renamed itself "Cultural Theory and Cultural Studies" instead of "Cultural Sociology and Cultural Research," without implying a cultural studies perspective in a narrow paradigmatic sense. Without following a certain paradigm or school, the section is now increasingly open up to interdisciplinary perspectives. According to the speakers of the section, all approaches that do justice to the complexities of modernity (modernity being the common denominator of this section) are possible, and individual scientists transgressing disciplinary borders are especially invited to participate.

Following the intellectual expansion of the arts and of the sociology of the arts especially in the francophone world, Henrik Kreutz and Ulf Wuggenig founded the section "Sociology of Art and Music" in the Austrian Society for Sociology in the same year, 1995. Several Austrian sociologists are now participating in both sections and, similarly to the cultural sociology section, there are regular meetings and publications. In line with the pragmatic and semiotic turn of Viennese logical positivism, this section emphasizes more a research orientation not restricted to a qualitative-interpretative methodology (the latter one dominating German cultural sociology) but also accepting and applying quantitative research with advanced statistical methods. This section holds on especially to Neurath's idea of encouraging interdisciplinary exchanges with artists and with other professional members of the art fields. Besides a wide-ranging interest in "production of culture" approaches there is also a strong interest in the analysis of the "constitution of art". As mentioned, the French sociology of art, i.e., Bourdieu's critical sociology of art and the French pragmatist sociology of art (Boltanski, Chiapello, Heinich, Hennion) are important reference points for this section.

Overall, the theoretical frame of this section and of the Austrian cultural sociology section is more related to French and American sociology, more pragmatic, more broadly oriented to paradigmatic issues, and more inclined towards empirical research than the German counterpart is.

Some final thoughts

Between the German and Austrian sections of cultural sociology, the historical differences, including a different institutionalization, became evident. New cultural sociology in Germany is partially based on a revitalization of the idealistic (but not critical) philosophical background of the 1920s and before, whereas cultural sociology in Austria is a continuation as well as a renewal of pragmatist, phenomenological and empirical traditions. None of these sections, therefore, jumped off the shoulders of their preeminent academic forefathers. The occurring, real changes in the German cultural sociology are more an adjustment to international processes in the field, not replacing a theoretical and hermeneutically oriented sociology but adding a new sub-field. This important sub-field has the primary objective of applied analyses of, as Diana Crane dubbed it, "recorded culture." It is also useful for the interpretation of everyday phenomena and maybe even for the empirical unearthing of basic structures, e.g. about the significance of cultural micro-patterns for societal macro-structures. This development assimilates German and Austrian cultural sociology to a certain degree. The cultural turn in the 1980s and especially the increasing popularity of cultural sociology in the 1990s occurred similarly in both countries; the borders of national traditions become blurred because of the close cooperation and high professional mobility of sociologists at least between Germany and Austria.

ENDNOTES

1 See http://www.soziologie.uni-freiburg.de/kuso-dgs/index. The recent speaker of the German section for cultural sociology, Wolfgang Essbach (University of Freiburg) has set up this Web site.

2 Winfried Gebhardt (2001): "Vielfältiges Bemühen. Zum Stand kultursoziologischer Forschung im deutschsprachigen Raum" http://www.soziologie.uni-freiburg.de/kuso-dgs/debatte/gebhardt.htm. Accessed March 9, 2004.

3 This cultural turn in Germany was initially launched by a special volume of the main German sociological journal, the Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie, edited by the ,new' founding father of German cultural sociology, Friedrich Tenbruck (cf. Wolfgang Lipp and Friedrich Tenbruck (eds.), 1979: Kultursoziologie. Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie, vol. 31/ issue 3). The main boost to the field came with another special volume in the 1980s, cf. Friedhelm Neidhardt, M. Rainer Lepsius and Johannes Weiß (eds.): Kultur und Gesellschaft. Special issue of Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie, vol. 27 (1986).

4 Gebhardt includes cultural anthropology and philosophical cultural sociology in this category.

5 Gebhardt views this list by far not as complete or constitutive. He emphasizes that the schools and the research lines are not antagonistic to each other and in fact open-minded and open for discussion.

6 This is not a complete list of all meetings. The authors translated the original German titles of these meetings for this compilation.

7 These four conceptual meetings were organized by (1) the former speaker of the section, Eckhardt Pankoke, Essen ("Limits of the cultural" 1998), (2) the author of the same-titled book, Wolfgang Lipp, Würzburg ("Drama culture" 1999), (3) Hannelore Bubitz, Paderborn, and Michael Makropoulos, Berlin ("Mass culture" 2002), and (4) Clemens Albrecht, Koblenz ("Cultural canon and education" 2003).

8 Udo Göttlich, Duisburg, and Rainer Winter, Giessen, organized the first of these two meetings about theoretical challenges ("The challenge of cultural studies" 2001), and the second will be organized by Hannelore Bubitz, Paderborn, and Wolfgang Essbach, Freiburg, ("The linguistic turn" 2004).

9 These three meetings, mostly in cooperations with other sections of the German Society for Sociology were organized by (1) Klaus Lichtblau, Kassel, a preeminent scholar of Weber and Simmel ("Art and religion" 1996), (2) Eckhardt Pankoke, Essen ("Medial culture and modernity" 1996), and (3) papers were contributed by, among others, Andreas Reckwitz (Frankfurt/Oder) and Hans-Peter Müller (Berlin) at a meeting at the 2000 German congress for sociology, titled "Good society".

10 These two meetings of cultural sociologists interested in applied topics were organized by (1) Eckhardt Pankoke, Essen ("Arts management, arts policies, arts scientists" 1998), and (2) Joachim Fischer, Dresden, and Michael Makropoulos, Berlin ("Potsdamer Platz" 2001).

11 These two meetings of empirically interested cultural sociologists were organized (1) by Kai-Uwe Hellmann, Magdeburg, and Dominik Schrage, Dresden ("Consumption and

culture" 2003), see also the spin-off of the sociology of culture section, a new working group on the sociology of consumption, www.konsum-soziologie.de), and (2) by Lutz Hieber, Hannover, and Karl-Siegbert Rehberg, Dresden ("Paradox of museum presentations" 2004).

12 The quote continues: "Different opinions exist not only regarding the idea of culture but especially regarding the concept of theory and critique. On the one hand, theoretical implications of modernization and value judgments are emphasized. On the other hand, the discussion evolved around the question of how a critique of mass culture can be sustained in view of present-day contingencies and without categorical determination." Cf. proceedings of the meeting "Theory of mass culture" in March 2002, documented by Dierk Spreen, University of Paderborn. The quotation is from the last page of the newsletter, vol. 1/2002; translation by the authors.

13 Proceedings of the meeting on "Popular culture and representative culture - the challenge of cultural studies" in June 2001, documented by Clemens Albrecht, University of Potsdam, and Udo Göttlich, Duisburg. The statement is from the second page of the newsletter, vol. 3/2001.

14 Some members of the "established generation" would be, e.g., Wolfgang Eßbach, Alois Hahn, Ronald Hitzler, Hubert Knoblauch, Klaus Lichtblau, Wolfgang Lipp, Hans-Peter Müller, Eckhardt Pankoke, Karl-Siegfried Rehberg, or Johannes Weiß. Some members of the "up-and-coming generation" would be, e.g., Andreas Göbel, Udo Göttlich, Gabriele Klein, Michael Makropoulos, Thomas Müller-Schneider, Dominik Schrage, Dierk Spreen, Andreas Reckwitz, or Rainer Winter. Of course, these lists are by no means exhaustive. The section consists of 120 paying members and 92 interested non-paying "observers" (2002).

15 Cf. Reckwitz, Andreas, 2000: Die Transformation der Kulturtheorien. Zur Entwicklung eines Theorieprogramms. Weilerswist.

16 Cf. www.objektivehermeneutik.de. "Objective hermeneutics" has been acknowledged in reports of other cultural sociology-related sections (on religion and knowledge) of the German Society for Sociology (cf. Orth, Barbara, Schwietring, Thomas, and Weiß, Johannes (ed.) (2003): Soziologische Forschung: Stand und Perspektiven. Opladen). Günter Burkart (Institute of Social Sciences at the University of Günter Burkart (Institute of Social Sciences at the University of Lueneburg) and Thomas Loer (editor of the journal Sozialer Sinn) are some of the sociologists following this school.

17 Cf. Reckwitz (2000), op. cit., p. 21.

18 Cf. Lamont, Michele / Wuthnow, Robert (1990): "Betwixt and Between: Recent Cultural Sociology in Europe and the United States", pp. 287-315 in: Ritzer, George (ed.): Frontiers of Social Theory. The New Synthesis. New York and Oxford.

19 For the sections of the Swiss Sociological Society see http://www.sagw.ch/soziologie/. The research committee "Symbols, Images, Ideologies" that had the most affinities to a sociology of culture and the arts, terminated its work at the end of 2002.

20 Collins classifies Schütz as a German philosopher. That is only true from a language point of view. Because of the Nazi-invasion, he had to leave Vienna in 1939 and became the teacher of, e.g. Berger and Garfinkel (cf. Collins, Randall (1994), Four Sociological Traditions. New York, pp. 268ff).

21 Fascism and Nazism forced all of them to emigrate from Austria to the United States (and Great Britain). Already in the 1930s, Viennese neo-positivism looked for alliances with American pragmatism (e.g. Morris, Quine), before it finally dissolved in analytical philosophy in the 1950s.

22 Cf. Neurath, Otto (1939): Modern Man in the Making. New York. See also Lonard, Robert (1999): "Seeing is Believing: Otto Neurath, Graphic Art, and the Social Order". Pp. 452-478 in: de Marchi, Neil and Goodwin, Crawford D. W. (ed.): Economic Engagements with the Arts. Durham and London.

23 A special issue of the journal "Österreichische Zeitschrift für Soziologie" ("Austrian Journal of Sociology") dedicated to "Art-Culture-Society" (Issue 1-2/1984) commenced the creation of the section. Five scholars have been speakers since then: Ingo Moerth, Gerhard Froehlich (Linz), Alfred Smudits (Vienna), Helmut Kuzmics (Graz) and Brunhilde Scheuringer (Salzburg).

24 The theme of this first joint meeting of the Austrian cultural sociology section and the corresponding Swiss research committee was "Culture in the life of the people – Development since 1945 and contemporary situation" (cf. Moerth, Ingo, and Meier-Dallach, Hans-Peter (ed.), 1990: Kultur-Weltbild-Alltagsleben. Linz, and Hoffmann-Nowotny, Hans-Joachim (ed.), 1989: Kultur und Gesellschaft. Zurich)

25 Cf. http://www.iwp.uni-linz.ac.at/lxe/sektktf/

26 One of these topics is the linkage between culture and cities (cf. Brandner, Birgit, Luger, Kurt, and Moerth, Ingo (eds.), 1994: Kulturerlebnis Stadt. Wien).

27 Especially the databank "HyperBourdieuHTM" found strong international attention. Bourdieu remarked in an interview, that the bibliography must be very comprehensive because it even includes contributions he himself had forgotten (cf. http://www.iwp.uni-linz.ac.at/lxe/sektktf/bb/HyperBourdieu.html for Bourdieu, http://www.iwp.uni-linz.ac.at/lxe/sektktf/GG/HyperGeertz.html for Geertz, and http://www.kuwi.uni-linz.ac.at/hyperelias/z-elias/ for Elias).

28 Both are also the speakers of this section. Henrik Kreutz is one of the main representatives of pragmatic sociology in Austria and teaches at the universities of Erlangen-Nuremberg, Vienna and Budapest. He is editor of the pragmatist journal "Angewandte Sozialforschung" ("Applied Social Research"), that also publishes work from the section "Sociology of Art and Music". Ulf Wuggenig is a sociologist of (visual) art and culture. He was a member of the University of Applied Art in Vienna and is now one of the directors of the art gallery "Kunstraum" of the University of Lueneburg.

29 In the mid-1990s avant-garde sub-fields of the visual arts became interested in sociology. In the artistic field, institutional analysis and institutional critique of the production of art had a remarkable revival. Thus, it was not by chance, that the first meeting of the section found its place in the Art Academy of Vienna, in the master-class of the Italian artist Michelangelo Pistoletto.

30 Some of the diverse themes discussed in this section in the last years are, e.g., "constructing a public for contemporary opera music in Vienna", "artistic (re)presentations of the

Holocaust in Vienna and Berlin", "contemporary art fields in comparative perspective (Austria, Germany, France)", "art, power and national representation", "contemporary art and globalization", "art and economy", "art in the public sphere", and "contemporary art, artistic critique and the new spirit of capitalism". Cf. Wuggenig, Ulf, 1996: "Soziologie und Bildende Kunst". Pp. 293-322 in: Smudits, Alfred and Staubmann, Helmut (ed.), Kunst-Geschichte-Soziologie. Frankfurt/Main and New York. Most of the Austrian sociologists of art and music have contributed to this "Festschrift" for the art sociologist Gerhardt Kapner, University of Vienna.

Who's Afraid of General Linear Regression?, continued

sulting from other (presumably non-cultural) areas misses the extent to which culture encompasses these other variables. If everything we observe is endogenous to culture, it can no longer make sense to evaluate the effect of culture on something else, or the effect of something else on culture.

Other cultural analysts conceptualize culture as so unique, so entirely situated and context dependent, that the necessary methodological approach is ethnography, or at least ethnography broadly conceived. A fruitful conversation about coding practices at last August's "M3C" conference in Atlanta clarified this critique as analysts debated my proposition that the practice of coding constitutes essentially a series of decisions about what information to discard in order to make sense of what remains. Artistic and culinary metaphors flew!

It is not at any of these critics that this article is aimed. Criticisms—whether theoretical or methodological—of the formal analysis of culture aside, the question I want to address here is different: why do formal cultural analysts find it necessary to reinvent methodological wheels?

Consider John Levi Martin's excellent presentation at the 2002 ASA meetings in Chicago (2000a; later published in AJS, 2000b). There are numerous examples I could use, and I choose Martin's work because of its brilliance and creativity. Indeed, I do consider it exceptionally interesting research, so my criticism is really one of process, not of quality.

Using the Zablocki data, Martin sought to evaluate a thesis in the public opinion literature: opinion constraint. Essentially, opinion constraint refers to the degree to which an individual considers it problematic to hold two beliefs that are logically mutually exclusive. To evaluate this, Martin used a form of metric scaling—a set of techniques that are growing more popular in cultural sociology, but with which most American sociologists outside the culture section have virtually no familiarity. In Martin's case, the metric scaling offered him the ability to "map" individuals and the beliefs they and other significant others held. He also used a form of Galois lattices to represent the geometry of opinion constraint within networks.

The claim of Martin's paper is, essentially, that individuals experience opinion constraint based on their significant others. That is, they are less constrained by researchers' assumed logical incompatibilities between political positions than they are by the fear of disagreeing with alters whom they respect. Although the graphical techniques used in the presentation were appealing, they were different enough from standard sociological techniques that a smart sociologist, unfamiliar with the particularities of cultural sociology, would likely have abandoned the talk rather than adapting to the new framework.

Similar cases in sociology include Ann Mische's groundbreaking work on settings in the Brazilian youth movement (Mische and Pattison, 2000); Peter Bearman's on narrative networks (Bearman and Stovel 2000); John Mohr's (1998) and Ron Breiger's (2000) on other forms of metric scaling; and more. In each of these cases, the theoretical point being made is that *variables we understand to be cultural* (e.g., beliefs, ideas, experiences, language) *may be expected to cause outcomes we (or others) understand not to be cultural.* Furthermore, each of these investigations is empirically innovative and theoretically brilliant. They deserve to be approached by the discipline in general, not just by that subset of cultural sociologists interested in formal analysis of culture.

Sociology has, for better or for worse, an established language for describing and evaluating such causal stories. It is linear regression, along with the various amendments and extensions used to tailor regression models to the vicissitudes of real data.In addition to standard linear regression, there are techniques for handling (among many others) curvilinear relationships; "stepped" relationships; nested data (in which people, messages, behaviors, etc., are hierarchically grouped); data observed over time; and behaviors measured in "yes-no" as opposed to "more-less" schemata. Regressions seek to evaluate the relative contributions of a collection of measured variables to a measured outcome.

"Foul!", many culturalists are presumably crying, as they envision the reduction of cultural complexity and vibrancy to mere numbers, stars, and daggers in a table. "Dichotomous and linear variables are fine for describing income or education, but when it comes to culture, this is criminally reductive!"

One misunderstanding, I think, springs from culturalists' belief that an analysis must consider all the information about a given case in order to be faithful. This was precisely the fissure we divided over in Atlanta. But the cases I'm talking about have already made that decision, choosing parsimony over idiography.

My concern is that by inventing new methods—or by adapting existing, but obscure, ones—we marginalize cultural analysis from the rest of sociology. Our colleagues know how to interpret regression coefficients, but are (perhaps correctly) highly suspicious of scaling methods that ask them to interpret a "cluster" of points on a graph. Furthermore, half a century of studies using regression and similar techniques offers a rich historical context for evaluating and reevaluating culture as one among many families of variables in causal chains.

Let me offer two examples from my own work. In both of these cases, I started by considering non-regression modes of quantitative analysis, then fell back on regression as the best balance between theoretical rigor and the ultimate capacity to speak to colleagues outside the cultural subfield.

The first case arose from my dissertation research. I had hand-coded the transcripts of 20 focus groups to a series of endogenous themes (morality vs. interests as logics for evaluating political action, to cite one example). The question was whether different kinds of groups were more amenable to different kinds of political talk, *even after accounting for the kinds of people who join those groups.* I spent quite a while working with correspondence analysis and other forms of metric scaling, which I used to analyze these data in my dissertation.

Ultimately, though, it became clear that a series of hierarchical linear models—essentially, multi-stage linear regressions—would be the clearest way to test that causal story. By offering an analysis in this form—however partial it might be—general sociologists can compare my analysis to others', ultimately letting them adjudicate between and among "cultural" and other analytical approaches to compelling social phenomena.

More recently, I have become interested in the shape and use of mediated public spheres in the United States: interactions between citizens and an anonyomous "public" through media like letters to the editor, Internet chat, and radio and television call-in shows. I decided to examine letters to the editors of regional newspapers before and after the September 11, 2001, attacks for signs of changes in authoritarian and anti-authoritarian tone in public discourse.

The obvious way to handle such data is qualitatively: through the rich, discursive examination of each individual text. But that proved unsatisfying; I had roughly 4,000 published letters per month, and the possibility of subjecting such a vast discursive field to a serious qualitative analysis seemed remote. Furthermore, my question was once more squarely causal: *did the 9/11 attacks make American public discourse more authoritarian and/or more anti-authoritarian than it had been before?* Again, I turned to hierarchical linear models to evaluate that question. And again, the results (Perrin, forthcoming) lend themselves to direct comparison and evaluation by sociologists of all stripes.

Much of the theory associated with current work on culture is explicitly causal. Ann Swidler's recent book, for example, asks "how culture matters"—demonstrating, in the process, that it *does* matter (2001). The exciting cross-cultural work by Michele Lamont and her colleagues (e.g., Lamont, 2001; Lamont and Thévenot, 2000; Saguy 2003) similarly tells a causal tale: this one about the causal chain from national identity, through repertoires of evaluation, to differing political and social outcomes. As productively reluctant as we are trained to be about endorsing empirical investigations of causality, the theoretical apparatus we have constructed around culture requires it. And a useful way of evaluating and discussing that investigation is the use of regression models.

Cultural sociologists with whom I have discussed this issue have suggested that the language and practice of regression analysis rubs culturalists the wrong way because (a) it seems to reduce complex phenomena to relatively shallow numbers (e.g., Andy Abbott's classic "Transcending General Linear Reality") and (b) its antiseptic rhetoric of hypothesis testing and *p*-values strikes us as brushing aside the intricate filigree of culture to reach the dull, stone interior.

These objections make sense from an ethnographic or discursive standpoint. But once we have entered a causal discussion, in which we are seeking, theoretically, to isolate elements in a sequential, causal story, we must give up on descriptive completeness. Our colleagues who operate with linear regression know this implicitly. They tend to be very cautious about inferring causality. More importantly, they are (or should be!) careful to delineate what elements and measures they use to stand in for the conceptual, causal ideas they seek to test.

Take, for instance, the following, from the introductory page of Hanushek and Jackson's classic *Statistical Methods for Social Scientists*:

> ...Models...are merely statements about the most important determinants of the behavior being studied. Models, by design, are simplifications and abstractions of reality. They describe the most important systematic aspects of behavior seen in a wide variety of circumstances rather than completely account [*sic*] for specific events (Hanushek and Jackson 1977:1).

Of course, the theory and practice of quantitative sociology don't always mesh, and sociologists have a way of hypostatizing—nay, fetishizing—variables and coefficients so they become, rather than representing, the concepts of interest.

Well-done research using regressions and associated techniques does not confuse empirical reality with its schematic representation in statistics. Ironically, though, formal modeling techniques in cultural sociology that seek closer mimesis violate an important principle of cultural analysis: the essential gap between a sign and its referent. In evaluating causal claims, the practices surrounding regression have two strong advantages: they offer a vocabulary for describing that gap, and they offer a common language for discussing causal stories with social scientists outside the cultural subfield.

I do not mean to denigrate the very creative, exciting work done by the people I've mentioned here, or by others in similar traditions. I am convinced that structured, formal analysis of cultural elements as caused and causal features is an important part of our subfield's future. But at least as important is making the case to sociology in general that culture is more than a residual category, available for explaining the remaining variance in a regression model. In order to do that, we should place a priority on speaking an empirical language our colleagues understand.

REFERENCES

Abbott, Andrew. 1988. "Transcending General Linear Reality." *Sociological Theory.*

Bearman, Peter, and Katherine Stovel. 2000. "Becoming a Nazi: A Model for Narrative Networks." *Poetics* 27:2-3 (March)

Breiger, Ron. 2000. "A Tool Kit for Practice Theory." *Poetics* 27: 2-3 (March)

Hanushek, Eric A., and John E. Jackson. 1977. *Statistical Methods for Social Scientists.* San Diego: Academic Press.

Lamont, Michèle. 2000. *The Dignity of Working Men: Morality and the Boundaries of Race, Class, and Immigration.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Lamont, Michèle, and Laurent Thévenot (eds.) .2000. *Rethinking Comparative Cultural Sociology.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Martin, John Levi. 2002a. "A Formal Approach to the Study of Belief Systems and Some Findings." ASA, Chicago.

Martin, John Levi. 2002b. "Power, Authority, and the Constraint of Belief Systems." American Journal of Sociology 107:4 (January).

Mische, Ann, and Philippa Pattison. 2000. "Composing a Civic Arena: Publics, Projects, and Social Settings." *Poetics* 27:2-3 (March), 163-94.

Mohr, John W. 1998. "Measuring Meaning Structures." *Annual Review of Sociology* 24.

Perrin, Andrew J. Forthcoming. "National Threat and Political Culture: Authoritarianism, Anti-Authoritarianism, and the September 11 Attacks." *Political Psychology*, 2004.

Saguy, Abigail Cope. 2003. *What is Sexual Harassment?: From Capitol Hill to the Sorbonne.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Swidler, Ann. 2001. *Talk of Love: How Culture Matters.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

The Georgia Workshop on Culture and Institutions, 2003-4
David Smilde
University of Georgia

The Workshop on Culture and Institutions at the University of Georgia (GWCI) was founded in 2002 by David Smilde and Tom Beamish (now of UC Davis) and receives funding from UGA's Center for Humanities and Arts. The Workshop aims to provide a forum for social scientists studying culture to discuss their work, and a means for graduate students to gain the "soft knowledge" necessary to become a functioning member of the sub-discipline. Discussion of work-in-progress demystifies the process of research; and presenting, critiquing, and responding to criticism help graduate students develop essential professional skills. Furthermore, the workshop regulars, local drop-ins and outside visitors provide graduate students with social capital that can facilitate the looming transition from graduate student to junior faculty. "There is nothing new under the sun" the Good Book says. And the GWCI is no exception. Our emphasis on work-in-progress and graduate student participation bears the tutelary influence of Wendy Griswold with whom Smilde coordinated the Culture and Society Workshop at the University of Chicago exactly a decade ago. And its web format and listserv have been shamelessly appropriated from Chuck Tilly's Contentious Politics Workshop at Columbia University.

An exhaustive summary of the papers and issues we discussed this year would be both impossible and undesirable. Instead, I will narrate two recurring themes—it would probably be more accurate to call them sustained battlegrounds—that, beyond any intentions or planning, crystallized over the course of the year. Such recurrence should not surprise as discussions build upon each other, fault lines develop, and egos wait for the chance to riposte.

The first recurring issue was the fate of meaning in the current (post)modern era. Does the decline of metanarrative mean that individuals and groups are cut adrift without established meanings to anchor them and establish consensus? Or has this decline meant the efflorescence of meaning resulting in people leading more "meaning-full" lives than in previous stages of modernity? The season began with Barry Schwartz's presentation of a paper he is coauthoring with Mark Jacobs called "The Ironic Turn in the Sociology of Culture." Jacobs and Schwartz's paper weaves a historical narrative out of a synthesis of ideas from Richard Rorty and Wayne Booth, in which the sociology of culture begins in a "metaphysical" mode in the post-War era, evolves into a "stable ironic" mode in the 1970s and 80s, but falls into "unstable irony" in the 1990s. The au-

Reminder:

"Culture Day" at ASA is Aug. 14, with section sessions carrying over to Aug. 15.

Check out the program at--

www.asanet.org.

thors coded books reviewed in *Contemporary Sociology* as well as fourteen years of presentations in Culture Section sessions. This data analysis, they argued, demonstrates the ironic fragmentation of the field. The sub-discipline now considers culture a "strategy" or a "tool" instead of a reality *sui generis*, has become esoteric in interests, and superficially empiricist in technique. As a result, it no longer facilitates public discussion, since ironic dissonance has been stretched beyond the limits within which it operates constructively, towards the point where it begins to turn into babel. Others in the room heartily disagreed with factual and evaluative elements of this narrative, arguing instead that this fragmentation was a positive symptom of the democratization of access to meaning-making. It represents not disintegration, they countered, but creativity and ferment. Smilde argued that while indeed the subdiscipline's center has not held, things are not falling apart. He also suggested that instead of a golden age, the influence of the Parsons-Kluckhohn model of culture should be seen as a twenty-five year blip in which abstract general theories dominated sociology. The current situation resembles the cacophony of theories, approaches and empirical studies that existed before the Parsons steamroller got moving in the 1940s.

In October James Jasper visited the workshop and brought an entirely different set of concerns regarding the viability of meaning. Here any worries regarding decline were preempted by a view of meaning as central to social movements. Jasper presented a draft of "Quintilian for Social Scientists" in which he argues for the theory of rhetoric as a model for overcoming the dualism between instrumentalist and culturalist accounts of action. Rhetoric is precisely the strategic symbolic pursuit of an end through moral, emotional and cognitive influence on an audience. Jasper argued that rejection of the metanarratives once provided by general theory does not require a retreat into a microsociology based on minimalist rational actors. A more realistic microsociology includes actors' emotions, moral visions and ideas. Once we get these "little things" straight, we are likely to be more successful in bridging micro and macro levels of sociological analysis. Smilde followed Jasper with a presentation that also focused on meaning in social movements. He looked at both Pentecostal plaza preachers and street protest in Caracas, Venezuela as "popular publics" in which social actors from the popular classes seek to extend their networks and the influence of their discourse. Largely marginalized from the political process as well as the mass media, this sort of public meaning making is these social actors' primary access to power. Discussing the paper at a time of dramatic conflict in Venezuelan society, the workshop discussed the conditions under which polarization occurs when public meaning making is decentralized.

Three other presentations acknowledged a threat to meaning in our current stage of (post)modernity, yet focused on the adaptive responses. James Dowd argued that the traditional moral authority provided by pastors, elders, community leaders and heroes has indeed waned, and the generality of traditional moral proscriptions and directives make them more suited to simpler times. Nevertheless, people still long to live an honorable life and frequently try to construct moral precepts through dialogue with popular culture. One space in which this process is unusually open and public is in the advice columns of *New York Times* ethicist Randy Cohen. People write Cohen to tell of the moral ambiguities of small everyday situations, and receive answers in terms of general philosophies of life. Jeff Kidder, in his participant observation ethnography of bicycle messengers in New York, asked "why do messengers carry-out such a low paying, dangerous job with such enthusiasm?" He looked at how largely suburban kids build an anti-establishment subculture through vocabulary, dress, particular biking equipment, and rituals such as "alley-cats"—illegal street races among bikers. This subculture provides an emotional grounding that for some makes a bad job sufficiently rewarding. The case study showed how everyday, arcane micro-rituals can provide meaning in lieu of convincing metanarratives. Christena Nippert-Eng visited the workshop in April to offer a glimpse of findings from her current project on conceptions and constructions of privacy. Chris and her collaborator Jay Melican use wallets, handbags, and other personal effects as a window through which we can see individuals actively managing — disclosing and concealing — more public and private aspects of their identities. In their study, they asked people to categorize the contents of their wallets and purses according to whether they considered those items more private or more public. This uncovered a rich source of data for exploring the identity work required of the modern subject, whose reputation and sense of self may be ill-supported by social or institutional affiliations. Participants in the study carried a wide variety of personal effects — from credit cards to family photos, from business cards to old movie ticket stubs. Some of these items were present because they were personally meaningful, while others would be shown on certain occasions to personal acquaintances or, on demand, to institutional representatives.

The second recurring issue of the workshop was authenticity in subcultures. Patrick Williams got this ball rolling with a presentation of research on an Internet forum used by members of "straightedge" subculture. He analyzed debates among members of the forum, in which different strategies of claiming authenticity were used by participants who held widely divergent views about who could and could not claim to be a "real" straightedger. These debates centered on the centrality of music in the subculture, on the one hand, versus the impact of information and communication technologies that facilitate new opportunities for "being" straightedge, on the other. Smilde suggested that the term authenticity is rarely helpful since it is usually unclear whether it is being used in an emic or etic sense. The issue turned up time and again as many of the presenters in the second semester were doing participant observation within a subculture they themselves were members of. Jeff Kidder looked at the way bicycle messengers evaluated each other depending on their skill, the type of bike they used, and their dress. More than anything else, being authentic meant riding a "track bike" (racing bike with no gears, brakes or ability to coast). Elizabeth Cherry looked at vegans and the way their networks affected their orthodoxy. The respondents in her sample had either become vegans through punk subculture, or through individual searches for identity. She found that the former were more heavily networked to each other with the result that they held the line towards orthodox veganism. The latter were much more likely to backslide on occasion, or de-

velop idiosyncratic definitions of veganism. Among the first group, authenticity was a network discourse, in the second it was a personal exploration.

Richard Lloyd from Vanderbilt University visited to discuss his work on "neo-bohemian" subculture in Chicago. From a perspective influenced by postmodern geography he argued that bohemianism has entered a new era. In a consumption and spectacle oriented society, bohemia has become eminently marketable and therefore unstable as it becomes stereotyped. While Chicago's Wicker Park neighborhood was once on the fringe, its very grit became glamorous, leading property values to sky rocket. But is not the very term "neo-bohemia" an emic evaluation of authenticity made into an etic concept by a bohemian (re-)turned sociologist? No, said Rich. Nothing is any more authentic than anything else. Bohemian subculture has always derived its members from suburban kids looking for meaning by experiencing raw urban conditions. That is not what has changed. The concept of neobohemia is rather an index of the changing insertion of bohemia in the postmodern economy. The workshop's co-organizer Brent Allison provided the last discussion of the year with his work on "anime" fandom as a transnational subculture. Through participation-observation in conventions in which creators and fans of Japanese animation meet, Brent looks at the way interaction and discussion serve to initiate people into anime subculture, appropriate aspects of Japanese culture, and form attitudes toward it. Workshop members' methodological discussion of the best way to access fans' attitudes towards these issues brought Smilde to suggest—to the the laughter and groans of Williams and others—that if Allison really wanted to uncover fans' attitudes towards these issues he needed to examine and portray those moments and exchanges in which his informants construct authenticity through conflict.

Culture section members living near or passing through the Atlanta-Athens area have an open invitation to drop in on our sessions. Those further away but interested in keeping up on our activities or downloading our online papers can visit our web page at www.uga.edu/gwci or join our low-traffic listserv.

Books of Note

Richard A. Peterson, Vanderbilt University

Three Solid Culture Texts

Griswold, Wendy. Cultures and Societies in a Changing World. Thousand Oaks, CA. Pine Forge Press. Griswold presents the humanist and anthropological definitions of culture, looks at culture as socially constructed meaning, as produced, as constructing social problems, as central to organizations, and in a "wired world." The diverse topics are knit together using the "cultural diamond" metaphor. Each chapter is followed by questions for study and discussion as well as a set of recommended readings (mostly books).

Inglis, David and John Hughson. Confronting Culture: Sociological Vistas. Cambridge, UK. Polity Press. In contrast to Griswold's pragmatic approach, Inglis and Hughson review a wide range of scholarly topics. These include culture in classical sociology, The Frankfurt school, mass culture in America, English culturalism, semiotics, postmodernism, the Bourdieu French style, producing culture in the US, and globalization.

Sandstorm, Kent L., Daniel D. Martin, and Gary Alan Fine. Symbols, Selves and Social Reality: A Symbolic Interactionist Approach to Social Psychology and Sociology. Los Angeles, CA. Roxbury Publishing Company. Sandstrom, Martin and Fine focus on the social construction of reality, socialization, self, roles in action, the negation of deviance, collective behavior and social movements. Each chapter contains special topic boxes and is followed by a glossary of key terms, questions for reflection or assignment, as well as a set of recommended readings.

****

Blumer, Herbert, Thomas J. Morrione, editor. George Herbert Mead and Human Conduct. Walnut Creek, CA. Altamira Press. Morrione has assembled a wealth of material written by Herbert Blumer about the ideas of George Herbert Mead. The chapters include "George Herbert Mead and Human Conduct", "Objects," "The Self" and "The Social Act". Also included are shorter notes and correspondence relating Blumer's thoughts on Mead. It is not clear from the editor's introduction whether the chapters were finished and ready to go to press some time before Blumer died in 1987 or if they were assembled by the editor after 1987 from manuscripts, lectures, class notes, and correspondence.

Reynolds, Larry T. and Nancy J. Herman-Kinney, editors. Handbook of Symbolic Interaction. Walnut Creek, CA. Altamira Press. The forty-four articles strive to encompass the past and point to the future of symbolic interactionism. After four chapters devoted to precursors and founders, four are devoted to schools, then there is a chapter on methodology and nine on concepts such as "mind," "interaction", and "role." Ten chapters follow on specific institutions such as economy, family, and religion. The only nod to the complex apparatus that manufactures symbols and vests them with meaning is a chapter on the mass media. Twelve substantive areas such as "deviance", "the life course," and "gender" are covered. Finally current and future trends in symbolic interactionism are seen through the matrix of "social problems," "cultural studies," and "semiotics." A wealth of information is contained between the covers of the handbook, but, frustratingly for a work of scholarship, no author index is provided.

Djao, Wei. Being Chinese: Voices from the Diaspora. Tucson, AZ. The University of Arizona Press. Contradicting Chinese identities are voiced by people living in Cuba, Malaysia, the UK, Indonesia, India, Peru, Singapore, and Zimbabwe.

Young, Kevin, editors. <u>Sporting Bodies, Damaged Selves: Sociological Studies of Sports-Related Injury</u>. St. Louis, MO. Elsevier. Athletes are asked to "give it all up" for victory, fighting through pain and risking permanent injury. The authors examine the social systems that normalize injury and foster such brave and reckless activity.

Indergaard, Michael. <u>Silicon Alley: the Rise and Fall of a New Media District</u>. New York. Routledge. Indergaard investigates the Manhattan scene in which edgy creative types built firms around digital technologies supported by financiers, publicists, and Wall Street interests. These are the financial engineers and hucksters who built the IPO machine that at the turn of the millennium made a few people very rich and many more broke and bewildered.

Cook, Daniel Thomas. <u>The Commodification of Childhood</u>. Durham, NC. Duke University Press. Cook finds that early in the twentieth century, manufacturers, merchants, and advertisers of children's clothing discovered that the child had distinctive needs and interests and began to target the child rather then the mother. The commodifying practices Cook describes were largely complete by 1960 by which time a second wave of commodification of childhood was just beginning with the introduction of TV.

Lembcke, Jerry. <u>CNN's Tailwind Tale: Inside Vietnam's Last Great Myth</u>. New York: Rowman and Littlefield, Publishers. In 1998, CNN aired a special report that detailed how the US Army secretly used nerve gas on a number of its own soldiers who had defected to North Vietnam. In the ensuing furor over the story the producer was fired and it was found that the story was "insufficiently supported by the facts." Lembcke asks how a story full of myth and legend could have been produced by qualified journalists and aired by a respected network. Have we heard the end of this?

Cantwell, David and Bill Friskics-Warren. <u>Heartaches by the Number: Country Music's 500 Greatest Singles</u>. Nashville, TN. Vanderbilt University Press. You may not agree that "Help Me Make It Through the Night" is the greatest country music song ever, but the compilers of the list provide a great deal of information about the song writer, artist, and social context in which each song came to the fore. Who would join me in voting for "He Stopped Loving Her Today"?

Five from Russell Sage

Neckerman, Kathryn, editor. <u>Social Inequality</u>. Inequality in income, earnings, and wealth in the US has risen dramatically in the past three decades. The authors ask whether the increasing inequality may be a temporary episode, but most conclude that the current economic divisions seem to be setting in motion a self-perpetuating cycle of social cleavage.

Dobbin, Frank, editor. <u>The Sociology of Economy</u>. The seventeen authors demonstrate in a wide range of specific empirical contexts the fruits of the new economic sociology that shows the power of social and cultural factors in a domain once thought to be ruled by blind market forces.

Hardin, Russell, editor. <u>Distrust</u>. The authors write primarily from the perspectives of politics, political science, psychology and economics examining the complex workings of trust and distrust in personal relationships, groups and international settings.

Gibson, James L. <u>Overcoming Apartheid: Can Truth Reconcile a Divided Nation</u>? Even in a world in which massive empires can fall without a shot being fired, the bloodless termination of the South African racist Apartheid regime is remarkable. As remarkable has been the efforts of the country's Truth and Reconciliation Commission that has been committed to recalling the painful human right violations by whites and blacks rather than suppressing and thus forging them into new fractional collective memories. The Commission found the confession-absolution process did much to foster common principals of human rights, political tolerance, and the acceptance of the principals of the new social order.

Moss, Phillip and Chris Tilly. <u>Stories Employers Tell: Race, Skill, and Hiring in America</u>. Through the last quarter of the 20th century, African Americans lost ground to whites in the labor market. This is commonly blamed on economic restructuring, globalization, and the like, but their wide ranging survey of employers in four major cities shows that racial discrimination remains an important factor.

New from Sage Publications

Howard, Philip N. and Steve Jones, editors. <u>Society Online: The Internet in Context</u>. Using data from the Pew Internet and American Life Project survey data as well as diverse other sources, the authors focus on how the internet and other new media transform community, political, cultural, and personal spheres in contemporary society. Chapters range from a concern with internet voting to music on line.

Thurlow, Crispin, Laura Lengel and Alice Tomic. <u>Computer Mediated Communication</u>. Text oriented, the authors offer students a task-based introduction to computer-mediated communication and the impact of electronic communication on social interaction. Chapters are designed to help students learn theory, critique current issues, and formulate studies of their own.
Jones Steve, editor. <u>Encyclopedia of New Media: An Essential Reference to Communication and Technology</u>. The electronic media are rife with neologisms, so this clear definition and explication of key terms can be very useful to all those who venture into this exploding field of New Media. For openers what is "new media" and how and when does it become classed as "old media"?

Wasko, Janet. <u>How Hollywood Works</u>. Wasko examines the processes that are involved in turning raw materials and labor into feature films and the sorts of decision processes that shape the process. The book explicates the diverse processes in production, distribution, exhibition, and ancillary markets.

Tuman, Joseph S. <u>Communicating Terror: The Rhetorical Dimensions of Terrorism</u>. Tuman argues that terrorism is best understood as a war of words, symbols, and frames that are

created and redefined by terrorists, authorities, media, and diverse publics. He illustrates his points with numerous contemporary examples.

Potter, W. James. The 11 Myths of Media Violence. Potter explains why media violence has not only been allowed but encouraged to escalate. Violence sells in television, the movies, popular music, and video games. The media industries say they are simply businesses responding to market desires, but when criticized for contributing to a culture of violence, they claim First Amendment protection. The book shows how Congress, journalists, as well as industry lobbyists and researchers contribute to the problem. Potter raises important questions that place the reader at the heart of the debate.

Taylor, Robert Joseph, Linda M. Chatters and Jeff Levin. Religion in the Lives of African Americans. The authors draw on evidence from several wide-ranging social surveys to look at the relationship between religious activity and physical and mental health and well-being in the African American population. They find that religion and religious specialists play widely differing roles in specific subgroups of the African American population.

Binnie, Jon. The Globalization of Sexuality. Binnie presents a view of queer globalization, national and sexual dissidence, the economics of queer globalization, the politics of migration and tourism, queer postcolonialism, AIDS, nationhood and sexual citizenship, and queering transnational urbanism.

On Movies and Music from the University Press of Kentucky

Phillips, Gene D. Godfather: The Intimate Francis Ford Coppola. Based on studio history, film criticism, interviews with Coppola and many who worked with him as well as his production journals, Phillips argues that Coppola is one of the few working in the Hollywood system of movie production to rise to the level of auteur.

Dick, Bernard F. Hal Wallis: Producer to the Stars. Wallice produced dozens of films ranging from "Casablanca" to the many Elvis flicks. Here Dick provides a thorough analysis of his career and work methods.

Birchard, Robert S. Cecil B. DeMille's Hollywood. DeMille created the model of the auteur movie director in the early days Hollywood as shown by this carefully researched biography by Birchard. Perhaps best known for his early colossal

epics, "Ten Commandments" and "Samson and Delila," he strutted like Mussolini and discovered Charlon Heston.

Carson, Mina, Tisa Lewis, and Susan M. Shaw. Girls Rock!: Fifty Years of Women Making Music. Based on interviews with women rockers both famous and not, Girls Rock! celebrates what female musicians have to teach about their experiences as women, artists, and rock musicians."

Wolfe, Charles K. and James E. Akenson, editors. Country Music Goes to War. Country music is not univocal on war and its consequences. Today it's the jingoism of Toby Keith and the criticism of the Dixie Chicks, in Vietnam it was "The Ballad of Lt. Calley" and the disabled vet's lament "Ruby, Don't Take Your Love to Town." The contributors to this volume examine the output of country music songs voicing responses to America's involvement from World War II through the recent Iraq wars.

Open University Press's Four

Scambler, Graham. Sport and Society: History, Power and Culture. In this text Scambler shows the early development of organized competitive sports in the 19th century, he reviews the theoretical perspectives of sociologists and develops a distinctive critical theoretical approach. In the Third section he uses this perspective to examine a number of specific topics such as the current hyper-commodification of football (soccer), the pervasive influence of the media, the reemergence of violence in and around sport, and the dialectical relationship between sports icons and their fans.

Weedon, Chris. Identity and Culture. Weedon looks at how cultural narratives and practices work to constitute identity in postcolonial societies. The focus is on the mobilization of forms of ethnic identity in societies still governed by racism.

Lindahl-Elliot, Nils. Nature: Environmentalism and Modern Culture. Lindahl-Elliot offers an introduction to the study of discourses, institutions, technologies, and media genres that shape modern environmental practices.

Hassan, Robert. Media, Politics, and the Network Society. In the "network society" much of the economy, culture, and society is suffused with digital interconnectivity according to Hassen, who shows how the new information order affects the way that both media and politics are "played" and reshape and reorder our world. Using the theories of media theory and cultural studies he concludes that "the network society is steeped with contradictions and in a state of deep flux." So nu?

SYMBOLIC INTERACTION SPECIAL ISSUE: "POPULAR MUSIC IN EVERYDAY LIFE" CALL FOR MANUSCRIPTS

Symbolic Interaction announces a call for papers for a special issue on recent research on popular music and everyday life.

Symbolic interactionism has become a major home for scholarly studies on the importance of popular music in people's lives. We define popular music broadly to include all musical experiences and styles commonly observable in everyday life (e.g., rock music, the blues, hip hop/rap, Christian pop music, klezmer, film soundtracks, folk, karaoke, and music videos). We welcome all particular theoretical frameworks (e.g., dramaturgy, existential social thought, and postmodernism) and methodologies (e.g., ethnography, performance, and multimedia presentations) relevant to symbolic interactionism. Topics could include (among others): audience experiences of popular music; the relationship of popular music to other social institutions, such as family life; popular music experiences informed by ethnicity, gender, or the life-cycle; the social organization of popular music creation, construction and/or dissemination; popular music and self-identity; and the social meanings of popular music.

The deadline for submissions is January 1, 2005. Please send two hard copies of your article and a Word file on disk (with one or two black and white photos, if relevant) to the special issue editor:

Joseph A. Kotarba
Department of Sociology
University of Houston
Houston, Texas 77204-3012
713-743-3954
jkotarba@uh.edu

NEW EDITOR, JRNL. OF CONTEMPORARY ETHNOGRAPHY

Scott A. Hunt is the new editor of the Journal of Contemporary Ethnography. JCE publishes theoretically, methodologically, and substantively significant studies based upon participant-observation, unobtrusive observation, intensive interviewing, and contextualized analysis of discourse as well as examinations of ethnographic methods. Submissions from all substantive areas and theoretical perspectives are welcomed. Email manuscript submissions (in Word or WordPerfect format) may be sent to sahunt00@uky.edu. Hardcopy submissions and all other correspondence should be sent to Scott A. Hunt, Editor, Journal of Contemporary Ethnography, Department of Sociology, University of Kentucky, Lexington, Kentucky 40506-0027. A processing fee of US$10 must be submitted via a check or money order made payable to the Journal of Contemporary Ethnography.