

division of labor will inevitably threaten interest groups who will mobilize against changes in the existing system of stratification. These countermovements will gain power when a large proportion of women play traditional gender roles and abide by gender definitions, when a significant number of male roles in the division of labor are threatened, and when the women's movement reveals a high degree of internal conflict and has thereby alienated former supporters of change.

Chafetz's theory thus seeks to explain both the reasons for the existence of gender stratification and the forces that must be unleashed for change in this system of stratification to occur. In specifying the conditions that maintain stratification, Chafetz emphasizes what must be changed, and in outlining the unintentional and intentional forces that can change gender definitions and roles, she offers strategic guidelines for how to change gender inequality. By examining any particular empirical case, Chafetz's theory provides insights into why some systems of gender stratification are difficult to change and why others reveal more potential for change. If coercive and voluntary forces sustaining gender inequality are strong while those causing change are comparatively weak, then change is not likely, whereas if the forces maintaining the system are weak and those for change are strong, then change is more likely. The theory thus allows researchers to make predictions about the potential for gender equity or inequity in human societies.

— Jonathan H. Turner

See also Feminism; Gender; Role Theory

FURTHER READINGS AND REFERENCES

- Chafetz, Janet Saltzman. 1984. *Sex and Advantage: A Comparative Macro-Structural Theory of Sexual Stratification*. Totowa, NJ: Rowman & Allanheld.
- . 1988. *Feminist Sociology: An Overview of Contemporary Theories*. Itasca, IL: F. E. Peacock.
- . 1990. *Gender Equity: An Integrated Theory of Stability and Change*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Lenski, Gerhard. 1964. *Power and Privilege*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

CHODOROW, NANCY

Nancy Chodorow (b. 1944) is an internationally acclaimed sociologist, feminist theorist, and practicing psychoanalyst. She was born in New York City, on January 20, 1944, the daughter of Marvin and Leah (Turitz) Chodorow. She graduated from Radcliffe College in 1966 and earned

her PhD in sociology from Brandeis University in 1975. Chodorow is regarded as a founding scholar of second-wave feminist theory based on her groundbreaking book *The Reproduction of Mothering* ([1978] 1999), an account that challenged normative views about gender: how individuals come to see themselves as masculine or feminine. That work won the Jessie Bernard Award from Sociologists for Women in Society (1979) and was named one of the "Ten Most Influential Books of the Past Twenty-Five Years" in the social sciences (*Contemporary Sociology* 1996). It has been translated into seven languages.

While first making her mark in the field of gender studies, Chodorow's enduring contribution to social theory is her focus on the inextricable links between self and society. The scope of her work is wide-ranging, from her "grand" theory about the social and cultural reproduction of gender identity, difference, and inequalities (1978) to her clinically informed account of psychological gender (a sense that one is male or female) and critique of postmodernism-poststructuralism (1999) to her rethinking of what constitutes sexuality in psychoanalytic thought (1994, 2000) to her most recent reconsideration of the psychology of biological and bodily experiences, such as fertility and aging (2003).

Chodorow was trained in the fields of anthropology and sociology and later trained as a clinical psychoanalyst at the San Francisco Psychoanalytic Institute. Her melding of these disciplines is unique and controversial within the social sciences. She argues that individual feelings, fantasies, and unconscious conflicts are bound up in, but not reducible to, cultural mandates about gender and sexuality and that efforts to explain gendered patterns in psychological life need not be at odds with "clinical individuality and personal uniqueness" ([1978] 1999:xv). Chodorow's keen sense that generalizations and theory building as well as clinical treatment depend upon close observation of individuals who have distinctive, rich inner worlds and who live in a particular place at a particular historical point in time aligns well with developments in the sociology of emotions, psychological anthropology, cultural psychology, and feminist relational psychology, all fields upon which she has had major influence.

Chodorow has had an impact on the field of sociology with her trenchant critique of theories of gender socialization, arguing that boys and girls do not learn to take on masculine or feminine traits by imitating others or because they are forced to do so, but because these gender traits become deeply and personally meaningful to them. Chodorow uses an object relations psychoanalytic perspective to frame her theory of gender. She argues that intrapsychic relational family dynamics (specifically early maternal-child relationships of attachment and separation) result in distinct gendered identities and personalities. According to this view, both girls and boys begin life experiencing a feeling of oneness or identification with their maternal caregiver. Over

the course of their development, however, boys and girls experience themselves differently in relation to their mothers. Equally important, women experience their mothering of boy children differently from their mothering of girl children. This acknowledgment of maternal subjectivity is a key element of Chodorow's theorizing, especially in light of the prevailing idealizations of motherhood that denied other parts of women's lives and identities in favor of children's (insatiable) needs. This axiomatic feature of Chodorow's work—that women bring distinctive desires, meanings, and motives to their experiences of mothering and sense of themselves in relation to their children—set the stage for a feminist rethinking of mother and child development that she and others have developed further (Chodorow and Contratto 1982).

Chodorow identifies certain patterns in the relational dynamic between mother and child as central to understanding gender identity development. Whereas girls establish their sense of self in connection with their female caregivers, boys establish their sense of self through separation. Girls' sense of self and identity is continuous with this early feminine identification, while boys must secure their masculine identity by rejecting or repressing what is feminine in themselves as well as by denigrating it in women. A problematic psychological feature of masculinity is its fragility, the need to constantly protect the boundaries between what is and is not female (and not mother). This point proved especially useful to feminist theorists who sought to account for the persistence of men's derogation and domination of women. These insights into the defenses and conflicts involved in masculine identification set the stage for what would later become a burgeoning field of "masculinity studies." Meanwhile, Chodorow notes that feminine identity is more continuous and complete, but it too is fraught with boundary confusion. Rather than defining the self in opposition, women generally tend to arrive at a sense of themselves in relation to others. This emblematic feature of femininity can be self-sabotaging, including not claiming enough autonomy or agency. Chodorow's effort to "revalue, without idealizing, both female psychology and the mother-daughter relationship that helps to found it" ([1978] 1999:x) became the springboard for a decade of research on girls' and women's development.

Another facet of Chodorow's work has featured the role of relational family dynamics and early gender identifications in shaping adult sexual lives. Joining other psychoanalysts, Chodorow (1994, 2000, 2003) extends upon Freud's legacy, particularly his *Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality* (1905) to argue that sexuality is far more complicated and comprises more than one's choice of sexual object. She argues that like gender identity, sexual identity is highly individual, conflict ridden, and constructed as a "compromise formation" between what is culturally and

psychologically posed in binary terms ("heterosexuality vs. homosexuality"; "masculinity vs. femininity"; "activity vs. passivity"). She identifies universal elements of sexuality that are taken up and combined by individuals in unique, idiosyncratic, and nonsingular ways, including eroticization or one's experiential sense of one's own body, such as pleasure and arousal; one's internal world and mental representations about self in relation to other; one's sense of feminine and masculine identity; one's sense of adequacy or conflict about one's sexual desire; and one's personal sexual fantasies (often filtered but not determined by culture).

The clinical dimension of Chodorow's work, her interest in the subjectivity of both client and clinician and the formative role of transference and countertransference is paramount. But this does not override her persistent search for patterns and explanations about the powerful links between psyche and culture.

— Wendy Luttrell

See also Gender; Psychoanalysis and Social Theory; Sexuality and the Subject

FURTHER READINGS AND REFERENCES

- Chodorow, Nancy. 1989. *Feminism and Psychoanalytic Theory*. Cambridge, UK: Polity; New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- . 1994. *Femininities, Masculinities, Sexualities: Freud and Beyond*. Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky, London: Free Association Books.
- . [1978] 1999. *The Reproduction of Mothering: Psychoanalysis and the Sociology of Gender*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- . 1999. *The Power of Feelings: Personal Meaning in Psychoanalysis, Gender, and Culture*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- . 2000. Foreword. In *Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality, Sigmund Freud*. New York: Basic Books.
- . 2003. "'Too Late': Ambivalence about Motherhood, Choice and Time." *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association* 51(4):1181–98.
- Chodorow, Nancy and Susan Contratto. 1982. "The Fantasy of the Perfect Mother." Pp. 54–75 in *Rethinking the Family: Some Feminist Questions*, edited by Barrie Thorne and Marilyn Yalom. New York: Longman.

CITIZENSHIP

Modern political thought has bequeathed two conceptions of citizenship, one leading to a conception of citizenship as participation in civil society and the other a view of citizenship as a legal status based on rights and generally

the person who, in the early stages of modern social theory, reflected so single-mindedly on these issues remains worthy of critical attention.

— Andrew Wernick

See also Althusser, Louis; Durkheim, Émile; Maistre, Joseph de; Saint-Simon, Claude-Henri de; Statics and Dynamics

FURTHER READINGS AND REFERENCES

- Comte, A. 1970. *Oeuvres d'August Comte*, 12 vols. Edited by Sylvain Pétrignon. Paris: Éditions Anthropos.
- Gane, M. 2002. *French Social Theory from Comte to Baudrillard*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Gouhier, H. 1965. *La vie d'Auguste Comte*. Paris: Vrin.
- Macherey, P. 1989. *Comte: La philosophie et la science*. Presses Universitaires de France.
- Milbank, J. 1993. *Theology and Social Theory: Beyond Secular Reason*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Pickering, M. 1993. *Auguste Comte, an Intellectual Biography*, vol. I. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Scharff, R. 1995. *Comte after Positivism*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Wernick, A. 2000. *Auguste Comte and the Religion of Humanity: The Post-Theistic Programme of French Social Theory*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

CONFLICT THEORY

Conflict theorizing originated in Europe in the works of Karl Marx, Max Weber, and Georg Simmel. In its more modern guise, conflict theory is an American invention, despite the fact that its reemergence in the mid-twentieth century was inspired by European and European-origin critics of structural functionalism. Early criticisms of functionalism came from David Lockwood and Ralf Dahrendorf, who argued that functional theory, especially the version practiced by Talcott Parsons, presented an overly integrated view of social organization that could not account for conflict and change. This critique was buttressed by immigrant critical theorists and, curiously, by Lewis Coser, another European immigrant, who argued that both conflict and functional theories were too extreme, requiring an assessment of the functions of conflict. These criticisms became ritualistic attacks on functionalism as American academia emerged from the repression of Marxist (communist-sounding) thought during the McCarthy era in the 1950s and as the student unrest of the 1960s accelerated during the course of the Vietnam War. Functionalism was seen as ideologically conservative and as providing justification for the status quo. All of these

criticisms were overdrawn, and most did not lead to new theorizing but, instead, caused the collapse of functional theorizing, especially the action theory of Talcott Parsons.

Yet the critique of functionalism did legitimate a revival of the European conflict tradition in the United States; and by the mid-1970s, Marx's and Weber's approaches were being recast into modern conflict theory, with occasional use of Simmel's ideas. Three lines of conflict theorizing emerged in America, two devoted to reviving Marx and Weber (again, with Simmelian elements) and a third combining elements of both Marx and Weber. These can be labeled, for convenience, *neo-Marxist*, *neo-Weberian*, and *historical-comparative* conflict theory. Alongside these general theories were more specific theories associated with social movements and identity politics (e.g., ethnicity and gender). Critical theorizing, however, did not enjoy the same revival in America, remaining predominately a European enterprise or being incorporated into the revival of Marxian conflict theory.

NEO-MARXIAN CONFLICT THEORIZING

Within the United States, the Marxian tradition was revived in a number of ways. All variants of this approach emphasized that patterns of inequality generate inherent conflicts of interest that lead subordinates to become aware of their interest in changing the system of stratification through mobilization for conflict.

Positivistic Marxism

The most influential approach was by Ralf Dahrendorf (1959), a European who emphasized Marx's dialectic and blended this imagery with useful elements from both Weber and Simmel. In essence, Dahrendorf tried to abstract above Marx's empirical categories (e.g., proletarians, bourgeoisie) so that they could apply to any pattern of social organization revealing a system of authority, which he labeled an *imperative coordinated association*, or an ICA. The task then became one of specifying the conditions under which subordinates in an ICA became aware of their interests in changing the distribution of authority and, then, in mobilizing to pursue conflict of varying degrees of intensity (emotional involvement) and violence. Dahrendorf's approach was decidedly positivistic in that he generated propositions specifying the conditions under which awareness of interests, intensity, and violence would vary. In addressing the questions of intensity and violence, Dahrendorf borrowed from Simmel's and Weber's respective critiques of Marx, arguing (against Marx) that the more subordinates are aware of their interests and organized to pursue conflict, the less intense and violent is the conflict with superordinates in an ICA; conversely, the less clearly articulated are the interests of subordinates and the less coherent their organization to

pursue conflict, the more violent is conflict when it erupts, especially if (1) rates of upward mobility for subordinates are low, (2) authority is highly correlated with the distribution of other valued resources, and (3) deprivations among subordinates escalate suddenly. A similar effort to rescue Weber's and Simmel's critique of Marx was performed by the American theorist Jonathan Turner (1975). None of these more positivistic theories was accepted by die-hard Marxists because they underemphasize the evaluative and emancipatory thrust of Marx's ideas.

Analytical Marxism

Eric Olin Wright (1997) is perhaps the most significant American theorist to sustain Marx's evaluation of stratification systems, while trying to take account of the problems that Marx's analysis presents. Wright has, over the last four decades, developed a kind of analytical Marxism that, unlike critical Marxism, does not distrust science. Instead, Wright's Marxism tries to take account of three vexing problems of postindustrial societies: (1) the increasing number of middle social classes (an empirical fact that goes against Marx's prediction of polarization of populations in capitalist societies into only the bourgeoisie and proletariat), (2) the diffusion of ownership with joint stock companies (and the corresponding separation of management from ownership), and (3) the increasing number of individuals employed by government (a nonprofit enterprise). At the same time, Wright wants to retain Marx's idea of exploitation whereby superordinates gain wealth from the surplus value of labor.

The basic analytical scheme emphasizes that the existing class system limits both class formation and class struggle, while class struggle will transform class structure and class formation. For Wright, neo-Marxian theory needs to specify the mechanisms generating class formation and class struggle, within the limitations imposed by the existing class structure. Class formation and struggle are influenced by the *material interests* of actors, or their total package of income from both economic activity and welfare; the *lived experiences* of individuals as dictated by their class location, as determined by their jobs in the highly differentiated economies of capitalist systems; and the *collective capacities* of individuals that become problematic because of occupational differentiation and proliferation of middle classes. Thus, the key forces of class analysis do not line up as neatly as they do in Marxian theory, especially when middle-class families can have contradictory class locations (and hence varying material interests and lived experiences that work against mobilization for conflict) and when government employs a high proportion of the workforce. Wright has posited a number of concepts to take account of these new complexities, but he has not fully been able to sustain the emphasis on exploitation, whether by business

or government. Indeed, because individuals have diverse class locations and lived experiences, they are less likely to use their collective capacities to engage in class struggle.

As the problems of reconciling Marxian categories to modern realities have become evident, an alternative form of Marxian analysis emerged in the 1970s in American sociology. This approach, in essence, shifted the unit of analysis from the nation-state to systems of relations among nations. Immanuel Wallerstein's (1974) work was the most influential, although not the first to adopt this form of Marxian analysis. Wallerstein divided history into the formation of world empires through military activities and world economy composed of core states of approximately equal military power; a periphery of weak states whose cheap labor and natural resources could be extracted through exploitive trade arrangements; and a few semiperipheral states standing between the core and periphery (whether as minor nations in the core area or as leading nations in poor regions). In many ways, the distinction between the core and periphery is similar to Marx's view of the bourgeoisie and proletariat, and the underlying evaluative argument is much the same: As capitalism goes global, the contradictions of capitalism will be exposed as competition between core states increases and as subordinate states resist exploitation, leading to the final collapse of capitalism and the emergence of a socialist alternative. Whatever the merits of the endgame, world-systems analysis has proven to be fertile new territory for Marxian theory. Much of the analysis is highly technical, revolving around cyclical tendencies of world economies (e.g., Kondratieff waves, Juglar cycles, and hegemonic sequences), while other approaches have emphasized the nature of exploitation of poor nations by their dependency on rich countries for technology and capital. Still other approaches have viewed the world system as a kind of dynamic machine whose operation constrains the internal dynamics of societies.

In sum, then, Marx's view of the social universe as rife with conflicts of interests between those who gain wealth at the expense of others persists in theoretical sociology at the beginning of the twenty-first century. The emancipatory thrust of Marx's theory is also retained in most neo-Marxian schemes, particularly as the more positivistic variants have fallen into obscurity or been incorporated into mainstream theorizing, thereby losing their distinctiveness.

NEO-WEBERIAN CONFLICT THEORIZING

Max Weber's implicit critique of Marx appears not only within the more positivistic neo-Marxian camp but also in theoretical approaches more directly in tune with Weber's sociology. Part of Weber's conflict theory reappears in historical-comparative analysis, to be examined below, but in the 1970s, Randall Collins (1975) developed a general

theory of social processes that had Weber's ideas on conflict at its core. Although Collins blended his approach with ideas from microsocial theories and from Émile Durkheim, the basic view of social organization is Weberian. Social reality unfolds at the microlevel through interaction rituals that when chained together, produce stratification systems and class cultures as well as organizational systems, which, in turn, generate more macrostructures that can range from the state and economy to the dynamics of geopolitical systems.

At any level of social reality, there is always inequality in the distribution of material, symbolic, and political resources, with the potential for conflict always present between individuals engaged in face-to-face interaction, within organizations, between classes and class cultures, and between societies. Although Collins used the label of *conflict sociology* for his approach, it is a much more general theory of how macrostructures are built from microlevel encounters. At the microlevel, Collins portrays individuals as seeking to enhance their cultural capital and emotional energy by using their resources to advantage and, if they do not possess resources, to limit their expenditure of cultural capital and emotion in rituals where they are at a resource disadvantage. At the mesolevel of social organization, Collins portrays organizations as control systems, with those having coercive, symbolic, and material resources using their advantage to gain conformity from those who resist these efforts. Early analysis of stratification systems emphasized variations in class cultures, but in more recent work, Collins has challenged the layered view of class hierarchy so prevalent in Marxian sociology. For if one looks at what actually occurs in public spaces, the deference and demeanor patterns typical of clear hierarchies have broken down in modern societies, with those in less advantaged resource positions controlling public and interpersonal space vis-à-vis those who occupy resource-advantaged positions. At the macrolevel, Collins has examined conflict within a society in terms of the ability of state to regulate internal activities, with this capacity resting, in turn, on the level of production in the economy and the level of control by the state of coercive, symbolic, and material resources.

Turning to geopolitics, Collins (1986) has borrowed from Weber's analysis and developed a theory that seeks to explain how empires expand, and when they are likely to collapse. Initial advantages in economic resources, military technology, and geography (marchland advantage) allow a state to expand through military conquest, but as the marchland advantage is lost (with ever-more enemies on its expanding borders) as resources are spent to control territory, as logistical loads of moving resources about the territory increase, as hostile neighbors copy the military technologies of an expanding empire, and as other powerful empires are threatened, the advantages that allowed an

empire to expand are also lost, thereby creating conditions that will lead to its collapse.

COMPARATIVE-HISTORICAL CONFLICT THEORY

Theories of conflict within the comparative-historical tradition emphasize two related sets of factors. One set of factors is the conditions that lead subordinate masses to mobilize ideologically, politically, and organizationally to pursue conflict against the state and elites who dominate them. The second set of factors is the forces that lead to the breakdown in the state's power and hence its capacity to control a population. The first factor has a Marxian emphasis, with Weberian refinement, whereas the second is more in line with Weber's concerns about the capacity of the state to dominate a population. Several prominent theorists have worked on specific questions and sets of historical data, but all have been concerned with the likelihood that a revolution will occur. Since revolutions have been rather rare historically, theorists have tended to work with the same societies in which violent overthrow of the state has occurred. And though each theory tends to be somewhat embedded within the specific historical time frames, all of these theories contain implicit theoretical statements that have general applicability to all societies.

MORE MARXIAN THAN WEBERIAN APPROACHES

Moore's Theory of Dictatorship and Democracy. One of the earliest contemporary theories in America is Barrington Moore's (1966) comparative study of the conditions producing dictatorships or democracies, with the implicit assumption that dictatorships would be more likely to generate conflict-producing tensions. If we abstract above the specific historical details, Moore can be seen as borrowing from Marx in emphasizing that the masses will become mobilized to pursue conflict when they constitute a coherent whole in terms of their structural location, experiences, and routines; when they experience deprivations collectively; when they can avoid competition with each other over resources; when traditional connections between subordinates and superordinates are weakening; and when subordinates perceive that superordinates are exploiting them.

Paige's Theory of Agrarian Revolution. Jeffrey Paige's (1975) work on revolts in agrarian societies was one of the first to adapt Marx's ideas to mass mobilizations of peasants in agrarian societies. Arguing that Marx's ideas are more relevant to agrarian than industrial societies, he sought to develop a series of generalizations about conflict between cultivators (agricultural workers) and noncultivators (owners/managers/elites). For Paige, economic exploitation alone will not lead to mass mobilization; rather, revolutionary conflict will occur when economic

conflict moves into the political arena. Like Marx, Paige posits a number of conditions that translate the inherent conflict of interest between cultivators and noncultivators into mass mobilization by cultivators: one is cultivators' receptiveness to radical ideologies, which increases when ties to the land are tenuous and unstable, and decreases when cultivators live on the edge, have few work alternatives, and reside in traditional/paternalistic communities. Another is collective solidarity, which increases when workers have high interdependence and when workers have had past success in collective action. Whether or not mobilization by cultivators will lead to collective action by the mass of workers depends upon the actions of noncultivators. If noncultivators do not themselves possess great economic advantages and, as a consequence, enlist actors in the state to engage in repressive control, then mass mobilization of workers is more likely. Conversely, if noncultivators have resources, can shift to capital-intensive processing of crops (i.e., mechanization), and can afford to hire free labor on open markets, they can engage in less repressive control and force cultivators to engage in collective negotiation.

MORE WEBERIAN THAN MARXIAN THEORIES

Tilly's Resource Mobilization Theory. Resource mobilization theory has been developed outside comparative historical sociology, but one of its creators, Charles Tilly (1978), has used this approach to analyze historical cases. Tilly distinguishes between a revolutionary situation punctuated by demonstrations, riots, social movements, civil wars, and the like against the state, and revolutionary outcomes where there is a real transfer of state power. The first part of his theory emphasizes the conditions that produce a revolutionary situation: multiple contenders to state power, large or elite segments of the population willing to support contenders to power, and inability and unwillingness of the state to use repressive control. A revolutionary outcome decreases when the state can mobilize coercive resources (with a standing army not preoccupied with geopolitical conflict), when it can make strategic but not too costly concessions to potential contenders so as to increase symbolic legitimacy for the state, and when the state is strong fiscally so that it can afford to support its coercive forces while spending resources to make key concessions.

Skocpol's Theory of States and Social Revolutions. Building upon both Moore's and Tilly's theories, with Weber's emphasis on the state's geopolitical situation, Theda Skocpol (1979) has developed an implicit theory of revolutionary conflict. For revolution to occur, the masses must be capable of mobilizing, and the likelihood of such mobilization increases with their ability to generate solidarity, to avoid direct supervision by superordinates, to perform

crucial economic activities for superordinates, and to have organizational resources. This mobilization, Skocpol argues, will lead to full-scale and successful social revolution when the central coercive apparatus of the state is weak, when the state experiences a fiscal crisis, when the state's power relative to dominant sectors of the society is declining, and when the state loses a war and its place in the geopolitical system, thereby undermining further its symbolic and coercive bases of power.

Goldstone's Theory of State Breakdown. Jack Goldstone (1991) adds a new variable to these historical-comparative theories of revolutions in agrarian societies: population growth. There is a lag time between initial population growth and the effects of this growth on political stability. Eventually, the economy cannot meet the needs of the growing population, nor can it provide the state sufficient resources for administration, coercive control, and patronage to elites and non-elites. Non-elites become mobilized to pursue conflict when demand for goods exceeds the capacity of the economy to produce them, when rapid inflation ensues as demand outstrips supply, and when rural misery leads to the immigration of the young to urban areas, where they become concentrated and more likely to mobilize. State breakdown is also related to elite mobilization against the state; and this source of mobilization increases as population growth causes price inflation that forces traditional landholding elites to seek patronage from the state in order to prevent their downward mobility. At the same time, upwardly mobile non-elites benefiting from price inflation in commerce seek patronage from the state as confirmation of their new status as potential elites. State breakdown becomes ever more likely as fiscal crises increase as a result of poor taxation formulas, patronage paid to elites, and military adventurism. And these forces together—mass mobilization, elite mobilization, and fiscal crisis—all act in concert to cause a state breakdown.

DOES CONFLICT THEORY STILL EXIST?

In many ways, conflict theory is an American invention that reflected a particular time: the growing dissatisfaction with functional theory, the repression of all Marxian (communist) ideas in the 1950s, the inability of existing theories (e.g., symbolic interactionism) to provide a viable alternative to functional theory, and the growing unrest embodied in first the student movement and then the anti-Vietnam War movement. In Europe, sociologists and public intellectuals had engaged in conflict-oriented analysis for many decades; and so, there was little need to proclaim a conflict theory that would compensate for past theoretical sins. By the time functionalism had receded in prominence in the 1970s, conflict theory was already waning, although its merger into the theoretical mainstream was not so evident

until the final decade of the twentieth century. Today, the topics emphasized by the conflict theories of the 1960s and 1970s are so thoroughly incorporated into the theoretical canon that they need not be highlighted by the term *conflict theory*. Few sociologists would dispute the centrality to sociological theory of inequality in the distribution of resources (material, political, symbolic) and the tensions that such inequality systematically generates in human groupings. Indeed, a good portion of general theory in many different traditions takes this core idea as its starting point. Conflict theory, therefore, is now so mainstream that it no longer needs to be labeled as distinctive.

What, then, can we take from the several decades of relative dominance of a conflict approach to understanding the social order? First, conflict theory did balance the tendency of functional theory to overemphasize integration, although the criticism was always overdrawn and often worked to push out of the canon some of the important ideas of functional theorizing that, perhaps, will have to be rediscovered in the future. Second, conflict theory encouraged the analysis of conflict dynamics in many substantive specialties of sociology, such as family, gender, education, organizations, law, culture, and communities, and it reinvigorated other areas, such as collective behavior, social movements, ethnic relations, historical sociology, stratification, and political sociology. Third, it was one of the moving forces behind new areas of sociological inquiry, such as world-systems analysis and the study of globalization. And perhaps most significantly, it left behind a series of theoretical principles that can be used in almost any context where inequalities are evident.

What are these principles? They can be found in the explicit statements of the positivistic forms of conflict theory, or they can be extracted from more discursive approaches that do not enumerate explicit propositions. These propositions highlighted the conditions under which subordinates in a system of inequality become mobilized to pursue conflict as well as the conditions that increase or decrease the intensity and violence of the conflict. Conflict theory did less well in articulating the conditions that generate inequality *per se*, although some conflict-oriented theorists did make an effort to specify these conditions beyond what Marx had sought to do in his analysis of capitalism (Turner 1984).

One strength of conflict theory, then, resides in specifying the conditions under which subordinates become mobilized to pursue conflict. Subordinates are more likely to mobilize when inequality is high, when upward mobility is low, when subordinates are in ecological propinquity and can communicate their grievances to each other, when relative deprivation (and the emotions that this generates) is experienced collectively, when superordinates are not in a position or do not have the resources to monitor and control the routines of subordinates, when subordinates possess

organizational, political, material, and symbolic (ideological) resources, when leadership among subordinates can emerge, and when superordinates are unable to repress or co-opt subordinates and cannot institutionalize conflict through law. Obviously, there are more factors involved, but these are the ones that emerged from conflict sociology in America during the middle decades of the twentieth century.

A second area of strength in conflict theory is its ability to specify the conditions under which the emotional involvement and the potential violence to conflict will increase. Emotions are aroused when deprivations escalate suddenly and can be experienced collectively, whereas violence increases when subordinates have begun to mobilize (ideologically, organizationally, and politically) but not to the degree that their goals and means to achieve these goals are clearly articulated.

A third area of strength in conflict theory is specification of the conditions that increase the likelihood of successful collective mobilization. Here, the capacities of superordinates to mobilize become critical. If superordinates are well organized and ideologically unified while possessing material and coercive resources, the likelihood of success in changing the distribution of power and other resources is reduced. If superordinates are highly dependent upon the outputs of subordinates for their well-being and cannot get these outputs from alternative sources, then superordinates will be more likely to negotiate with subordinates, thereby allowing the latter to realize some of their goals. These negotiations will be more successful if subordinates are sufficiently organized to have clear goals that can be subject to negotiation. And if a system of law exists to mediate and enforce agreements, then subordinates are likely to be at least partially successful in realizing their goals.

Again, various theories add refinements to these generalizations, but one point should be emphasized in closing: Conflict theories reveal a bias toward how successful or unsuccessful subordinates will be in mobilizing. When the theories are formally stated, this bias becomes immediately evident because the theories address the conditions under which subordinates will mobilize and be successful in forcing superordinates to redistribute valued resources. One could phrase the matter differently: Under what conditions can superordinates hang on to their privilege and prevent mobilization by superordinates? But this question would go against the ideological bias of the approach as it was initially inspired by Marx. Indeed, conflict theory implicitly adopts Marx's emancipatory goals, even in its more positivistic variants, because it emphasizes what it takes for subordinates to mobilize and be successful. Nonetheless, despite the obvious bias, conflict theorizing dramatically shifted the focus of theoretical sociology toward problems of inequality and conflict.

See also Globalization; Historical and Comparative Theory; Historical Materialism; Power; Revolution; Social Class; Social Movement Theory; State; Structural Functionalism; World-Systems Theory

FURTHER READINGS AND REFERENCES

- Collins, Randall. 1975. *Conflict Sociology: Toward an Explanatory Science*. New York: Academic Press.
- . 1986. *Weberian Social Theory*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Dahrendorf, Ralf. 1959. *Class and Class Conflict in Industrial Society*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Goldstone, Jack. 1991. *Revolution and Rebellion in the Early Modern World*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Moore, Barrington. 1966. *Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy: Lord and Peasant in the Making of the Modern World*. Boston, MA: Beacon.
- Paige, Jeffrey. 1975. *Agrarian Revolution: Social Movements and Export Agriculture in the Underdeveloped World*. New York: Free Press.
- Skocpol, Theda. 1979. *States and Social Revolutions: A Comparative Analysis of France, Russia and China*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Tilly, Charles. 1978. *From Mobilization to Revolution*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Turner, Jonathan H. 1975. "A Strategy for Reformulating the Dialectical and Functional Theories of Conflict." *Social Forces* 53:433-44.
- . 1984. *Societal Stratification: A Theoretical Analysis*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel. 1974. *The Modern World System*, 3 vols. New York: Academic Press.
- Wright, Eric Olin. 1997. *Class Counts*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

CONSUMER CULTURE

CONSUMER CULTURE IN CLASSICAL SOCIAL THEORY

Social theory has long debated the claim that consumption plays a uniquely central role in modern Western societies. The terms *consumer culture* and *consumer society* imply that modern social order can be defined by the place of consumption in both social action and social structure. At the same time, this characterization carries a potent moral and political charge: The labelling of modernity as a consumer culture is generally part of an overall critique, or apologia, for the current state of the social.

Consumption is, of course, essential to any social order: To reproduce themselves as identifiable ways of life and

social structures, societies require material and symbolic resources that are used to sustain bodies, interactions, institutions, and organizations (Slater 1997). Hence, both historians and anthropologists have well-developed literatures on the material cultures and consumption structures of non-modern societies. To talk of a "consumer culture," however, is generally to make a much stronger set of claims: that initially in the modern West (but now increasingly as a global phenomenon), consumption was separated out from other social processes to become an identifiably separate sphere with recognizable identities, institutions, and values. This is often closely identified with the development of market capitalism. For example, in Marx's somewhat romanticized view, precapitalist society involved production of use-values directly for consumption by the immediate producers or by known others within small communities. The development of markets and the commodity form drives a wedge between production and consumption, as well as introducing a veil of mystification, so that workers produce commodities in exchange for wages that they will spend on consumption goods that they did not produce. Similarly, feminist scholars have focused on the related division between public and private spheres in modern life, which divides public social action (including paid work outside the home) from a private, primarily domestic, sphere of consumption.

In both cases, a sphere of consumption is formed that is closely identified with the reproduction of meaningful everyday lives and identities within modern society (as opposed to the alienated spheres of work and political action); and the figure of "the consumer" appears as an identifiable social role for the first time in history. In positive versions, generally elaborated within liberal and utilitarian thought, the consumer represents an archetypal modern social subject, one who is "free to choose" on the basis of knowing his or her own wants and desires. However irrational these may be, the consumer is able rationally to calculate their intensity (particularly in relation to market prices) and to act accordingly. The consumer therefore contains the substantive underpinnings of the formally rational social subject of modern society. Thus, conventional economics, like liberal political thought, treats the private desires of individuals as sacrosanct and beyond judgement by social analysts or political actors. Similarly, the measure of a good modern social system is its ability to respond transparently and without moral judgement or political direction to the expressed preferences of the sovereign consumer through mechanisms such as markets or elections.

This has been a minority view within modern social thought, however. For the most part, both the consumer and consumer culture have been held to represent a range of debasements and degradations that characterize the modern. First, the consumer is able to act entirely on the basis of their preferences to the extent that they have the money

acknowledging that not all professors with PhD degrees are intellectuals); *scientific* (creative intellectuals); *Washington* (both governmental officials and transitional intellectuals); and *mass-culture industries intellectuals* (those involved with production efforts). Coser (1965) states that having intellect is not the same as having intelligence. Intellectuals live for, rather than off, ideas and are found in all aspects of society. *Intellects* help contribute to the change of a society through ideas. Coser fears that American society has become too bureaucratic and that it needs to find a way to inspire others intellectually, in order to end social problems such as inequality.

Lewis Coser has made a number of lasting contributions to sociological thought. His work as a conflict theorist who attempts to incorporate some of the basic constructs of functionalism is a significant donation to the academic world. Many of his ideas remain relevant at the beginning of the twenty-first century. In all societies, conflict is inevitable. Conflict serves to bind members of a group together and is a determinant of boundaries and power. Societies are not born, and they do not die like organisms: They change. Individual members within a society are free to change with the changing system, or they can choose to lag behind.

— Tim Delaney

See also Conflict Theory; Power

FURTHER READINGS AND REFERENCES

- Coser, Lewis. 1956. *The Functions of Social Conflict*. New York: Free Press.
- . 1965. *Men of Ideas: A Sociologist's View*. New York: Free Press.
- . 1967. *Continuities in the Study of Social Conflict*. New York: Free Press.
- . 1974. *Greedy Institutions: Patterns of Undivided Commitment*. New York: Free Press.
- . 1977. *Masters of Sociological Thought*. 2d ed. New York: Harcourt, Brace, & Jovanovich.
- . 1993. "A Sociologist's Atypical Life." *Annual Review for Sociology* 19:1–15.
- Wallace, Ruth and Alison Wolf. *Contemporary Sociological Theory*. 5th ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

COSMOPOLITAN SOCIOLOGY

WHY IS THERE A NEED FOR A COSMOPOLITAN SOCIAL AND POLITICAL THEORY?

At the beginning of the twenty-first century, we have to redefine and reinvent the social sciences and humanities for

the global world. This is a double challenge: first, to discover and criticize how sociology, political science, history, and so forth are still prisoners of the nation-state and gave birth to a historically mistaken national imagination. Second, how to transnationally redefine the basic theoretical concepts and units of empirical research, such as politics, society, identity, state, history, class, law, democracy, community, solidarity, justice, mobility, military, and household, in a cosmopolitan perspective. This calls for a paradigm shift. This is also a "Cosmopolitan Manifesto for the Social Sciences," not only to renew their scientific standing and public claims but also to bring the social sciences back on the public agenda.

The classics of sociology are so thoroughly pervaded with a spatially fixed understanding of culture that it is rarely remarked upon. It is a conception that goes back to sociology's birth amidst the nineteenth-century formation of nation-states. The territorial conception of culture and society, the idea of culture as "rooted" and "limited," constituted through the opposition of the "We" and "Them," was itself a reaction to the enormous changes that were going on as that century turned into the twentieth century. It was a conscious attempt to provide a solution to the uprooting of local cultures that the formation of nation-states necessarily involved. Sociology understood the new symbols and common values, above all, as means of integration into a new unity. The triumph of this national imagination can be seen in the way the nation-state has ceased to appear as a project and a construct and has become instead widely regarded as something natural. The opposition between national and international has become the internalized compass of the social sciences. A cosmopolitan sociology poses a challenge to this idea that binding history and borders tightly together is the only possible means of social and symbolic integration. This also means that sociological perspectives are geared to, and organized in terms of, the nation-state. All the traditional fields of the social sciences (such as the sociology of inequality, of the family, of politics, of mobility and migration, and so on) are still being researched in the nation-state tradition. The concept of "cosmopolitanization," by contrast, is an explicit attempt to overcome this "methodological nationalism" and produce concepts capable of reflecting a newly transnational world. It consciously develops a new methodology: "methodological cosmopolitanism."

WHAT DOES "COSMOPOLITAN" MEAN IN THIS PERSPECTIVE?

From a national perspective, "cosmopolitan" or "cosmopolitanism" is viewed pejoratively, as an enemy image. "Cosmopolitan" refers to the "global player," the "imperial capitalist," or "middle-class intellectual without local roots" and as such is a loaded concept. It should not be

confused with a global sociology trying to homogenize the world. It is a concept with a long tradition, but not in the social sciences. It goes back to ancient Greek thought, trying to express the transcendence of local limitations in thought and practice. Alexander the Great elevated cosmopolitanism to a political principle. Superseded by Christian Universalism, it became one of the basic concepts of the Enlightenment. With the formation of the nation-state, the concept disappeared from public discourse and was used mainly as a pejorative term. This is beginning to change.

Cosmopolitan Moments

As people try to strengthen the philosophical and historical foundations of the theory of cosmopolitanism, more and more thinkers have been drawing on what they regard as a previous golden moment of cosmopolitan thought, namely, the Enlightenment (Bohman and Lutz-Bachmann 1997). However, the Enlightenment's relationship to cosmopolitanism is not the direction taken by cosmopolitan sociology.

Hellenism might be a good starting point for current cosmopolitan sensibilities (Baldry 1965). Besides claiming it as the first golden age of cosmopolitanism, many of the principles that underlie our current theories and practices of cosmopolitanism derive as much from this period as from the cosmopolitan golden age of the Enlightenment. Historically, there are many things we can learn from this period that are often obscured when we study Enlightenment cosmopolitanism alone. The first thing that is obvious when we look at the Hellenistic period is that the rise and spread of cosmopolitan ideas always had a social and political underpinning. This is often less obvious when we concentrate on the abstract philosophy of the Enlightenment. In the Hellenistic period (as opposed to the Enlightenment), cosmopolitan ideas spread among people at all levels of society. And part of the reason they did so is because philosophy became religion, specifically the syncretistic religions that are still considered one of the prime characteristics of specifically Hellenistic culture. It presents, therefore, the clearest historical example of what actually happens when universalistic philosophy and particularistic local cultures exist side by side for centuries: They mix and produce new forms of both. They produce new forms of rooted cosmopolitanism, and they produce new forms of localism that are open to the world. By "rooted cosmopolitanism," we mean universal values that are emotionally engaging, that descend from the level of pure abstract philosophy and into the emotions of people's everyday lives. By becoming symbols of people's personal identities, cosmopolitan philosophy becomes a political and social force. And by embodying philosophy in rituals, such identities are created, reinforced, and integrated into communities. This is what happened in the transition from Greek philosophy to syncretistic religions.

The most important syncretistic religion to grow out of the Hellenistic period was Christianity, a clear combination of universalistic, Hellenistic Greek philosophy (especially Stoicism and neo-Platonism) and local religious beliefs (most notably Jewish Messianism). Together, they changed the elite ethos of Stoicism into the mass religion of Christianity. But what difference does it make for the spread of cosmopolitan ideas? Calling it a secularized religion rather than an abstracted philosophy emphasizes the centrality of emotional engagement and social integration. And it emphasizes that both are bound up with symbol and ritual, not just with spoken ideas. Symbol and ritual are what make philosophy into personal and social identity. And for a cosmopolitan sociology, this is a central point distinguishing it from abstract cosmopolitan ideas.

Moral Cosmopolitanism

For example, one of the leading modern cosmopolitan ideas today is expressed in the concept of human rights. The text most people think of as the founding text of modern human rights campaigning is Kant's *On Perpetual Peace*. But Kant's idea was that a stable and peaceful political order could be constructed only out of nation-states that made mutually supportive vows of nonintervention. This view was embodied to a large degree in the League of Nations and the original United Nations charter and can be considered in many ways to be the beginning of the idea of modern international law, an essential cosmopolitan idea. But there is no escaping that Kant's project regards the sovereignty of nation-states as sacrosanct. However, modern cosmopolitan politics begins with the principle that sovereignty is not the highest principle and is not sacrosanct. Rather, the highest principle comprises human dignity and well-being and the duty to prevent suffering wherever it occurs—to not stand by and allow innocent people to be slaughtered.

So, the philosophical origins of a cosmopolitan sociology lie not only in the French and German Enlightenment, whose ideas it reversed, but mainly in the Scottish Enlightenment, specifically in the idea that there are duties imposed by sympathy and benevolence. Scottish Enlightenment thinkers argued that the social conditions that fostered sympathy were the increase in wealth, the increase in interaction, and the increase in equality, and that all of these conditions would be increased as the market spread. In other words, it was argued that market cosmopolitanism and moral cosmopolitanism were mutually supportive.

Market Cosmopolitanism

History has, in fact, borne that argument out. As the market has developed over the last few centuries, our tolerance for cruelty has dramatically changed. The market does

injure lots of people. But it also brings them within the circle of sympathy. That is, it seems consistently to excite a politically significant mass of people that this harm can and must be remedied. And, crucially, it provides the means to do something about it. It brings people inside the circle not only of sympathy, but of effective sympathy. And this is one of the key social foundations of cosmopolitanism. By moral cosmopolitanism, we mean the belief that our duty to ameliorate the suffering of individuals is more important than any artificial political barrier that may stand in our way.

One of the main parallels between the Hellenistic and Enlightenment moments of cosmopolitanism is that the spread of cosmopolitanism among the population depended on the growth of trade and communication. As Marx once said, the market puts people into contact with innumerable unknown others—and to this we would add, who then become known others through the newly incited movement for reform, which would not have taken place (and would have had no “purchase” to affect things if they did take place) so long as such ill treatment remained outside the market. And for cosmopolitanism to spread widely among the world’s population and become the basis of political mobilization, it needs to be embodied in symbols and rituals so that it can become the basis of personal identity. This last point is important because this is finally the ultimate political foundation of cosmopolitanism: the feeling of individuals that they are doing something wrong by ignoring suffering. Properly mobilized, this is what creates the new political facts that enable cosmopolitan political action.

NEW COSMOPOLITANISM

And this is why a new cosmopolitanism is in the air: Through criticism, the concept has been rediscovered and reinvented. Over the last years or so, there has been a sharp increase in the literature that attempts to relate the discourse on globalization (in cultural and political terms) to a redefinition of cosmopolitanism for the global age.

Thus, cosmopolitanism relates to a premodern ambivalence toward a dual identity and a dual loyalty. Every human being is rooted by birth in two worlds, two communities: in the cosmos (that is, nature) and in the polis (that is, the city-state).

To be more precise: Individuals are rooted in one cosmos but in different cities, territories, ethnicities, hierarchies, nations, religions, and so on at the same time. This creates not exclusivity, but an inclusive plural membership. Being part of the cosmos means that all men and women are equal by nature yet part of different states organized into territorial units (polis). “Cosmopolitanism” ignores an “either/or” principle and embodies a “this or that” principle. These are ancient hybrid, or *mélange*, scale-flow concepts. Thus, cosmopolitanism generates a logic of

nonexclusive oppositions, making “patriots” of two worlds that are at the same time equal and different.

Toward a Cosmopolitan Social Science

What makes cosmopolitanism so interesting for the social and political theory of modern societies is its thinking and living in terms of inclusive oppositions. Nature is associated with society; the object is part of subjectivity; otherness of the other is included in one’s own self-identity and self-definition; and the logic of exclusive oppositions is rejected. Nature is no longer separated from national or international society; either as a subject or object, “We” are not opposed to “Them.” The opposition between war and peace has been overthrown by the one between war and “heroism.” This has clearly methodological consequences. We argue, therefore, that in the social sciences, “methodological cosmopolitanism” is opposed to “methodological nationalism,” rejecting the state-centered perspective and sociological (lack of) imagination. It attempts to overcome the naive universalism of early Western sociology. Methodological cosmopolitanism implies becoming sensitive and open to the many universalisms, the conflicting contextual universalisms, for example, of the postcolonial experience, critique and imagination. Methodological cosmopolitanism also means including other (“native”) sociologies, the sociologies of and about African, Asian, and South American experiences of “entangled modernities” (Therborn 2003). “Entangled modernities” replace the dualism of the modern and the traditional, pointing to and again creating the image of a deterritorialized *mélange* of conflicting contextual modernities in their economic, cultural, and political dimensions.

All of our existing political categories presume the nation-state as the ultimate political reality, and this methodological nationalism is clearly at work in our conviction that the way to clarify any mixture is to segregate out which nation is the influencer and which one is the influencee. The world is generating a growing number of such mixed cases, which make less sense according to the “either/or” logic of nationality than to the “this-as-well-as-that” logic of transnationality. Our intellectual frames of reference are so deeply ingrained that this transnational way of thinking has been comparatively undeveloped. A cosmopolitan sociology is an antidote to ethnocentrism and nationalism. It should not be mistaken for multicultural euphoria. On the contrary, cosmopolitanism starts from the hard-won insight that there is an invariable connection between ethnocentrism and the hatred of foreigners, and tries to advance beyond this sort of “common sense.” For a similar reason, cosmopolitanism is an advance over the concept of “hybridization” because it avoids the dangers inherent in using biological metaphors for human difference.

Institutionalized Cosmopolitanism

The first modern world was a national world. There was a clear division between inner and outer, between domestic and foreign. In that world, the nation-state was the principle of order. Politics was national politics; culture was national culture; and labor, class formation, and class conflict were all primarily features of the nation-state. International politics was a multiplication of nation-states, each defining each other's borders and mirroring each other's essential categories. National and international were two sides of an interdependent whole. It was as impossible to conceive of a nation-state in isolation as to imagine an inner without an outer. Rooted cosmopolitanism, on the other hand, is defined against the two extremes of being at home everywhere and being at home nowhere. It means to be engaged in the local and the global at the same time. It is opposed to ethnocentrism but also to universalism, whether from the Left or the Right. When it comes to the critique of imperialism, rooted cosmopolitanism points out that in a postcolonial world, there is no pure, precolonized nation to go back to.

A cosmopolitan sociology means, therefore, that issues of global concern are becoming part of the everyday local experiences and the "moral lifeworlds" of the people. This paradigm change has already been announced by different people in different fields in the social sciences (Appadurai 1990; Archibugi and Held 1995; Beck 2000, 2002; Cheah and Robbins 1998; Vertovec and Cohen 2002). Thus, a cosmopolitan sociology imposes fundamental questions of redefinition, reinvention, and reorganization. These challenges are related to two fundamental processes: globalization and individualization. Globalization is mostly related to space and often defined in terms of "time-space compression" and/or "deterritorialization." But the other side of the coin, individualization, also means the cosmopolitanization of time and collective memory. The experience of a cosmopolitan crisis (world risk society) implies, as well, that more and more people all over the world are reflecting on a shared collective future, which might even contradict nation-based memories of the past. Cosmopolitan sentiment or a cosmopolitan common sense has to be distinguished from *institutionalized cosmopolitanism* through legal institutions such as the International Criminal Court, the human rights regime codified in conventions and courts and multilateral agreements. The European Union and its "cosmopolitan entrepreneurs," the European Commission, Court, and Parliament appear to provide some answers not only to the horrors of the twentieth century but also to the increasing loss of state sovereignty.

The Holocaust, or rather the collective memories that have sprung from it during the last six decades, is a paradigmatic case for the political and cultural salience of cosmopolitan sentiments (Levy and Sznajder 2002). A "cosmopolitan state" not only separating nation and state but also acting transnationally seems to be the next stage in

an institutionalized cosmopolitanism (Beck 2002). Cosmopolitan states connect self-determination with responsibility for those who are not part of the nation-state. And this becomes institutionalized through the human rights regime, which will find a way to civilize a global risk society. And it should not be confused with a "false cosmopolitanism" or global unilateralism, which means nothing but the pursuit of national interest in the name of cosmopolitan values. Another side of "institutionalized cosmopolitanism" is through individualism or internalized cosmopolitanism. Issues of global concerns are becoming part of one's moral lifeworld, no matter if people are for or against them. The cosmopolitan horizon becomes institutionalized in our own subjective lives. A cosmopolitan sociology, therefore, brings the subject back into the social sciences after system theory and poststructuralist theories have tried to construct a social science without subjects.

Cosmopolitanism and Universalism

Cosmopolitanism diverges from universalism in that it assumes that there is not one language of cosmopolitanism, but many languages, tongues, and grammars. Cosmopolitanism means also disputing about its consequences. This paradigmatic reconstruction of social science from a national to a cosmopolitan perspective can be understood and explained as a "positive problem shift" (Lakatos 1970). Previously, the national cosmos could be decomposed into a clear distinction between inside and outside. Between the two, the nation-state governed, and order was established. Thus, there is a strong and hidden relationship between universalism and nationalism. In the inner space of the nation-state, the central themes of sociology, such as work, politics, law, social inequality, justice, and cultural identity, were negotiated against the background of the action. And even here, the national/international distinction always represented a permanent self-affirming prophecy. Against the background of a cosmopolitan social science, it becomes suddenly obvious that it is neither possible to distinguish clearly between the national and the international nor, in a similar way, to contrast homogenous units. National spaces have become denationalized, so that the national is no longer national, just as the international is no longer international. And therefore, the universalism of social and political theory collapses as well.

— Ulrich Beck and Natan Sznajder

See also Beck, Ulrich; Giddens, Anthony; Globalization; Nationalism; Postmodernism; Risk Society

FURTHER READINGS AND REFERENCES

- Appadurai, Arjun. 1990. "Disjuncture and Difference in the Global Cultural Economy." Pp. 295-310 in *Global Culture*, edited by M. Featherstone. London: Sage.

- Archibugi, Daniele and David Held, eds. 1995. *Cosmopolitan Democracy: An Agenda for a New World Order*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.
- Baldry, H. C. 1965. *The Unity of Mankind in Greek Thought*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Beck, Ulrich. 2000. "The Cosmopolitan Perspective: Sociology in the Second Age of Modernity." *British Journal of Sociology* 51(1):79-106.
- . 2002. "The Cosmopolitan Society and Its Enemies." *Theory, Culture & Society* 19(1-2):17-44.
- Bohman, James and Matthias Lutz-Bachmann, eds. 1997. *Perpetual Peace: Essays on Kant's Cosmopolitan Ideal*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Cheah, Pheng and Bruce Robbins, eds. 1998. *Cosmopolitics: Thinking and Feeling beyond the Nation*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Held, David. 1995. *Democracy and the Global Order: From the Modern State to Cosmopolitan Governance*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Kant, Immanuel. [1795] 1982. *On Perpetual Peace*. Indianapolis, IN: Hackett.
- Kleingeld, Pauline. 1999. "Six Varieties of Cosmopolitanism in Late Eighteenth-Century Germany." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 60:505-24.
- Lakatos, Imre. 1970. "Falsification and the Methodology of Scientific Research Programmes." Pp. 91-6 in *Criticism and the Growth of Knowledge*, edited by Lakatos and Musgrave. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Levy, Daniel and Natan Sznaider. 2002. "Memory Unbound: The Holocaust and the Formation of Cosmopolitan Memory." Pp. 87-106 in *European Journal of Social Theory* 5(1).
- Therborn, Goran. 2003. "Entangled Modernities": *European Journal of Social Theory* 6(3):293-305.
- Vertovec, Steven and Robin Cohen, eds. 2002. *Conceiving Cosmopolitanism: Theory, Context, and Practice*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

CRIME

Crime refers to acts forbidden by and subject to sanctions from the state. In modern societies, the term refers to violations of the criminal law that are punishable by the criminal justice system. The concept predates sociology and has been much studied since the discipline's beginnings. Sociological theories of crime can be divided into those that seek to explain why some individuals commit crimes and those that try to understand crime's place in the larger society.

ACCOUNTING FOR CRIMINAL BEHAVIOR

Some theories argue that criminals are different from law-abiding people. The nature of this difference depends

on the dominant scientific models of the time. During criminology's long history, theorists from a great variety of disciplines have speculated that criminals have distinctive racial characteristics, body types, personality types, intelligence levels, or genetic predispositions. Although these theories have attracted some sociological interest, most sociologists have resisted interpretations rooted in the criminal's biology, in favor of explanations that focus on social experiences.

Sociological theories of criminality can be divided into two major schools. The approach now known as *control theory* had its roots in the classical criminology articulated by Cesare Beccaria in the eighteenth century. It argues that crime is an expression of natural, short-term self-interest. In this view, taking what one wants or striking out in anger, the sorts of acts that tend to be defined as crimes, are normal reactions of most organisms. What is remarkable is that most people, most of the time, do not give in to raw self-interest. Rather, socialization leads to self-control; at an early age, most children learn to reign in their self-interested impulses in order to gain adult approval. The contemporary version of this approach, control theory, argues that criminals have had ineffective, erratic socialization, and as a result, they lack self-control and therefore commit crimes.

Social networks play key roles in socializing individuals. During early childhood, the family is the central arena for teaching these limits; parents who love their children, pay attention to them, and offer firm, consistent discipline to instill self-control. Older children influence one another; Edwin H. Sutherland's *theory of differential association* suggested that individuals whose social contacts are mostly law-abiding will become law-abiding, but that those whose associates are involved in criminality will commit crimes themselves. The expectations of a partner in a stable, loving relationship, typically involving marriage and family formation, also can constrain criminality. In addition, other social institutions can foster self-control. School tends to reward students who display disciplined learning habits; later in life, the demands of steady work or military service discourage criminality. Thus, the conventional life course—childhood in a nurturing family, youth spent among peers in school, followed by an adulthood focused around work and a family of one's own—provides a web of social control. To the degree that individuals are deeply enmeshed in this web, they are unlikely to become criminals, but to the degree that individuals have only loose ties to conventional life, the lessons of self-control are less likely to be learned, and crime becomes more likely.

The second major sociological approach to explaining individuals' criminality is *strain theory*. In this model, society places some individuals under strain, and they respond by turning to crime. Thus, individuals who find themselves in difficult circumstances, raised in poverty or in broken families, victims of racial discrimination or class

- Kellner, Douglas. 1995. *Media Culture. Cultural Studies, Identity and Politics between the Modern and the Postmodern*. New York & London: Routledge.
- . 2002. "New Media and New Literacies. Reconstructing Education for the New Millennium." Pp. 90–104 in *Handbook of New Media: Social Shaping and Consequences of ICTs*, edited by Leah H. Lievrouw and Sonia Livingstone. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- McLaren, Peter. 1995. *Critical Pedagogy and Predatory Culture: Oppositional Politics in a Postmodern Era*. New York & London: Routledge.
- Winter, Rainer. 2001. *Die Kunst des Eigensinns. Cultural Studies als Kritik der Macht*. Weilerswist, Germany: Velbrück Wissenschaft.

CULTURAL CAPITAL

The late Pierre Bourdieu, one of the leading French social thinkers of the twentieth century, developed the concept of "cultural capital" to explain the ability of elite managers and professionals to transmit their privileged status to their children, a process he referred to as "social and cultural reproduction." By "social and cultural reproduction," Bourdieu referred not only to the intergenerational reproduction of family status but also to the reproduction, first, of larger systems of social inequality and, second, of systems of cultural hierarchy (for example, the prestige of high-culture genres such as ballet and classical music compared with chorus lines and hip-hop).

Bourdieu was an abstract thinker with a gift for concrete social analysis. Like his other concepts, cultural capital has both a general definition and specific referents. Most abstractly, cultural capital comprises familiarity with and easy use of cultural forms institutionalized at the apex of a society's cultural hierarchy (for example, orthodox religious doctrines in a theocracy). In his work on contemporary France, Bourdieu used "cultural capital" to refer to familiarity with prestigious aesthetic culture, such as the high arts, literary culture, and linguistic ability. Such "high culture" is often produced by artists who eschew commercial values and claim to pursue art for art's sake. In many countries, it is distributed by nonprofit or public institutions. And its status is ensured by substantial public and private investment in school and university curricula that celebrate it, as well as high-culture programming in libraries and broadcast media and, in many countries, direct government support for high-culture artists and cultural institutions. Consequently, compared with other forms of prestigious knowledge, familiarity with the arts (or an understanding that such familiarity is a sign of distinction) tends to be nearly universal, cross-cutting boundaries of

region, gender, or profession. The precise content of cultural capital, however, differs from society to society (e.g., in Japan, cultural capital includes knowledge of Noh Theatre and tea ceremonies).

Bourdieu asked how high-status people with relatively little personal wealth, for example, managers of publicly held corporations or professionals such as lawyers, doctors, and university professors, are able to pass down their privileged positions to their children. Before the rise of the manager-control firm, transmission of privilege was easy: The owner of a business simply bequeathed it to his (very rarely her) children. Once businesses passed into the hands of shareholders, direct transmission was no longer practical. Instead, Bourdieu argued, families transform their economic capital into "cultural capital" by exposing children to prestigious culture from early childhood on, through household conversations, lessons, and visits to museums and performing-arts events. Thus trained, children possess what Bourdieu called "embodied cultural capital": cultural capital built into their ways of seeing and their schemes of evaluation, which they carry with them wherever they go. (Bourdieu also wrote of "linguistic capital," the ability to speak with confidence, correctness, and grace, which may be regarded as a form of cultural capital.)

When children from privileged backgrounds go to school, their teachers mistake this embodied cultural capital for intelligence or giftedness. Thus, they convert their cultural capital into good grades, encouragement, and admission into competitive academic programs. Success in school facilitates success in later life, especially with completion of university training, at which point embodied capital is supplemented by the *credentialed cultural capital* of degrees and diplomas. (Bourdieu also wrote of "objectified cultural capital," or books, paintings, musical scores, and other physical objects that one needs embodied cultural capital to appreciate, but this plays a less important role in his theory.) After completing schooling, children from high-status families "reconvert" their cultural capital back into economic privilege, completing the circuit of reproduction. Cultural capital remains useful after school, however, enabling its possessors to establish comfortable relations with potential patrons, employers, or marital partners.

In advanced capitalist societies, Bourdieu argued, cultural capital is most important for those members of the "dominant class" (owners of capital, high-level managers, and credentialed professionals) with the least economic capital. Scions of the wealthiest families, he argued, can afford to be casual in their approach to schooling and culture. By contrast, lower-income professionals (educators or librarians, for example) rely almost exclusively on their ability to transmit cultural capital (and with it, school success and an agreeable personal style) in order to ensure their children's success. Bourdieu thus portrayed the "dominant class" as an inverted pyramid: Those with the most

economic capital have the least cultural capital, and vice versa. Corresponding to differences in the volume and composition of capital are differences in values, lifestyles, and tastes: Artists and intellectuals, for example, distinguish themselves from corporate managers by valuing avant-garde art too complex or radical for the latter to understand, and embracing a simplicity of dress and décor consistent with their limited financial resources.

THEORETICAL ORIGINS

Although Bourdieu coined the term "cultural capital," the notion that culture may represent a source of status or power is rooted in classical social theory, particularly in the work of Max Weber and Émile Durkheim. Weber wrote extensively about what he called "status groups": persons connected by a shared status culture (that is, by a common identity, shared values, similar aesthetic tastes, forms of dress or speech, typical pastimes, and collective rituals) that they regard as a source of honor. (Weber's observation that almost any criterion of distinction, no matter how trivial, can serve as a basis for status group formation is echoed in Bourdieu's early use of the term "cultural arbitrary" to characterize cultural capital.) Weber also provided a classic account of the Chinese literati that foreshadows Bourdieu's description of the modern professional who invests intensely in cultural capital as a basis for claims to elite status. Central to Weber's theory was the insight that status groups use culture as a means of maintaining strong boundaries against outsiders in their efforts to monopolize scarce resources and market opportunities.

From Émile Durkheim, Bourdieu derived the notion that prestigious culture had a *sacred* quality: that it holds itself apart from the everyday world, that cultural symbols embody the power of the group in a physically compelling way, and that command of a group's most esteemed cultural icons represents a source of power. These ideas are most commonly associated with Durkheim's *Elementary Forms of Religious Life*. But Durkheim explicitly linked curricular change and social power in his posthumously published lectures on the history of higher education in France. Bourdieu was also influenced by Durkheim and Marcel Mauss's *Primitive Classification*. Onto Durkheim's observation that taxonomy is central to cultural systems, Bourdieu grafted his own emphasis on culture as a field of conflict, producing the concept of "classification struggle" that figures in his understanding of cultural change.

Bourdieu's account of cultural capital was also influenced, though less deeply, by Thorstein Veblen, whose *Theory of the Leisure Class* was successfully published in French translation in the 1960s, and by the American economist Gary Becker, whose book *Human Capital* popularized within economics the general notion that nonmaterial resources contribute to social mobility. Although he

acknowledged both as influences, Bourdieu's understanding of culture was very different from that of Veblen or Becker.

WHAT CULTURAL CAPITAL IS NOT

Cultural capital has entered into the sociological lexicon, but it is often used loosely and incorrectly to refer to any tastes, dispositions, or cultural knowledge that help people get ahead. Used properly, cultural capital refers only to those cultural resources that are, first, institutionalized and, second, broadly understood to be prestigious. For a cultural form to establish legitimacy at the level of the modern national society, its value must be guaranteed by institutions, such as universities, the state, or established churches.

It is also necessary to distinguish between Bourdieu's ideas about cultural capital and Veblen's notion of "pecuniary emulation": competition for prestigious and expensive signs of distinction. First, for Bourdieu, the critical mechanism is the monopolization of cultural capital by status groups, not competition for status between individuals. Second, in arguing that prestigious cultural forms are perceived as sacred, Bourdieu emphasizes that cultural capital must be *legitimate* (that is, widely understood to be intrinsically valuable) and not merely fashionable. Third, it follows that whereas for Veblen, status competition generates an inflationary process in which prestigious cultural goods lose value as they trickle down the class hierarchy, for Bourdieu, the collective action of dominant status groups, backed by institutions and the state, can reproduce cultural hierarchies over long periods of time.

It is likewise important to distinguish between cultural capital and *human capital*, which includes any skills, information, and know-how that contribute to social mobility. Human capital operates in the marketplace and is directly productive. Cultural capital operates through informal social interaction and is only rarely economically productive. (Human capital and cultural capital overlap in occupations, such as finance, sales, or banking, that require incumbents to earn the trust of elite clients.) Put another way, human capital is a semipublic good: Increasing the human capital of individuals enhances the productive capacity of the entire society. (Indeed, economists invented the concept to explain why societies with high levels of formal education had substantially larger gross national products than one would predict based on their physical capital stocks alone.) By contrast, because status groups use it to appropriate economic rents, cultural capital may actually reduce economic productivity by interfering with the functioning of economic markets.

Cultural capital, as sociologists use the term, should also be distinguished from two quite different uses by economists and urbanists. Cultural economists sometimes employ cultural capital to refer to a society's stock of moral

and aesthetic knowledge, or its "cultural heritage." Urbanists have used the term (or its cognate, "creative capital") to refer to the putative economic benefits of arts spending and creative industries for urban economies.

Finally, we should distinguish between cultural capital and social capital. For Bourdieu, the distinction was quite clear: "Social capital" refers to social connections that provide access to jobs and other resources. More recently, however, social capital has been used by authors like James Coleman and Robert Putnam to refer to those features of a social group (including such "cultural" features as trust and normative consensus) that facilitate collective action to produce public goods. Culture in this sense should not be confused with the kinds of prestigious status cultures from which cultural capital flows.

EMPIRICAL RESEARCH ON CULTURAL CAPITAL

Although Bourdieu documented differences in tastes and cultural styles among different French "class fractions" (his term for social groups defined largely on the basis of occupation and educational attainment), he opposed the kind of causal modeling that dominates the study of social inequality in much of the world. It was not long, however, before students of social stratification began to test hypotheses derived from his theory with individual level data on family background, cultural tastes and practices, educational attainment, occupational achievement, and other outcomes.

Most of this research has operationalized cultural capital using measures of survey respondents' participation in high-culture arts audiences. Studies in the United States, Western Europe, Eastern Europe, and Latin America have documented strong associations between socioeconomic status and cultural capital, as well as significant effects on cultural capital of family of origin. Consistent with Bourdieu's perspective, as opposed to Veblen's, the strongest predictor by far is education, with family income playing a minor role. Also consistent with Bourdieu's approach, and contradicting cognitive explanations of the association between education and taste for the arts, tastes cluster more by prestige (e.g., people who like classical music also like fine art) than by formal similarities (e.g., liking all kinds of music); and attendance at and attitudes toward high-culture arts events are better predictors of school success than are measures of what students know about the arts.

Research also provides much evidence to support the view that cultural capital is a significant predictor of school achievement and educational attainment, as well as some evidence that cultural capital is related to occupational attainment and to the educational level of one's spouse. Ironically, the ubiquity of such findings poses a challenge to the underlying theory. For if cultural capital were only a means for the well-off to reproduce their status, it would

simply mediate the effect of family background. Yet cultural capital *independently* affects outcomes, serving as a means of upward mobility as well as of social reproduction. If cultural capital is most important when direct inheritance of wealth and position is least practical, its effects should be greatest in socialist societies: Yet studies undertaken during or just after the socialist era in Eastern Europe show effects similar to those found in the West. Similarly, many observers argue that Americans are less familiar with and care less about "high culture" than Europeans, yet the results of empirical studies in Europe and the United States are not markedly different. Moreover, in many studies, gender, a factor that Bourdieu leaves out of his theory, explains as much or more of the variance in cultural capital as does socioeconomic background, with women reading more literature, attending more plays, and visiting more museums than their male peers. These results suggest that internal family processes related to the gender division of household labor play an important and neglected role in cultural reproduction.

In other words, the links between family socioeconomic status, cultural capital, and educational and other outcomes are well established, but the processes that produce these links are poorly understood. Based on existing research, it is still uncertain to what extent cultural capital (1) enhances life chances by enabling its possessors to impress high-status gatekeepers and move easily into elite social circles; (2) serves as an indicator of the "social intelligence" necessary to identify and assimilate prestigious tastes, styles, and knowledge more generally; or (3) represents a proxy for unmeasured factors such as work habits or motivation.

THE FUTURE OF CULTURAL CAPITAL

Although Bourdieu emphasized the stability of cultural capital over processes of transformation, he certainly recognized the possibility of change. It is convenient to use the term *cultural capital regime* to refer to the nature of cultural hierarchy in a given society at a given time. The cultural capital regime includes the content of prestigious culture, the nature and effectiveness of the institutional arrangements that sustain cultural capital's legitimacy, and the role of cultural capital in processes of social reproduction and individual mobility. Cultural capital regimes may be more or less open with respect to the breadth of cultural contents and competencies included in cultural capital, more or less stratified in the value accorded to different cultural forms, and more or less consequential for the outcomes of stratification processes.

Cultural capital regimes may change as a result of *classification struggles*. Classification struggles entail collective action by subordinate groups to improve their social position and, in so doing, to elevate the prestige and legitimacy of cultural forms associated with their identity

groups. In the United States, the recognition of jazz as a legitimate art form and its embrace by universities, non-profit institutions, and government arts programs was the outcome of successful classification struggles (by artists themselves and as an indirect effect of the civil rights struggle of African Americans).

Cultural capital regimes may also change as a result of *deinstitutionalization*. Classification struggles may modestly expand the stock of legitimate culture without altering other aspects of the cultural capital regime; but if enough of them occur simultaneously, they may undermine the legitimacy of the cultural hierarchy as a whole. Many observers have noted an erosion, in the United States at least, of the cultural hierarchy that privileges traditional European aesthetic forms over popular culture or forms with Asian or African origins. This, they contend, is a result both of classification struggles and of the vast expansion of commercial cultural industries and the segmentation of the cultural marketplace.

Although such claims are plausible, there is surprisingly little statistical evidence that the association between high-cultural tastes and social background has become weaker. But there is abundant evidence that socioeconomic status (and especially educational attainment) is positively related to enjoyment of many forms of popular, folk, or alternative culture, as well as to participation in high culture. According to Richard Peterson, the new cultural elites in the United States are "cultural omnivores," whose trademark is appreciation of a wide range of cultural forms and an open disposition to the new. Following postmodern theory, cultural omniverousness can be seen as reflecting higher levels of occupational and geographic mobility, more fluid forms of identity, and industrial regimes of "flexible production" suited to fine-grained audience segmentation. Omniverousness also reflects the social networks of highly educated individuals, which tend to be larger and more diverse on many dimensions than those of less educated persons. As Bonnie Erickson has demonstrated, diversity of taste is associated with the size and diversity of one's social networks.

We must not confuse omniverousness with promiscuity: Omnivores continue to eschew certain low-status activities and genres. Moreover, cultural capital inheres not simply in the culture one likes, but in *how* one appropriates it. Nonetheless, in this view, the cultural capital regime in the United States has become more inclusive; the institutional system guaranteeing the prestige of European high culture has become weaker; and the link between cultural capital (measured conventionally) and life course outcomes should diminish.

Cultural capital, of course, need not be limited to the arts. It is possible (though little, if any, research bears on this) that a *deinstitutionalization* of high culture has been accompanied by the constitution of new candidates for cultural capital, embraced by parts of the U.S. population but not yet institutionalized in the broader society. One leading

candidate, perhaps dominant among employees of large and midsize firms, is business culture, prizing resourcefulness, independence, group skills, technophilia, and familiarity with business concepts and personalities. A second candidate, based on more explicit cultural struggle, is the religious culture of evangelical Christianity, with its emphasis on scriptural knowledge, distinctive linguistic conventions, and alternative schools, media, publishers, and record companies.

CONCLUSION

Bourdieu's notion of cultural capital is a flexible and powerful tool for understanding the relationship between culture, power, and inequality in contemporary societies. Western societies over the past two centuries have derived their most potent and universal forms of cultural capital from the arts, and most researchers have focused on understanding continuities in the role of cultural capital in the reproduction of social inequality. A broader view of cultural capital, equally consistent with Bourdieu's approach, might focus more on institutional analysis and on social and cultural struggle and change. Ultimately, a thorough understanding of cultural capital requires attention both to stability and to change to micromechanisms and to macro-historical processes.

— Paul DiMaggio

See also Bourdieu, Pierre; Durkheim, Émile; Postmodernism; Social Capital; Veblen, Thorstein; Weber, Max

FURTHER READINGS AND REFERENCES

- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1983. "The Forms of Capital." Pp. 241–58 in *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*, edited by J. G. Richardson. Westport, CT: Greenwood.
- . 1984. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgment of Taste*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre and Jean-Claude Passeron. 1977. *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- DiMaggio, Paul and John Mohr. 1985. "Cultural Capital, Educational Attainment and Marital Selection." *American Journal of Sociology* 90:1231–61.
- Erickson, Bonnie H. 1996. "Culture, Class and Connections." *American Journal of Sociology* 102:217–51.
- Mohr, John and Paul DiMaggio. 1995. "The Intergenerational Transmission of Cultural Capital." *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility* 14: 167–99.
- Peterson, Richard A. and Roger M. Kern. 1996. Highbrow Taste: From Snob to Omnivore." *American Sociological Review* 61(5):900–907.
- Swartz, David. 1997. *Culture and Power: The Sociology of Pierre Bourdieu*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

At their best, the major traditions of cultural studies combine social theory, cultural critique, history, philosophical analysis, and specific political interventions, thus overcoming the standard academic division of labor by surmounting specialization arbitrarily produced by an artificial academic division of labor. Cultural studies thus operates with a transdisciplinary conception that draws on social theory, economics, politics, history, communication studies, literary and cultural theory, philosophy, and other theoretical discourses—an approach shared by the Frankfurt school, British cultural studies, and French postmodern theory. Transdisciplinary approaches to culture and society transgress borders between various academic disciplines. In regard to cultural studies, such approaches suggest that one should not stop at the border of a text, but should see how it fits into systems of textual production and how various texts are thus part of systems of genres or types of production and have an intertextual construction, as well as articulating discourses in a given sociohistorical conjuncture.

Cultural Marxism thus strengthens the arsenal of cultural studies in providing critical and political perspectives that enable individuals to dissect the meanings, messages, and effects of dominant cultural forms. Cultural studies can become part of a critical media pedagogy that enables individuals to resist media manipulation and to increase their freedom and individuality. It can empower people to gain sovereignty over their cultures and to be able to struggle for alternative cultures and political change. Cultural studies is thus not just another academic fad, but can be part of a struggle for a better society and a better life.

— Douglas Kellner

See also Benjamin, Walter; Cultural Studies and the New Populism; Frankfurt School; Globalization; Gramsci, Antonio; Hall, Stuart; Jameson, Fredric; Lukács, György

FURTHER READINGS AND REFERENCES

- Anderson, Perry. 1976. *Considerations on Western Marxism*. London: New Left Books.
- Appadurai, A. 1996. *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Benjamin, Walter. 1969. *Illuminations*. New York: Schocken.
- . 1999. "The Artist as Producer." In *Collected Writings*. Vol. II, *Walter Benjamin*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- . 2000. *The Arcades Project*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Best, Steven and Douglas Kellner. 2001. *The Postmodern Adventure: Science Technology, and Cultural Studies at the Third Millennium*. New York & London: Guilford & Routledge.
- Bloch, Ernst. 1986. *The Principle of Hope*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Bürger, Peter. 1984. *Theory of the Avant-Garde*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Cvetkovich, Ann and Douglas Kellner. 1997. *Articulating the Global and the Local. Globalization and Cultural Studies*. Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Durham, Meenakshi Gigi and Douglas Kellner, eds. 2001. *Media and Cultural Studies: KeyWorks*. Malden, MA, and Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Gramsci, Antonio. 1971. *Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci*, edited and translated by Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith. New York: International Publishers.
- . 1985. Pp. 389–90 in *Selections from Cultural Writings*, edited by David Forgacs and Geoffrey Nowell-Smith. London: Lawrence & Wishart.
- Hall, Stuart. 1980a. "Cultural Studies and the Centre: Some Problematics and Problems." Pp. 15–47 in *Culture, Media, Language*. London: Hutchinson.
- . 1980b. "Encoding/Decoding." Pp. 128–38 in *Culture, Media, Language*. London: Hutchinson.
- . 1988. *The Hard Road to Renewal*. London: Verso.
- . 1991. "Globalization and Ethnicity" (Lecture on Videotape). University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN.
- Harvey, David. 1989. *The Condition of Postmodernity*. Cambridge, UK: Blackwell.
- Hebdige, Dick. 1979. *Subculture. The Meaning of Style*. London: Methuen.
- Jameson, Fredric. 1991. *Postmodernism, or the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Jefferson, Tony, ed. 1976. *Resistance through Rituals*. London: Hutchinson.
- Jessop, Bob, Kevin Bonnet, Simon Bromley and Tom Ling. 1984. "Authoritarian Populism, Two Nations, and Thatcherism." *New Left Review* 147.
- Kellner, Douglas. 1995. *Media Culture. Cultural Studies, Identity and Politics between the Modern and the Postmodern*. New York & London: Routledge.
- . 2003. *Media Spectacle*. New York & London: Routledge.
- Lukács, Georg. [1910] 1971. *The Theory of the Novel*. Cambridge, MA: MIT University Press.
- McGuigan, Jim. 1992. *Cultural Populism*. New York & London: Routledge.
- Williams, Raymond. 1961. *The Long Revolution*. London: Chatto & Windus.

CULTURAL STUDIES AND THE NEW POPULISM

"The cultural turn" in the social sciences recognises that all human practice is mediated symbolically and therefore must be understood as meaningful. This way of thinking can be traced back to Max Weber's switch from economics to sociology and the methodological principles of *Verstehen*. Recent social theory has become yet more concerned with the cultural. The formation of a particular field of education and

research since the 1960s, the interdisciplinary, transdisciplinary or postdisciplinary field of cultural studies, is devoted to the study of the mediating power of signs and symbols in social life. It has a special interest in popular culture and the activity of consumption under late-modern conditions. Although cultural studies is diverse and varied in its concerns, mainstream work in the field is chiefly motivated by sentiments of a populist kind and rarely justifies itself exclusively on grounds of disinterested social science. Cultural studies was originally associated politically with a New Left populism that contested elite culture in academia and sought to politicise the study and practice of popular culture. Since the 1980s, however, cultural studies has been drifting toward a newer kind of populism, recently named "market populism" by Thomas Frank.

CULTURAL STUDIES

What is now known as cultural studies emerged in British adult education during the 1950s. This context provided access to higher education for those who had missed out on university and was especially oriented to working-class self-improvement and egalitarian social reform. The founding figures, Raymond Williams, Richard Hoggart, and E. P. Thompson, were themselves literary scholars of a leftist persuasion. They were interested in making sense of literature's social significance and its contribution to what Williams referred to as a "long revolution," bringing about an "educated and participatory democracy" that developed from working-class cultural traditions and labour movement politics. Hoggart wrote a widely read book, *The Uses of Literacy*, on the role of popular literacy and the impact of "Americanisation," including Hollywood and rock 'n' roll, on working-class culture in Britain. Thompson turned to the discipline of social history and studied how the English working class had made itself culturally during the period of the Industrial Revolution.

Williams was the leading figure in that he sought to theorise the practice of cultural analysis within the specific intellectual circumstances of university English and post-Second World War social democracy in Britain. He argued that the study of culture should be the analysis of relations in a "whole way of life" in order to reveal the "structure of feeling" of a generation, instead of simply conducting endless exegesis and evaluation of a "selective tradition" of great works from the past. Such an argument was hardly novel from an anthropological point of view. It effected, however, a transition from literary criticism to sociology in cultural analysis. No longer could the cultural analyst neglect the social dynamics of culture or ignore what was happening in the present because it was deemed too soon to pass critical judgement. This opened up the range of cultural objects and practices worthy of study, stretching out to include contemporary popular culture in its myriad forms. In Williams's catchphrase, "culture is ordinary." According

to Williams's later formulation of "cultural materialism," processes of signification should be studied with regard to their actual conditions of production and circulation. And as Williams was to remark toward the end of his life in the late 1980s, the emergence and development of cultural studies itself should be understood in this way.

Cultural studies was first institutionalised at the University of Birmingham, in the West Midlands of England, during the 1960s (see Turner 2003). In 1964, Richard Hoggart founded the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies (CCCS), within the English department. A research fellowship was partly funded through covenant by Allen Lane of Penguin Books, who was grateful to Hoggart for his defence witness at the obscenity trial of D. H. Lawrence's *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, in 1960, and no doubt for the paperback sales of Hoggart's own *The Uses of Literacy*. The Oxford-educated Jamaican cultural critic and New Left activist Stuart Hall was appointed to the fellowship. With Paddy Whannel of the British Film Institute's education department, Hall wrote *The Popular Arts*, a guidebook for educators. It applied the Leavisite protocol of "discrimination" to the evaluation of "good" and "bad" texts from mass communications and popular culture, as Hoggart himself had recommended. This approach broke, however, with F. R. Leavis's actual advice to teachers of English to discriminate against all products of modern media in general by demonstrating their inferiority to literary art.

Research students were recruited to pursue Hoggart's and Hall's more open-minded agenda for studying media and popular culture. When Hoggart left Birmingham in the late 1960s to become deputy director of UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization), Hall succeeded him as director of CCCS. In the 1970s, a distinctly Hallian school of thought gelled at Birmingham, quite different from Hoggart's revised Leavisism, for which the now defunct centre is chiefly remembered. During that decade, the "Birmingham school," considered by some to be of comparable significance to the Chicago school of urban studies and the Frankfurt school of critical theory, was formed by a succession of talented young scholars under Hall's inspirational leadership. These included such illustrious names as Dick Hebdige, Angela McRobbie, David Morley, and Paul Willis. By the time Hall departed for the Open University in 1979, where he participated in the production of its Popular Culture course, the original Birmingham school had peaked and was becoming fragmented with its dispersal. Paradoxically, Birmingham's influence on the expanding field of cultural studies around the world increased for several years after its effective institutional demise in the 1980s, which preceded the eventual closure in 2002 of the department that had grown out of the original CCCS.

Hall was of a much more theoretical turn of mind than Hoggart. He was involved in disseminating Western Marxist theories of culture and ideology into Britain. Hall also appropriated ideas from French structuralism and semiology in his early work, and in the 1980s and 1990s,

having previously been sceptical, he came increasingly under the sway of poststructuralism, especially the work of Jacques Derrida and Michel Foucault. Hall's own encoding/decoding model of television combines a materialist sense of the production and circulation of culture with a semiological sense of the multiple operations of the sign-vehicle. This was partly inspired by Umberto Eco's argument concerning the normality of aberrant decoding of media messages in modern, highly differentiated societies. Roland Barthes's essays on myth and naturalising ideology in popular culture and Louis Althusser's structural Marxist theory of ideological state apparatuses and the interpellation of subjects were drawn into a heady mixture of eclectic theorising by Hall and his close associates.

On leaving Birmingham, Hall (1980) distinguished between two strands of cultural studies that had vied with one another at the centre: "culturalism" and "structuralism." Culturalism referred to the British tradition's emphases on agency and lived experience, whereas the continental tradition of structuralism emphasised determinate conditions and unconscious processes. Although Hall favoured structuralism by then, he argued that they both had strengths and weaknesses that could be subsumed and overcome by Gramscian hegemony theory. The struggle for social leadership was in constant political negotiation between dominant and subordinate forces in society whilst simultaneously being played out on the terrain of culture. Hall's much celebrated analysis of Thatcherism as an authoritarian-populist project, which unfolded throughout the 1980s, was already anticipated by the greatest work of the Birmingham school, *Policing the Crisis*, on the "mugging" panic (Hall et al. 1978).

Only recently has Hall come to be assessed in detail as a theorist in his own right (see Rojek 2003). He is a brilliant synthesiser and charismatic proselyte, however, rather than a thoroughly original thinker. His later work on "New Times" and cultural "hybridity" draws on postmodernism and poststructuralism similarly to how his earlier work drew on developments in Marxism and structuralism. Yet Hall's influence is immense, as attested by the work of his former students. In fact, his most significant contribution to cultural studies may be pedagogic, in training a generation of scholars collaboratively who carried the message further afield and in his own standing as a figurehead for cultural studies in the United States and elsewhere.

It is no calumny to say that Hall and his Birmingham students were politically motivated, though quite implausible to suggest they represented a threat to the prevailing hegemony of crumbling social democracy and emergent neoliberalism. These were members of the revolutionary 1968 generation who had benefited from the expansion of higher education and postgraduate grants. They, amongst others, conducted a neo-Marxist intervention in the academy, which entailed critical theorising across disciplinary boundaries and research that was supposed to connect organically with the interests of a succession of subordinate and "popular"

constituencies: the working class, women, blacks, and so forth. In this sense, cultural studies bore a family resemblance to the American radicalisation of sociology in the 1970s.

Some Birmingham scholars favoured textual analysis; others, ethnography. The differences and interplay between the two methodological options are best exemplified in their research on youth culture (see Jefferson 1976). Spectacular subcultures—mods, rockers, hippies, skins, punks, rastas, and so on—were studied as symbolic forms of resistance to capitalism and authority. Hebdige read punk style in dress and music as a set of ironic texts that were resistant to the dull conformity of mainstream and consumerist youth culture. Willis interviewed working-class "lads" about their resistance to schooling and refusal of the myth of meritocracy. The young Birmingham scholars were uncovering popular culture that was not produced by the market, but drew upon its resources to issue subversive messages. For McRobbie, even a romantic and patriarchal magazine for adolescent girls such as *Jackie* enabled working-class girls to resist the oppressive culture of schooling and being forced to read nasty tomes like *Jane Eyre* by Leavisite teachers of English. Here, we see the seeds of the new populism that was to become so central to the development of cultural studies as a presence on the curriculum and an attractive field of research.

POPULISM

The Birmingham scholars were at least as concerned with contesting old-fashioned left-wing ideas about culture and society as they were with contesting the culture of capitalism. They were implacably opposed to the standard critical view that capitalism necessarily produces degenerate culture for the masses and that ideological forms simply reflect dominant class interests. The Frankfurt school's mass-culture critique of "the culture industry" was demonised along with Leavisite English as passé cultural elitism.

"The superstructure" was also considered relatively autonomous from "the base." Theorists associated with the Birmingham school in the 1970s were much more concerned with developing Marxist analysis of the state and ideology than with analysing late capitalism and its relation to cultural change. There was a peculiarly narrow interest in the nation-state and nationalistic ideology, exemplified by Hall's own writings on the ideological underpinnings of "balance" in public service broadcasting and the Thatcher government's programme of "regressive modernisation." This denial of political economy was modified much later by the "New Times" thesis on post-Fordism and postmodernism in the late 1980s. However, even that shift in perspective was curiously consistent with a long-standing and unusually positive attitude to consumer capitalism in the work of a network of once avowedly Marxist scholars, albeit subsequently "post-Marxist."

For them, the commodity was not just a fetish object, but a sign; and signs are inherently multi-accentual, open to

differential articulation. Thus, commodities were available for appropriation and resignification in the mode of popular resistance, as in the cases of subcultural bricolage, picking and mixing to create new and subversive meanings, and active viewing of popular television genres in, say, women's appreciation of soap opera. Hall always maintained that the growth of mass consumption from the 1950s was liberating for working-class people, whose material conditions had been much poorer in the past. In fact, the market was held to afford greater space for "grounded aesthetics," "symbolic creativity," and, in effect, "common culture" than paternalistic public support for the arts, as Willis later claimed. There were strains of folk culture romanticism in this view of cultural consumption as uncontrollably productive. That represented yet another challenge to orthodox Marxism, its attribution of a privileged status to production over consumption in the real scheme of things. The subordinate and negative term of consumption in binary opposition with the dominant and positive term of production was retrieved and given both feminist and market-friendly inflections. It was a simple inversion similar to and, indeed, connected to the inversion of elitism and populism in cultural evaluation.

This brand of cultural populism (McGuigan 1992, 1997) was taken to a logically absurd extreme by the leading populariser of cultural studies outside the immediate Birmingham school network, John Fiske. For instance, he compared some young people's petty theft in shopping malls to the Vietcong's guerrilla tactics against the U.S. military during the Vietnam War. Such arguments were quite common in the codification of cultural studies as an undergraduate subject during the 1980s and 1990s. It had an obviously popular appeal for a new and less politically radical generation of students and, as it turned out, might be cashed in the labour market for careers in management, public relations, and marketing. Cultural cool would incorporate rebellion into profitable enterprise, though not, of course, in order to encourage pilfering.

Populism is first and foremost a political category with a complex history and quite striking variations in actual politics. It is not necessarily on the Left or on the Right. Populism represents "the people" as an imagined community against the political elite or "power bloc," however that is conceived. In early twentieth-century American populism, the interests of poor farmers and industrial workers were articulated against bankers and big business. Toward the end of the twentieth century, Thatcherism constructed an authoritarian populism that pitted the people against the social-democratic state, at once "setting them free" from overbearing governmental constraint and creating a consumer paradise whilst simultaneously reducing welfare and increasing social discipline in the name of law and order. Hall was accurate in probing the popularity of this right-wing regime. However, the analysis that he produced was narrowly focused upon the cultural politics of the nation-state and insufficiently related to the rise

and globalisation of neoliberalism, particularly spurred on by the collapse of Soviet communism.

Similarly, cultural populism has no necessary political belonging. The Birmingham school legacy placed it on the Left, yet its subsequent fate is not, of necessity, to remain there. According to Thomas Frank (2001):

The signature scholarly gesture of the nineties was . . . the power and "agency" of audiences and fans, of their ability to evade the grasp of the makers of mass culture and their talent for transforming just about any bit of cultural detritus into an implement of rebellion. (p. 282)

Frank may well overstate the case that populist cultural studies has not only met up with but also informed free-market ideology and practice, which is partly what he means by market populism. None the less, it is manifestly evident that a correspondence exists between the populist sentiments of consumerist cultural studies and cultural capitalism, especially in the ways in which meaningful commodities, such as clothing, are designed and marketed to the young and style conscious. This argument is consistent with Naomi Klein's critical analysis of branding culture in *No Logo*. The actual conditions, forces, and relations of production are normally suppressed. They occasionally erupt into public view, however, with various campaigns against the leading brands, the exploitation of sweatshop labour, and the despoiling of natural and cultural environments, a politics of consumption that contests the ideology of consumerism. Primary producers across the globe are exploited fiercely, and investment is pumped into design, advertising, and marketing. Sign-value becomes more important than use-value. It is all about cool style and identity for the freewheeling and imaginary rebel consumer.

The drift into market populism is a discernible trajectory for cultural studies, albeit more pronounced than is normally acknowledged. It is not, however, the only one. Hall's own engagement with the politics of difference retains a critical edge. There are other lines of development as well, most notably multidimensional analysis that brings together political economy, textual analysis, and research on consumption and reception (Kellner 1997). Hall himself has also contributed to such a development with the formulation of the circuit of culture model (Du Gay et al. 1997), which seeks to account for popular consumption in relation to processes of production, representation, identity, and regulation. Serious study of popular culture and consumption is entirely justifiable on sociological grounds. The problem arises, however, when populist sentiments obscure difficult questions of critical analysis.

— Jim McGuigan

See also Althusser, Louis; Cultural Marxism and British Cultural Studies; Foucault, Michel; Frankfurt School; Gramsci, Antonio; Hall, Stuart; Marxism; Political Economy; Post-Marxism; Semiology; Social Class; Structural Marxism; Verstehen

FURTHER READINGS AND REFERENCES

- Du Gay, P., S. Hall, L. Janes, H. Mackay, and K. Negus. 1997. *Doing Cultural Studies—The Story of the Sony Walkman*. London: Sage.
- Frank, T. 2001. *One Market Under God: Extreme Capitalism, Market Populism and the End of Economic Democracy*. London: Secker & Warburg.
- Hall, S. 1980. "Cultural Studies: Two Paradigms." *Media, Culture & Society* 2(1):57–72.
- Hall, S., C. Critcher, T. Jefferson, J. Clarke, and B. Roberts. 1978. *Policing the Crisis: Mugging, the State, and Law and Order*. London: Macmillan.
- Hall, S. and P. Whannel. 1964. *The Popular Arts*. London: Hutchinson.
- Hoggart, R. 1957. *The Uses of Literacy*. London: Chatto & Windus.
- Jefferson, T., ed. 1976. *Resistance through Rituals*. London: Hutchinson.
- Kellner, D. 1997. "Critical Theory and Cultural Studies: The Missed Articulation." Pp. 12–41 in *Cultural Methodologies*, edited by J. McGuigan. London: Sage.
- Klein, N. 2000. *No Logo*. London: Flamingo.
- McGuigan, J. 1992. *Cultural Populism*. London: Routledge.
- . 1997. "Cultural Populism Revisited." Pp. 138–54 in *Cultural Studies in Question*, edited by M. Ferguson and P. Golding. London: Sage.
- Rojek, C. 2003. *Stuart Hall*. Cambridge, MA: Polity.
- Turner, G. 2003. *British Cultural Studies: An Introduction*. 3d ed. London: Routledge.

CULTURE AND CIVILIZATION

CONCEPTS

Culture is one of the most complex concepts in social theory. In their classical investigation in 1952, Alfred Kroeber and Clyde Kluckhohn already listed several hundred definitions which were used in scientific discourse. In the current usage of language, two concepts of culture may be distinguished: (1) *An extended concept of culture* that describes all man-made creations of human living conditions; "culture" here is in contrast to all things found in nature. The spectrum of cultural forms then stretches from house building to the use of tools, clothing, and social manners to state and social institutions up to the spheres of science and art. (2) *A narrow concept of culture*, on the other hand, limits itself to spiritual and artistic aspects. It often carries a connotation of something "higher" and free of purpose. "Culture" in this context is mainly identical with the literature, the fine arts, and philosophy. For a long period of time the extended concept of culture was used mainly in anthropology and ethnology, whereas for the most part, sociology was concerned with the scope of the narrow concept of culture. Today sociological research

attempts to concern itself more with the forms of daily culture, such as table manners, sport types, and interior decorating. In current empirical research the immaterial dimension of culture is highlighted: conceptions, orientations, norms, and values which guide the actions of those involved. As an example, Ronald Inglehart described the change of values in the Western world that have occurred since the 1960s as going from a materialistic to a post-materialistic set of preferences. It has permanent effects on the way people live their lives, whether they are primarily concerned with striving for material goods or if they are looking for self fulfillment, for meaning, and for a better quality of life through preserving an intact environment.

Although the object culture itself has a long historical tradition and the linguistic roots of "culture" and "civilization" are derived from ancient Latin (*colere* [to live, to build in the agricultural sense], *cultus*, *cultura*; *civis* [citizen], *civilis*), the more complex and collectively oriented concept of culture as we know it today was established as late as in the second half of the 18th century. Authors like Johann Gottfried Herder, Denis Diderot, and Thomas Paine wrote about the cultures of peoples and correlated those with a historical perspective of development and progress in contrast to wildness and barbarism. Certain evolving language configurations then resulted in an important differentiation: "Culture" (German "Kultur") was used predominantly in the German speaking region while the term "civilization" (French "civilisation") was more common in the Anglo-Saxon and French regions. Both conceptual traditions contain nearly the same meanings and are often connected with a common European or "occidental" culture.

The differences were only partly accentuated; for example, when the German sociologist Alfred Weber (the brother of Max Weber) in 1912 stated that "culture" marks a step in the development of the process of civilization beyond the necessities and utilities of daily life (a scenario similar to that in Oswald Spengler's influential work concerning the "Decline of the West" (1918)). In the context of the First World War, especially in Germany, there were some nationalistically motivated attempts to distinguish the apparently more valuable (spiritual, moral, inner) German "Kultur" (culture) from the Western "Zivilisation" (civilization) that was negatively described as being "technical" and "superficial." In this "battle of the cultures" German sociologists Werner Sombart, Ernst Troeltsch, and George Simmel, among others, participated while on the French side Emile Durkheim, amongst others, also took a polemic stance.

Later most of these differences were smoothed out. A classical definition as that of the anthropologist Edmond Tyler (1871:1) who defined culture and civilization synonymously as "that complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, custom, and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society," is still often quoted today. In scientific discourse the term "culture" has primarily established itself, whereas the term "civilization" refers to a specific subsection. This is true,

choice theory or resource mobilization theory in the study of social movements. In contrast, frame analysis emphasized agency, the free choice of both activists and audiences (especially of potential participants in a movement), the importance of meaning and interpretation in human events, and the cultural backgrounds out of which varying interpretations of events could arise or within which interpretations could be accepted. Frame analysts studied, for instance, how activists devised arguments that would appeal to broad publics; how media organizations interpreted public events in politically consequential ways; and how various audiences responded to different appeals and interpretations. In America, for example, movements often frame their arguments as a fight against "injustice" and cast arguments drawing on widely held values, such as individual rights, equality of opportunity, or freedom from government intervention. Scholars examined how the "alignment" of frames with the fundamental values of audiences affected acceptability and how frames could be extended or reshaped. The underlying message of frame analysis in social movements theory is that a movement's audiences—members, potential members, opponents, and the public at large—are affected by the interpretation they place on events, and the interpretations (a) can be shaped deliberately by movement activists and (b) frequently rest on emotional and symbolic responses to messages as much as on logical or empirical grounds.

— Daniel F. Chambliss

See also Discourse; Goffman, Erving; Social Movement Theory

FURTHER READINGS AND REFERENCES

- Benford, Robert D. and David A. Snow. 2000. "Framing Processes and Social Movements: An Overview and Assessment." *Annual Review of Sociology* 26:611–39.
- Goffman, Erving. 1974. *Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Snow, David A., E. Burke Rochford Jr., Steven K. Worden, and Robert D. Benford. 1986. "Frame Alignment Processes, Micromobilization, and Movement Participation." *American Sociological Review* 51(4):464–81.
- Williams, Rhys H. and Robert D. Benford. 2000. "Two Faces of Collective Action Frames: A Theoretical Consideration." *Current Perspectives in Social Theory* 20:127–51. Greenwich, CT: JAI.

FRANKFURT SCHOOL

The "Frankfurt school" refers to a group of German American theorists who developed powerful analyses of the changes in Western capitalist societies that occurred since

the classical theory of Marx. Working at the *Institut für Sozialforschung* in Frankfurt, Germany, in the late 1920s and early 1930s, theorists such as Max Horkheimer, T. W. Adorno, Herbert Marcuse, Leo Lowenthal, and Erich Fromm produced some of the first accounts within critical social theory of the importance of mass culture and communication in social reproduction and domination. The Frankfurt school also generated one of the first models of a critical cultural studies to analyze the processes of cultural production and political economy, the politics of cultural texts, and audience reception and use of cultural artifacts (Kellner 1989, 1995). The approach is valuable in that it links the reading and critique of cultural texts with economic analysis of the system of cultural production and social analysis of uses and effects of media culture. This systematic approach combines social theory with cultural criticism in a synoptic approach that overcomes the one-sidedness of many positions within cultural studies and media critique.

Moving from Nazi Germany to the United States, the Frankfurt school experienced firsthand the rise of a media culture involving film, popular music, radio, television, and other forms of mass culture (Wiggershaus 1994). In the United States, where they found themselves in exile, media production was by and large a form of commercial entertainment controlled by big corporations. Two of its key theorists, Max Horkheimer and T. W. Adorno, developed an account of the "culture industry" to call attention to the industrialization and commercialization of culture under capitalist relations of production ([1948] 1972). This situation was most marked in the United States, which had little state support of film or television industries and where a highly commercial mass culture emerged that came to be a distinctive feature of capitalist societies and a focus of critical cultural studies.

During the 1930s, the Frankfurt school developed a critical and transdisciplinary approach to cultural and communications studies, combining political economy, textual analysis, and analysis of social and ideological effects. They coined the term "culture industry" to signify the process of the industrialization of mass-produced culture and the commercial imperatives that drove the system. The critical theorists analyzed all mass-mediated cultural artifacts within the context of industrial production in which the commodities of the culture industries exhibited the same features as other products of mass production: commodification, standardization, and massification. The culture industries had the specific function, however, of providing ideological legitimation of the existing capitalist societies and of integrating individuals into their way of life.

For the Frankfurt school, mass culture and communications therefore stand in the center of leisure activity, are important agents of socialization and mediators of political