Marco Santoro

Introduction to the Second Part

(doi: 10.2383/29617)

Sociologica (ISSN 1971-8853)
Fascicolo 1, gennaio-aprile 2009

Ente di afferenza:
()

Introduction to the Second Part

by Marco Santoro

doi: 10.2383/29617

This second part of the symposium on the international circulation of Bourdieu's work (see the general Introduction to the Symposium in # 2/2008 for a detailed discussion of its ratio and objectives) features five new contributions on as many regions so geopolitically distributed: one in Europe (German-speaking countries), two in America, both Northern and Southern (Canada and Brazil), and two in Asia (Israel and China).

In his article, the Swiss sociologist Michael Gemperle offers a detailed overview of the trajectories and current status of Bourdieu' work in Germany and at least in part in Austria and German-speaking Switzerland. A specialist in the social history of ideas and reception studies, Gemperle is well suited to identify and interpret the paths followed by "Bourdieu" (himself and/or his ideas) in this part of Europe, one of the first to devote careful attention to his work when still a young scholar. What emerges from this research is the articulation of Bourdieu's intellectual personality in two distinct, and differently used in the local intellectual life (especially marked by the autochthon tradition of Critical Theory), identities: the academic cultural and social theorist coming from French structuralism, and the public and critically engaged intellectual, with the latter which, after it has taken precedence in recent years, is currently being superseded by a revival of the former (a pattern which could probably be found, even if with different meanings and under different constellations of interests, in other countries as well).

Canada is a special case study, as it is linguistically split into two areas, English and French, whose cultural lives are inevitably affected by the more general dynamics separately occurring in English-speaking countries (above all the close U.S.) and in France, the home-country of Bourdieu. As Marcel Fournier (a renowned scholar of French sociology, and of Marcel Mauss in particular: cfr. Fournier [1994]) and Lionel Vécrin show, however, Canada has played a role of its own in the circulation of the French scholar's sociological ideas, offering important venues for the diffusion of his ideas mainly thanks to a number of students who had studied with him in Paris. By all evidence, this interpersonal network has contributed to the diffusion of his ideas within Canada as a whole. Interestingly, the authors note from their data that Bourdieu's reception within the Canadian scholarly community has however also many analogies to that of the United Kingdom (for which see the article by Derek Robbins in the first part of the Symposium).

As anticipated, in this issue we have for the first time the opportunity to know what happened and is happening in the sociological communities of two countries from the East, Middle and Far. Israeli sociology is a very special and important case study, for its strong historical, both intellectual and political, links with the West (U.S. above all) but at the same time its linguistic identity. In their contribution, Lior Gelernter and Ilana F. Silber (the latter a sophisticated scholar of Bourdieu's social theory also in its relations with others intellectual programs [e.g. Silber 1995, 2009]) show how the importance of Bourdieu's work, which would seem to be self-evident to most sociologists in Israel today, is less straightforward than it may appear at first sight. As they write on the basis of a research conducted with interviews and document analyses, Bourdieu's thinking was not absorbed as the unified and synthetic theory it purports to be. Neither did his writings become the ground for the emergence of a distinct school in the context of Israeli sociology. Rather, Bourdieu's trajectory in Israel led to increasing and diffuse canonization but also conceptually fragmented, largely de-politicized and often ambivalent reception – a pattern indeed similar, they notice, to the U.S. one (for which see the contribution by Zavisca and Sallaz in the first part of the Symposium). They suggest that the very success of Bourdieu's ideas in permeating institutional and intellectual boundaries contributed to the selective and fragmented nature of their reception.

A crucial case study from the Far East is the article on China by Nabo Chen and Xiaowei Zang, the latter a Chinese sociologist currently teaching and researching in the UK, which makes him in condition to enjoy a direct comparative eye on both China and Europe. From it we learn among others things that a French intellectual work could enter a Communist country through North American scholarship, something which influences of course also the kind of reception that work could

have (and this, as the authors write, urges efforts to increase collaboration between European sociologists and their counterparts in China). The article discusses how Bourdieu's theories and analytic tools have been applied to research on social issues in China, showing how a French theory could offer insights also for studying very different and culturally distant places – something Bourdieu himself to be sure had already showed while presenting his tools to a Japanese audience [see Bourdieu 1994].

Last but not least, the article on Brazil by Fernando Antonio Pinheiro Filho, a former student of Sergio Miceli (who was himself a student of Bourdieu in Paris and is today one of the most influential intermediaries of Bourdieu's work in Portuguese), offers a nicely textured historical reconstruction of the large reception of Bourdieu in this country – in both sociology and the human sciences – since the seventies, and of its role in the re-founding of the local social sciences, even comparing it, briefly, with the Brazilian reception of another sociologist of culture whose work is often both associated and contrasted with that of Bourdieu, the American Howard Becker, a pure fruit from the Chicago tradition of sociology.

As a whole, this second part adds new insights and dimensions to our grasp of the global circulation of a sociological work like Bourdieu's, not only by widening the gaze to regions previously untouched (especially in Asia), but also by introducing some further elements of knowledge and reflection about the many ways a sociological work can spread beyond its original home-country and be received abroad, with all the various stakes, contradictions and consequences this circulation could engender.

The third and last part of the Symposium will be published in the next issue of the journal (2/2009), featuring articles on further countries like Russia, Italy and Australia (and possibly India), plus two papers devoted to thematic issues: one on the flow, timing and structure of Bourdieu's book translations from French, which offers an insightful and very useful general overview of the international circulation of an important part of Bourdieu's *oeuvre*; and another on the reception in Latin America of Bourdieu's harsh criticism of U.S. cultural imperialism, which nicely complements the two articles already published on this region of the world (on Argentina see the article of Baranger in the first part).

References

Bourdieu, P.

1994 *Raisons pratiques*. Paris: Seuil.

Fournier, M.

1994 *Marcel Mauss*. Fayard: Paris (English Trans.: *Marcel Mauss: A Biography*, Princeton, Princeton University Press 1995).

Silber, I.

1995 "Space, fields and boundaries: The rise of spatial metaphors in contemporary sociological theory." *Social Research*, 62, 2, pp. 323-355.

2009 "Bourdieu's Gift to Gift Theory: An Unacknowledged Trajectory." *Sociological Theory* 27, 2, pp. 173-190.

Marco Santoro is Associate Professor of Sociology at the University of Bologna. He works on the sociology of culture, the sociology and history of professions, the sociology of ideas and the political sociology of organized crime. He is currently writing a book on the production of culture movement in sociology, and with Timothy Dowd a textbook on the sociology of music.