

SP405 Contemporary Social Thought:
making sense of power and sociological theory

Mark Haugaard
Mark.Haugaard@nuigalway.ie
Ext 2298

While there is much diversity in contemporary social theory, there are a few themes which are central to most theoretical analysis. One of these is power, which is used as a thread to structure the course. Power has two radically different connotations, as follows: on the one hand, it entails *power over* others, suggesting domination; on the other hand, it also entails the capacity for action, or *power to*. With regard to domination, one of the interesting phenomena is that actors frequently are not simply coerced, through the overt threat of sanctions: they consent to their own domination. How do we explain this? Are they brainwashed? That seems too crude! With respect to emancipatory power, this capacity for action is not something that they possess singly but is derived from membership of a social system, which consists of an assembled set of social structures that both enable and constrain. In other words, domination and emancipation are both systemic and structural and, as such, are not separate processes.

In this course we shall take the theme of power and also related themes of structure, agency, social knowledge and social systems, as a focus for our analysis of contemporary social theory. Theories analysed will include those of Steven Lukes, Talcott Parsons, Antonio Gramsci, Nicos Poulantzas, Barry Barnes, Norbert Elias, Anthony Giddens, Pierre Bourdieu, Michel Foucault, Stewart Clegg and Mark Haugaard (some of my own reflections in the end).

Learning outcomes: understanding sociological theory; in particular, power and social order.

There is no general text for this course but the following is the closest to it:
Haugaard Mark (2002) *Power: A Reader*, [303.3 Pow]
Manchester University Press, Manchester. This contains many of the key texts and some commentary - purchase recommended.

David Inglis and Christopher Thorpe, *An Invitation to social theory*, Polity; 2012 is useful to give a sense of direction but is too general, for in-depth analysis – check in library, rather than purchase.

Mark Haugaard and Stewart Clegg's collection *Power and Politics*, (London: Sage) is also a useful source. There is only one copy in the library (as it is so expensive), so relevant articles from the collection will be uploaded to blackboard – no reason to fight over it.

You may wish to purchase books in individual topics which interest you. Key readings on topics are indicated with an asterisk or the symbol *.

Please note that I don't expect you to read all the works in this bibliography! They are simply there as a resource. You will also find additional books of your own which are relevant.

Assessment: exam plus short essay.

Special topics:

1) 1-D, 2-D and 3-D Conflictual Power: The Development of ‘Radical’ Views of Power – Robert Dahl, Bachrach and Baratz, and Steven Lukes.

This topic constitutes an introduction to the US power debates, which began in the 1950s and culminated in Lukes’ three-dimensional perspective. It is a reference point for all contemporary debates on power. In this perspective power is perceived in a manner close to everyday usage: power is equated with domination or the capacity to get another to engage in action, which they would not otherwise. The assumption is that power is negative, exercised against the interests of the subaltern, or subservient, actor.

Questions you might wish to think about: is the most effective form of power the control of people’s minds and desires? If so, what does it mean to suffer from false consciousness? Does a person who is willing to give their life for their country suffer from false consciousness? Is the working class Conservative (UK) or Republican (US) voter suffering from false consciousness? Are Muslim women who voluntarily wear the hijab victims of false consciousness? Would an affirmative answer to the latter constitute an expression of ethnocentric bias?

Michels Robert (1912) *Political Parties* The Free Press, Glencoe.

Hunter Floyed (1953) *Community Power Structure*, North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill.

Mills C Wright (1956 - and more recent editions) *The Power Elite*, Oxford Univ. Press, Oxford.

Weber Max (1978) *Economy and Society, An Outline of Interpretative Sociology*, University of California Press, California

Weber Max (1948 - more recent editions) *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology* (ed.) H.H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills, Routledge, London.

Bachrach P. and Baratz M.S. (1962)* “The Two Faces of Power”, *American Political Science Review*, vol. 56 reprinted in *Power: A Reader*

Bachrach P. and Baratz M.S. (1970) *Power and Poverty*, Oxford.

Crenson Mathew (1971) *The Unpolitics of Air Pollution*, John Hopkins Press, Baltimore.

Dahl R. A. (1961) *Who Governs?* Yale University Press, New Haven.

Clegg S. (1989) *Frameworks of Power*, London. 303.3

Dahl R.A. (1968)* “Power”, in *International Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences*, New York, also in Lukes S. (ed.) *Power*, Oxford, reprinted in *Power: A Reader*.

Haugaard M. (1997) *The Constitution of Power*, (ch1) Manchester University Press, Manchester. 303.3 Hau

Haugaard M. (1992) *Structures, Restructuration and Social Power*, (ch.1) Avebury, Aldershot. 303.3 Hau

Lukes S. (1974 and 2005)* *Power: A Radical View*, Macmillan, London (Extract also in *Power: A Reader*) - Second Edition 2005 (Pakgrave Macmillan), which includes the first edition as chapter one.

Lukes S. (1986) (ed.) *Power*, Basil Blackwell, Oxford. 303.3

Polsby Nelson W. (1980) *Community Power and Political Theory*, Yale University Press, New Haven.

Gaventa John (1983) *Power and Powerlessness*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Hayward C and S. Lukes (2008) ‘Nobody to Shoot? Power Structure and Agency: A Dialogue.’ *Journal of Power*, vol 1,1 pp. 5-20.

2) Functionalism and Power – Parsons.

In the previous lectures it was assumed that power equates with domination. However, is power not also the capacity for action? Is power *power to*, not simply *power over*? What is the objective of political organizations? Surely it is not simply to dominate people. Rather, it is to empower them collectively.

Parsons argued that power constitutes a capacity for action which actors derive from their membership of social systems. He integrated power into his famous, biologically based, structural-functional systems theory. Essentially, social systems exist as entities with functional needs that have to be fulfilled if the system is to survive. These needs include the ability to adapt to the environment, which is achieved by the economic subsystem. Another need is to get things done, or to achieve goals, which is carried out by the political system. The circulatory medium of the economy is money and that of the polity is power.

Questions to think about: Why do some systems survive and others go into decline? Is it because some perform functions well and others do so badly? If power is all about empowerment, how does this relate to power as domination? Are we (social actors) really just cogs acting out the structural functional needs of the social system?

Craib Ian, (1992) *Modern Social Theory: From Parsons to Habermas*, Harvester Wheatsheaf, London. 301.01 CRAs

Holmwood John (1996) *Founding Sociology? Talcott Parsons and the Idea of General Theory*, Longman, London.

Giddens A. (1968)* “‘Power’ in the Recent Writings of Talcott Parsons” *Sociology*, vol.2. Also in Cassell Philip (1993) (ed.) *The Giddens Reader*, Macmillan, London and in Giddens (1977) *Studies in Social and Political Theory*, Hutchinson, London.

David Lee and Howard Newby, (ed.) (1982) *The Problem of Sociological Theory* Dorsey Press Homewood Ill.

Haugaard M. (1992) *Structures, Restructuration and Social Power*, (ch.2) Avebury, Aldershot.

Parsons, Talcott (1968) *The Structure of Social Action*, Free Press New York.

Parsons Talcott (1963)* “On the Concept of Political Power”, *Proceedings of The American Philosophical Society*, reprinted in *Power: A Reader*.

Parsons, Talcott (1991) *The Social System*, Routledge, London. 20 C 8 or 301

Parsons, Talcott (1967) *Toward a General Theory of Action*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass.

Savage S. P. (1981) *The Theories of Talcott Parsons*, Macmillan, London. 301 PAR

Scott John (1995)* *Sociological Theory: Contemporary Debates*, Edward Elgar. 301.01 SCO

Ritzer George (2000) *Modern Sociological Theory*, McGraw Hill.

Wallace Ruth and Alison Wolf (2005) *Contemporary Sociological Theory*, Pearson.

(Please note there are many other books and introductions to sociology which cover Parsons and are not listed above but which you may wish to use)

3) Some Marxist Perceptions of Power and Hegemony – Antonio Gramsci and Nicos Poulantzas:

Is the state really about representing our interests or is a mode of domination? Are the prevalent ideas of a society necessarily the best ideas or do they represent the hegemonic perceptions of the dominant classes? The perception that the state and ideas represent the interests of dominant classes are central to Marxism, yet,

theorizing this process without resorting to conspiracy theories (accounts of elites, in secret locations, running the world) is actually surprisingly difficult.

In recent years Gramsci's account of hegemony, which was written while in prison under orders from Mussolini, has become of increasing theoretical interest as an account of how domination, not simply as a material phenomenon, is rooted in the taken-for-granted beliefs of a society.

One of the surprising facts, which seems to undermine any vulgar, or simplistic, interpretations of the Marxist hypothesis that the state is simply the executive of the dominant class is the phenomenon that, when in power, the Left do not, generally, undermine the fundamentals of capitalism. Poulantzas' argument provides us with a subtle account of this process, which has some resonance with the current situation of the Left.

Questions you may wish to think about: Why, after the collapse of Lehman Brothers in 2008, which was the consequence of neo-liberal lax regulation, has the neo-liberalism not died as an ideology? The British Labour party, under Tony Blair, gained power after years of Thatcherism, to what extent was this a victory for socialist policies?

Gramsci Antonio, (1971) *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*, Lawrence and Wishart

Bellamy Richard (1993) *Gramsci and the Italian State* Manchester Univ. P.

Fontana, Benedetto (1993)* *Hegemony and Power: On the Relation between Gramsci and Machiavelli*, University of Minnesota Press.

Fontana, Benedetto (2006) 'State and Society: The Concept of Hegemony in Gramsci' in Haugaard and Lentner (ed.) *Hegemony and Power*, Lexington Books.

Femia Joseph (1981) *Gramsci's Political Thought*, Oxford

Hoffman John (1984) *The Gramscian Challenge: Coercion and Consent...* Oxford

Martin James (1999) *Gramsci's Political Analysis: A Critical Introduction*, Macmillan Press.

Ransome Paul (1992) *Antonio Gramsci: A New Introduction*, Harvester.

Althusser Louis (1996) *For Marx* Verso, London.

Althusser Louis and Etienne Balibar (1970) *Reading Capital*, NLB London.

Lukes, Steven (1977) *Essays in Social Theory*, (Ch. 1) Macmillan, London.

Jessop Bob (1985)* *Nicos Poulantzas*, Macmillan, London.

Jessop Bob (1982) *The Capitalist State: Marxist Theories and Methods*, Blackwell, Oxford.

Jessop B. (1990) *State Theory: Putting the Capitalist State in its Place*, Polity, Cambridge.

Poulantzas N. (1973)* *Political Power and Social Classes*, NLB, London.

Poulantzas N. (1975) *Classes in Contemporary Capitalism*, NLB, London.

Poulantzas N. (1978)* *State, Power, Socialism*, NLB, London. Extract also in *Power: A Reader*

Lukes Steven, (1977) *Essays in Social Theory*, Macmillan, London.

Lukes Steven (2005) *Power: A Radical View* (second edition) later chapters.

(Please note that there are many other excellent books on Gramsci in the library, which I have not listed.)

4) 'Violence and Civilization' - Norbert Elias:

If we were to go back to the 14thC we would be surprised by the lack of restraint shown by people. Bodily functions that we would consider 'private' or 'disgusting'

would be public. Individuals moved from extremes of love and poetry to the heat of battle, with blood everywhere, with relative ease. In some senses our psychological makeup has been profoundly transformed by an increase in self-restraint. Vestiges of the older way of being-in-the-world can be seen in the Hollywood depiction of the typical Mafia boss, who cries about his love for his family but never hesitates to kill in cold blood if he thinks that his honour has been tainted by another – that killing can sometimes include those whom he loves. This being-in-the-world is psychologically far from the middle-class, bureaucratically employed members of modern society, as described by Max Weber. Elias theorized this change in emotional habitus, through, what he calls the *civilizing process*. In Elias' technical sociological usage civilization is not necessarily normatively desirable - a good thing.

Questions: Is human nature constant? Is civilization simply the internalization of constraint? Are traditional societies less restrained or maybe just differently restrained? Is contemporary society becoming less restrained, or civilized?

Burkitt, Ian 1996 "Civilization and Ambivalence" *The British Journal of Sociology* vol 4 135-150

Dunning Eric (2003) *Norbert Elias*, Sage London

Fletcher Jonathan (1997) *Violence and Civilization: an introduction to the work of Norbert Elias*, Polity Cambridge

Kilminster Richard (2007) *Norbert Elias: Post-Philosophical Sociology*, Routledge.

Kilminster Richard and S. Mennell (2003) "Norbert Elias" *The Blackwell Companion to Major Contemporary Theorists* (ed.) G Ritzer, Blackwell, Oxford.

Mennell Stephen* (1998) *Norbert Elias: An Introduction*, UCD Press (also earlier Blackwell edition) 301.ELIM

Mennell Stephen and J Goudsblom (1998) *On Civilization, Power and Knowledge: Selected writings*, Univ. Chicago Press.

Elias Norbert*(1994 - various editions) *The Civilizing Process*, Blackwell, Oxford. 909.ELI

Elias, Norbert (1994) *The Established and the Outsiders*, Sage, London.

Elias Norbert (1998) *The Norbert Elias Reader* (ed.) Johan Goudsblom and Stephen Mennell, OUP, Oxford.

Elias Norbert (1991) *The Society of Individuals*, Blackwell, Oxford.

Elias, Norbert (2008) "Power and Civilization" *Journal of Power*, Routledge, London. Vol 1.

Smith, Denis (2001) *Norbert Elias and Modern Social Theory*, Sage London.

Pinker, Steven (2011) *The Better Angels of our Nature: A history of violence and humanity*. London: Penguin.

Quilley, Stephen and Stephen Loyal *The Sociology of Norbert Elias*, CUP Cambridge.

Van Krieken, Robert "Norbert Elias & Process Sociology. *The Handbook of Social Theory* (ed.) George Ritzer and Barry Smart, Sage London.

5) Theories of Capital – Pierre Bourdieu:

It is an observed fact that when children from economically deprived backgrounds are given more or less the same material resources as middle-class children they still, somehow, do not achieve as well in the educational system or in the job market. Similarly in colonial type situations 'locals' do not do as well as the colonizers even with concerted attempts are made to create a level playing field. According to Bourdieu part of the reason is that capital is not simply economic capital. There are many forms of capital, beyond economic capital, which ensures that elites can protect

their privilege in way other than crude economically based modes of domination. The most significant of these is ‘cultural capital’, which entails a privileging of the taken-for-granted knowledge, or *habitus*, of a class over and above the rest.

Questions to think about: it is a colloquial Irish expression to say something is “class” as a form of commendation, does this represent a tacit insight into a profounder truth that class determines what is held in esteem? Is class conflict really about material things or is it also about privileging certain ways of life? Are abstract art or, more especially conceptual art, less about innovation in artistic creation (as is claimed by its protagonists) than a form of elitist social exclusion whereby those ‘in the know’ define taste in a way that is hard for the ordinary person to penetrate or understand?

Bourdieu, Pierre (1984)* *Distinction : A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste* , Routledge, London. 305.5BOU

Bourdieu, Pierre (1988) *Homo Academicus* , Polity, Cambridge.

Bourdieu Pierre (1989)* ‘Social Space and Symbolic Power’ *Sociological Theory* Vol. 7. Also in *Power: A Reader*.

Bourdieu, Pierre (1990) *The Logic of Practice* , Polity, Cambridge. 303.83BOU

Bourdieu, Pierre (1990) *In Other Words: Essays Towards a Reflexive Sociology*, Polity, Cambridge.

Bourdieu, Pierre (1991) *Language and Symbolic Power: The Economy of Linguistic Exchanges*, Polity, Cambridge.

Bourdieu, Pierre (1998) *Practical Reason : On the Theory of Action*, Polity, Cambridge.

Bourdieu, Pierre and Loic J. D. Wacquant (1992)* *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology* , Polity, Cambridge.

Jenkins, Richard (1992)* *Pierre Bourdieu*, Routledge, London. 301.BOU.J

Fowler Bridget (1997) *Pierre Bourdieu and Cultural Theory : Critical Investigations*, Sage, London.

Harker, Richard, Cheleen Mahar, and Chris Wilkes (1990) *An Introduction to the work of Pierre Bourdieu : The Practice of Theory*, Macmillan, Houndmills, Basingstoke.

Calhoun, Craig, Edward LiPuma and Moishe Postone (1993) (ed.) *Bourdieu : Critical Perspectives*, Polity, Cambridge.

Robbins, Derek (1999) (ed.) *Pierre Bourdieu*, Sage, London. 31111401106628

Robbins, Derek (2000) *Bourdieu and Culture*, Sage, London

Paras, Eric (2006) *Foucault 2.0: Beyond Power and Knowledge*, The Other Press.

Swartz, David (1997) *Culture & Power : The Sociology of Pierre Bourdieu*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago. 301.bou.s

Webb, Jean, Danaher, Geoff, and Tony Schirato , (2006) *Understanding Bourdieu*, Sage.

6) Knowledge and Social Order – Barry Barnes and John Searle:

If we understand power as *power to*, as the capacity for action, the challenge is to theorize this without the unsatisfactory account presented Parsons, where social actors are cultural dupes and power relates to system goals. Barnes attempts to provide us with a theory of power, as empowerment, based upon a social philosophy derived from the work of historian of science, Thomas Kuhn. Essentially we inhabit shared paradigms, which are constitutive of social knowledge, that facilitate social power. Social order is actually a massive self-fulfilling prophesy in which our beliefs self-validate. If we believe marriage is marriage or that Obama is the President of the

USA, then that belief makes these social facts true. The latter, in turn, confer upon us a shared capacity for action - power.

John Searle is not in direct dialogue with Barry Barnes but his theory is close to Barnes'. Searle argues that social life constitutes a massive set of performative actions, whereby we construct social institutions through social action. He reduces social life to a formula X counts as Y in circumstances C - Obama (X) counts as President of the United States (Y) in the circumstances that he wins the Presidential election (C).

Questions you might wish to consider: Contrary to the perception of power as guns and money, is power really all about belief and ideas? If so, why can't we 'un-think' the power of the powerful, if that suits, or can we? How does Ghandi's doctrine of passive resistance really work?

Kuhn Thomas (1971) *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, MIT Press.

Laver Michael (1997) *Private Desires, Political Action*, Sage, London.

Barnes Barry (1982) *T.S. Kuhn and Social Science* Penguin Harmondsworth

Barnes Barry (1988)* *The Nature of Power*, Polity Press, Cambridge, 303.3.BAR
Extract reprinted in *Power: A Reader*.

Barnes Barry (1995) *The Elements of Social Theory*, UCL Press.

Barnes Barry (1996) *Scientific Knowledge: A Sociological Analysis*, Athlone Press, London.

Haugaard M. (1997) *The Constitution of Power*, (ch.2 - Barnes) Manchester University Press, Manchester.

Mazzotti Masimo (2008) *Knowledge as Social Order: Rethinking the Sociology of Barry Barnes*, Aldershot: Ashgate.

Searle J. (1996)* *The Construction of Social Reality*, London: Penguin Books.

Searle J. (2007)* "Social Ontology and Political Power" in *Freedom and Neurobiology: Reflections on Free will, Language and Political Power*, New York: Columbia University Press.

Searle John (2010)* *Making the Social World: The Structure of Human Civilization*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Koepsell David and Laurence S. Moss (2003) *Searle on the Institutions of Social Reality*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

7) Structuration Theory – Anthony Giddens:

Social structures are often considered something external to actors, which propel them along. In his theory of structuration, Giddens presents an alternative vision of our relationship to social structures, which avoids this kind of structuralist determinacy. Key is the theorization of structures in *verb* form, as *structuration*, which is something we do. Social structures do not simply act upon us (as victims). Rather, we create social structures in order to facilitate social action. We do this because ordering the world is essential not only to our capacity for action but also for, what Giddens calls, our ontological security, which relates to our being-in-the-world. If we look to concentration camps and ritualized torture one of the key elements is undermining of ontological security. As George Orwell once observed, the ultimate torture is to teach someone that two and two makes five.

Question to think about: if your social actions as a 'student' constitute acts of structuration which reproduce the social system, to what extent are these acts of structuration both enabling and constraining?

- Archer Margaret A. (1988) Chapter 4 of *Culture and Agency: The Place of Culture in Social Theory*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Bryant G.A. and Jary D. (ed.) (1991) *Giddens' Theory of Structuration: A Critical Appreciation*, London.
- Callinicos A. (1985) "Anthony Giddens", *Theory and Society*, vol.14.
- Cassell Philip (1993) (ed.) *The Giddens Reader*, Macmillan, London. 301.01 GID
- Clark Jon et al (ed.) (1990) *Anthony Giddens: Consensus and Controversy*, Falmer, London.
- Cohen Ira J. (1989) *Structuration Theory: Anthony Giddens and the Constitution of Social Life*, Macmillan, London.
- Cohen Ira, J (1987) "Structuration Theory and Social Praxis" in Giddens (ed.) *Social Theory Today*, Polity Press, Cambridge.
- Craib Ian (1992) *Anthony Giddens*, Routledge, London. 301.01.GID.C
- Giddens A. (1976) *New Rules of Sociological Method*, Hutchinson, London.
- Giddens, A. (1979) *Central Problems in Social Theory: Action, Structure and Contradiction in Social Analysis*, Macmillan, London.
- Giddens A (1981)* *Contemporary Critique of Historical Materialism*, Macmillan, London. 335.4119GID
- Giddens, Anthony (1982) *Profiles and Critiques in Social Theory*, Macmillan, London.
- Giddens A. (1984)* *The Constitution of Society*, Polity, Cambridge. Extract also in *Power: A Reader* 301.GID
- Giddens A (1985) *The Nation State and Violence*, Polity, Cambridge.
- Giddens Anthony (1995) *Politics, Sociology and Social Theory*, Polity, Cambridge
- Haugaard M. (1997)* *The Constitution of Power*, (ch. 4) Manchester University Press, Manchester.
- Haugaard M. (1992) *Structures, Restructuration and Social Power*, (ch.4-7) Aldershot.
- Held D. and Thompson J. B. (1989) *Social Theory of Modern Societies: Anthony Giddens and His Critics*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

8) Power, Systems of Thought and Social Subjects: Michel Foucault:

In Lukes' account of power in the third dimension, power is a product of untruth, or rationalization. Thus, truth and reason are emancipatory. Unlike this Enlightenment position, following Nietzsche, Foucault argues that systems of thought are central to forms of domination. In Giddens and Bourdieu we saw that agents are empowered by occupying certain social roles. In Foucault our social roles are not simply a set of resources which we adopt, they are constitutive of whom we are as social subjects. Through the analysis of the development of the prison system and the history of sexuality, Foucault shows that we are both subjects and objects of our own knowledge, which constitutes a form of subjectification that entails domination. During the 19th C new modes of being were created which are central to modernity as a mode of domination.

Questions to think about: we spend our lives trying to certain kinds of persons, to what extent is this pursuit a mode of emancipation or self-subjectification? Reflect upon your own schooling, to what extent was it about learning, in the true sense of the word, and to what extent was it about creating docile social subjects?

- Barker, Philip (1993) *Michel Foucault: Subversions of the Subject*, Harvester Wheatsheaf, London.
- Clegg S. (1989) *Frameworks of Power*, Sage, London.
- Cousins Mark and Hussain Athar, (1984) *Michel Foucault*, Macmillan, London.
- Dreyfus, H. L. and Rabinow P. (1983) *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*, Harvester Wheatsheaf, Chicago.
- Danaher, Geoff, Tony Schirato and Jean Webb, (2000) *Understanding Foucault*, Sage.
- Foucault, Michel (1971 and 90) *Madness and Civilization*, London: Routledge 616.89009033FOU
- Foucault, Michel (1970)* *The Order of Things*, Routledge, London. 001.2.FOU and 909.FOU
- Foucault M. (1979)* *Discipline and Punish, The Birth of the Prison*, Penguin, Harmondsworth. 365.643.FOU Extract also in *Power: A Reader*
- Foucault Michel. (1980) *Power/Knowledge: Selected Essays and Interviews*, Harvester Press, Brighton. 303.3.FOU
- Foucault M. (1983) "The Subject and Power", an afterword in Dreyfus and Rabinow (1983) Foucault Michel (1989) *The Birth of the Clinic: An Archaeology of Medical Perception*, Routledge, London.
- Foucault M. (1990)* *The History of Sexuality: An Introduction*, Vol. 1 Penguin, Harmondsworth.
- Foucault, Michel (1991) *The Foucault Reader: An Introduction to His Thought* (ed.) Paul Rabinow, Penguin, Harmondsworth. 194.FOU
- Gane M. (1986) *Towards a Critique of Foucault*, Routledge, London
- Gutting, Gary (ed) (2005) *The Cambridge Companion to Foucault*, CUP, Cambridge.
- Haugaard M. (1997)* *The Constitution of Power*, (ch.3) Manchester University Press, Manchester.
- Hoy D. C. (ed.) (1986) *Foucault: A Critical Reader*, Basil Blackwell, Oxford.
- Kelly, Michael (ed.) (1994) *Critique and Power: Recasting the Foucault/Habermas Debate*, MIT, Cambridge Mass..
- McNay Lois (1994)* *Foucault: A Critical Introduction*, Polity, Cambridge. 194.FOU.M
- Mills Sarah (2003) *Michel Foucault*, Routledge.
- O Farrell Clare (2005) *Michel Foucault*, Sage.
- Poster Mark (1984) *Foucault, Marxism and History*, Basil Blackwell, Oxford.
- Rabinow Paul (1986) *The Foucault Reader*, Penguin, Harmondsworth.
- Sheridan A. (1990)* *Michel Foucault: The Will to Truth*, Tavistock, London.
- Shumway David R. (1992)* *Michel Foucault* University Press of Virginia, Virginia.
- Simons Jon (1995) *Foucault and the Political*, Routledge, London.
- Smart Barry (1985)* *Michel Foucault*, Routledge, London. 194.FOU.S
- Taylor C. (1986) "Foucault on Freedom and Truth" in Hoy D. C. (ed.) (1986).

9) The Postmodernist Synthesis: - Stewart Clegg

Lukes and Foucault's work are often considered incompatible, as incommensurable paradigms. While Clegg clearly prefers Foucault to Lukes, he argues that the two perspectives can be brought together in the idea of 'circuits of power'. He argues that one has to distinguish between the *episodic* exercise of power, which takes place in a moment, and the deeper *dispositions* that the exercise of power reflects. In chess, we understand what makes the queen powerful not simply by focussing upon some

specific instance that she takes a pawn. Rather, we can properly ascertain her power by understanding the rules of the game which defines her dispositions.

Question to think about: to what extent is the effectiveness of domination rooted in the fact that we always focus upon episodic power, to the neglect of dispositional power? In other words, is the subtle ruse of domination not that we tend to analyse who does what, where, and when, while neglecting the rules of the game that defines their agency in the first place?

Readings:

Clegg S. (1989)* *Frameworks of Power*, Sage, London. Extract also in *Power: A Reader*

Clegg Stewart, David Courpasson and Nelson Phillips (2006) *Power and Organizations*, London: Sage.

Critchley S. (2004) *Laclau*, Routledge.

Laclau E. and Mouffe C. (1985) *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy*, Verso, London. 335.009.LAC

Laclau E. (1990) *New Reflections on the Revolution of our Time*, Verso, London.

Torring Jacob (1999) *New Theories of Discourse*, Blackwell, Oxford. 300.1TOR

Zizek Slavo (1989) *The Sublime Object of Ideology*, Verso, London.

10) Power, Knowledge and Structure (some thoughts of my own by way of conclusion!):

Having analysed the power debates for many years, it seems to me that the central questions of social theory is really to understand how and why it is that the relatively less powerful, consent to their own domination, while also answering the question, how are social actors empowered? Bringing the big debates in social theory together, like Giddens, I argue that social structures both enable and constrain. Unlike Giddens, and more like Foucault, I would claim that that this structural reproduction entails high levels of conflict. Social structures are reflections of our beliefs, as in Barnes and Searle, but those beliefs are frequently distorted through reification of truth claims, as in Lukes, Gramsci and Foucault. The creation of subject positions entails domination, as described by Foucault, but also is a condition of possibility for ordered interaction, thus is emancipatory. What emerges is presented, and considered by me, as a coming together of the debates above.

Questions to consider: Are truth claims really about truth or are they about making a particular version of reality count for the purposes of domination? Foucault presents the internalization of self-restraint in largely negative terms, however is self-restraint not a condition of possibility for modern democratic politics and, indeed, scientific achievement?

Haugaard Mark (2003) 'Reflections on Seven Ways of Creating Power', *European Journal of Social Theory*, vol 6 (1) 87-113

Haugaard (2012) 'Power and Truth', *European Journal of Social Theory*, 15(1): 73-92.

Haugaard (2012) 'Rethinking the Four Dimensions of Power', *Journal of Political Power* 5(1): 35-54.

Haugaard (2010) 'Democracy, Political Power, and Authority' *Social Research* 77, 4: 1-26.

Haugaard Mark (2008) "Power and Habitus" the *Journal of Power*, Vol 1 Routledge, London.

Haugaard Mark (1997) (second half of) *The Constitution of Power: A Theoretical Analysis of Power, Knowledge and Structure*, Manchester University Press, Manchester. Extract also in *Power: A Reader*

Richardson Tim and Mathew Cashmore "Power Knowledge and Environmental Assessment" *Journal of Political Power* vol. 4. 1. pp. 105-125.

Clegg Stewart, David Courpasson and Nelson Phillips (2006) *Power and Organizations*, Sage London.