No 45 October 1989

NETWORK

NEWSLETTER OF THE BRITISH SOCIOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

ESRC RESEARCH INITIATIVES

Since 1987 the ESRC has divided support for substantive research projects between its Research Grants Board and its three Research Development Groups. The Research Grants Board operates responsively and considers unsolicited applications submitted through the Research Grant Scheme against three closing dates each year.

The three Research Development Groups have responsibility for the development of research initiatives. These are intended to address research opportunities and priorities through the establishment of co-ordinated multi and inter-disciplinary programmes of related projects. The Groups submit bids to Council in an annual competition and successful bids receive an allocation of funds against which Group invite proposals.

In considering research opportunities and priorities for research initiatives, Groups will be seeking to identify areas which are of both intrinsic intellectual importance, and likely to be able to inform policy making, and which would benefit from the focussed attention of a co-ordinated set of research projects.

The Research Development Groups are not constituted on a disciplinary basis, and aspects of Sociology will be found within the remits of each.

The Groups are:

Industry, the Economy and the Environment
This covers the areas of industrial and corporate structure and management; regional and urban policy; technological change and competitiveness; employment and the organisation of work; the built and natural environment, and transport; financial and capital markets; macro-economic policy; fiscal studies; and trade policy and international co-ordination.

Human Behaviour and Development
This covers the areas of human behaviour; health; education; welfare; cognitive studies (including lead responsibility for information technology); developmental studies; the family; social services; and deviance.

Society and Politics
This covers the areas of organisation and structure of society; legal, political and bureaucratic systems; cultures and sub-cultures and the systems of relations between them; population studies; social history; social values; crime and justice; international relations; community studies; leisure; media studies; and ethnography.

In identifying research opportunities and priorities, the Groups will consider the nature and extent of past research and the existing and potential research capacity in the field. They will also consult policy makers and researchers, including their relevant learned and professional association.

Martin Kender, ESRC

The BSA has established a Strategy Sub-committee one objective of which is to explore means whereby the voice of the membership may be presented to the ESRC. If you have clear ideas about the kinds of direction along which *Research Initiatives* should be developed and the priorities which should inform the selection of topics contact Malcolm Cross, Centre for Research in Ethnic Relations, University of Warwick, Coventry, Warcs, CV4 7AL. Telephone (0203) 523971. Remember suggestions should be specific to Research Initiatives.

IN THIS ISSUE

SOCIOLOGY – BACK IN THE USSR

Manchester trains Soviet Students

After decades of suppression and neglect soviet sociology is undergoing something of a renaissance. With new faculties of sociology being established at the Universities of Moscow, Leningrad, Kiev and Novosibirsk there is an urgent need for soviet scholars to gain access to the latest sociological thinking produced by colleagues elsewhere. Recognising this necessity, Professor Teodor Shanin of Manchester University recently organised a nine week long intensive training course on current developments in sociology for twenty one Soviet students. Held over the summer, the course, costing £100,000, was funded by the ESRC, British Council, British Academy and Soros and Maxwell Foundations. Topics selected from a 'menu' presented to Soviet authorities included urban sociology, gender and class, criminology and recent issues in theoretical sociology. A similar course will be held next year at the University of Kent with another in 1991 a distinct possibility. Informal contacts were made between the BSA and the Soviet Sociological Association with the possibility of more definite links in the future.

The Shanin initiative demonstrates that Perestroika and Glasnost represent an enormous opportunity for UK academics keen to co-operate in research and teaching with their Soviet colleagues. The British Council now has new funds to expand its work in the USSR and is keen to encourage Higher Education interchange initiatives. Among the priority subject areas highlighted in a report by a British delegation which visited the Soviet Union recently are 'comparative and applied social studies..., business and management, sociology, ... and computing/informatics especially in education'. For further information on the types of collaborative arrangements that might be considered, and the kind of financial assistance available from the British Council (in general terms, basic travel costs and a contribution towards subsistence) contact

Europe Division
The British Council
10 Spring Gardens
LONDON SW1

There is serious Soviet interest in co-operation with British higher education institutions and equally marked puzzlement at the apparently low level of British commitment to such co-operation. Lack of funds on the British side, and bureaucracy on the Soviet side have been major obstacles in the past but the present situation suggests some improvement making purposeful, mutually beneficial collaboration feasible.

CLASS, STATUS AND DEPARTMENTS:

University Sociologists stratified

After the non–hierarchial rankings produced by the UGC of the teaching of sociology in Universities (remember that?) the extremely hierarchial UFC review of research comes as a much surer indication of future developments. 'Fives' go to Essex, Warwick, Kent, Lancaster, and Oxford – clearly destined to reinforce their position as core departments when it comes to the future allocation of government derived funds for research and research training. Competition to join these 'Centres of Excellence' by another name will be fierce amongst the 'fours', but presumably they must await another (£4 million plus) RSE in order to improve their rankings. 'Threes', 'twos' and 'ones' might seek amalgamation or comfort themselves by becoming dedicated teaching units now Robert Jackson has so emphatically endorsed this aspect of University life. The sociology panel consisted of R Pahl (Kent 5), Professor F Bechhofer (Edinburgh 4), Dr Colin Crouch (Oxford 5), Professor D Parkin (SOAS 3) and Ms Jennifer Platt (Sussex 4). No cheap cracks about self–rated class please. No truth either in the rumours that the BSA will be distributing 'We Gotta 5' T shirts.

RSE / Review Ready Reckoner

		UGC Review Categories					
		1A	1B	1C	1D	II	III
UFC RSE Score	5	Kent Lancaster	Essex Warwick				Oxford
	4	Leicester Sussex	LSE Manchester Surrey Edinburgh	Queen's, Belfast		Birmingham	Cambridge
	3	Bristol Leeds Liverpool Salford York	Glasgow	Durham	Bath Keele Birkbeck Loughborough Southampton Swansea	City RHBNC	
	2	Goldsmiths Reading Cardiff Aberdeen			Exeter Hull	Brunel East Anglia	
	1					Nottingham Strathclyde	
not included in RSE as sociology units		Ulster			Bradford Sheffield	Bangor Stirling Aston Newcastle	

UFC.RSE Ratings

5 International excellence in many areas, national excellence in all others
4 National excellence with some evidence of international excellence
3 National excellence in a majority of areas or limited international excellence
2 National excellence in up to half of areas
1 Little or no national excellence

UGC Review categories

1A Generally mainline sociology departments
1B Departments with distinctive research training traditions
1C Departments on the borderline between 1A and 1B
1D Departments where sociology is part of an integrated social science structure
II Variety of institutions with generally small groups of sociologists
III Cambridge and Oxford

DAVID WEBSTER

1945–1989

David Webster, passionate campaigner against apartheid and anthropologist, was assassinated outside his home in Johannesburg on 1st May 1989. In a paper he wrote with Maggie Friedman only days before his death he and his co–author pointed to 'the steady tempo of kidnappings and assassinations of anti–apartheid activists.... [which] ... have the effect of controlling opposition when all other methods... have failed. It is a rare event indeed when such assassinations are solved'. According to figures compiled by the Human Rights Commission and Webster himself, 61 anti–apartheid activists have been murdered in South Africa since 1978. In 60 of these cases no–one has been arrested or charged.

Born in Zambia in 1945 David Webster joined the anthropology staff at the University of Witswatersrand in 1971 having completed a PhD at Rhodes University. Responding to the gross inequalities of the apartheid system and the plight of the underprivileged (and finding academic anthropology mute on these issues) he became deeply committed to the struggle for Human Rights in South Africa. In pursuit of the destruction of apartheid David Webster devoted himself to a range of activities and organisations including, the Detainee's Parents Support Committee, the Five Freedoms Forum, NUSAS and the United Democratic Front. His funeral on 6th May, attended by over ten thousand mourners was a powerful tribute to his quiet determination and the cause to which he was committed – a commitment which cost him his life. Thus far no one has been charged with his murder.

OCCUPATIONAL MOBILITY

Dr Muhammed Anwar has been appointed as new Director of the ESRC – funded Centre for Research in Ethnic Relations (CRER) at the University of Warwick. Professor Catherine Hakim is the new Director of the ESRC Data Archive at the University of Essex and Professor Tony Coxon has been appointed Director of the ESRC Interdisciplinary Research Centre in Micro Social Change also at Essex.

Stewart Clegg has been appointed to the Chair in the Department of Management at the University of St Andrews (January 1990). Chairs also at Warwick for Gillian Rose and Jim Beckford; at Keele for John Law, at Exeter for Philip Corrigan, Peter Golding at Loughborough, and Miriam David at South Bank Polytechnic. Martin Shaw has been promoted to Senior Lecturer at Hull, Peter Cressey appointed as Lecturer in Industrial Sociology at Bath and J Gershuny has moved to a Fellowship at Nuffield College, Oxford.

MILOTTE GOES WEST

Mike Milotte long time publications officer of the BSA has taken the post of Investigations Editor with the Sunday Tribune in Dublin. Under Mike's tutelage the Book Club grew in range and importance as a service to BSA members, and he will be missed by all those involved in getting material published under the BSA imprint. The BSA Executive Committee and membership wish him well in his new job.

RATES FOR MEMBERSHIP from 1990

Membership rates are charged according to income on a sliding scale which ensures that people pay what they can afford. The BSA is largely dependent on members' subscriptions. Running costs are kept to a minimum by voluntary work undertaken on behalf of the Association, which supplements the activities of the two staff members. Annual subscription rates are:

£6 = Unwaged/state benefits
£9 = under £4,000/ *FT postgrad.
£12 = £4,000 – £7,499
£20 = £7,500 – £9,999
£25 = £10,000 – £14,999
£30 = £15,000 – £19,999
£35 = £20,000 – £24,999
£40 = £25,000 – £29,999
£45 = £30,000 – £34,999
£50 = £35,000 – £39,999
£55 = £40,000 and over

All members in the above categories receive the Association's quarterly journal, *Sociology*, free of charge.

* UK only

Undergraduate students who provide confirmation of their status from a tutor pay a nominal membership fee of £3 pa. Undergraduates who wish to subscribe to *Sociology* may do so at the privileged rate of £6.00.

Overseas members:

£20 = Third World
£30 = Europe
£35 = Rest of the World

The BSA is registered as having charitable status and members can claim tax relief on subscriptions under Section 16 of the Finance Act 1958. Allowances are generally made at the basic rate of taxation and can considerably reduce the real cost of subscription to members.

LEARNING FROM DISASTERS?

Abbeystead, Falkirk, Bradford, Beverley, Zeebrugge, River Twoy, Kings Cross, Piper Alpha, Clapham, Bellgrove, Purley, Kegworth, Hillsborough, River Thames. A long, sad list of disasters in the past five years. But are these accidents – each with their unique aspects and circumstances – just a series of tragic events, or is there a more fundamental connection between them? If so, can sociology say something of this?

In the immediate aftermath of almost all of these disasters, certainly the most well-publicised among them, there occurred a public apportioning of blame upon an individual or individuals immediately on the scene of the disaster, usually workers, sometimes members of the public, who were, often victims of the tragedy themselves. Focus was upon triggering events – the dropping of a cigarette or match, faulty wiring, a failure to visually check bow doors – while the factors that allowed such events either to occur or to cause a disaster were only later (sometimes partially) uncovered in the course of an inquiry. Inquiries located fundamental responsibility for the incidents in organisational features and managerial errors – 'negligence and continued inaction', 'a disease of sloppiness', a 'seriously flawed, blinkered and dangerous attitude towards safety', and so on.

But the arriving at fundamental causes is important if such disasters *and* accidents are to be prevented. Over 600 deaths and 20,000 major (non fatal) occupational injuries are reported to the Health and Safety Executive every year. Yet these are not followed by large-scale, public inquiries and remain largely viewed as discrete, unconnected and unexpected events – archetypal accidents.

Thus, within managerial discourse on occupational safety, there predominates an ideological understanding of the worker-industrial accident relationship, according to which 'human' (that is, worker) error causes the vast majority of accidents. The absence of rigorous inquiry facilitates this obscuring of fundamental (first and second order) causes. Accidents of a similar nature are bound to recur, since any remedial action takes place at the level of symptoms rather than causes.

My own work on the chemical industry (Tombs, 1989) has highlighted a number of common accident-generating factors. Yet an assessment of the preventability of these (first order) causes – such as poor maintenance, inadequate training, insufficient knowledge of a process or substances – requires an understanding of those (second order) phenomena from which they derive. Thus, for example, if they are a consequence of an increasingly complex, technological society, they are less eradicable than if they are rooted in the absence of a national 'safety culture'.

One response to recent disasters which neither remains at the level of symptoms nor first order causes, but which attempts to address fundamental, second order, causes is that they have resulted from a lack of investment and a generally inadequate infrastructure, this highlighting a contradiction between safety and profits (see, for example, Jacques, 1989). This argument is particularly persuasive, since the images of decay and discomfort which it evokes strike chords with our experiences as commuters, spectators, passengers, and so on. But while an antipathy to (forms of) public investment is one aspect of Thatcherite economic management, there is another set of fundamental causes often obscured in such commentaries on disasters. And it is here that insights both from organisational, and from Marxist, sociology are crucial.

Turner (1978) has argued that *energy + misinformation = disaster.* Disasters occur where complex and systemic, human and organisational factors prevent relevant information reaching those individuals or groups who may have acted upon it in order to pre-empt the disaster. Such 'communication failures' are of four kinds. Two of these – the non-existence of knowledge, or the existence of knowledge which has no place in prevailing modes of understanding – are in principle ineradicable. Crucially, however, Turner also notes errors resulting from information being 'known but not fully appreciated', and 'known by someone' but 'not brought together with other information at an appropriate time when its significance can be realised'.

Pearce (1987) has noted that these latter forms of communication error may be rooted in the ability of corporate technocracies to define what is legitimate knowledge, what knowledge may or may not be acted upon, who do or do not constitute sources of serious statements, and so on. In these ways, 'errors' of communication are related to the maintenance of what Habermas (1970) has called repressive or distorted communication/speech.

Here, then, we have somewhat a different set of second order causes. The argument concerning investment and the contradiction between safety and profits posits a prioritisation of accumulation above other goals under capitalism. On the other hand, second-order causes related to the predominance of 'repressive communication' highlight the significance of the need for the powerful to control and guard the right to manage, and to exclude workers, commuters, spectators, and others from having a voice in decision-making; this may be equally relevant, therefore, to 'socialist' countries.

Thus almost all the disasters might have been prevented had use been made of the knowledge possessed by those with regular and on the ground experience of the 'technologies' in question. That workers, passengers, consumers, spectators, and so on, be treated as sources of serious statements on health and safety might thus be isolated as one precondition of eradicating some accidents. Without positing the need for a utopian situation of 'ideal speech', if we conceive of this at one extreme of a continuum, with 'repressive communication' at the other, then any shifts from the latter towards the former will facilitate the prevention of certain forms of accidents. *Safety must be organised rather than managed.*

This also goes some way to explaining why recent years have witnessed a veritable procession of disasters in the UK. Of course, just as a lack of investment can be related to 'Thatcherism', so can repressive communication be linked much more directly with governments whose aims have been to reduce the power – the voice – not only of organised labour, but also, contrary to much of their rhetoric, of many consumer groups, environmental interests, and so on. The authoritarian and centralising nature of Thatcherism has thus entailed a shift towards the repressive end of the continuum posited above. The right of capital to manage has been (re)asserted.

The challenging of this technocratic (and disastrous) hubris will require the development of institutional forms whereby representatives of various publics are granted a voice in organisation of potentially hazardous technologies which may affect them. This is not unthinkable, even at present; one consequence of the Hillsborough disaster, for example, may be a participative role for the (grass-roots) Football Supporters Association.

Finally, there is a broader political point to all this (since this is an attempt at objective yet also committed sociology). One of the reasons for the success of the emergence of Thatcherite hegemony was its ability to strike chords with aspects of very real popular experiences. Similarly, the supercession of this hegemony will be facilitated by efforts which hook onto the real popular fears that have emerged around the issues of safety and the environment. Conservative governments have appeared particularly vulnerable on these issues. It is up to the political forces of the Left not to allow this moment to pass without an explicit attempt to fashion a politics which places the quality, and indeed preservation, of life, before other social goals.

References

Habermas, J., 1970. Towards a Theory of Communicative Competence. In: Dreitzel, H., ed., **Recent Sociology**. Macmillan, New York: 115–148.

Jacques, M., (1989) 'By disaster's light, our ills revealed', **Sunday Times**, 26 February 1989.

Pearce, F., 1987. Corporate Crime, a Review Essay. In: **Critical Social Policy**, 19: 116–125.

Tombs, S. (1989) 'Deviant Workplaces and Dumb Managements? Understanding and Preventing Accidents in the Chemical Industry', **Industrial Crisis Quarterly**, forthcoming.

Turner, B., 1978. **Man-Made Disasters**. Wykeham, London.

Steve Tombs
Wolverhampton Polytechnic

BSA ANTI RACIST LANGUAGE GUIDELINES

Following an Emergency Resolution at the BSA Annual General Meeting, the BSA Executive have drawn up guide–lines for anti–racist language guidance in BSA publications, journals and all activities.

These guidelines are at present a draft copy drawn up in consultation with the Anti Racist Study Group. The more obvious terms of abuse have been omitted on the grounds that sociologists would be unlikely to use them in any case.

Comments would be welcome. Please send them to Claire Wallace at the BSA address.

* * *

The guidelines are divided into three sections:

acceptable terms
acceptable/
unacceptable
(depending on context)
unacceptable terms

Acceptable Terms

Black. This is a term often used as a new cultural construction with the implication of solidarity among minorities against racism. To accept this suggests that we should seek to avoid the many negative connotations relating to the word 'black' in the English Language. However, some Asians in Britain object to the term black being applied to them. The single term confuses a range of ethnicities. So some way of referring to these Asians seems desirable as an additional term for use as occasion indicates. Persons of South Asian origin may be most appropriate for Indians, Pakistanis and Bangladeshis. However, reference to origins is not entirely satisfactory since many second generation members of the minorities were born in Britain and prefer some term which indicates their Britishness. One answer to this might be – British Asians. One might also use the nationality for more specific reference – British Pakistani, or Chinese British. It may not matter whether we put the term 'British' before or after the accompanying nationality origin. A further advantage of the two term reference is that the two ethnicities are mentioned and this avoids any suggestion that a member of a minority has chosen or has to choose between them for his/her identity.

Afro–Caribbean is another term popular among many West Indian British. Its overtones seem to be those of an anti–racist language.

Minorities. This is a useful term. It is generally preferable to 'ethnic minorities' as this term infers that the majority is not ethnic too. A snag which needs to be born in mind if one is addressing an American audience is that American sociologists seem often to use the term not in a numerical sense but in a power sense. This makes it possible to refer to a numerical majority as a minority if they have minimal power. If one has a British and American audience, one ought therefore to clarify how one is using the term.

Preferred Terms

Black people/person. Also black British.
British Asians. Also British Pakistanis or Indian British.
Afro–Caribbean.
Minorities.

Acceptable/Unacceptable

There seems to be a case for a category which is neither wholly acceptable, nor wholly unacceptable. Rather, there are some concepts either acceptable or unacceptable depending on the context or usage. Three concepts are considered in these terms and there may well be others.

Non–White. This may be acceptable where one wishes to refer to say, whites and non–whites. However, continual reference to non–whites might be seen as demeaning. Frequent allusion would therefore do better to use terms like black people, British Asians etc.

Overseas. Some people argue that it is a neutral term. Other people feel that there is a suggestion of Britain's former overseas possessions. However, there may be no reason for not using the term for persons from the Third World. But, it is doubtfully relevant for black British since many such will have been born in Britain and hence not be from overseas.

Naming a race or ethnic group. In general there is no case in attempting to avoid spelling out relevant races or ethnic groups. Even so, this is true only if relevant to the context. Unless this is so, the naming device may well be another, if subtle form, of racism. It could be a means of identifying a racial/ethnic group so that they are clarified for pejorative comment.

Unacceptable Terms

There are many terms of racial abuse and there is little point in trying to cover them all. However, it may be useful to mention some of the very common ones since some sociologists will often find themselves in positions where the terms are in common use. Moreover, in some situations, people have to be taught not to use such terms, eg. some schools, neighbourhood groups, youth clubs, etc.

Racist terms	Non–racist comment
Cannibal(s) Cannibalism	A tradition of cannibalism seems to exist in many parts of the world but it is best avoided in jokes where it tends to be derogatory to black people.
Civilized/ civilization	Colonialist perception. Often associated with Social Darwinist thought. Full of unperceived value judgements and ignorance of Third World history. Use industrial society. However, in some circumstances (eg. work of Natell Elisa), civilisation has a different meaning and does not have racist overtones.
Coloured	Offensive to many black people. Use terms like black persons, etc.
Host society	Unwise term to use now since many former immigrants can rightfully claim to be part of the host society. One could preferably talk of the society receiving immigrants.
Immigrants	Many of the post–World War 2 immigrants are now part of British society. Use nationality if known else use terms such as black people, etc.
Indigenous	At what point does one become native–born? Many black people now born in Britain.
Native	Native born is acceptable. Otherwise the term has strong colonialist connotations eg. whites and natives.
Negro/Negress	Often considered acceptable in Britain but not in America. Use depends on the audience.
Primitive	Derogatory overtones. Prefer non-industrial.

Finance and Membership Sub–Committee

There are currently two vacancies on the Finance and Membership Sub–Committee of the BSA. Any BSA members interested in the financial position of the BSA are invited to apply to join this Sub–Committee which meets three times a year in London. If you would like further information please contact Sara Arber (Hon. Treasurer), University of Surrey, or Ann Dix at BSA headquarters at the LSE.

PLEASURES OF THE TEXT

This is a new feature in which a sociologist is invited to write 500 words on two or three articles or books published in the last year or so which she or he feels to be worthy of note, set a good example etc., and wishes to bring to the attention of their colleagues. Martin Bulmer of the LSE starts the series.

STUDIES OF SUBSTANCE

W E B DuBois, the first black American sociologist, wrote in a well known aphorism in 1903 that 'the problem of the twentieth century is the problem of the colour line – the relation of the darker to the lighter races of men in Asia and Africa, in America and in the islands of the sea'. Three recent sociological studies of black men – and women – bear him out.

Land of Hope: Chicago, Black Southerners and the Great Migration, by James R Grossman, an historian, (University of Chicago Press, 1989) is a brilliant reconstruction of the beginnings of the great movement of black Americans from the Deep South to the north of the United States during World War One. Using a range of sources including contemporary sociological studies, Grossman shows the forces which led people to migrate and the social and economic circumstances of migrants once settled in Chicago. The monograph tests various theories of migration, but more importantly illuminates the transformation of peasant agriculturalists into urban workers and the processes of urbanisation. For all the institutionalised discrimination which migrants experienced in Chicago, they had there a sense of freedom and of residing in a section of a great city – 'Black Metropolis' – in which minorities could achieve a degree of autonomy never possible in the South.

Poverty, Ethnicity and the American City, 1840–1925: changing conceptions of the slum and the ghetto, by David Ward, a geographer, (Cambridge University Press, 1989) is more concerned with social ideas and social segregation in the great American conurbations to which both black southerners and white Europeans came in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. A concern with overcrowding and disease, organised about the concept of the 'slum', gradually gave way to the emergence of the notion of the ethnic enclave (of both hyphenated whites and of blacks) and an initial concern with housing issues was transmuted in time into a wider focus on ethnic and cultural variation. Much of the material in the book is derived from contemporary studies of social conditions, such as the early American social surveys and the Chicago School.

From Many Strands: Ethnic and Racial Groups In Contemporary America, by Stanley Lieberson and Mary C Waters, Sociologists, (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1988) uses data from the 1980 census on race and national origin to provide an up to date account of the condition of Black, Puerto Rican, Hispanic and Asian Americans. It documents the continuing discrimination which the first two in particular experience. New light is thrown also upon white ethnics, particularly the emergence of 'unhyphenated whites', who have little interest in their European origins. This is a quantitative study, worth persevering with because of the rich data it contains about contemporary society. It is also of interest to us because of the prospect of a question on race and ethnicity in the 1991 British Census, which would provide social scientists with the opportunity to produce a similar picture of variation in British society.

Martin Bulmer
L.S.E.

CONTROVERSY

A WITHERING DEBATE?
A reply to Milner

Does Judith Milner (Network No 44 May 1989) know what sociology actually is, never mind what it 'should' be? Many sociologists, 'proper' or not, and I include myself in the latter category, would find it difficult to answer this clearly and unambiguously. However, as one of the 'targets' of her article I feel that I must briefly take up some of her points.

Her critique of my 'piece' (Network No 42 October 1988) was threefold: firstly, my immersion in 'yet another introspection of teaching methods', secondly, my complaint about the new sort of fragmentation of sociology and the 'place of the founding fathers in both the study and presentation of sociology', and finally, my failure to mention gender, thus rendering it totally absent – not even relegated to the sidelines. On the first two counts I think that Milner misses the main point of my article. My work was based upon a small comparative study of Advanced Level and University syllabuses, endeavouring to suggest a replication of subject content as one, but not necessarily the only reason why students can become dissatisfied. This may be one aspect of the far wider question of pedagogy, and indeed the effects of the study of sociology into perspectives and 'bits' was a reference to the way in which some syllabuses, textbooks, and other material may encourage teachers and students to focus upon a kind of 'star wars' of sociological perspectives rather than upon a number of unifying concepts. It was not necessarily meant to be directly linked to issues concerning the role of the 'founding fathers' – itself a term I would not personally favour using.

The critique of gender–blindness is, I feel, more serious and merits deeper consideration. Yes, I do realise that the vast majority of GCE A level students are female. I also agree that gender is of central concern in sociology as much as to anything else. I certainly do not 'tack it on', either in my teaching, my research and other work, or in my life as a house–husband come to that. Yet I am unsure whether the gender perspective is a *sociological* perspective, especially when grouped alongside positivism, functionalism, Marxism, Weberianism, critical theory, structuralism, interactionism and ethnomethodology. I am not denying the significance of feminist perspectives on gender, but it seems that the question of sociological perspectives, and the 'essence' of sociology, whatever that might be, is much more problematic than it at first appears, and so consequently is the relationship of gender to them.

Moreover, it is an assumption that, by failing to mention gender, I do not appreciate it's significance. Indeed, there was a further reason for its omission – namely that gender did not seem to figure prominently in the three A level syllabuses under study and in many of the thirty–three University first year syllabuses. The study was, it must be noted, undertaken during 1986. However, gender was often subsumed within social stratification and social inequality. Perhaps usage of the term 'social divisions' (see BSA Annual Conference 1990) means that we may also encompass age, region and housing as well as gender, class and race. Come to think of it, I didn't specifically mention these either! The point is that there may be unifying concepts, Cynthia Cockburn's aspects of power, outlined by Milner, is one, that enable us to better understand and appreciate the difficulties here. And to imply that gender is *the* central issue, at the expense of the others aforementioned, could open up a veritable hornets nest and agonising which I seem to have heard before.

I sympathise with much of what Judith Milner says and I do agree that a serious consideration of gender issues could 'lead to a massive reorganisation of traditional sociological theory'. Nevertheless, I do feel that there is some way to go yet. I am also somewhat disturbed by the almost fratricidal attack on the Bradford Conference (I admit that I was not there) and not a little feared that it comes from a 'life long critic of men' which, if taken literally, means that I, along with others, have no chance of redemption! However what saddens me most is the feeling I have that gender as a perspective, reeks of a hijack of sociological theory by some feminists. If this is indeed the case then I too can see little real way forward.

Roger Walters
University of Lancaster

CONVERSATION, DISCOURSE, CONFLICT: A Reply to Torode

The account of the CDC conference given by its main organiser, Brian Torode (Network No. 44), is itself a striking example of one phenomenon to which he alludes: the 'ever-availability of alternate versions of events, identities and situations'. My own version is that of a feminist belonging to what Torode calls the 'discourse analysis' (DA) current: this identity leads me to a reading of the event and its component situations which is different from and in conflict with Torode's many points. Could this be an 'underlying reality' which both Torode and I are using, in our vulgar ways, to account for the appearance of conflict at the conference?

I should start by re-formulating and re-examining certain positions and criticisms attributed to me and to feminists in general by Torode's account. First, it is true that I 'avoided' sessions in which I could have offered competing close readings of data to Conversation Analysts. This reflected, at least in my case, the banal fact that CA and DA (especially feminist) papers were invariably scheduled against each other: one could not usually go to both.

This prosaic observation aside, though, some feminists did go to CA sessions and reported feeling alienated and silenced in them; I want to take issue with Torode's treatment of this response. Let us focus on a concrete example. One session analysed a phone call in which discussion centred around an incident which was clearly a case of domestic violence, though it was not explicitly defined as such. The question asked was what features of the organisation of talk enabled us to formulate that account. It was suggested that various sequential features, including a reference to calling the police, were crucial here. The question of *gender* – that is, the use participants make of our everyday knowledge that men are perpetrators of domestic violence against women and children (as was the case in this extract) – was not deemed interactionally relevant, presumably because the speakers showed no obvious sign of orienting to it. Feminists present felt constrained not to point this out; they were sensitive to possible accusations of vulgarity and bias.

To me this seems like a missed opportunity, since if anyone had raised the issue it would have led to discussion of an important theoretical question many linguists and sociologists would want to pose, namely how far orientation has to be explicitly displayed in order to be interactionally relevant.

Let us also consider the criticisms feminists made regarding the composition of plenary panels (four men, one woman, male Chair in each case). It should not need to be explained why we found this tokenistic. Torode's suggestion that criticism called for women to be treated as 'bodies rather than minds' is absurd and offensive: I hope and believe that women's minds are equal in quality to men, and therefore that a random selection of representative speakers would turn up the two sexes in proportion to their participation, in this case at a ratio of two men to one woman (thus if there were 12 plenary panellists, four should have been women).

But there is an interesting theoretical issue here too. In both the cases I have cited, women (and indeed, to the extent that they became threatened and defensive, men) actually did orient to gender as an interactionally-relevant feature of the speech situation. Any transcript of, say, the closing plenary, would show many explicit displays of this perceived relevance. It is thus inconsistent of Brian Torode to attempt to deny the legitimacy of feminist readings of the situation by calling them 'vulgar' and even 'an authoritarian insistence on the relevance of gender difference'. Relevant-for-participants is what CA *counts* as relevant: I think it is Torode who reveals himself as authoritarian when he seeks to discredit the account I and other women formulated.

Turning now to issues other than gender, I believe many participants at the conference would want to question Brian Torode's labelling of non- or anti-ethnomethodologies as 'pre-ethnomethodologies', which seems to imply that CA stands at the apex of theoretical and methodological sophistication. Sadly, the conference itself gave support to this arrogant view of things. Why, for example, did the distinguished CA practitioners present have nothing to say about theoretically critical papers like my own (which a number of them attended)? No wonder the exchange of views the organiser claimed to want did not get off the ground!

In this connexion it is also necessary to say something about the structure and process of the conference ... hackneyed as this kind of complaint may be, where will it be taken seriously if not at a conference on conversation? So, let me point out that the aims of a meeting like this – discussion, in a constructive spirit, of work in progress between colleagues – is not best served when many speakers are unable to fit their remarks into the allotted time; when 'discussion' is nothing more than questions from the floor; when chairs are arranged in rows before a platform and spaces are so large the audience appears to have dropped randomly through the ceiling; when styles of intervention are aggressive and chairing is often perfunctory. Can some attention not be given to these recurrent irritations by organisers of future conferences?

As a dialogue between differing perspectives this conference failed miserably: for me it was all conflict and no conversation. One of a number of regrettable consequences is that Brian Torode's account fails to reflect a lot of people's perceptions of what happened. It is therefore desirable to present an alternative account, acknowledging the conflicts we couldn't resolve.

Deborah Cameron
New College
Oxford

MOBILITY AND BIAS: A Reply to Saunders

Peter Saunders (Network 44, May 1989) makes two different kinds of argument in his critique of 'Left Write in Sociology'. One is that British sociology in general is 'trapped in a stifling collectivist-socialist orthodoxy', and the other is that two specific, very good, studies of class and mobility are examples of this failing. While I find the first claim of systematic left-wing bias unconvincing, and feel that the second is much exaggerated, I would like to suggest that there is perhaps a little more to debate in the latter than either Saunders himself states, or the otherwise excellent response by Gordon Marshall and David Rose allows.

In discussing equality of opportunity between social classes, both articles can be read as if there were a single accepted measure of 'relative mobility'. However, both the Oxford and Essex studies use a range of measures, which do not all point in the same direction. For example, there are basic mobility tables; straightforward comparisons of chances as in disparity ratios; simple odds ratios; and more complex loglinear models, in which the association between pairs of terms (such as origin, destination, age cohort, etc) are shown to have greater or lesser effect. Neither study relies exclusively on one measure, although Goldthorpe in particular is interested in the extent of mobility once the changes in occupational distributions have been taken into account. It follows that Saunders does ask an important question, albeit in an imprecise way: why is it that there is an emphasis on this *residual* constant fluidity?

There are several possible answers to this question, which go beyond the Marshall and Rose key point that absolute measures of mobility on their own do not address equality of opportunity. First, both the Oxford and Essex studies, far from displaying 'unconscious bias', develop in an explicit and consistent way from stated theoretical positions. To a large extent, it is this explicit, reasoned interest that leads to an interest in mobility chances apart from the occupational transition effect, and is one of the strengths of the studies. (Indeed, contrary to Saunders' assertion, it seems at least as plausible to claim that, in comparison with sister social sciences like economics, psychology, politics or human geography, British sociologists tend to engage in *more* self – and mutual criticism about ideological positions, not less).

Given this explicit theoretical foundation to both of the studies, it is unsatisfactory to use them to illustrate how the profession as a whole tends to share a 'Westergaard and Resler View' of society at an *unconscious* level. On the other hand, it is true that our basic conventional wisdom about class mobility per se has been unusually coherent, depending on what Hope has called an

agreed reading of the 1949 Glass mobility study. This might be interpreted as an unconscious left–wing bias, but equally it could be read as a simple case of paradigmatic dominance in which political ideology is not significant. It certainly seems plausible to suggest that Goldthorpe discounts the occupational transition effect because sociologists in many countries including many with far from left–wing persuasions (Lipset and Bendix, to name but two) have followed Glass's pioneering techniques of regarding the difference in mobility tables' occupational distributions as nuisance rather than substance.

One particular aspect of this distinction between structure and process is that it enables Goldthorpe to address an issue which is also part of the New Right's agenda, namely the performance of welfare socialism. In terms of his own arguments, Goldthorpe argues that British mobility is not unusually low (Ch.11) and that 'egalitarian reform' – ie. the post war Welfare State – has largely failed in its aims (Ch.12). In the light of Saunders' antipathy to the state, this should be music to his ears, because it is the best of reluctant testimony. However, in Saunders demonography, this is only more evidence of left–wing bias.

On the other hand, Goldthorpe's conclusion that the Welfare State has failed is dependant on the logic behind the operationalisation of relative mobility chances, which as we saw above involves the consideration of relative mobility not of structural effects. If instead of taking this approach (which incidentally also depends on comparing older with younger people, not an ideal method), we take the Oxford and Essex studies *together* as diachronic measure of social change, a different picture of relative mobility can be derived from the simpler measurements calculable from the published texts. There are, inevitably, severe methodological constraints in this exercise. Not least, the figures in Table 1 are for men only, moving between Service, Intermediate and Working Classes.

What these figures show are relative chance of mobility, but without the artificial removal of structural change, as well as absolute measures. We see that the service class's success in retaining service class positions (a) does not diminish, while the disadvantage experienced by those with working class origins is ameliorated (b), (c) and (d). Furthermore, the proportion of those exposed to disadvantage falls (e). In other words, this mobility evidence points towards an improvement in equality of opportunity between 1972 and 1984, although we are still far from achieving complete equality.

Where does this leave the arguments between Saunders and Marshall and Rose? While I would suggest that the latter, and John Goldthorpe, have been unduly pessimistic in their conclusions, Saunders is wrong when he says that sociologists are only interested in change 'where the working class gain *at the expense* of those above them'. A change in relative mobility can – and in practice does – mean that the working class's chances improve *faster* than those of the service class, not that the service class's chances are reduced. That is the key implication of occupational transition: as middle class employment increases, the expansion can be shared by the children both of the middle and the working class. Mobility is not a zero–sum game. Surely, this view resembles the Right's 'moving column' metaphor? But that point can only be grasped if we include absolute *and* relative mobility in our thinking.

So that when Marshall and Rose give the analogy of income changing from £30 to £10 to £300 and £100, I think they have over–simplified. It is not only the levels that have changed, but the numbers of people at each level. It may be the case that such a position is congruent with unconscious left–wing political assumptions, but a simpler answer, as we saw above, is that both Oxford and Essex have simply stayed within an established international methodological paradigm.

If there has been a movement towards equality of opportunity, how is it to be explained? Saunders offers two main possible explanations of mobility: the structural success of capitalism, and the individual success of 'talented' people in achieving occupational success (there being more 'talented' people among those with middle class origins). If the latter were true, how can we explain an *increase* in upward mobility without some additional idea, such as biological mutation (the working class being now born with more 'talent') or a structural liberation of 'talent' due to social and economic change?

It is the latter that must therefore seem the most significant, and which of course represents the most clearly sociological explanation. But this in turn raises difficulties for Saunders. First, structural arguments fit uneasily with the stress on individualism in New Right writing. Second, while the Oxford and Essex studies may underestimate structural effects, the recently published reports from the third major British study, the Scottish Mobility Study, take a very different position. It is not for me to say that these publications have the merit of Goldthorpe and Marshall et al's work, but they do place such an emphasis on structural change and non–marxist explanations that Saunders lays himself open to the charge of highly partial selectivity in his choice of illustrations. And third, if it *is* capitalism that creates the new opportunities of white collar work and life style, Saunders and the New Right are still left with a problem. How is it that such different forms of capitalism as Sweden, Australia and Germany (to take three countries on which mobility data are readily available) all show similar structural trends – as indeed do those somewhat less capitalist societies like Poland and Hungary?

While aspects of the argument in this rejoinder are more technical than those usually appearing in *Network*, and perhaps more suited journals like *Sociology*, there is a good reason for presenting them here. At the heart of the Saunders, Marshall and Rose exchange lies not so much a professional or narrowly sociological issue, but a public one: equality of opportunity. If there is a broad problem for British sociology, it is not unconscious political bias, but rather how to engage in debate about public issues, when faced with the increased technicity of our discipline. I believe we are in danger of retreating from this dilemma, although as this contribution shows, I do not have any easy answers. But if we cannot connect the complexity of our work to public concerns, then the future of our discipline must be in doubt.

Geoffrey Payne
Polytechnic South West

Table 1 Patterns of Intergenerational Male Mobility

	1972 Oxford	*1984 Essex*
(a) Service Class origin, Service Class Destination	58.8%	60.0%
(b) Working Class origin, Service Class Destination	15.4%	20.1%
(c) Disparity ratio; relative chances of SC and WC origins obtaining SC destination	3.8	2.7
(d) Odds ratio; competition between SC and WC origins to obtain SC or WC destinations	14.3	7.4
(e) Those with WC origins, ie. 'at risk' of experiencing the disadvantage in (a) to (d)	53.9%	47.3%
(f) Those with SC origins, ie. 'at risk' of experiencing the advantage of (a) to (d)	13.2%	15.8%

CONTROVERSY

Dear Editor,

I was surprised to learn from the last issue of *Network* that the motion for a boycott of South African academics had been passed; a visit to the United States prevented me being at the BSA Conference, or learning about the outcome earlier. Two things in particular amaze me. First, that the BSA is prepared to take a position on this which is in advance of, and out of step with, the democratic movement in South Africa; and that the proposers of the motion were so uninformed about what the opinion is of the democratic movement.

The report on the debate seems to suggest that the standard used to assess this opinion was the attitude adopted by the ANC. This actually simplifies matters because their stance is more clear cut than that reflected in the democratic movement as a whole; Bishop Tutu, for example, favours a blanket boycott, whereas many officials in the trade union movement (notably within COSATU) support a more selective form of economic divestment and disinvestment. With respect to the cultural boycott, Oliver Tambo has clarified the position of the ANC on at least two occasions. Where contact benefits the democratic movement, he is of the opinion that it should be encouraged rather than abandoned. A mid-ranking official in the ANC recently spoke out against the boycotting of certain South African Universities (specifically mentioning the University of the Western Cape), and those academics (there and elsewhere) who play an active role in the process of liberation. The bone of contention is one of validation and who it is who decides whether or not benefit accrues. The ANC thinks it should be their choice, rather than that of the academics themselves. None the less, the ANC supports *selective* contact.

But the last issue of *Network* had a third surprise for me. I looked in vain for some mention of the assassination of Dave Webster, a social scientist at the University of Witwatersrand who was murdered because of his very active involvement with the democratic movement. He probably did more to benefit Black South Africans than any exile or knee-jerk opponent in Britain, as the orations at his funeral attest, and it was doubly sad for me to note that his death was not being mourned by the BSA. It is an offence to his memory to suggest that he, and those of his like in South African Universities, should be boycotted; the BSA needs to do its utmost to encourage people like Dave rather than shun them.

However, I have no moral prerogative on grief, and many in Britain might suggest in good faith that blanket boycotts are the means to facilitate people like Dave Webster. But again we must be led in this by the democratic movement – anything else appears as arrogance, even if well intentioned – and the ANC wishes to encourage certain forms of academic contact. The orations at Dave Webster's funeral by UDF officials made this absolutely clear. Rather than impose a blanket boycott, the BSA needs to discover what are the forms of contact which are endorsed by the democratic movement inside South Africa, and then foster them.

If the BSA is also to avoid the allegation of hypocrisy as a result of the success of this motion, it now needs to expel those of its members from South African universities, ban all sales of *Sociology* inside South Africa, and boycott those companies and expel individual sociologists who retain contact. Should British authors not permit their books to be used for research and teaching purposes inside South Africa? The logic of this motion is for us to adopt our own censorship and to marginalize critical academics, which is exactly what the South African government has been trying to do for years; it even resorts to murder when it cannot silence them by other means. Are we now to help silence the last remaining critical voices? The absurdity of this position is precisely the reason why the ANC is opposed to a blanket cultural boycott which harms the good, bad and ugly alike: to call for such is almost ark-like in the context of current political trends in the democratic movement inside South Africa.

British sociologists could more reasonably spend their time seeking the advice of the democratic movement on what form of selective contact is considered by them to be most profitable to Black South Africans. Let me give you an example of how this operates at Yale University, from where I have just returned on sabbatical. The President of Yale is on a jury of international lawyers overseeing the latest treason trial for a human rights organization. (This is a brief, of course, which forces him to go to the country and be in contact with various South Africans who represent all shades of opinion; is this a role which foreigners should abandon?) He was persuaded that while in South Africa he should consult with officials in COSATU and the UDF over the utility of Yale divesting itself even further of its South African holdings. I do not know the outcome of the debate, but it is an example of how the democratic movement would prefer the issue of sanctions to be addressed in future, successfully taking it beyond the level of emotion.

Yours sincerely

John D Brewer
Queen's University of Belfast

Dear Editor,

One scarcely needs a deep appreciation of indexicality to gather that the UGC Review of Sociology was about University sociology. However, the conclusion that the demise of sociology at the Universities of Aston and Birmingham "leaves a major city without a mainstream sociology department" (p.61) appears somewhat insensitive to a Department which has produced approaching 1,000 single honours sociology graduates since the late 1960's.

Nevertheless, the disappearance of University sociology departments was met with considerable dismay and regret by colleagues here together with a sense of wonderment at the lack of evident support from within the university sector. As the current exercise continues to demonstrate, however, sociologists appear rather better at hierarchy than solidarity but this is an occupational hazard of longstanding.

Yours sincerely,

Mike Filby
Department of Sociology
and Applied Social Studies
Birminham Polytechnic

No sex (questions) please, we're British!

REPORTS AND PUBLICATIONS

BSA SUMMER SCHOOL: SOCIOLOGICAL RESEARCH IN CONTEXT

South Bank Polytechnic, 24–27th July 1989

Last July I was lucky enough to attend the BSA Summer School, held this year at South Bank Polytechnic. I mean 'lucky' quite sincerely, it was a pleasure to be there. PhD work can be an isolating business, and for me, the school was an ideal antidote. It offered the chance to meet other people in a similar situation, and to build up a network of personal contacts all over the country, and further. In the process we gained an understanding of others' research approaches and concerns, and were called upon to elaborate our own. Past attenders had described the school as 'intense', and it is, I found myself intellectually engaged throughout the day, not just in the various sessions offered, but during refreshment breaks and throughout the evening – frequently until the early hours. However, while this pace would have been exhausting if sustained over a long period, the overall effect of four days worth, was invigorating.

The school was divided into panels, workshops and tutorial groups. The panels this year were on ethics, and researching in a policy context, and both touched on significant issues of relevance to many of us. For example, the first panel, comprising Abbey Cronin, Eileen Barker, Jeff Weeks, Paul Gilroy and Barbara Harrison, brought out issues such as the ethics of access, confidentiality, respect for the integrity of individuals or groups researched, ambiguous loyalties, and the political context in which research is carried out. We were offered a choice of several workshops, on topics such as feminist or anti-racist research, fieldwork, interviewing, data analysis, SPSSX, writing, publishing, and teaching. Those I attended were extremely useful, and provoked some interesting debates, such as the feminist approach to research concerning males, and the power relationships involved in interviewing. The tutorials took up approximately half our time, and were extremely valuable, and here I quote students speaking at our final report back session.

> 'Our group was non-directive, there were no presentations for example; rather, we talked round common interests'.
>
> 'Our group adopted a case study approach, with each member outlining their research... The variety of perspectives within our group was not a hindrance, but highly fruitful, encouraging our lateral thinking, and enabling us to identify themes in common'.
>
> 'In discussing and explaining our research, we each reached a better understanding of our own research intentions'.
>
> 'We all appreciated the freedom to discuss our research, in an uninhibited atmosphere of mutual aid, where there was no point scoring'.
>
> 'We found it useful to gain information from those at different stages of research, particularly those of us at the very beginning. We all felt that in future students should be encouraged to attend the school at the beginning of their research *and* at the end'.
>
> 'Our tutor gave us perceptive advice, and felt she had got a lot back from this. We appreciated her ability to allow a flow of talk within the group'.

Thanks to all involved, particularly Stina Lyon, and the tutors: Barbara Harrison, Rob Moore, Kate Purcell, Carolyn Vogler and Andy Webster.

Pauline Fuller
University of Essex

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR SEMIOTIC STUDIES

IV Congress 'Humanity and its Signs'

Barcelona – Perpignan, 31 March – 6 April 1989

The world congress of semioticians takes place every five years, the 1989 version bringing almost 400 participants to Catalonia's two major towns. The event was subdivided into plenary sessions, round tables and straight paper presentations, and meetings were devoted to a series of anniversaries that happened to fall this year: 1989 marked twenty years of the IASS and fifty years of the *Foundations of the Theory of Signs* by Charles Morris, while it was one hundred and fifty years after the birth of C S Peirce, two hundred since the French Revolution, and a thousand away from the beginnings of Catalonia. Main speakers included Umberto Eco (Bologna) on 'Forgeries, Originals and Identity', Joseph Margolis (Philadelphia) on 'The Human Voice of Semiotics', Francis Jacques (Paris) on 'La contrainte de communicabilite' and the president, Jerzy Pelc (Warsaw), on 'The Teaching of Semiotics and its Institutionalization'.

When the term 'semiotics' is mentioned to English-speaking European sociologists, the work of Saussure almost invariably comes to mind. So I was surprised to discover that it had been almost totally displaced by that of Peirce. Castel and Lacassagne (Clermont-Ferrand) attempted to reconcile the binary signifier/signified schema of Saussure with the triadic system of Peirce, but nobody seemed convinced. The Peircian slant of the French delegation appears to owe much to the philosopher Gerard Deledalle (Perpignan) who, reflecting on the development of his seminar in the 1970s, asked: 'Etions-nous devant un choix: Saussure ou Peirce?'. The American appears to have been elected. Eco, indeed, greeted us with 'Salut a Peircepignan!'.

The generalized chaos of the Barcelona organization makes it difficult to give a coherent account of what went on there, but the Perpignan sessions were divided thematically into Literature, Aesthetics, Sociology, Linguistics, Media, Philosophy, Psychoanalysis and Psychology (if I may so translate *psyche*), and Semiotic Theory and Practice. 'Sociology' turned out to mean two sessions on anthropology, two on sociolinguistics, one on politics and ideology and my own on socio-semiotics. I was pleased to meet two other people who work on the sociology and semiotics of clothing, but we were each originally scheduled to speak at three quite different sessions. If there was a transcendent principle of organization at work, then substantive topic was not it. The sociology events appeared to be sparsely attended by comparison with, say, those on *psyche* or even aesthetics.

One of the less happy sides of the Congress concerned the standard of chairing which, with some honourable exceptions, ranged from the plainly incompetent to the downright rude. Now it is clear that there may be large cultural variations in expectations of good chairpersonship, but an international conference ought to be just the place for the issuing of clear chairing instructions. This was not done. That a session was frequently chaired by one of that very session's paper presenters created a space for abuse that was all too often exploited.

An intriguing aspect of the Congress concerned the almost total absence of anglophone Europeans. Although some were said to be attending, I met none. A look at the most recent (March 1989) statistics on individual membership of the IASS shows great imbalance between various countries (see Table 1). The very high figures for Italy and Austria can be partly explained by the holding of earlier conferences in Palermo and Vienna, by the Viennese editorship of the IASS *Bulletin*, and by the formidable presence of Umberto Eco. Even taking this into account, the proportionally low British membership is striking. As far as I can determine, it consists of linguists, communications specialists, literary critics, architects, and a legal scholar. The Irish membership consists exclusively of sociologists – all two of us. So is semiotics of no interest to British sociologists? I find this hard to believe: a science that attempts to grasp the phenomenal world interpretively surely needs ways of accounting for signs, signification and semiosis in general. Semiotics also offers the opportunity for productive, rather than merely confusing and frustrating, trans-disciplinary meetings, acting as a sort of Esperanto between people who might otherwise not have anything to say to each other.

TABLE 1

ITALY	180	USA	116
AUSTRIA	106	FRANCE	69
CANADA	43	GFR	43
SPAIN	33	SWITZERLAND	21
ARGENTINA	19	BULGARIA	19
BRAZIL	16	BELGIUM	14
ISRAEL	14	NETHERLANDS	14
HUNGARY	13	BRITAIN	12
OTHERS	107		

'OTHERS' represents 30 countries with less than 10 members each.

Source: IASS *Bulletin*, special issue March–April 1989. The statistics are my own, based on the membership list published in this issue.

Apart from organizing world congresses, the IASS publishes a twice-yearly *Bulletin* which is full of information on upcoming meetings, reports on past ones, accounts of the activities of the national semiotic associations, journal summaries, thesis abstracts, details of current research projects and bio-bibliographies. The annual individual membership fee is US$15, and details can be obtained from: Gloria Withalm, Treasurer of the IASS, Viktoriagasse 148/4–5, A-1150 Wien, Austria. Anybody interested in coordinating socio-semiotic work in anglophone Europe might contact me at the following address: Dr Peter Corrigan, Department of Sociology, Trinity College, Dublin 2, Ireland. Telephone: 772941 extn. 1871 or 1808; Fax 772694.

Peter Corrigan,
Trinity College, Dublin

REPORTS AND PUBLICATIONS

BSA LEISURE AND RECREATION STUDY GROUP

On Friday 9 June, a workshop/information exchange, organised by the British Sociological Association's Leisure and Recreation Study Group, was held at the University of Warwick. The meeting was designed to bring together sociologists, physical educationalists and a variety of practitioners interested in the area of sport and ethnicity. The programme was organised around four papers and the subsequent discussions. Horace Lashley evaluated 'The Issue of Black British Youth Success in Sport' and argued that this was a by-product of racialised social control. Jose Parry presented a paper on 'Sport and the Black Experience' while Scott Fleming outlined 'A Cultural Account of Sport and Asian Youth Culture'. Finally, Bruce Carrington and Trevor Williams reported on their Northern England based research on 'Gender and Generation; the Leisure and Life Styles of South Asians in Northern England'.

It is hoped that the next meeting of the study group will take place at the University of Loughborough some time during the *Spring Term* of 1990. The proposed title is 'Sport and Historical Sociology'. For further details please contact Grant Jarvie, University of Warwick, Westwood Campus, Coventry, CV4 7AL, or telephone (0203) 523523 Ext 2496.

POSTGRADUATE FORUM (PGF)

The Postgraduate Forum of the BSA – News Update

Recently a letter was sent to all postgraduates currently on the BSA mailing list, and some non-BSA members who had expressed interest, asking for:

1) A brief abstract of research/areas of interest, (to be included in a detailed Postgraduate Register for distribution to all PGF members).
2) Postgraduates willing to co-ordinate regional meetings.
3) People willing to become involved in the possible regeneration of the PGF Journal, (CRITICAL SOCIAL RESEARCH).

With regard to 1), thanks are due to all those who have sent in their abstracts, and for the many encouraging comments and suggestions. Recommendations have been noted, and will be raised eventually at the appropriate BSA executive committee meeting. **Will those remaining postgraduates interested in being included in the PGF Register please send in their abstracts as soon as possible, (300 words maximum).**

There are now several PGF members willing to co-ordinate regional meetings/events.

REGIONAL CO-ORDINATORS

Hertfordshire
Jenny Densham, 36 Baldwins, Welwyn Garden City, Herts AL7 2BD.
0707 335 892

York and surrounding areas
Rachel Ward, Department of Sociology, University of York, Heslington, York YO1 5DD.
0904 433 060
0904 426 389 (home)

West Yorkshire
Steve Leman, Department of Industrial Technology, University of Bradford, Bradford, West Yorkshire BD7 1DP.
0274 733 466
0274 566 180 (home)

Devon, Cornwall, Somerset and Avon
Sue Fisher, Tudor Cottage, Barbican Road, East Poole, Cornwall PL13 1EU
0503 645 05

London
Cathy Pope, Department of Public Health and Policy, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, Kepper Street, London.
0322 524 140

East Anglia
Pauline Fuller, Department of Sociology, University of Essex, Wivenhoe Park, Colchester, Essex.
0206 873 333
0206 438 13 (home)

North West
Jane Attfield, Department of Social Administration, Fylde College, Lancaster University, Lancaster LA1 4YF.
0524 652 01 ext 4102

Postgraduates interested in meeting on a regional basis should contact the appropriate co-ordinator direct. **Individuals willing to act as co-ordinators for those regions as yet unrepresented please get in touch as soon as possible.** Likewise for those interested in helping to regenerate the PGF Journal.

A PGF meeting was held at South Bank Polytechnic, during the BSA Postgraduate Summer School, on 27 June 1989. The minutes were recorded by Monica Dowling, (Joint PGF Rep), and are available upon request. Several issues were raised, upon which members may like to express an opinion, thus a letter will be circulated in the near future, with a view to gaining firm proposals to take to the executive committee.

The PGF welcomes correspondence from all postgraduates, whether research students or research assistants, and hopes to provide a valuable contact point. If the PGF is to develop to its full potential it must receive the support and interest of as many postgraduates as possible, so please **encourage others in your departments to become involved.** Regular space in NETWORK is available to us, and can be used to publicise events/items of interest/ debates etc. Again, if you wish to contribute do get in touch. For more information contact:

Wendy Burke, Postgraduate Forum, BSA, 10 Portugal Street, London WC2A 2HU.

Wendy Burke
(PGF Representative – Joint with Monica Dowling)

ALSISS – Social Science Forum

The Social Science Forum have produced a document 'Making Use of Westminster' which advises on how to make successful use of contacts with parliamentarians for those seeking to publicise and promote social science. BSA members may obtain copies from the BSA office. Further information from Janet Lewis, Beverley House, Shipton Road, York, YO3 6RB.

STANDING CONFERENCE OF ARTS AND SOCIAL SCIENCES (SCASS)

Summary of a report on Research Selectivity in the Humanities: Consultation and its Outcome

Before launching its 1989 'research selectivity exercise', the University Grants Committee issued a consultative paper for comment in 1988. SCASS has examined the comments submitted by 25 national academic organisations, representing between them most arts and social science disciplines. The report on the results points to some disturbing discrepancies between these expressions of professional opinion and the actual form of the enquiry.

Main suggestions in response to consultation

The balance of opinions expressed about the aims of research evaluation distinctly favoured provision of informed advice for future activities rather than 'selectivity'. In respect of procedures, there was widespread agreement on many points including the following –

- Avoid inappropriate uniformity of criteria and simplistic quantification.
- Take extensive account of individual staff records of publications and research initiatives.
- Take a good pinch of salt to information about 'input' in the form of research grant and contract income.
- Give subject-specific guidance about criteria in advance.
- Accompany or follow up unit gradings by explanations and advice for the future.

Many respondents also wanted an appeals mechanism as a further safeguard for the integrity of the exercise.

The actual enquiry to universities

The UGC accepted some part of recommendations in this spirit by inviting professional bodies to nominate panel members and other expert advisers, and by extending the review period to five years. But arrangements for the exercise otherwise proved notably insensitive to the suggestions made by these organisations of the humanities. The late 1988 enquiry thus –

- Emphasised quantitative information, about publications as well as outside income.
- Had the same format for all subjects, and gave no subject-specific guidance.
- Notified no intention to explain unit gradings, or to use them to give advice for the future; and refused provision for appeals.

The outcome, the report concludes, must undermine confidence among the humanities in processes of both consultation and research evaluation.

A copy of the report may be obtained from Dr Sara Delamont, 62 Park Place, Cardiff CF1 2AS. Price including postage £1.50 (Please make cheques payable to 'SCASS')

SOCIAL SCIENCES

The new and glossy ESRC information sheet can be obtained via Louise Hardy at the ESRC. The *ESRC Newsletter* is to be relaunched as a twice yearly journal.

REPORTS AND PUBLICATIONS

PAPERS IN SOCIOLOGY

Staffordshire Polytechnic

The Experience of Running a Small Business in North Staffordshire
Tony Chapman, Occasional Paper No. 10, June 1989 £3.00

Hanley in 1851: A Survey Based on the Census Returns
David Alan Gatley, Occasional Paper No. 11, June 1989 £3.00

From: Department of Sociology, Staffordshire Polytechnic, Leek Road, Stoke-on-Trent ST4 2DF.

Strathclyde Papers on Government and Politics

1989 New Papers
No. 59 *Privatisation 'With the Grain': Distinguishing Features of the Sale of the National Bus Company*
Geoff Dudley
No. 60 *The Extension of Popular Capitalism*
Anthony Heath, Roger Jowell, John Curtice and Geoff Evans

No. 61 *Labour Elites in Glasgow*
Mike Keating, Roger Levy, Jack Geekie and Jack Brand

No. 62 *Electoral Change in Western Countries: Consequences of Post-Industrial Social Change.*
Mark Franklin and Tom Mackie

No. 63 *Towards a 'New' Political Science of Technology.*
Wolfgang Rudig

Please place orders with: Strathclyde Papers on Government and Politics, Politics Department, University of Strathclyde, McCance Building, 16 Richmond Street, Glasgow G1 1XQ, U.K.
Orders will be invoiced at the following rates: £3.00 for students and those working in education; £4.00 for all other U.K. orders; £5.50 for all overseas orders.

Centre for Scandinavian Studies

Kvinner, gårdssmør og meieriet. Arbeidsdeling og inntektsdeling. Papers/Skrifter 1a. £2.50/ NOK 30. –

Women, farm butter and the dairy. Division of labour and division of income. Papers/Skrifter Ib. £2.50.

Increasing women's parliamentary representation. The Norwegian experience. £2.50.

From: Centre for Scandinavian Studies, 12 Lavender Gardens, Newcastle upon Tyne NE2 3DE.

NEW JOURNAL

Time and Society

An international, interdisciplinary journal
Senior Editorial Advisers: J T Fraser and Michael Young

ANNOUNCEMENT AND CALL FOR PAPERS

June 1989 (for first volume immediately and not later than **30th November 1989** to **Barbara Adam, School of Social and Administrative Studies, University of Wales College of Cardiff, 62 Park Place, Cardiff. Wales UK CF1 3AS.** Tel: work – 0222 874000; home – 0633 892090; Fax: 371921.

Aims and Objects:

1) to explore the importance of temporal organisation and concepts in relation to theories of individual behaviour, and of society and culture in general, and to the theoretical approach of specific disciplines in the social sciences and humanities;
2) to explore, in their contemporary and historical context, the interrelationships of natural and biological science views of time and temporality and those of the humanities and social sciences;
3) to provide a forum for scholarly critiques and proposals for change in the way that temporal assumptions affect public, social and economic policy formation.
4) to notice and review current work and literature relating to the above.

Publication:
The journal will be published by Merlin Press, three times a year in English and distributed at a variable subscription rate. Members of ISST, ASSET and similar bodies will pay least, then other individual subscribers and institutions. (The last for £40 p.a.). It will have 128 pages an issue which will be either general or built (by a guest editor) around a particular theme or discipline. Articles will be subject to peer review. The editor will aim at a response within one month, publication within 6–9 months of acceptance and the publishers will require a six months cycle. The first issue will appear in 1990.

VISITORS

Have you a visiting scholar in your department? Let *Network* know.

AUSTRALASIAN DIFFERENTIATION

The Sociological Association of Australia and New Zealand (SAANZ) no longer exists. It has been replaced by The Australian Sociological Association (TASA) and in New Zealand by the Sociological Association of Aotearoa (New Zealand) (SAANZ).

The President of TASA is John S. Western of the Department of Anthropology and Sociology, University of Queensland. The President of the Sociological Association of Aotearoa (New Zealand) is Paul Spoonley, Massey University.

EVENTS

BSA MEDICAL SOCIOLOGY GROUP

The convenor of the BSA Medical Sociology Group is Steve Platt, MRC Unit for Epidemiological Studies in Psychiatry, Royal Edinburgh Hospital, Morningside Park, Edinburgh, EH10 5HF.

The Group newsletter, *Medical Sociology News* , is published three times a year (December, April and August). Subscriptions — £8 (institutions and overseas), £5 (waged) and £2.50 (unwaged). Write to the editor, David Woodman, 43 Sydenham Park, London, SE26 4EE.

Conference Dates

BSA Medical Sociology Group Conferences, 1989-1992

1990, 14 – 16th September, University of Edinburgh
1991, 27 – 29th September, University of York
1992, 17 – 21st September, University of Edinburgh (Joint meeting with European Society for Medical Sociology)

Regional Groups — Events

Bristol and South-West
Convenor: Norma Daykin, Dept. of Social Administration, University of Bristol, The Alfred Marshall Building, 40 Berkeley Square, Bristol, BS8 1HY.
19th October, Family Planning Services: A Change for the Better? Dr. Christine Hine.
2nd November, Bristol Inner City Health Project: Three Years On.
These meetings will be held at 5.15 p.m. in Room A.13 (first floor) at the above address.
For more details please contact Norma Daykin 0272 510350.

London
Convenors: Ulla Gustafsson and Mary Bollam.
Programme for the remainder of 1989:
October 11, *The Social History of AIDS in the UK* , Phil Strong and Virginia Berridge, LSHTM.
November 8, *Sound Advice: Delivering Health Care to Patients who are Deaf* , Lesley Jones, Bristol University.
December 6, *Reflections on Teaching Medical Sociology* , Margaret Stacey, Dept. of Sociology, Warwick University.

Everyone is welcome to attend LMSG meetings – the group has no formal membership. At each meeting there is a presentation by a speaker – often about work in progress – followed by a discussion.

Meetings begin at 6 p.m. and are held in the 3rd floor seminar room, Dept. of Community Medicine, University College London, 66-72 Gower Street, London, WC1. Meetings may have to be changed owing to circumstances beyond our control. If in doubt contact Mary Bollam on 01-267-4411 x218. If you would like to receive the 1990 programme, please send a stamped addressed envelope to Ulla Gustafsson, 31 Hillfield Avenue, London, N8 7DS.

Northern and East Midlands
Joint convenors: Nick Fox, Dept. of General Practice, University of Sheffield (0742 766222 ex.2527); David Clark, Dept. of Health Studies, Sheffield City Polytechnic (0742 665274 ex.3213); Carol Thomas, Dept. of Community Medicine, Sheffield Health Authority (0742 670333 ex. 162).

This is a new regional group based in Sheffield, with a potential catchment area including Yorkshire and parts of the East

EVENTS

Midlands. Those interested should contact Nick Fox.

The details of the Autumn programme are not known in full but the likely topics of papers/ seminars are: Community Care Policy: Current Issues for Research and Practice;Workshop: Models of Empowerment in Health Promotion Details can be obtained from David Clark.

North-East
Convenor: Malcolm Colledge, School of Behavioural Science, Newcastle-upon-Tyne Polytechnic, Northumberland Building, Northumberland Road, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, NE1 8ST.

North-West
Convenors: Sue Scott, Dept. of Sociology, University of Manchester, Stopford Building, Oxford Road, M13 9PT. A full programme of events and activities can be obtained by sending an s.a.e.

Scotland
Convenors: Margaret Reid, Dept. of Community Medicine, 2 Lilybank Gardens, Glasgow, G12 8QQ; Sarah Cunningham Burley, address as above.

The programme for 1989/90 has not been decided and anyone interested should contact either Margaret or Sarah.

Wales
At present the Wales Group are convenor-less. Anyone interested should contact Steve Platt as soon as possible.

BSA MAX WEBER STUDY GROUP

The study group has now some 30 persons on its mailing list and is sending out a regular newsletter. A seminar series has been planned for the coming academic year; the lectures for October to December are as follows:

October 25th, Professor Martin Albrow. Max Weber: From Social Theory to Sociology.
November 8th, Dr. Irving Velody (Durham). Politics Without Foundation.
November 22nd, Dr. D. Owen (Durham). Weber and Nietzsche.
December 6th, Dr. J.R.R. Thomas (Bristol Poly). Title to be announced.
The meetings will be held in the German Historical Institute, 17 Bloomsbury Square, London, WC1 at 2 p.m.
Further information can be obtained from D.J. Chalcraft, 12 Hadland Road, Abingdon, Oxon, OX14 3XW.

BSA SOCIOLOGY + ENVIRONMENT + ARCHITECTURE STUDY GROUP

The next meeting of the study group will be on Saturday 18 November, at the LSE. The theme will be Participation in Design, with reports of current research from Alison Ravetz (Leeds), William Watson (Cambridge) and Tom Woolley (Hull).

For information contact Tim Brindley, Department of Architecture, Leicester Polytechnic (0533 551551, ex.2534) or Ian Robinson, Department of Human Sciences, Brunel (0895 74000, ex.2504).

FAMILY LIFE IN ONE PARENT HOUSEHOLDS: CURRENT RESEARCH AND THEORY

University of Surrey
27th October 1989

The purpose of this conference is to bring together researchers and academics from different disciplines who are involved in work based on the one parent family in order to explore theoretical issues and to discuss recent research findings.

Papers on the following topics will be presented:

- One parent families in France
- Housing strategies of lone parents
- Patterns of health and illness amongst lone parents
- The labour market and one parent families
- Lone parenthood and employment

For further details contact Michael Hardey, Family Life Conference, Department of Sociology, University of Surrey, Guildford, GU2 5XH. Tel. (0483)509292, ex.3004.
EMAIL (soc046@uk.ac.surrey.sysh).

BRITISH SOCIETY FOR POPULATION STUDIES

Monday, 11 December, "Mortality in Developing Countries", Board Room, London School of Economics, 2.30 p.m.
Thursday, 4 January 1990, "Where is Fertility Going?", Vera Anstey Room, London School of Economics, 2.30 p.m.-5 p.m. There will be 3 papers on the fertility assumptions for population projections in the UK by OPCS and other speakers. Anyone who is interested in contributing please contact John Ermisch, NIESR, tel. 01-222-7665.

STUDY GROUP ON COMPUTERS IN SURVEY ANALYSIS

The Study Group on Computers in Survey Analysis is pleased to announce that its next one day conference, **The Impact of New Technology on Survey Processing** will take place on Wednesday, November 22, 1989, at the City University, London. For further information, please contact Liz McKay, 4 Mansel Drive, Borstal, Rochester, ME1 3HX.

SOCIAL RESEARCH ASSOCIATION (SRA)

Annual Conference, December 11th
Theme: "Into the 1990s — The Climate for Social Research", Regent's College, London. Contact Norma Clayton, 9 Windsor Road, London, N13 5PP.

THE CENTRE FOR THE STUDY OF ADULT LIFE

Teesside Polytechnic
The Future of Adult Life, Second International Conference, will be held on July 4th-8th, 1990, at The Leeuwenhorst Congress Centre, The Netherlands. For further information contact C-SAL, Dept. of Administrative and Social Studies, Teesside Polytechnic, Borough Road, Middlesbrough, Cleveland, TS1 3BA.

ESRC TRAINING COURSE ON CASE STUDY METHODS

Lancaster University
December 17th-20th 1989
An interdisciplinary course on case study methods for postgraduate students and researchers. Plenary sessions, tutor groups and workshops. Some bursaries available to cover fees, residence and travel.

Further details from Rosemary Brockbank (ESRC Case Studies Conference), Dept. of Sociology, Lancaster University, Lancaster, LA1 4YW, or from the organizers, Alan Warde and Janet Finch.

Call for Papers

Czechoslovak Sociological Association

Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences
Institute for Philosophy and Sociology in cooperation with the Czechoslovak Sociological Association — Section for Methods and Technics will organize on April 2-6 1990 in Bechyne, South Bohemia, a four days International Symposium, *Measurement in the Social Sciences* , general theoretical and methodological problems. English will be the official language of the Symposium. All printed materials will be in English too.

Institute for Philosophy and Sociology, Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences, Jilska 1, 110 00 Prague 1, Czechoslovakia (Dr. Hynek Jerabek).

International Sociological Association

12th World Congress of Sociology
Madrid, 9-13 July 1990

Ad Hoc Sessions: Ethnicity and the Nation State
Two ad hoc sessions on the subject of *Ethnicity and the Nation State* are being organised for the 12th World Congress of Sociology. The purpose of these sessions is to discuss the problematic relation between states, nations and ethnic groups in the contemporary world. Particular emphasis will be given to papers that discuss a) theories of ethnicity and the nation-state and, b) the relationship between national and ethnic identities in multi-ethnic and multi-national states. We hope to form an international research group on ethnicity and the nation state from this initial meeting in Madrid. The organisers of the sessions are Elektra Tselikas from the Foundation for Mediterranean Studies in Athens, Greece and Ephraim Nimni from the University of New

South Wales in Sydney, Australia. Papers will be accepted in English, German, Spanish and French, and we hope to organise some translation for papers read in catalan or Euskera.

If interested in offering a paper, please send an abstract of between 100 and 300 words. Abstracts, offers of papers and enquiries to: Ephraim Nimni, School of Political Science, University of New South Wales, P.O. Box 1, Kensington, NSW 2033, Australia, Fax: (61-2) 662-7463). Deadline for the submission of abstracts, 20 October 1989.

Social Aspects of AIDS

The 4th Conference of Social Aspects of Aids will be held at South Bank Polytechnic on Saturday, April 7th, 1990. Abstracts are now invited for papers. The conference's main themes are: Social Responses to Aids, Perceptions of Risk, Policy Issues, Perspectives on Care. Abstracts, not exceeding 200 words in length, typed double spaced on one side of A4 paper, should be submitted to Graham Hart, Academic Departments of Genito-Urinary Medicine, University College and Middlesex School of Medicine, London, W1N 8AA, no later than December 6th 1989. To receive further details of the conference, write to Peter Davies, Department of Social Sciences, South Bank Polytechnic, Borough Road, London SE1 0AA.

International Conference on the Home

Polish Academy of Sciences
October 18-20, 1990, Warsaw, Poland.
Theme – Home: Physical, Social and Value Dimensions. Abstracts or papers are due January 31, 1990. Mail to any one of the following: Prof. Andrzej Sicinski, Director, Division of Lifestyle Studies, Institute of Philosophy and Sociology, Polish Academy of Sciences, Nowy Swiat 72, 00 330 Warsaw, Poland; Prof. Eleen Baumann or Prof. Richard G. Mitchell, Department of Sociology, Oregon State University, Corvallis, OR, USA 97331, (503) 737-2641.
Bitnet address: Baumanne@Ucs.Orst.Edu or Mitchelr@Ucs.Orst.Edu.

Professions and Public Authority: Historical and Comparative Perspectives

An International Conference on April 21-22, 1990, at Henderson House, Northeastern University, Boston, Massachusetts.

This ISA conference will consider new concepts and approaches to the study of the changing relationships among professions, public authorities such as states and international bodies (EEC, OECD, GATT), and such other centers of power as sectors of capitalism and organized consumer associations.

Potential contributors: send one page paper proposal, before December 1, 1989.

For information write to: Elliott A. Krause, Center for the Professions, Department of Sociology, Northeastern University, Boston, Massachusetts 02115, USA; Louis H. Orzack, Committee on Professions, Department of Sociology, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, New Jersey 08903, USA.

A PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME FOR SOCIOLOGISTS

This programme, announced in the previous *Network* , is taking further shape having been discussed and endorsed at the ESRC training board. The concern is to improve our performance as sociologists by forwarding practical policies to promote and bring resources to the discipline.

A series of meetings has been planned, the first of which will be held in Leeds, May 9-10, 1990, on the topic of *Marketing and Media Relations* . The coverage will be wide including sessions such as — sociology as a pressure group, sociologists in the media, performing as a pundit, the perils of popularization, presentation and production of departmental literature, do-it-yourself publishing, etc. We will not gather simply to hear the words of the media 'experts', since much of the meeting will be 'participatory'. In short, if you are concerned to promote the discipline, your department, your research findings (or even yourself), you should think twice about blowing your annual travel allowance on sweltering Madrid and come to balmy Leeds instead.

The programme as a whole is designed to have something for everyone. A wide range of professional skills will be encouraged and future meetings have already been planned on *Income Generation* (6-7 Nov. 1990), *Teaching Methods* and *Curriculum* with more to follow. Since professional development is largely a matter of self-help, it is hoped that departments in all the highways and byways of sociology will consider being represented at each of the meetings.

The meetings will, as a rule, be held in May (before the examinations rush) and in November (when the dust has settled). They will be from noon to noon, with an overnight stay if necessary. The initial gathering will be in Leeds, but, if successful, the scheme will become a travelling show. There will, of course, be reductions for B.S.A. members. A detailed programme for the first meeting will appear in *Network* and other B.S.A. publications. Information on costings, accommodation, etc. may be had shortly from the course secretary, Ms Kristina Eddon, C.P.E., University of Leeds, Leeds LS2 9JT (Tel. 0532 333234).

Further information from and suggestions to: Frankie Todd, Director of Continued Professional Education, The University of Leeds, Leeds LS2 9JT; Ray Pawson, Dept. of Sociology, The University of Leeds, Leeds LS2 9JT; Roy Todd, Head of Sociology, Trinity and All Saints College, Horsforth, Leeds, LS16 5HD.

UNESTABLISHED SOCIOLOGISTS

A collective of postgraduates who are, or have recently been, carrying out doctoral research, are planning to establish a series of occasional papers in applied social theory. We want to encourage the development of a theoretically informed analysis of substantive problems in modern social life. The intention is to stimulate the *use* of theory, in the belief that its challenge should be accepted, rather than simply restated.

We are keen to hear from anyone who would like to be involved in the project. In particular, we want the main participants and contributors to be unestablished sociologists, by which we mean people who are not sitting comfortably in tenured posts or have a long list of publications behind them. It seems that today's theorists have some difficulty getting work published, and although we would only want to publish pieces that warrant whatever audience we might have, we are committed to the work of new sociologists. One way of getting published is to publish ourselves. A series of occasional papers would be one (small) way of gaining a voice.

Interested? Then write to Keith Tester, 16 Renforth Street, Dunston, Gateshead, Tyne & Wear, NE11 9BE.

"HISTORY OF THE PRESENT" STUDY GROUP

Nikolas Rose wishes to form a new study group intended for doctoral students and others actively engaged in researching the history of the human sciences and medicine and their links with practices of social regulation. It will take up the approaches developed by Michel Foucault and his co-workers, especially in relation to analyses of technologies of power and knowledge in Britain in the twentieth century.

The aim would be to meet about every two months, with an initial meeting in November.

If you are interested, please contact Nikolas Rose, Department of Human Sciences, Brunel University, Uxbridge, Middx., UB8 3PH. Tel. (0895) 56461, ex.251.

THE INSTITUTE OF 'FAMILY STUDIES' (IFS)

Aims and Objectives

1. To promote the Founding of the New 'Family Studies' in which to assert the importance of 'Family Life'.
2. To develop a role as a Teaching Institute.
3. To develop a role as a Research Institute.
4. To develop an Information Resource to hold details of research, publications and interested individuals/bodies.
5. To form a national Association of 'Family Life'.
6. To found the Journal of 'Family Studies'.

Those interested should contact Dr. Jon Bernardes, School of Economics and Social Science, Wolverhampton Polytechnic, Arthur Storer Building, Molineux Street, Wolverhampton, WV1 1SB. Dr. Bernardes would also like to hear from BSA members interested in forming a BSA Family Studies Group.

EUROPEAN CONSORTIUM FOR POLITICAL RESEARCH (ECPR)

Those wishing to receive information on ECPR activities should write to David McKay, Executive Director, ECPR, University of Essex, Wivenhoe Park, Colchester, CO4 3SQ, UK. The new format News Circular will be issued in November.

PHILIP ABRAMS MEMORIAL PRIZE 1989

Dick Hobbs, *Doing the Business: Entrepreneurship, the Working Class, and Detectives in the East End of London*

Oxford, OUP, 1988, £25.00 hardback, £4.95 paperback.

This is the best book I've read for a long time. Half of it is a detailed ethnography of illegal entrepreneurship in East London; the other half is about the Metropolitan Police's Criminal Investigation Department (CID) and the way in which 'the occupational culture and subsequent operational style of detective work in London, and more specifically East London, borrows stylistically from East End culture' (p7). *Doing the Business*, however, is not just a 'good read', it is also of theoretical importance – for two major reasons. First, because in giving a socio-economic history of the East End, it demonstrates that working-class culture is not monolithic – that the factory discipline which shaped the occupational culture of some parts of the North of England workforce has been mainly unknown to the predominantly casual workers of London's East End. Second, because it is a first-rate example of how the best ethnographic studies can demonstrate the relationships between history, social structure and subjectivity. For whether they are engaged in skullduggery or (and) criminal investigation, the men who duck and dive throughout the pages of this book are all doing a business shaped by the shared rules and discourses of a very specific area – the East End of the nineteenth century mob and Jack the Ripper; and of the twentieth century Krays and the Detective Superintendent Nipper Reed who determined to put them behind bars.

The book is ingeniously organised in three modular blocks. The first chapter, the Postscript and the Appendix together provide a many-sided and in-depth picture both of the author's methods of investigation and of 'his' East End. These sections are important because they invite readers to share both the author's closeness to the people he describes as well as his fond but unromanticised vision of continuity and change in East London. Indeed, Hobbs's most remarkable feat in these sections is to present a riveting analytic description completely devoid of nostalgia. (Though the postscript does detail the history and current antics of The London Dockland Development Corporation (LDDC) for anyone still unaware of the scandal of the Docklands so-called development). Chapters 2, 3, 4, 8 and 9 comprise the second block which gives a history of the British police, and the development of the CID and its particular mode of operation in East London. And in the centre of the book is the history which informs the preceding and following chapters – the history of East London, its youth styles and its entrepreneurship. Throughout, the already elegant text is enlivened by the colourful and informative stories, analyses and arguments of the (legal and illegal) wheeler dealers themselves.

It is unusual for a sociology book of theoretical importance to be such an 'easy read' that it can be recommended wholeheartedly to non-sociologists. But *Doing the Business* can be unreservedly recommended to lay readers for its intelligence, verve and penetrating analysis of police work. For the same reasons, of course, the book will be popular with students of criminology, social work, social history and sociology. But to students the book offers much more than a satisfying literary and academic experience – it is excellent value in terms of the wide range of topics it covers. For this book is not just a lively ethnography of the symbolic relationship between East End detectives and East End entrepreneurialism. It is also to be read for its good discussions of: recent scandals involving the CID; the effects of the Police and Criminal Evidence Act on detective work; the many attempts to make the CID more accountable; and the critique of previous work on youth/cultures and subcultures. But even that list is not exhaustive. So ... having run out of superlatives all I can now say is: read it! It's a winner.

Pat Carlen
Centre for Criminology, University of Keele

PHILIP ABRAMS PRIZE 1989 – RUNNERS UP

Stephen Horigan, *Nature and Culture in Western Discourses*

London, Routledge, 1989, 120pp, £25.00.

One common characteristic of critical discourse in the human sciences today is a suspicion and skeptical questioning of inherited assumptions, categories and conceptual oppositions. We are continually reminded by a variety of perspectives that our terms of reference are 'constructed', ideologically mediated, underdetermined by empirical evidence, theory-laden, relative to conceptual, social and cultural frameworks, constituted in and by discourse. The outsider would be forgiven in thinking that much contemporary sociology is in fact epistemology by other means. Unfortunately, many of these 'relativistic' positions are simply admonitions, creating 'debates' and 'controversies' that endlessly proliferate to meet the expanding spaces of academic life – the intellectual equivalent of Parkinson's law.

Stephen Horigan's meditation on the categorial opposition between 'nature' and 'culture' does not, however, fit this description. In a well-argued, concise and elegant style he not only manages to deconstruct the various versions of this distinction as it operates in sociology, anthropology, linguistics and intellectual history, but sketches the necessary steps for an empirical and sociological exploration of the social origins and functions of categories within the Enlightenment *episteme*.

Horigan takes his reader on a journey that begins with the ancient Greek dispute on the natural or conventional operation of language; the *physis/nomos* controversy in turn provides one of the foundational oppositions of the western metaphysical tradition, revived in the writings of moderns like Hobbes, Locke and Rousseau, articulated into something like a world view by the Enlightenment and finally setting into a rigid grammar and vocabulary of motives for the project of the human sciences. Horigan has no difficulties in tracing its modern incarnation in the way in which 'culture' and its conjugates are used to ideologically define the object of social inquiry. Horigan thus sets himself the task of analyzing and dismantling some of the central texts in which the nature/culture couplet operates. The journey takes us through American cultural anthropology, the structural anthropology of Claude Levi-Strauss, eighteenth century narratives of feral children, controversies relating to language use amongst chimpanzees (chapter 5 is titled 'From Plato to Washoe'), concluding in reflections on the discursive constitution of metaphysical systems, influenced by the work of Michel Foucault.

The book might be read as one of a number of recent works concerned with unravelling the way in which the terms and boundaries of western discourse and practice have been historically constructed; this is most evident in the chapters describing the ideological role of the 'savage' (noble and wild) in the western imagination and in the Enlightenment obsession with those who fall from civilization; feral children serve well as an image and metaphor of how a particular society construed the limits of human possibility. Unlike Foucault, however, Horigan refrains from following the analysis of texts in which such boundaries are set into the historical *practices* through which they were elaborated and used by specific social groups and interests.

It is certainly important to diagnose the metaphysical origins of such distinctions, but this can only form the starting point of analysis; we should then explore the *institutional* appropriation of these texts by concrete social actors and agencies in the different phases of modern European thought.

Horigan's work needs to be supplemented or continued by turning to the specific ways in which the boundaries drawn between the human and the animal are set to work in constructing the human sciences, biology, physiology; how debates on feral children, the margins of human community, unreason, and so forth were used to create such discipline 'sciences' as social physics, physical anthropology, eugenics, Lombrosarian penology, phrenology and other equally exotic 'enlightenment' discourses. For this project we need to turn more wholeheartedly in the direction marked by Foucault's historical practice, supplementing an analysis of the metaphysical secrets of modern discourses with an ideological archaeology of the social configurations and practices into which discourses are woven and through which they exert their effects on the present. Only through this form of historical and institutional reflexivity can we hope to escape the 'metaphysical essentialism' and unreflexive presuppositions of social science.

Barry Sandywell
University of York

BOOK TALK

Liz Kelly, *Surviving Sexual Violence*

Oxford, Polity Press, 274pp., £29.50 hardback, £8.50 paperback.

'When radical feminists point to the appalling incidence of sexual violence we are seen by many as hysterical and, even by other feminists, as placing too much emphasis on women's victimization'. So begins Liz Kelly's exploration of the impact of sexual violence on the lives of 61 women – 60 interviewees and herself. This is feminist research at its best – by which I mean at its most feminist, where the researcher's presence in her interviews and writing is not merely tolerated as an inevitable side effect, but actively welcomed and honestly explored. The power of women talking to each other: in groups, in refuges or in these 60 interviews, is present throughout the book.

The power of naming, of finding words for experience which has been distorted or denied in malestream thought, has been recognised since the earliest consciousness raising days of the Women's Liberation Movement, but Liz Kelly's very particular use of this understanding to explore the particularity of women's experience of sexual violence made me examine afresh what have become 'common sense' explanations for women's responses to male violence. She pays particular attention to the acts of 'forgetting' and 'remembering' past abuse. It has long been accepted by adult survivors of child sexual abuse that 'forgetting' abusive experiences – sometimes for many years – is a common response to such abuse, but this has been most commonly explained by the 'experts' as a coping strategy – a way of distancing oneself from a painful past. Liz Kelly places this coping strategy in a political context where definitions of abuse are limited, stereotypical and 'extreme' and prevent women from recognising and naming what has happened to them. She reclaims from the psychologists (whose theories have been much in evidence in this area in recent years) the right to analyse sexual violence and women's responses to it as socially caused. As a feminist involved in Rape Crisis work I found her insistence that women's responses are largely *realistic* responses to what has happened to them, rather than pathological reactions requiring treatment, a timely reminder to all of us involved in the support of individual women who feel we are swimming against a tide of psychological explanations.

The book argues for the use of the concept of a continuum of sexual violence, not in order to 'place' instances of sexual violence in a hierarchy of 'seriousness', but in order to estimate the extent of sexual violence in individual women's lives; to point out the similarities between different forms of sexual violence while not losing the particular nature of experiences, and to give women less limited definitions within which to make sense of their abuse. The idea of a continuum is one I would like to see much more widely explored by feminists. It could provide a powerful means of challenging the discreet 'shocking' or 'trivial' instances through which the media tends to portray rape, domestic violence and child sexual abuse. It could also encourage far closer work between feminist support agencies such as Women's Aid and Rape Crisis, who sometimes lose the wider view in the particularity of their own work.

Liz Kelly's final chapter 'Individual survival and collective resistance' is particularly thought–provoking for those of us involved in providing feminist services. The interviews she conducted were frequently part of a woman's process of understanding, and the extracts from those interviews convey this process very powerfully:

> "Doing the interview was absolutely positive. It was the first time I talked to somebody that I didn't know and in such depth. It surprised me how much I could say without cracking up. It's like another bit of saying 'Yes, I'll get through it somehow'."

Evidence from the interviews, however, suggests that many women do not contact feminist support services because they do not see their experience as constituting a 'crisis'. These women do not see their needs being met by a refuge or by individual 'counselling', but that does not mean they do not feel strongly about their experiences and may not want other services, groups or contexts for collective action. Those of us involved in providing femi-nist services should be thinking about women's diverse needs, but we should be doing so in the context of a strategy of collective resis-tance against sexual violence and not by limiting ourselves to what Liz Kelly calls 'band aid' solutions.

Sara Scott
Manchester Rape Crisis

Anthony Giddens, *Sociology*

Oxford, Polity Press, 1989, 848pp., £35 hardback, £9.95 paperback.

The arrival of a series of blockbuster introductory texts in the early 1980's (Haralambos, Bilton et al, O'Donnell etc) certainly helped meet the needs of the isolated 'A' Level Sociology teacher who had previously devoted hours to the preparation of endless handouts in an attempt to provide adequate syllabus coverage and keep up to date. These texts, however, generated a variety of problems for those concerned with the expanding 'A' Level industry. Students objected to the complexity of the language and dry style. Examiners claimed that differentiating between candidates and question setting became difficult as certain topics produced an inevitable rash of 'Haralambos' or 'Bilton' answers.

'Sociology' by Anthony Giddens enters the market against this background, and at a time when sociology teachers are faced with a new series of challenges brought about by a generation of clients nurtured on a diet of G.C.S.E. coursework and long overdue 'A' Level syllabus modifications – the ideal time one would imagine for the 'new and innovative text' as announced by Polity Press.

At first glance this intimidatingly bulky text might appear to solve at least some of our problems. The written style is user friendly, and for reasons I will discuss later, the book is unlikely to produce a mass of 'Giddens' answers at exam time. The book comprises 22 Chapters ranging from old favourites such as 'Stratification and Class Structure' and 'Conformity and Deviance' to new sections on 'War and the Military' and 'The Globalizing of Social Life'. 'Sociology' is indeed a comprehensive text in terms of the range of topics it attempts to deal with, although there are some surprising omissions.

The dominant historical/comparative approach makes for a mixture of interesting insights and rather 'commonsense' observations. In such a Herculean work some uneveness of quality is inevitable. Giddens' priority is to make the subject matter accessible to a wide audience; but in places I found myself wondering if it needed a Professor of Sociology to tell us that in the 70s and 80s Britain had privately run schools that 'all depended on fees from parents' or that the influence of newspapers 'has waned with the rise of ..... television'.

'Sociology' contains a number of lengthy sections with genuine appeal to the 16–19 age group. The 'Gender and Sexuality' Chapter is particularly lucid – I predict that our College Library copy will soon fall open naturally at the 'Normal Sexual Behaviour' sub–section. In contrast 'Stratification and Class Structure' reads like an exam revision aid; this over dependance on familiar reworked material applies to some of the most popular and well resourced 'A' Level topic areas including Education, Deviance and Sociological Theory.

The 'Methods of Research' Chapter manages to cover some gaps left by texts that examine research through a rigid perspective based framework, and provides useful illustrations. Ultimately even this section is of limited value to teachers and students aiming to do project work because it does not encourage the reader to *do* anything. Lacking an 'activity–based learning' approach and underplaying theoretical complexities underpinning substantive topics, Giddens sidesteps two significant aspects of the subject at 'A' Level that pupils and teachers must confront.

Alan Lyon
Godalming College

G Fyfe and J Law, *Picturing Power*

Routledge, London, 281pp, £9.95.

Unlike artists and blind people, sociologists have apparently had little need to examine their assumptions about things visual. They depend on their sight to read texts, but textual layout and typography have received scant attention, visual depictions are rare, and the text–bound nature of the discipline as a whole still goes largely unremarked. However, the visual would seem a good mode for the postmodern discourse with its multifaceted character, its quick takes on many topics like gazing through the TV channels, flicking through the photos; whereas the verbal was a sine qua non for modernist sociology, where the predominantly male concepts of universalism, progress, generalisation required the building up of 'rational' argument in a linear fashion. And in fact more sociological–type texts concerned in one way or another with the visual are beginning to appear, but this book is important because it focuses fairly and squarely on the visual depiction of social relations.

Most of the articles in it are excellent; although I find the phrase 'technologies of visual depiction', central to the book but not in itself discussed, rather difficult to grasp. The nine contributions divide into three sections. In the first of these, the four authors address the topic of visualisation and social reproduction. Bruno Latour's *Opening one eye while closing the other* shows the gradual shift from a religion/god/heaven–centred universe to a science/map/sky–centred one via an examination of a series of paintings made between 1450 and 1550. This is a superb verbal analysis of visual material; and its also the most relativising socio–historical view I've yet met of anything. It is followed by

Gordon Fyfe's *Art and its Objects: William Ivins and the reproduction of art.* This brilliantly shows how reproduction in the fine arts 'terraces taste' and thereby constructs social difference. In so doing it effectively handles the visual as argument, as knowledge in itself. And Fyfe's critique of the notion that photography is merely reproducing reality, that photographers operate without a **photogrammar** (to borrow a concept from Corrigan's later article) connects with a growing body of work from other disciplines on photographs as **ways of viewing**.

The four articles in part two concentrate on the specific social processes which produce visual difference. Law and Whittaker's general point that any visual representation discriminates, so that some things are suppressed and represented by others, thus political will have been exerted, is nicely complemented by Robert Budd's *Seeing Science Through Museum Eyes.* This brings out the series of practical **constraints** that, in the case of the construction of a major new Chemical Industry Gallery at London's Science Museum, played a major part in determining what was depicted and thus counted for the general public as knowledge of this subject. The final section consists of one article, a tour de force by Philip Corrigan, on visualisation as power. His concept of photogrammar, that is the socially contingent and historically situated rules of depiction, will surely help us to view ideologies at work where before we merely saw reality reproduced.

The introduction is wide in its sweep and is called *On the invisibility of the visual,* but in terms of what the book takes for granted, and explicitly closes off, it is tantalising, even disappointing: 'We cannot, and neither do we necessarily wish to, reform sociology so that it uses the technologies of visual depiction more centrally in its own projects'. Well, maybe at the moment, this would be jumping the gun. However, the very title of the introduction suggests to me that sociologists should start **looking at their own texts**. The philosophical limitations imposed by the standard sociological textual forms themselves have recently been highlighted by those using new literary forms, and I suggest we could extend this pioneering work by taking a reflexive look at our taken-for-granted visual conventions; at how typography, page layout, even colour of paper, contribute to an argument – for example diagrams which use upper case for 'male' and lower case for 'female'. I guess that when such visual components of sociological arguments are scrutinised, we will become dissatisfied with what we 'bring to light', and in consequence sociology may change visually in a way that could make certain aspects of this introduction seem conservative.

Was the intention to leave us with no verbal reference to the (18th century German?) picture on front cover of a male ruler, whose body is made up of tiny little subjects, surveying his kingdom? I'm not sure. As an alternative, what about a reflexive picture – not a Magritte, an artist now overused by sociologists – but a geometric abstract by Joseph Albers? For this would constitute a visual theoretical comment on their suggestion that the double hermeneutic character of sociological argument is partially responsible for the lack of visualisation in our discipline.

Elizabeth Chaplin
University of York

W G Runciman, ***A Treatise on Social Theory, Volume Two: Substantive Social Theory***

Cambridge University Press, 450pp, £35 hardback, £12.95 paperback.

All theory is stupidity. Theorists collect and catalogue intellectual matchboxes, deciding what to put in them, in what order to place them, which are their favourite matchboxes. But while theories may be stupid, some are more stupid than others; we want simplifications that help rather than hinder understanding.

W G Runciman is naive enough to believe he can produce original theory, which is one reason why he succeeds. The central volume of his ambitious three-part *Treatise on Social Theory* has just been released. The first outlined its author's views on the purview and methodology of social theorising. The last will apply his perspectives to twentieth-century England. Volume two effects a thorough transition from method to case in substantive theory, describing different forms of society and how they change.

The bare essentials of society, says Runciman, can be summarised in a verbose commonplace; societies consist of people interacting non-randomly. That's too obvious to be useful, except in its implications. If interaction is not random, we can generalise structured regularities. Studying societies is studying people in roles.

People interacting in roles implies their mutual influence on one another's behaviour. The study of people in roles is thus the study of the social, and within this the institutional allocation of power. Power for Runciman is a fundamental feature of society and a motor of change, impersonal, omnipresent and reciprocal.

He avoids reducing power to economic terms, examining economic power, instead, alongside coercive and ideological power in a tripod which is interdependent but not reducible to any one element. One may have priority in specific instances, but this is never to be presupposed.

Runciman seeks to ascertain which particular realisations of these principles are possible at any historical point, and why any given society has become what it is and becomes what it does. Much of his work is thus taxonomy, outlining the different possibilities and giving examples, which in turn reveal the range of variation.

To understand social change, Runciman moves from Linnean to Darwinian principles. Any substantive social theory is necessarily evolutionary. 'It is possible to begin', he says, 'to do for the study of societies what Darwin and his successors have done for the study of species'. Social evolution arises from competitive selection taking place through all three zones of power.

Runciman is rare in being an original theorist. Not for him simple precis or development of others' ideas. Even more unusual is that he is a twentieth-century polymath. He is thereby prone to the polymath's occupational hazards, compression and oversimplification (as he himself recognises), and of simply not knowing enough (for instance, his words on the composer Webern in volume one).

Since his aims are theoretical, not descriptive, challenging a few details does not undermine his work. It is more important to criticise his taxonomies. Like theory, taxonomy is stupid (as Borges, and Flaubert's Bouvard and Pecuchet, have shown). It seems glib at times to propose six stages of this, so many of that, or bridge them by recourse to 'transitional categories'. It is also possible to half-reconcile disparate facts by deft definition. Although noting the danger of explanatory anachronism, Runciman's 'feudalism', for instance, tenuously links societies miles and centuries apart.

More fundamental criticisms concern his emphasis on power. To view societies principally as intertwined networks of power can lead to reductionism, even if it is sophisticated enough to be to three rather than one axes. Or power can be defined in such general terms (theoretical knowledge is power, so is the Bayeux' tapestry, Cromwell's army or Mrs Mills) that it substitutes for rather than furthers explanation.

Runciman carefully distances his evolutionary theory from previous attempts. Evolutionary change arises not from adaptation but competitive selection – selection not of whole societies or groups but of practices. And this is not an unlinear, teleological process. There are only people in their roles, linked in institutions by relations of domination and cooperation, competing for power in ways whose outcome they can only to a limited extent control or foresee.

Theories of social evolution are fine if they are not misleadingly conflated with biological evolution. One error, which Runciman avoids, is to reduce social evolution to sociobiological interest. Another is to neglect the uniquely human complexities of social life. Genetic mutation is random, but people think they are free. A comprehensive theory need to tackle the relation of subject and society.

Runciman rightly argues that the reasons behind people's actions are immaterial to analyzing the changes their quirks initiate. But to understand transition we need to take people into account. As Runciman argues, we do not have to choose between seeing all individuals as incidental vehicles for impersonal forces, or seeing a few great individuals as shapers of society. Yugoslavia developed as it did after the Second World War, he suggests, because of cultural tensions, but also because of the character of Tito. Runciman's theory of social evolution is considerably weakened by failing to clarify the relation of subject and society, and then by not discussing how far these complexities make social evolution different from that of biology.

Nevertheless, this is the stupidity of theory at its most audacious, and whether we theorise for the fun of it, for the money, or to build a better world, Runciman's *Treatise* deserves respectful attention.

David Revill
University of Southampton

Theory and Methods provides some good reading. In ***On Durkheim's Rules of Sociological Method*** (Routledge £9.95) Mike Gane succeeds in rescuing this maligned text not only from poor translation but also misguided criticism. The *Rules* that emerges, its subtleties restored, context revealed and strengths and weaknesses properly discussed is an altogether more interesting statement than that which blighted many an undergraduate career. Another challenge to the dull caricature of Durkheim as positivist par excellence and closet conservative is offered by Frank Pearce in ***The Radical Durkheim*** (Unwin Hyman £25.00 and £8.95). By creating a critical dialogue between the work of Marx and Durkheim, Pearce aims to specify a realistic set of goals for socialism and thereby to envision the features of a feasible democratic socialist society.

The relationship between political engagement and scholarship provides a major theme in Wolfgang Mommsen's ***The Political and Social Theory of Max Weber*** (Polity £29.50). Mommsen elaborates the intimate corrections between Weber' political experience and his academic work on democracy, socialism, and bureaucracy with great clarity, the treatment of Weber's 'debate' with Marx, and relationship with Michels being especially interesting. Robert Holton and Bryan Turner utilise Weber's work and Weberian sociology in defending, and advancing, the case for liberalism in ***Max Weber on Economy and Society*** (Routledge £29.95). Noting the acute crises afflicting most of the positions critical of liberalism – especially Marxism – the authors offer a series of lively and provocative essays including considerations of; sociology individuallism and liberalism; modernism, post-modernism and world religions; and the future of class analysis. While Holton and Turner wish to revitalise liberalism with sociological theory, Keith Tribe heralds the liberation of Weber from the 'sociological tradition' which claims his work. Some might jib at the proposition that the task of reading Weber has barely begun but ***Reading Weber*** (Routledge £14.95), edited by Tribe, is an effective antidote to the sanitised Max that appears in some accounts of the development of sociological thought. Emphasis is given to Weber's work as *writing* – as interventions in contemporary issues of profound significance in pursuit of particular lines of argument. Essays by Scaff and Tenbruck are included as well as three early papers by Weber previously unavailable in English.

In a similar spirit the essays in ***Ideology, Method and Marx*** edited by Ali Rattansi (Routledge £14.95) reject the 'one' Marx for readings which respect the fractures, inconsistencies, and incoherencies of his enormous output. Focusing on the intellectual formation of Marx and benefitting from an introduction of characteristic clarity by the editor the essays include contributions by Rancière, Mepham, Tribe and Echeverria. The pre– and post Althusserian understanding of Marx is represented as an 'epistemological break' which cannot be reversed. Less impressive in execution, more ambitious in scope is ***Modes of Production in World History*** (Routledge £30.00) by James Russell. Nine modes of production are identified, ordered and analysed, but the author is in danger of being overwhelmed by the object of his interest.

Sue Mendus subjects the relationship between the liberal tradition and individual to searching examination in ***Toleration and the Limits of Liberalism*** (Macmillan £25.00 and £7.95). Both the conceptual foundations of liberalism and policies of liberal states are found to fall short of their claims to be tolerant and to foster toleration. This philosopher, having interpreted toleration in various ways has donated her royalties to Amnesty International. A more general account of the state can be found in ***The State*** by John A Hall and G John Ikenberry (Open University £18.50 and £5.95). Eschewing detailed examination of formal debates the authors choose to explore the nature of state capacity by way of an historical analysis of the relationship between the state and other sources of social power. Tensions arising from the contradictory dynamics of the world economy and international system of states are also considered. This contradiction has contributed toward the decline of 'Pax Americana' and a crisis in the legitimacy of the state, leading in turn say John A Agnew and James S Duncan, to a revitalisation of 'place'. ***The Power of Place*** (Unwin and Hyman £28.00) brings together the concrete, descriptive imagination of geography and the abstract, analytical and explanatory vision of sociology. Two major themes dominate this important and enjoyable book, the intellectual history of concepts of place and the interpellation of power and place. [Not strictly relevant to theory but very much so to 'place' is ***Liverpool: Gate of Empire*** by Tony Lane (Lawrence and Wishart £4.95) an affectionate analysis of the special nature of that city. Learn why those who hail from Liverpool regard those who don't as fundamentally deficient in character].

Literary analysis yields insight into the working of ideology in ***Ideological Representation and Power in Social Relations*** edited by Mike Gare (Routledge £14.95). Barthes and Derrida are discussed in the first section, followed by textual analyses – Marin on Perrault and Pascal, Deleuze on Tournier, Falk on Eco and Gane on Borges – and a final section on power and discourse. An illustration of how fiction can inform social theory. Raymond Boudon takes a quite different task on ideology in his ***The Analysis of Ideology*** (Polity £29.50). Rejecting theories of irrationality, Boudon believes that collective belief in false ideas is best understood by regarding ordinary social actors as rational in the sense that they can evince good reasons for believing what they do. Two case studies are used (Developmentalism and Third Worldism) to exemplify his argument.

'Reason–giving' plays some part in Jeff Coulter's ***Mind In Action*** (Polity £25.00 and £8.95) in which the author proposes a radical sociology of the cognising subject, drawing upon the movement in the sociology of knowledge from causal–explanatory strategies to a concern with the logic of the intelligibility of social life. A recognition of the intersubjective character of intelligibility and the practical nature of cognition, requires, in Coulter's view, a reformulation of the nature of the human subject in society and a reconstituted understanding of personality and mind. Practices not persons should be the centre of analytic attention.

Text and Talk as Social Practice edited by Brian Torode (Foris Dfl.48) displays the possibilities and achievements of discourse and conversation analysis. There is some dispute amongst the contributors as to whether the distinction between CA 'making close comparative reference to how talk works' and DA, wherein talk and other aspects of social life are treated as texts, is valid or useful. Essays on verbal representations of the Mexico earthquake and the male colonisation of childbirth weigh in for discourse analysis, whilst conversation analysis is represented by papers on emotion talk and medical consultation.

Ray Pawson takes on the seemingly simple but intimidating question – 'can sociology be substantiated?' – in ***A Measure for Measures*** (Routledge £12.95). Plunging bravely into the disputed waters between those who regard sociology as a substantive discipline and those who argue that sociological knowledge is discursive, Pawson aims to provide a set of standards for empirical data in sociological research. Whilst acknowledging the power of certain criticisms of positivism his position amounts to a cogent rejection of phenomenological and relativist objections to measurement in sociology. The debate over the value of qualitative or quantitative approaches to social research is central to Martyn Hammersley's ***The Dilemma of Qualitative Method*** (Routledge £35). Using Herbert Blumer's methodological writings and examining the intellectual context from which they emerged Hammersley attacks the problem that there seems to be no way of capturing subjective factors which meets the requirements of science. No happy ending here but deep concern over the unresolved issues that mark qualitative research.

Austin L Hughes has an answer to this unease, at least as far as anthropology is concerned. In ***Evolution and Human Kinship*** (Oxford £22.50) he claims that anthropology will become the 'natural science of society' envisaged by Radcliffe Brown only if it returns to its roots in evolutionary biology and is thereby purged of the pernicious influence of American cultural anthropology.

Those pondering the state of corporalist theory will appreciate ***Corporalism in Perspective*** by Peter J Williamson (Sage £25.00 and £8.95). Designed as an introductory text for undergraduates the arguments are set out clearly and conveniently.

On to the **Sociology of Economic Life**. Jane Marceau has produced a fine study of the emerging european business class in ***A Family Business?*** (Cambridge £27.50). Based on research into the social background, education and careers of students attending INSEAD – europe's most prestigious business school – the study reveals how established families with national business classes have responded to the opportunities and challenges of the post war changes in the european and international economies in the search to secure high corporate positions for their sons. Marshalling complex material with aplomb Marceau demonstrates the emergence of a network of 'parallel–families' across Europe and an associated business class. Fear not however, there is room for talented outsiders. Mike Reed also investigates power in business organisations in ***The Sociology of Management*** (Harvester £9.95). Reed focuses on the perpetual dilemmas with which management must contend in dealing with contradictions arising from the tension between structural constraint and human recalcitrance, and is severely critical of the technocratic bias which pervades most work on management and management thinking itself.

Since many become acquainted with sociology, or some derivative of it, through their participation in 'Business Studies' Martin Joseph should find a ready audience for his ***Sociology for Business*** (Polity £29.50 and £8.95). A range of relevant topics are presented in a carefully arranged text which will enhance coursework. However before we go too far down the vocational

road attention should be paid to the conclusions of Michael Useem's ***Liberal Education and the Corporation*** (de Gruyter & Co DM76 and DM38). Drawing upon a survey of the hiring and promotion policies of over 500 American corporations, the study documents the value of liberal arts graduates to the corporate sector, and the advantages of such programmes over more job-focussed education. Liberal education appears especially good at producing graduates who are flexible, innovative, socially responsive and sensitive to the international context of corporate operations – qualities which are in high demand as new technologies are introduced and shaped.

The attempt to manage the dialectic between the commercial benefit and social cost of the introduction of new technology in advanced market economies is examined in ***New Technology*** edited by Greg Bamber and Russell Lansbury (Unwin Hyman £35). Technological change and employee involvement and new technology and labour market segmentation are among the topics covered, in a collection utilising material from many countries.

Finally, in this section, Philip Harding and Richard Jenkins present a vigorous critique of much contemporary writing about the 'informal' economy in ***The Myth of the Hidden Economy*** (Open University £25.00 and £8.95). After guiding the reader through the proliferating literature on the hidden economy the authors firmly reject the notion that the economy can be divided into distinct and separate domains. Harding and Jenkins propose an alternative analysis which both gives more weight to the perceptions of those involved in these economic activities and conceptualises such supposedly 'marginal' methods of making a buck as integral to the modern capitalist economy.

A good selection of books on the **sociology of gender and related matters**. Feminist theory has developed an intricate and potentially perplexing internal differentiation but help is at hand in the form of ***Feminist Thought*** by Rosemary Tong (Unwin Hyman £9.95). Liberal, marxist, radical, psycho-analytic, socialist, existential and post modern forms of feminism are described and evaluated. A clear and useful guide. Rather more specialised is a collection which assesses the impact of feminist thinking on traditional philosophy. ***Women, Knowledge and Reality*** edited by Ann Garry and Marilyn Pearsall (Unwin Hyman £35.00 and £11.95) brings together twenty essays on methodology, metaphysics, the theory of knowledge, and much else. A thorough reconstruction of philosophy is proposed and a series of alternatives to androcentric thought suggested.

Turning to matters of policy ***Staking a Claim*** by Suzanne Franzway, Diane Court and R W Connell (Polity £9.95) aims to make good a lacuna in feminist theory by formulating a systematic view of the state as an agent in sexual politics. This, it is argued, requires an examination of how the state is constituted and shaped by gender relations and the vicissitudes of sexual politics. A series of case studies dealing with the interaction between feminism and state structures in Australia exemplify the general theory of the state and gender constructed by the authors. Carole Smart examines a particularly important aspect of the state in ***Feminism and the Power of Law*** (Routledge £25.95 and £9.95). Rather than an exercise in 'adding' women in this book questions why the law is so resistant to the challenge of feminist knowledge and criticism, and finds much of the answer in the congruence between 'masculine culture' and law. Chapters cover topics such as rape, child sexual abuse, and the quest for a feminist jurisprudence. Of related interest but written from a quite different perspective is ***Pornography in a Free Society*** (Cambridge £22.50) by Gordon Hawkins and Franklin E Zimring which examines the relationship between pornography and law in Britain, Canada and the USA. Commissions of Enquiry are dissected and the subjugation of women, child protection, and social control without censorship discussed before the authors conclude on the futility of employing criminal law in the control of sexual communication.

Sex and sexuality in schooling is the central theme in ***Girls and Sexuality*** edited by Lesley Holly (Open University £8.95) covering as it does sex and health education, masculine and feminine behaviour in schools, and harassment by teachers and peers. In papers which cover topics such as child sexual abuse, the experience of being female in schools, and AIDS, schools are shown to reflect, and maintain, the oppressive sexual attitudes and practices of the wider society.

In an absorbing study of different perceptions of women's reproductive processes ***The Woman in the Body*** (Open University £7.95) Emily Martin demonstrates how deeply medical discourse concerning menstruation, childbirth and menopause are permeated by metaphors of production. This ideology she compares with descriptions women themselves give of these experiences noting the divergences in the degree to which different groups of women accept or resist medical discourse. Martin reveals how the cultural grammar of reproduction works to alienate women from their own bodies.

Feminist thought calls for a fundamental reworking of the theory and practice of masculinity. Victor J. Seidler responds in ***Rediscovering Masculinity*** (Routledge £9.95) by attempting a reclamation of masculinity as an historical and social experience in relation to men's bodies, language and power. This requires Seidler states, a critical engagement with personal and emotional experience and the terms through which that experience is grasped and theorised. A specific target here is structural assumptions about identity and language though the argument ranges over reason, sexuality, language, strength and intimacy.

Transvestism may seem to diminish male power since it involves transgression of the unwritten rules of masculinity, but as Annie Woodhouse reasons in ***Fantastic Women*** (Macmillan £25 and £7.95) the switching of roles and identity requires the maintenance of masculinity and femininity as separate and exclusive entities. Certainly wives' accounts of marriage to transvestites are at odds with the view that transvestism is a fundamental assault on the tyranny of gender.

Relative Freedoms (Open University £9.95) edited by Erica Wimbush and Margaret Talbot contains a dozen essays which explore women's perceptions and experiences of leisure. It serves not only to rectify neglect of this topic but also to contest, existing assumptions about the relations of work to leisure and those leisure policies which marginalise the participation of women in leisure activities. Gail Braybon has mythology of a related kind in her sights in ***Women Workers in the First World War*** (Routledge £9.95). Portrayed as popular, well rewarded and welcome workers filling the breech left by their mobilised menfolk, women were in fact often taken on with reluctance, frequently treated with cynical disregard for their real performance, and almost always underpaid. Peace brought redundancy, criticism for taking men's jobs and calls for women to return to their 'proper place'.

Now for **the sociology of deviance and criminology**. ***Degrees of Deviance*** by Stuart Henry (Avebury £22.50) is based upon student reports of undergraduate deviance. What results is a rather earnest (consumer?) guide, american style, to drug use (cocaine, steroids, marijuana), survivalism, poaching and games with guns (including an AK47!). Plans to steal a car by overenthusiastic participant observers were thwarted by the anxious tutor. More compelling first hand accounts are the descriptions of prison life in England during the present century put together by Philip Priestley in ***Jail Journeys*** (Routledge £20). Filled as it is with the futility and despair of imprisoned existence, the book also documents the persistent efforts of human beings to live decently in conditions which deny them that possibility. Priestley's book contains a few extracts which deal with the experiences of black prisoners, but a vivid personal recollection of the manner in which confinement is compounded by racism can be found in ***Labelled a Black Villain*** by Trevor Hercules (Fourth Estate £4.95). The immediacy of this account is complemented by the academic, but none-the-less forceful, analysis found in ***Race Relations in Prison*** by Elaine Gender and Elaine Player (Oxford £22.50). Three institutions were studied closely with particular attention to race relations policy, the implementation of that policy, and staff and inmate practices and opinions relevant to racial issues. In a situation where racism amongst staff and inmates is rife, and where effective sanctions against transgression are virtually absent, the problems of effecting an imprecise policy appear legion.

This varied literature on prison life provides insight into the conditions associated with the outbreak of prison riots, the american experience of which is reported in ***States of Seige*** by Bert Vseem and Peter Kimball (Oxford £25.00). Nine riots occurring between 1971 and 1986 are scrutinised and though the outbreaks are often represented as chaotic and irrational, the authors discern rationality, instrumentality and structure in the mayhem. Inmate organisation appears not to be the key factor in the occurrence of disturbances. Rather it is the disorganisation of the state which saps its ability to contain resentment whilst convincing prisoners of the injustice of the conditions of their incarceration which precipitates violence.

The dominant reasoning in correctional institutions locates the development of violent natures in bio-physiological and/or social environmental factors. Lonnie H Athens departs somewhat from this line of thinking in ***The Creation of Dangerous Violent Criminals*** (Routledge £22.50) by constructing a four stage model emphasising social experience (brutalisation, belligerency, violent performance, and virulency) and recommending new policies to interrupt the cycle of violence.

High rates of unemployment rekindled the debate over the relationship between joblessness and crime. An authoritative examination of this issue can be found in ***Unemployment, Crime and Offenders*** by Iain Crow et al. (Routledge £25.00), which reveals the complexity and conditional nature of the link. Attention is also given to the manner in which unemployment

affects the criminal justice system, to training schemes, and to the formulation of new policies relevant to unemployment and crime prevention.

Those interested in securing an overview of the input of psychology into criminological theory might consult ***Psychology and Crime*** by Clive Hollin (Routledge £12.95) which also considers the police, the courtroom, and the role of psychology in crime prevention.

Much has been written about crime, criminals, and the police, less about the victims of crime. Sandra Walklate brings together what material there is in ***Victimology*** (Unwin/Hyman £25.00 and £8.95) aiming thereby to undermine many common-sense assumptions about victims. She discusses the main assumptions and methods utilised in the study of victims and also considers the victim in the criminal justice system, the role of the voluntary sector in victim support, and crime prevention schemes viewed from the position of the victim.

Moving on to policing, Rod Morgan and David J. Smith have compiled a stimulating collection of papers which explores the role of the police and their accountability to the community. ***Coming to Terms with Policing*** (Routledge £14.95) includes discussions of, police behaviour and the law, public expectations of the police, the role of chief constables, the police and race relations, and how the effectiveness of policing can best be assessed.

Pertinent here is a book that looks at matters of method in the context of the study of crime and the criminal justice system. In ***Methods of Criminological Research*** (Unwin Hyman £28.00 and £9.95) Victor Jupp is rightly critical of the separation of 'methods' from, the problems they address, the theoretical systems which frame the field of research, and the social and political context in which research is conducted. Various types of data and data collection are considered, measurement and explanation examined, and issues arising from the operation of research discussed with the aim of making the technicalities of research design, data collection and analysis available in a sensible and interesting form.

Now to a varied selection in **Social Policy** and the **Sociology of Medicine**. Long term unemployment and its effects on the young and their parents are the subject of ***Taking the Strain*** (Open University £27.50 and £9.95) by Susan Hutson and Richard Jenkins. Their research conducted in Swansea and Port Talbot in the mid-80s, makes the point that it is the coping capacity of the family, mainly mothers, that allows youth unemployment to be treated as a personal trouble rather than a public issue of major dimensions. In contrast to earlier work this study found that youngsters continue to make their claim for adulthood, even if unemployment renders the transition more problematic than it might have been.

Beyond Thatcherism edited by Phillip Brown and Richard Sparks (Open University £25.00 and £7.95) is a crisp overview of the claims and impact of conservative social policy in the 80s. Contributors include C C Harris on the state and the market, Ashton on unemployment, Jobling on Health and Abbott and Wallace on the family. Some consideration is given to theoretical issues raised by Thatcherism but the emphasis lies on policy and the formulation of practical alternatives. Changes in social policy in the late twentieth century are also central to the papers which comprise ***The Goals of Social Policy*** edited by Martin Bulmer, Jane Lewis, and David Piachand (Unwin Hyman £30.00 and £10.95). Focused around discussions of the family, community, and economy the authors assess the impact of the devolution of responsibility from the state to the family. Questions are also raised about the desirability of importing american policy models and the probable role of social policy in securing a more equitable distribution of work. A much briefer guide to the effects of the 'welfare crisis' (1975, p.5), in Denmark, Finland, Norway and Sweden, can be found in Steffand Marland's ***Paradise Lost?*** (Arkiv £6.95).

A Radical critique of social policy as both academic discipline and social practice is delivered by Fiona Williams in ***Social Policy*** (Polity £29.50 and £7.95). Although the Fabian dominated tradition of social policy was challenged in the 1970s, Williams maintains that feminist and anti-racist critiques of welfare were largely excluded from this process. Consequently the discipline has failed to respond to the unmet welfare needs of women and black people. Having identified the omission the author offers a new framework which allows for an integrated analysis of gender, race and class in the investigation of the development of the welfare state.

As each BSA annual demonstrates, and the UGC review confirmed, the 'greying' of british sociology is well advanced. This gives ***Ageing and Health Care*** edited by Marcia Ory and Kathleen Bond (Routledge £30.00 and £13.95) a certain frisson though its pages are confined to american experience. There are interesting discussions of the implications of life sustaining technologies, and of the family as the main source of support for the aged.

In the first essay in ***AIDS: Social Representations, Social Practices*** edited by Peter Aggleton, Graham Hart and Peter Davies (Falmer £20.00 and £9.95) Jeffrey Weeks remarks that 'what is remarkable about AIDS... is not simply its virulence, but the weight of symbolic meaning that it carries'. This statement is ably documented in essays which deal with HIV, popular belief and media representation of AIDS and HIV, changes in the behaviour of gay men in response to AIDS, and injecting drugs and AIDS.

Health economics may never be the same again if its practitioners read ***Health and Efficiency*** by Malcolm Ashmore, Michael Mulkay and Trevor Pinch (Open University £25.00 and £10.95). Then again it might transform sociology if its multivocal, multilinear, and multilayered presentations were to become standard practice. A study of the attempts of health economists to apply their expertise to the improvement of the everyday performance of the NHS, the book is also a reflection upon, and of, the ways and means employed by sociologists to make senses of things. One is left to ponder whether policy makers can ever acknowledge in practice the interpretative multiplicity of the social world that is the revealed delight of such intellectual discourse.

The Social Organisation of Death by Lindsay Prior (Macmillan £35.00 and £12.95) is an analysis of responses to deaths registered in Belfast in 1987, which uncovers the schemes of knowledge and social practices which people drew upon to organise the deaths that fell within their domain. Prior examines the certification, registration and explanation of death by state agencies before moving on to the more private world in which the beliefs, sentiments and rituals of the living are structured around the dead. Of related interest is David Field's study which deals with the social and psychological aspects of ***Nursing the Dying*** (Routledge £8.95). In particular Field looks at the interplay between nurses attitudes, especially those related to their communication and emotional involvement with patients, and the organisational features of nursing affecting the care of dying people. Sheer pressure of work emerges as a major obstacle to the standards which nurses wish to achieve and here the author suggests improvements in the care of the dying which include support for those professionals whose work this is. Lesley Mackay tackles the crisis in nursing in ***Nursing a Problem*** (Open University £25.00 and £9.95). Using material derived from interviews with nurses Mackay places special emphasis on the difficulties emanating from within nursing itself, which, when combined with other problems deriving from poor pay, relations with doctors and management, and the pervasive influence of gender inequalities, produces a clear vision of what must be changed if nursing is to offer a satisfying and rewarding career.

Two enlightening books in the **Sociology of Culture**. First a book you can not only read – parts can be sung too! ***The Singing Bourgeois*** (Open University £27.50 and £12.50) by Derek Scott deals with the development of Victorian 'drawing room ballads' – a cohesive body of song of a class alyned nature. Bourgeois popular song is shown to be related to class dominance and hegemonic control and to have been central to the birth of the modern music industry. If, like the nineteenth century bourgeois, you believe that music making and practical musicianship is life enhancing, whistle along with this one. For aficianados of horror, or those interested in the sociology of fear dip into ***Terrors of Uncertainty*** by Joseph Grixti (Routledge £25.00 and £8.95). Beginning with an examination of two best selling horror authors – James Herbert and Stephen King – Grixti then peruses various academic arguments about the social and psychological role of horror fiction. An interesting comparison is drawn between the rise of the idea of the 'beast within' and the emergence of arguments emphasising environmental influence on human behaviour. Reductive simplicities are avoided in this clear, but not chilling, study.

The **sociology of education** continues to flourish – is anyone up there reading its products? Substantiation for recent doubts about the operation of vocational and work experience schemes is provided by Chris Shilling in ***Schooling for Work in Capitalist Britain*** (Falmer £22.00 and £9.95). It transpires that a major unintended consequence of such programmes has been the alienation of many young people from sectors of work crucial to the efficient operation of a capitalist economy. Utilising material drawn from the experiences of students, teachers and industrialists involved in TVEI and SVP Shilling presents a detailed analysis of the relationship between educational experience and employability. In a decade when one perception of the needs of the economy has come to dominate change in education policy, and raised vocational schemes to a position of unparalleled prominence, this book is a timely demonstration that bringing about an increased correspondance between schooling and vocational requirements is a far more complex matter than allowed for by present arrangements.

A major feature of the transformation of education in the 80s has been a proliferation in the cult of management. In ***Politics and the Processes of Schooling*** edited by Stephen

BOOKENDS

Walker and Len Barton (Open University £25.00 and £9.95) the ascendancy of management principles in current attempts to both redefine and control the nature and method of schooling is investigated drawing up British, Australian and American experiences. Three areas are subject to particular scrutiny, who controls education and how, the management of social, especially gender, relationships; and the management of school norms.

Now five books based largely on american material but of some relevance to present developments in this country. Strict grade–to–grade promotion is given the thumbs down in ***Flunking Grades*** edited by Lorrie Shepard and Mary Lee Smith (Falmer £17.50 and £8.95). Children required to repeat years once labled 'disadvantaged' are now 'at risk'. However as Virginia Richardson et al show in ***School Children At–Risk*** (Falmer £25.00 and £9.95) the novenclature may have changed, but the process of identification and categorisation remains fundamentally the same, and equally suspect. 'At risk' children who drop out are a major problem for the American school system, states adopting a wide range of policies of varying success in order to reduce truancy. These are surveyed in Gary G Wehlage et al in ***Reducing the Risk*** (Falmer £18.95 and £9.95). Education for the educators. Those interested in assessing the effects of the National Curriculum will find material of interest in ***Re–Interpreting Curriculum Research*** edited by Geoffrey Milburn et al. (Falmer £20.00 and £8.95). School curricula are considered in their wider cultural context with regard to changing power relationships within the state. There are also discussions of the methodologies appropriate to the cultural analysis of education. ***Public Values, Private Schools*** edited by Neal E Devins (Falmer £22.00 and £11.00) focuses on government authority and non–discriminatory values and practices in private and public education in the USA.

Truancy in Scotland is central to ***Out of Place*** by Fiona Paterson (Falmer £22.00 and £9.95). Taking her lead from Foucault's analysis of power/knowledge Paterson examines the relationship between structural form, the general issue of truancy, and individual identity. Her argument is that the thematic roots of the current problem of truancy lie in nineteenth century concerns embedded in the system of schooling. Class control has become 'neutralised' as a programme of efficient and economic administration, and irregular attendance transmuted into an indicator of personal failure.

Doreen Grant is also concerned with failure in ***Learning Relations*** (Routledge £9.95) – in particular the problem of educational under achievement of children of low income families. Believing that the potential of the inner city child can only be unlocked if parents and educators cooperate to bring together the disparate strands of children's lives, Grant has attempted to create a more coherent learning environment for children in Glasgow in defiance of professional and official scepticism.

Rosemary Chamberlain's ***Free Children and Democratic Schools*** (Falmer £16.00 and £7.50) is written in the belief that children should be educated as participating members in the democratic process not patronised members of a sub–species – 'education in democracy and democracy in education'.

Two recent books deal with different aspects of Race Relations and Politics in Britain. Anthony M Messina examines the dilemmas of public policy that have been posed by race for the Conservative and Labour parties since 1950 in ***Race and Party Competition in Britain*** (Oxford £25). He examines, in particular, the effort to keep race off the political agenda between 1964 and 1975 and the subsequent re–politicisation of race. A different angle on the relationship between 'racial' segregation and politics can be found in Susan J Smith's ***The Politics of Race and Residence*** (Polity £29.50 and £9.95). Smith reasons that the operation of housing policy and the restructuring of welfare rights has played a vital role in sustaining racial inequality and creating segregation. Legitimation for the principle of racial segregation derives from both high politics and the 'common–sense' of the public. In tendering a new theory of racial segregation which stresses its social and political construction the author rejects 'race' as an explanatory concept.

Phil Stanworth

Finally, a section inadvertently omitted from John Scott's last Bookends.

A number of interesting books in the area of health and welfare.

The Regulation of Madness by Robert Castel (Cambridge University Press, £29.50) is in the traditions of Foucault, Scull and Ignatieff. Castel examines the rise of the psychiatric profession in post-revolutionary France, arguing that it must be understood in the context of the overall redistribution of power within the state. In particular he looks at the struggles between psychiatrists and the judiciary to define areas of competence for themselves. Phil Brown's ***The Transfer of Care*** (Routledge, £9.95) appears in paperback, having originally appeared three years ago. Brown's concern is with the professionalism of psychiatry in relation to recent processes of deinstitutionalisation. ***One Foot In Eden*** by Michael Bloor, Neil McKeganey and Dick Fonklert (Routledge, £27.50/£12.95) looks at what happens in the 'community' treatment of patients. It is a comparison of a number of psychiatric and related, but diverse, therapeutic communities. They argue that behind the diversity are common features such as the power struggle between staff and residents. In ***Women and Mental Illness*** (Wheatsheaf, £25) Agnes Miles looks at the (male) medical definition of female 'neuroses'. Based on interviews with women, the book explores the way in which they respond to the experience of a gender-differentiated diagnosis. Miles firmly rejects the approach of Brown and his colleagues, which rooted female depression in the life circumstances of women, and argues that diagnoses must be seen as part of a male-dominated labelling process.

Robert Dingwall, Anne Marie Rafferty and Charles Webster have produced a fascinating account in ***An Introduction to the Social History of Nursing*** (Routledge, $30/£10.95). The book traces the emergence of modern nursing from the status of household servant during the nineteenth century, and they show the gradual specialisation of nursing into various distinct branches – midwifery, health visiting, etc. ***Doctors and Rules*** by Joseph Jacob (£30) looks at the professional ethics of doctors. The author is a lawyer and is interested in the way in which ethical norms are created and established as a framework for regulating the 'profession'. The book looks at the historical pattern of professionalisation in Britain and its transformation with the National Health Service. ***Social Aspects of Aids*** , edited by Peter Aggleton and Hilary Homans (Falmer Press, no price) is a collection based around papers given at a conference at Bristol Polytechnic in 1986. In addition to the editors, contributors include Jeffrey Weeks, Ken Plummer, and Tony Coxon, and many of the contributors are concerned with the stigmatisation of homosexuals and the moral panic generated by commentary in the mass media.

Living With Heroin (Open University Press, £25/£7.95) is the latest report on the subject by Howard Parker, this time jointly with Russell Newcombe and Keith Bakx. The book reports on ethnography in Liverpool, and at official responses. Colin Brown and Jean Lawton carried out an investigation in Hampshire for ***Illicit Drug Use in Portsmouth and Havant*** (Policy Studies Institute, £7.95), and they too are critical of official reactions. Although there was widespread use of cannabis, most official concern centred around heroin. The authors highlight the important supportive role played by local drug advice centres. Michael Newcomb and Peter Bentler in ***Consequences of Drug Use*** (Sage, £25) look at the implications of drug use for later life. The research is a follow-up study, though their respondents are still only a few years out of adolescence and the author's recognise that some consequences may take longer to manifest themselves.

Social Security by Andrew Achenbaum (Cambridge University Press, £30/£10.95) is a general review of the development and prospects of welfare in the United States. Achenbaum puts particular emphasis upon the issue of retirement and an ageing population and their implications for universalism and selectivity in social security and health care. Brij Mohan's ***The Logic of Social Welfare*** (Harvester, £29.95) is also concerned with the threats facing welfare provision today and especially with the crisis of social welfare. Mohan takes a much broader pen to this theme, relating his argument to social philosophy and utopianism.

John Scott

CONTENTS

No 45 October 1989

The next issue of Network will be published in January 1990. All material, on A4 double-spaced please, should be sent to the editor by November 24th. Address: Philip Stanworth, Department of Sociology, University of York, Heslington, York YO1 5DD.
Telephone 0904-433049
FAX 0904-433433
Electronic mail: PHS1@UK.AC.YORK.VAX.A.
Edited by Philip Stanworth. Published by BSA Publications Ltd., 10 Portugal Street, London WC2A 2HU. Typeset by Computype Manuscript Services, Standard House, 49 Lawrence Street, York YO1 4BU. Printed by J.W. Bullivant & Son, 296 Bishopthorpe Road, York YO2 1LG.