A BRIEF OVERVIEW AT THE NEWSLETTER

In this Newsletter, you will find:

- An overview of CPS activities during the second semester of 2021.
- Comments on two books presented in CPS seminar series.
- The latest publications from our members.
- Information about The Survey Data Recycling Project.
- A call for Resilient Cities and Migration Governance papers.
- Information about the Master Degree on Political Sociology at the UNSAM.
We live in a time of great uncertainty about the future. Those heady days of the late twentieth century, when the end of the Cold War seemed to be ushering in a new and more optimistic age, now seem like a distant memory. During the last couple of decades, we’ve been battered by one crisis after another and the idea that humanity is on a progressive path to a better future seems like an illusion.

It is only now that we can see clearly the real scope and structure of the profound shifts that Western societies have undergone over the last 30 years. Classical industrial society has been transformed into a late-modern society that is molded by polarization and paradoxes. The pervasive singularization of the social, the orientation toward the unique and exceptional, generates systematic asymmetries and disparities, and hence progress and unease go hand in hand. Reckwitz examines this dual structure of singularization and polarization as it plays itself out in the different sectors of our societies and, in so doing, he outlines the central structural features of the present: the new class society, the characteristics of a post-industrial economy, the conflict about culture and identity, the exhaustion of the self resulting from the imperative to seek authentic fulfilment, and the political crisis of liberalism.

Andreas Reckwitz is Professor of Social Theory and Cultural Sociology at Humboldt University, Berlin. His research works have analyzed the genealogy of creativity as a late-modern social imaginary and singularity as a distinctive feature of the current era. His lines of work are Comparative Cultural Sociology, Social Theory, and Cultural Changes in Contemporary Identity.

You can buy it in printed or eBook version at the following link: https://www.politybooks.com/bookdetail?book_slug=the-end-of-illusions-politics-economy-and-culture-in-late-modernity--9781509545698
This provocative and groundbreaking book challenges accepted wisdom about the role of elites in both maintaining and undermining democracy in an increasingly authoritarian world. John Higley traces patterns of elite political behavior and the political orientations of non-elite populations throughout modern history to show what is and is not possible in contemporary politics. He situates these patterns and orientations in a range of regimes, showing how they have played out in revolutions, populist nationalism, Arab Spring failures to democratize, the conflation of ultimate and instrumental values in today’s liberal democracies, and American political thinkers’ misguided assumption that non-elites are the principal determinants of politics.

Critiquing the optimistic outlooks prevalent among educated Westerners, Higley considers them out of touch with reality because of spreading employment insecurity, demoralization, and millennial pursuits in their societies. Attacks by domestic and foreign terrorists, effects of climate change, mass migrations from countries outside the West, and disease pandemics exacerbate insecurity and further highlight the flaws in the belief that democracy can thrive and spread worldwide. Higley concludes that these threats to the well-being of Western societies are here to stay. They leave elites with no realistic alternative to a holding operation until at least mid-century that husbands the power and political practices of Western societies.

Drawing on decades of research, Higley’s analysis is historically and comparatively informed, bold, and in some places dark—and will be sure to foster debate.

John Higley is an Emeritus Professor of Government and Sociology and held the Jack S. Blanton Chair in Australia Studies until his retirement in 2012. In addition to chairing the Government Department, he was founder and director of the Edward A. Clark Center for Australian and New Zealand Studies and chair of the International Political Science Association’s Research Committee on Political Elites. He has written extensively about political elites, especially roles they play in democracies.

You can buy it in printed or eBook version at the following link: https://www.politybooks.com/bookdetail?book_slug=the-end-of-illusions-politics-economy-and-culture-in-late-modernity--9781509545698
The logics and ethics of neoliberal capitalism dominate public discourses and politics in the early twenty-first century. They morally endorse and institutionalize forms of competitive self-interest that jettison social justice values, and are deeply antithetical to love, care and solidarity.

But capitalism is neither invincible nor inevitable. While people are self-interested, they are not purely self-interested: they are bound affectively and morally to others, even to unknown others. The cares, loves and solidarity relationships within which people are engaged give them direction and purpose in their daily lives. They constitute cultural residuals of hope that stand ready to move humanity beyond a narrow capitalism-centric set of values.

In this instructive and inspiring book, Kathleen Lynch sets out to reclaim the language of love, care and solidarity both intellectually and politically and to place it at the heart of contemporary discourse. Her goal is to help unseat capital at the gravitational centre of meaning-making and value, thereby helping to create logics and ethical priorities for politics that are led by care, love and solidarity.

“One of the most significant books I have read in years. Lynch challenges many of the key assumptions underpinning neoliberalism and the norms that guide it. At the same time, she provides powerful and insightful alternatives”. Michael W. Apple, Beijing Normal University and University of Wisconsin–Madison.

Kathleen Lynch is an Emeritus Professor at the School of Education, University College Dublin. As both academic and activist, she has been working on different projects related to reducing inequality and promoting social justice with community groups non-governmental organizations, and statutory bodies, both nationally and internationally. Also, she has been working on educational related research, and in establishing the first Black Studies modules at UCD School of Education.

You can buy it in printed or eBook version at the following link: https://www.politybooks.com/bookdetail?book_slug=care-and-capitalism-9781509543830

This book analyses how authoritarian rulers of Southeast Asian countries maintain their durability in office, and, in this context, explains why some movements of civil society organizations succeed while others fail to achieve their demands. It discusses the relationship between the state-society business in the political survival context. As the first comparative analysis of strategies of regime survival across Southeast Asia, this book also provides an in-depth insight into the various opposition movements, and the behavior of antagonistic civic and political actors in the region.

“In this fascinating and timey intervention, Sokphea Young takes stock of the region’s political landscape in a sobering account of the difficult path ahead. Insightful, engaging, and an urgent appeal for political change at a moment when Southeast Asia is quickly rising in global strategic and economic importance”. Simon Springer, Professor, University of Newcastle, Australia.

Sokphea Young is a postdoctoral researcher at the University College London, UK. His research is published, variously, in Journal of International Relations and Development, Journal of Civil Society, Asian Politics and Policy, Asian Journal of Social Science, Journal of Current Southeast Asian Affairs, the Chinese Journal of Comparative Law and South East Asia Research.

You can buy it in printed or eBook version at the following link: https://rd.springer.com/book/10.1007/978-981-33-6112-6#about
This volume examines civilizations through the broad lens articulated by the works of Max Weber. In focusing upon his comparative-historical mode of analysis and his causal explanations for the sources, contours, and trajectories of civilizations, this study reconstructs Weber's sociology in a manner that provides clear guidelines to researchers seeking to investigate civilizations systematically.

Through detailed interpretations of the West's unique development from Antiquity to the Modern era, precise comparisons to the long-range and singular pathways taken by China and India, and careful demarcations of the “particular rationalisms” of several civilizations, the author addresses Weber's powerful model-building on the one hand and his opposition to organic holism and structural presuppositions on the other hand. Both a broad-ranging conceptual framework and case-based empirical investigations are pivotal to Weber.

His research strategy emphasizes further the “subjective meanings” of actors East and West and the deep cultural origins of groups. Finally, this volume masterfully conveys Weber’s contextual and multi-causal methodology rooted in a tight interweaving of the present with the past.

Max Weber's Sociology of Civilizations: A Reconstruction will appeal to comparative sociologists and historians, as well as to theorists of all persuasions. The social scientist pursuing a cross-civilizational agenda will here discover the distinct contribution of Weber's "interpretive understanding" procedures to the now-essential field of civilizational analysis.

Stephen Kalberg is Professor of Sociology Emeritus at Boston University and Local Affiliate of the Center for European Studies, Harvard University, USA. He is the author of Max Weber's Comparative-Historical Sociology; The Social Thought of Max Weber; Searching for the Spirit of American Democracy: Max Weber's Analysis of a Unique Political Culture; and Max Weber's Comparative-Historical Sociology Today. He is also the editor of Max Weber: Readings and Commentary on Modernity, and the translator of Weber's The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism.

You can buy it in printed or eBook version at the following link: https://www.routledge.com/Max-Webers-Sociology-of-Civilizations-A-Reconstruction/Kalberg/p/book/9780367497286
PAPERS AND BOOK CHAPTERS ANNOUNCEMENTS

We have received the following list of our members’ publications between 2021 and 2022: papers, book chapters, articles on websites, and book reviews. All are accessible at the mentioned links hereunder:

Simon Susen

- [https://doi.org/10.1177/1468795X211051514](https://doi.org/10.1177/1468795X211051514)

- [https://doi.org/10.36253/smp-12996](https://doi.org/10.36253/smp-12996)

**Reflections on the (Post-)Human Condition: Towards New Forms of Engagement with the World? (2021).** *Social Epistemology*
- [https://doi.org/10.1080/02691728.2021.1893859](https://doi.org/10.1080/02691728.2021.1893859)


- [https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/cambridge-handbook-of-social-theory/civil-society/B6639FC172AF0AD28367FF638293D7EF](https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/cambridge-handbook-of-social-theory/civil-society/B6639FC172AF0AD28367FF638293D7EF)

- [https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/cambridge-handbook-of-social-theory/jurgen-habermas/56C63AAA60C52D333F16E812017C3CA](https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/cambridge-handbook-of-social-theory/jurgen-habermas/56C63AAA60C52D333F16E812017C3CA)

Simon Susen and Bryan Turner

**Classics and Classicality: JCS after 20 Years (2021).** *Journal of Classical Sociology*, volume 21, issue 3-4.
- [https://doi.org/10.1177/1468795X211034946](https://doi.org/10.1177/1468795X211034946)

- [https://journals.sagepub.com/toc/jcsa/21/3-4](https://journals.sagepub.com/toc/jcsa/21/3-4)
Chris Rhomberg

- https://doi.org/10.4000/nrt.10213

Chris Rhomberg and Steven Lopez

*Understanding Strikes in the 21st Century: Perspectives from the USA (2021).* *Research in Social Movements, Conflicts and Change*, volume 44.
- https://doi.org/10.1108/S0163-786X20210000044005

Peter Krauss

*Popular Republicanism versus Populism: Articulating the People (2021).* *Social Sciences*, volume 1, issue 1.
- https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci10100366

Peter Krauss, Vicent Climent-Ferrado, Melanie Frank and Núria García

*Governing complex linguistic diversity in Barcelona, Luxembourg and Riga (2021).* *Nations and Nationalism*, volume 27.
- https://doi.org/10.1111/nana.12662

Maro Youssef

- https://doi.org/10.1093/sp/jxab020

Anil Kumar Vaddiraju

- https://doi.org/10.1177/00195561211035946
CPS ACTIVITIES

PERMANENT SEMINAR: "CPS TALKS WITH AUTHORS"

During the second semester of 2021, the CPS organized the last four Seminars: "CPS Talks With Authors" of the year. Each of them gave us the opportunity to share with political scientists and political sociologists and comment on their recent book publications. The recordings of these seminars are available at the links mentioned further down.

In the 5th session, Dr. Laurence Morel (University of Lille and Science Po Paris, France) presented her book about The Question of Referendum, thereafter discussed by Yannis Papadopoulos (Institute of Political Studies, University of Lausanne).

You can access the session at the following link: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7z9cofgGMFo&t=7s

In the 6th session, we talked with Cristóbal Rovira (Diego Portales University, Chile) and Tim Bale (Queen Mary University of London, UK) about their edited book Riding the Populist Wave. Europe’s Mainstream Right in Crisis, commented by Javier Sajuria (Queen Mary University of London, UK).

You can access the session at the following link: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ROPjcUStr1s
In the 7th session, Dr. Muriel Surdez (University of Fribourg, Switzerland) and Dr. Eric Neveu (Sciences Po Rennes, France) presented their edited volume Globalizing Issues. How Claims, Frames, and Problems Cross Borders, thereafter commented by Manfred Steger (University of Hawaii-Manoa).

You can access the session at the following link: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Z1WqvOwmKTc

In the 8th session we talked with Kellee S. Tsai (Hong Kong University of Science and Technology) and Chun-Chih Chang (Xiamen University) about their edited book called Evolutionary Governance in China. State-Society Relations under Authoritarianism, then discussed by Hiroko Takeda (Nagoya University).

You can access the session at the following link: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6Z7NVlY4q20
All of our CPS Standing Seminars have had amazing commentators. Two of them, Manfred Steger and Hiroko Takeda, have sent us exclusive comments from their respective sessions that we want to share with you.

Globalizing Issues: How Claims, Frames, and Problems Cross Borders
Edited by Erik Neveu & Muriel Surdez

Commented by professor Manfred Steger

SUMMARY:
The impetus for writing this book was what the editors describe as two sources of dissatisfaction with the extent literature on transnationalization processes and globalizing issues:

The first source is the indiscriminate academic use of the words “global” and “globalization” in relation to social issues or problems: not enough emphasis on a political sociology of how “global issues” are being transformed into “global problems”. In particular, constructivist approaches are undervalued in much of the “global problems” literature.

The second source is that there is not enough synergy and conversations between two dominant streams of scholarship on public problems: (a) the "social construction of public problems" paradigm (Gusfield and Spector); and (b) the “agenda setting tradition” (Cobb & Elder; McComb and Shaw). The editors argue that there is a need for synthesis and the exploration of possible contact points and convergences between these two academic currents.

The book engages three related research questions:
- What can be defined sociologically as a “global problem”?
- How are issues debated across borders and how do they find institutional supports and translations?
- How do multi-level dimensions of globalization work in terms of the construction and promotion of global problems such as climate change, health matters, agriculture, energy, etc.

The various chapters of the book offer detailed case studies that engage these three research questions in concrete local, national, regional, and global settings and contexts.

Social interdependencies are the basis on which claim-makers develop the rhetoric of “global problems.” But, in addition, there are complementary social and political conditions that make a process of problem globalization possible. These can be summarized as “three flows”: 
- **Material flows** made up of things and humans (tradeable commodities, viruses, migrants, tourists, etc).

- **Expert flows** made up of claim-makers who tackle issues, give them political importance and resonance, and provide frames and tools for dealing with them. The book posits that “issues” need to be transformed into “problems” before they can draw attention. They have to be placed on the media and political agendas and require claim-makers who organize and act across borders. To understand how global problems emerge, it is necessary to focus on the ecosystem of institutions, resources, and claim-makers that interact across all spatial scales (local-global: glocalization).

- **Cognitive and symbolic flows** made up of images, narratives, and analytical categories.

**Organization of book:**

**Part I:** revisits the major paradigms (social constructivism, agenda setting, and need for new disciplinary connections like IR Theory).

**Part II:** analyzes the social logic of the actors defining global problems.

**Part III:** offers case studies that show how actors and frames change and circulate between specific venues and arenas placed at various spatial scales.

**POINTS OF DISCUSSION:**

(1) **Interdisciplinarity**

One of the virtues of this book is that the authors urge less respect for disciplinary boundaries and discourage the habit of living in intellectual silos (see my own work). But, what exactly forms of boundary crossing do they have in mind: inter-, multi-, or transdisciplinarity? Or all three? Are these distinctions significant for the authors (there is a growing literature on transdisciplinarity: to what extent does this literature inform the authors’ own efforts)?

(2) **The Role of IR Theory**

The authors make a strong case for a stronger integration of IR theory in the study of global problems. While I see some of the advantages in bringing in an IR perspective, there are also significant problems with it. First, most of IR is still based on methodological nationalism (taking the nation-state as the basic unit of analysis), which runs counter to the authors’ strong critique of the national framework (pp. 13-15). Thus, what is the value added of including an increasingly antiquated IR perspective? This brings me to the second point. There is no discussion of the growing transdisciplinary field of Global Studies in this book. As shown in my own work and that of other GS scholars, the GS framework—made up of the 4 pillars of globalization (anti-methodological nationalism), transdisciplinarity, space & time, and critical thinking—would be a much more productive and suitable framework for the study of global problems. I wonder why the authors do not discuss the GS paradigm in their book? Do they have reservations or associate certain problems with it? Like to hear them elaborate on this point.
(3) Globalization

This focus on GS brings me to my final discussion point: globalization. I agree with their initial critique of the often-indiscriminate use of the concepts “global” and “globalization” in relation to issues and problems. In Chapter 2 of the volume, Elitza Katzarova and Erik Neveu (p.31) make a brief attempt to define the keyword “global” but only insofar as it is related to “problems” as in “global problems.” The second keyword “globalization” is never explicitly defined. The closest we come to a definition occurs in Chapter 1 (pp.6-7) where Neveu and Surdez offer a characterization of “global interdependencies” in terms of their three global flows: material, claim-makers, and cognitive-symbolic. While useful, their tripartite typology still does not advance beyond long-standing globalization typologies offered decades ago by such authors as Held, Scholte, Appadurai, or Robertson. My own definitional attempt is to understand globalization as a set of processes involving the expansion and intensification of social relations and consciousness across world-space and world-time. While the core elements of this definition are widely shared among globalization theorists, we need to consider some important qualifications.

First, globalization is a geographically uneven set of processes. It does not happen everywhere at the same time, or in the same way, and with the same intensity. Moreover, it prompts both imitation and resistance. Second, multiple spatial scales intersect as the global shapes the local and vice-versa. Third, globalization does not always manifest as intensifying connections. Disjunctive movements among the major globalization formations can inhibit flows and disable existing links. What are these globalization formations? This is where my new fourfold typology of globalization comes in: first, there is embodied globalization (worldwide flows, connectivities, and imaginaries of people including tourists, refugees, and business travelers); second, there is disembodied globalization (worldwide flows and connectivities of ideas and information, including images and digital data); third, there is objectified globalization (worldwide flows and connectivities of things including tradeable commodities and greenhouse gases); and institutional globalization (worldwide flows and connectivities of organizations including transnational corporations and sports clubs). Disjuncture is apt term describing the disjointed dynamics of disintegration and integration that frequently occur among these four globalization formations especially in our own era of digitization.

I believe that greater attention to definitional matters and conceptual innovation regarding the keywords “global” and “globalization” would make the author’s study of global problems even more focused and productive than it already is.

CONCLUDING ASSESSMENT:

Let me end on a high note. This is a terrific book
and I have learned much from it. Although this anthology has many virtues, let me just mention what I consider to be its two most significant academic achievements:

(1) It provides a valuable focus on exploring the subjective dimensions of globalization. Objective phenomena of globalization, their patterns and processes, have been studied in extraordinary detail. Scholarly publications abound describing the flows and nature of global financial interchange, the movement of goods and people, and even the spread of global culture. By comparison, the subjective dimensions of globalization in terms of ideas, ideologies, imaginaries, cognitive frames, and shared mental models have not received even close to the level of attention that has been paid to these objective dimensions of globalization. After all, globalization involves both the objective spread and intensification of social relations across world space, and the subjective meanings, ideas, sensibilities, and understandings, associated with those material processes of extension. Moreover, objective and subjective relations and meanings are bound up with each other. It is this ever-present dimension of “the subjective” that remains strangely neglected in globalization research. This book is a welcome contribution to rectify this research neglect by exploring the impact of subjective dynamics of globalization on concrete policy agendas and crucial problem construction processes.

(2) Its second achievement lies in its innovative fusion of the two dominant social constructivist and agenda settings currents of studying social problems. I expect many other scholars to follow this promising research path staked out by Erik Neveu and Muriel Surdez.

**Evolutionary Governance in China: State-Society Relations under Authoritarianism**
Edited by Szu-chien Hsu, Kelle S. Tsai & Chun-chih Chang

Commented by professor Hiroko Takeda

From Japan’s vantage point, China is not only powerful but also mysterious, a neighboring country with multifaceted, often contradictory faces. This is aptly epitomized by the term ‘authoritarianism in China with adjectives’ discussed in *Evolutionary Governance in China: State-Society Relations under Authoritarianism*. Kellee S. Tsai, one of the editors of the volume, lists a series of expressions dating back to 1987 that were used by different scholars to explain and analyze authoritarianism in China, including ‘consultative authoritarianism,’ ‘popular authoritarianism,’ ‘responsive authoritarianism,’ and ‘deliberative authoritarianism.’ These terms are certainly oxymoronic, subsuming different types and forms of political interactions between the state and society observed in China since the 1980s. Together with the literature review and the quantitative case survey (QCA) conducted by Szu-chien Hsu and Chun-chih Chang, the other editors, the volume argues that the
multiplicity and hybridity of political realities that the list of ‘authoritarianism in China with adjectives’ projects can be understood as different phases of the evolutionary process of the governance system in China. The state and societal actors interact and negotiate with each other to achieve their political goals, resorting to intertwined soft and hard strategies that are enabled or restricted by the institutional conditions and the political climate in a given historically contingent context. In this way, the volume demonstrates that in order to maintain its legitimacy, even the authoritarian Chinese state has operated, if necessary, with the need to be responsive to societal actors' demands, but this, in turn, feeds into the resilience of the Chinese authoritarian regime.

This dynamic understanding of authoritarianism in China raises some intriguing questions about the meaning and nature of authoritarianism. To outline them, allow me to introduce 'authoritarian populism', which I have observed in contemporary Japan. The term ‘authoritarian populism’ was proposed by Stuart Hall in the late 1970s to discuss the transformation of the hegemonic structure in Britain in the process of the government change from the Labour government based on the postwar consensus to the Conservative government led by Margaret Thatcher. Under the authoritarian populist regime, electoral competition remains, but popular support is mobilized from above by imposing on the populace a set of ideas regarding social values, morals, and ethics, with which people make sense of what is right/wrong, as well as what a good/bad life is. In so doing, authoritarian populism reorganizes and consolidates the hegemonic structure in a way that fits the political agendas of the dominant party.

In Japan, the Liberal Democratic Party (LDP) has been in office since 1955, except for brief periods of 1993-1994 and 2009-2012. In this circumstance, political changes are often solicited from negotiations between policy-making elites (LDP politicians, bureaucrats, and business leaders) and societal actors over the prospect of economic growth that leads to the bettering of the Japanese people’s everyday family lives—that is, a prioritized element of the postwar political value system in Japan. The new Kishida government established in October 2021 has certainly exploited this formula by advocating a need to introduce a ‘new capitalism’ based on a kinder and more secure employment practice, with which ‘prudent’ Japanese people would enjoy their everyday family lives through their hard work, backed up by the sound management of the national economy. In this way, the LDP attempted to survive a political crisis generated by the previous Abe and Suga governments, particularly concerning the handling of the COVID-19 pandemic. In this way, the LDP maintains its dominant position within Japan’s party system, demonstrating its resilience.

Reading Evolutionary Governance in China has made me understand some similarities between authoritarian and authoritarian populist regimes. To take a further step, perhaps, we need to pay closer attention to the ways in which authoritarian political forces operate in a given political setting in a concrete manner, along with the examination of the type and nature of the concerned regime.
The Survey Data Recycling project (SDR) is developing a public online database that harmonizes into a comparable measures the major social, demographic, and political variables from over 3,500 international surveys covering 24 major survey programs for over 142 countries covering 1966-2016. The 1.0 version of the data and documentation are available at:


Further updates will be posted as they are completed. In 2022, the project will publish Survey Data Harmonization in the Social Sciences (Wiley), which reviews the field of survey harmonization. Further information on the project and its publications are available at: http://dataharmonization.org. Issues of the SDR project newsletter Harmonization: Newsletter on Survey Data Harmonization in the Social Sciences are available at:

https://dataharmonization.org/newsletter/

SDR Principal Investigators:

- **J. Craig Jenkins**, Academy Professor of Sociology and Senior Research Scientist, Mershon Center, Ohio State University, USA. https://sociology.osu.edu/people/jenkins.12
- **Irina Tomescu-Dubrow**, Visiting Associate Professor of Sociology, Ohio State, & Associate Professor, Institute of Philosophy and Sociology, Polish Academy of Sciences, USA & Poland. https://irinatomescudubrow.wordpress.com/
- **Kazimirez Slomczynski**, Academy Professor of Sociology, Ohio State, & Director of Research Team on Comparative Social Inequality, Institute of Philosophy and Sociology, Polish Academy of Sciences. https://sociology.osu.edu/people/slomczynski.1
- **Spyros Blanas**, Assistant Professor, Dept. of Computer Science and Engineering, Ohio State University, USA. https://web.cse.ohio-state.edu/~blanas.2/
- **Han-Wei Shen**, Professor, Dept. of Computer Science and Engineering, Ohio State University, USA. https://web.cse.ohio-state.edu/~shen.94/shen.94/Welcome.html
- **Yamei Tu**, Phd student, Dept. of Computer Science and Engineering, Ohio State University, USA. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Yamei_Tu
- **Juonghyuan Kwak**, Postdoctoral Fellow, Ohio State & University of Essex, U.K. https://www.iser.essex.ac.uk/people/jk20007
- **Christof Wolf**, President, GESIS, Germany https://www.gesis.org/en/institute/staff/person/christof.wolf

This project is sponsored by The Dataverse Project.

If you want to sign up for the newsletter, please email Craig Jenkins at jenkins.12@osu.edu
CALL FOR PAPERS
Resilient Cities and Migration Governance

In migration studies most of the recent literature mentions pressures and constraints that cities must face in building their migration governance, but very few try to theorize an approach to better grasp these challenges. Resilience is a framework that may help to analyze how cities empower and construct their autonomous agency in an adverse environment, combining public management, governance, and claim-making. Taken broadly, the World Bank (2015) describes resilience as the ability of a system to adapt to a variety of changing conditions and to withstand shocks while maintaining its essential functions. Urban resilience is about developing urban capacities and learning to govern with the spectrum of uncertainties, hazards and risks related to multiple migration-related social stresses. The overall purpose of this Special Issue is to explore how we can draw an empirically informed resilient theory that may inform future research and policy paths of resilient cities and migration governance.

Resilient cities often look for innovative ways to face pressure in their legal, institutional and policy infrastructures. This Call is particularly interested in proposals examining how resilience acts as a catalyst of policy innovation and urban transformation. Current City agency is pushing towards resilient migration governance from different avenues: from upper level of governance, from the same urban context, from the international and national policies, often obsessed by national security. An urban resilient governance approach is particularly aiming at exploring how governance’s constraints system invites towards strategic and holistic thinking for migration governance. This multidirectional pressure system determines often decision-making and policy official’s behavior, and shape definitively the future of migration governance.

One of the increasing resilient strategies showing cities agency-capacity and their autonomy-building is when we focus on refugees, undocumented migrants, unaccompanied children, vulnerable women. Namely, extreme human situations often produced by external factors, such as the state and/or EU legislation/policies, and now aggravated by the pandemic shock. An urban resilient governance approach is particularly aiming at exploring how governance’s constraints system increases multi-level governance tensions/cooperation, multi-scalar alliances with civil society organizations networks and translocal ties with other cities within/outside urban areas. This Call will accept proposals empirically constructed and theoretically motivated. We invite future contributors looking at policy strategies affecting norms, services, structures and regulations, and the place of city agency within a regional, national and global context.

The deadline for submitting proposals is February 28, 2022. For more information, please enter at the following link:

https://www.frontiersin.org/research-topics/27258/resilient-cities-and-migration-governance
El mundo vive acelerados procesos de movilización social. Las élites políticas carecen de recursos para dar respuestas o están más preocupadas por resolver la agenda de las élites económicas. Estudiantes, movimientos feministas, colectivos LGBTIQ+, movimientos de trabajadorxs precarixs y de clases medias desestabilizadas conmueven la política a nivel global. Asimismo, el espacio público digital cambió buena parte de las lógicas del debate y el involucramiento político. Los procesos de polarización política y los dilemas frente a la cuestión ambiental trastocan las coordenadas de la politización contemporánea. La Maestría en Sociología Política provee herramientas para abordar, desde perspectivas renovadas, temas clásicos y fenómenos emergentes de nuestras sociedades. Desde el pluralismo disciplinario, teórico y metodológico, promueve la adquisición de destrezas para la investigación empírica, la innovación conceptual y la reflexividad intelectual.

El programa aspira a reunir y potenciar las inquietudes por la práctica académica y la docencia, la comunicación y el análisis de la política, así como por el involucramiento directo en agencias estatales. Está dirigida a todxs lxs interesadxs en entrenar una mirada sensible a los matices del

**Director:** Gabriel Vommaro (Universidad Nacional de San Martín, IDAES y CONICET)
mundo político y sus actores, evitar la reproducción de lugares comunes y a la vez mantener un compromiso con su tiempo. Se organiza en dos tipos de cursos: por un lado, cuatro seminarios centrales en los que se discutirán grandes nudos temáticos de relevancia actual:

1. Conflicto, activismo y acción colectiva
2. Estado, burocracias y políticas públicas
3. Elites, poder y organizaciones políticas
4. Espacio público, medios y redes sociales.

Por otro lado, dos talleres metodológicos en los que se realizará una formación orientada a la investigación en las dos perspectivas más innovadoras de la sociología política actual: la etnografía y el análisis de datos cuantitativos con inteligencia artificial.

Está dirigida por Gabriel Vommaro e integran su plantel docente: Cecilia Ferraudi Curto, Mariana Gené, Gabriel Kessler, Mariana Heredia, Luisina Perelmiter, Sebastián Pereyra, Martín Plot, Lorena Poblete, Germán Rosati y Daniela Slipak.

El programa capitaliza el reconocimiento académico obtenido por sus docentes, en estrecha conexión con la discusión internacional y el debate público sobre las problemáticas de nuestro tiempo y nuestras sociedades.

You may find this and more information at bit.ly/sociologiapolitica. Also, you may ask any question at the following email: sociologiapolitica@unsam.edu.ar