



HAL
open science

Post-Western Sociology

Laurence Roulleau-Berger

► **To cite this version:**

Laurence Roulleau-Berger. Post-Western Sociology. Roulleau-Berger, Laurence; Li Peilin; Kim, Seung Kuk; Yasawa, Shujiro. Handbook of Post-Western Sociology: from East Asia to Europe, 1-16, Brill, 2023, 978-90-04-52931-1. <10.1163/9789004529328_002>. <hal-03931185>

HAL Id: hal-03931185

<https://hal.science/hal-03931185v1>

Submitted on 9 Jan 2023

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire HAL, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



HAL Authorization

Post-Western Sociology

Laurence Roulleau-Berger

Although the social sciences and particularly sociology may have been almost entirely monopolized by certain Western countries, they were born in Europe for the most part. However, for almost 20 years now, the Western world has lost its hegemony over the production of their paradigms (Wieviorka 2007), organized around two master narratives: the superiority of Western civilization (through progress and reason) and the belief in the continuous growth of capitalism. Hegemonic thought in the history of social science was generated through a process of “epistemic injustice” (Bhargava 2013). Some Western scholars supported the hypothesis of the marginalization of Eurocentrism and the weakening of European traditions in science. While scientific thought has been constructed as an element of Western societies, this phase in global sociological reasoning has challenged the conditions for creating universalizing and tautological accounts in Western social sciences. We can perceive a diversity of Westernisms—some more Eurocentric, others more Americanocentric—either merging or in tension. There is a diversity of Westernisms and semi-Westernisms; there is also a plurality of Easternisms and semi-Easternisms situated in different epistemic spaces and ordered into hierarchies according to differentiated political, historical, and civilizational contexts.

Postcolonial studies were a major step forward in the production of sociological knowledge by displacing Eurocentrism, deconstructing binaries, and creating a narrative to include the multiplicity of world views in the social sciences; this in turn gave rise to Subaltern Studies through epistemologies from the “third-space” (Patel 2003). For over three decades, hegemonic Western thought has been subjected to critical reviews in Asia, Africa, Latin America, and the Arab world by intellectuals responding to Eurocentric fundamentalism (Hanafi 2020). Western hegemonies also received criticism from non-Western and Westernized intellectuals living and working in the heart of the West. A considerable portion of postcolonial critique came from universities in the North. The “Westernization” and “de-Westernization” of knowledge have often gone hand in hand in showing that weapons against Western domination were manufactured in the Western empire (Brisson 2018). The political decline of colonial empires failed to recognize knowledge developed outside

the “imperial” borders. According to Raewyn Connell (2007), the sociological canon was essentially formulated in the United States, where social science was viewed through an imperialist lens in the second half of the 20th century. The institutional and academic dependency of certain researchers in the global South on Western social sciences encouraged the replication of theories conceived in the United States, Great Britain, France, and Germany. These mimetic processes have stymied reinterpretations, reformulations, and the production of knowledge in other societies, most notably in Asia.

Numerous avenues are leading to emancipation from Westernisms. For example, *Western Westernisms* are based on the awareness and use of non-hegemonic theories while keeping in mind that they cannot become hegemonic. Or, *Reimagined Westernisms* are produced by integrating fragments of non-hegemonic thinking while retaining epistemic frameworks derived from hegemonic frameworks. Alternatively, *Eastern Westernisms* are based on the coproduction of hybrid thinking by means of strong emancipation from the processes of epistemic colonialization.

To open a Post-Western Space means taking into account the “cosmopolitan turn in social science”—as Beck and Grande argued (2010)—where sociological cosmopolitanisms may be defined by radical openness and inclusiveness and where a plurality of narratives can exist. Westernisms form graduated, plastic, and moving hierarchies that rapidly become elusive. Therefore, it is vital to undo both Westernisms and Easternisms in order to reveal transnational spaces that bring into the light of day a tissue of knowledge that is still partially concealed and even—in some cases—invisible.

Post-Western sociology proceeds from de-centering and the renewal of universalisms originating in different Eastern and Western spaces. Post-Western sociology is, above all, relational, dialogue-based, and multisituated. This positioning goes beyond postcolonial studies, which could be understood as reinforcing hegemonic positions by means of a strong assertion of critical postures visible in the work of certain intellectuals from the Anglo-Saxon academic world. In post-Western sociology, a strong awareness of hegemonism serves to reveal transnational knowledge spaces in which the diversity of situated knowledge and shared or joint knowledge is rendered visible (Roulleau-Berger 2016; Roulleau-Berger and Li 2018; Xie and Roulleau-Berger 2017).

In this edition, we offer a glimpse beyond the “East” and the “West” by opening the horizons to a wealth of self-directed narratives by societies worldwide, thus laying the foundations for a post-Western space. This is a place where “Western” and “non-Western” sociologies can intersect and interact, forming shared divergent understandings of myriad *ethnoscapes* since for more than 10 years we have produced a *post-Western sociology* to enable a dialogue—on

a level footing—on common concepts and concepts situated in European, Chinese, Japanese, and Korean theories, to consider the modes of creation of continuities and discontinuities, the conjunctions and disjunctions between knowledge spaces situated in different social contexts, to work on the gaps between them.

This handbook is divided into two parts:

- Part 1: Post-Western Social Sciences: From East Asia to Europe.
- Part 2: Translation and Ecologies of Knowledge: Dialogues East–West.

In Part 1 from the production of epistemologies of the “Souths” and the re-Easternization of the Westernized East we will introduce the idea of the demultiplication, the complexification and the hierarchization of new epistemic autonomies vis-à-vis Western hegemonies in sociology, and the new epistemic assemblages between European and Asian sociologies (Rouleau-Berger 2016; Rouleau-Berger and Li Peilin 2018; Xie Lizhong and Rouleau-Berger 2017). In fact, epistemic autonomies become plural and diversify, even hierarchize among themselves, without this dynamic of recomposition of the geographies of knowledge in the social sciences being really perceived on the side of the Western worlds. The question of Western hegemonies continues to arise through the process of the recognition, visibility, and legitimacy of this plurality of epistemic autonomies. Then, we identify some transnational theory, theoretical discontinuities and continuities, and located and common knowledge in Western and non-Western contexts.

Part 1, *Post-Western social sciences: from Asia to Europe*, will be organized around four sections that reflect different dimensions of the post-Western theory:

- Section 1: Toward Post-Western Social Sciences
- Section 2: Non-hegemonic Traditions and Pluralism in Asian Social Sciences
- Section 3: Heritages and “Re-Asiatization” of Social Sciences
- Section 4: Epistemic Autonomies and Located Knowledge

In Section 1 we will give different definitions of post-Western sociology. Laurence Rouleau-Berger (Chapter 1) explains how a Post-Western Sociology enables a dialogue—held on an equal footing—on European and Asian theories. From an ecology of knowledge we can observe, on one hand, the multiplication of epistemic autonomies vis-à-vis Western hegemonies, and, on the other hand, epistemic assemblages between European and Asian sociologies to coproduce a post-Western space in a cross-pollination process. Then, starting from the origin issue of Chinese sociology, Li Peilin (Chapter 2) discusses the formation of Chinese sociological characteristics, and holds that the growth of sociology with different characteristics in different countries is the basis for the formation of global sociology as a post-Western sociology.

The new debates mean that sociologists in non-Western countries are consciously thinking about how global sociology, as a post-Western sociology, has been formed. Xie Lizhong (Chapter 3) will demonstrate, due to the diversity of discourse systems, that “post-Western sociology” will constitute many systems of sociological knowledge that are derived from many discursive sources, including Western discourse systems and non-Western discourse systems; so, “post-Westernization” tries hard to avoid that extreme “Western/non-Western” dichotomy and conveys a tendency to produce the continuity, consistency, and commonality while maintaining those differences. Therefore, it should be a non-hegemonic world of sociological knowledge. Kim Seung Kuk (Chapter 4) will attempt to propose a preliminary approach to constructing an East Asian theory to build a post-Western sociology, employing the concept of hybridization as a key to connect East Asian theoretical perspectives with Western perspectives. Theories of solipsist and spiritualist individualism and middle way for love are also introduced as a uniquely East Asian type of theoretical orientation. East Asian theoretical perspective is an effort to recognize and reinvent both the connectivity and compatibility with a Western perspective. Yazawa Shujiro (Chapter 5) analyzes historical and social contexts, and meanings of post-Western sociology in Japan. The knowledge space is constructed by historical and social background, intellectual contexts, relationship with different knowledge spaces, interests, theoretical attitudes, and theory itself. But the best product of Japanese sociology is post-Western sociology. Japanese sociology is important as a bridge between Eastern and Western sociology.

In Section 2 we draw the theoretical continuities and discontinuities between Western and non-Western sociologies, and we will introduce traditions and controversies.

For Li Youmei (Chapter 6) Chinese sociology has not been able to systematically reflect on its own localized knowledge production process. Therefore, the reconstruction of Chinese sociological knowledge still has a long way to go. This article attempts to reflect on the knowledge production path of Professor Fei Xiaotong, one of the most outstanding sociologists regarding his contribution to the production of localized knowledge of Chinese sociology, to investigate how Chinese sociology will make its own contribution to the “post-Western sociology”. Yama Yoshiyuki (Chapter 7) examines the history of Japanese thought, especially the new type of Confucianism and Nativism (Kokugaku) in the Edo period, in comparison with Western sociology. He contributes to reevaluating sociology in the non-Western world by understanding sociology as not limited to Western sociology, and designing the hybrid sociology that integrates Western sociology and non-Western sociology based on these achievements. Zhou Xiaohong and Feng Zhuqin (Chapter 8) shows

how in the establishment of Chinese sociology in the early 20th century, the Sinicization or indigenization of its disciplinary system began to receive great attention from academia. The author believes that the profound and extensive social transformation in contemporary China not only puts forward the historical mission of sociological indigenization, but also provides a realistic possibility for the accomplishment of this mission and the advancement towards global Chinese sociology. Shoji Kōkichi (Chapter 9), focusing on developing Yoshida's and Mita's theories, is proposing a theory of global sociology that can be used by any sociologist of any country to analyze one's own society in the world society backed up by the global ecology. Sociology is a program science to disclose programs that construct societies and their global nexus taking root in the earth's ecological system. Sociology can propose to reform programs by rejecting bad selections and inserting new ones to make societies better. In his contribution Lim Hyun-Chin (Chapter 10) attempts to examine the major challenges and responses Korean sociology has faced in an era of globalization. Korean sociology has long suffered from lacking its own identity. This lack of identity has inevitably resulted from the development process influenced by Western sociological tradition. Korean sociology is a mixture of American, Japanese, German, English, and even French sociological orientation. Therefore, it is critical for Korean sociology to develop its own concepts and theories. Kim Mun-Cho (Chapter 11) considers the cosmopolitan turn in sociology must be a significant movement that enables the recognition of the intellectual limitations of conventional Western sociology. Given the current meta-dynamic of convergence, however, the march to "post-Western sociology" should be continued to the point where all of the boundaries besides the continental divide of the East and the West are to be implored as well. It means an alternative sociological imagination coinciding with the coming age of the convergence civilization.

In Section 3 we will see how post-Western sociology is also organized around common heritages, circulation, and hybridizations of sociological knowledge. Yang Dian (Chapter 12) will explain how Western social sciences have dominated modern social sciences for centuries; however, from the point view of the sociology of knowledge, Western social sciences are just "local knowledge" produced from the experiences of Western countries. The different modernization patterns of China and other non-Western countries call for the development of post-Western sociology, which is more inclusive and scientific, and has stronger explanatory power. Shen Yuan (Chapter 13) tries to sort out the clues of the development of labor sociology on the Chinese mainland during the past 30 years. The last decade of the 20th century may be termed as the first period of the development of contemporary Chinese labor sociology. In

the first decade of the 21st century Chinese sociologists tried to classify labor research into theoretical frameworks, especially American sociology. The second decade of 21st century was characterized by the research of exploration of new labor groups and some new visions of theories. Han Sang-Jin (Chapter 15) argues that post-Western sociology calls for a normative vision against the hegemonic modernity built into the Western sociology. He demonstrates how the United States' hegemonic power has been threatened by the analysis of global survey data. He concludes that we should extend post-Western sociological imaginations to conceptualize the possibilities of a non-hegemonic global sociology that we can create and share. Okumura Takashi (Chapter 16) explores the discussions of Yanagita and Tsurumi on the modernizing process of Japan, focusing on the dynamic relationship between wanderers and settlers. Kazuko Tsurumi (1918–2006), a sociologist educated at Princeton under Marion Levy, took Yanagita's (1875–1962) ideas of “wanderers and settlers” seriously, and adapted them to analyze the relationship between *jigoro* (settlers or insiders) and *nagare* (wanderers or outsiders) in Minamata areas damaged by serious industrial pollution causing Minamata disease in 1970s. For Nomiya Daishiro (Chapter 14), away from the Western ethos, a “*hibakusha*” collective memory represented a significant turning-point in the post-war history of two atomic bomb-laden cities, Hiroshima and Nagasaki; it makes a counterargument against the Western modernity and capitalism. So we are invited to come back to a fundamental theoretical question: what constitutes the Western world?

In Section 4 we will see how the epistemic autonomies and local knowledge are constructed in a process of Easternization of the Westernized East which looks like a kind of matrix of epistemic autonomies today in non-Western countries from Asia.

Qu Jingdong (Chapter 17) introduces the post-Western sociological imagination from Chinese experiences. Case study is an irreplaceable sociological strategy for research on social construction. It aims to make a long chain of interpretations from a typical case to the construction of the whole society. Case study is not only influenced by the policies made by central or local governments at different levels, but also located in grassroots customs and mores at the bottom. Sun Feiyu (Chapter 21), in a very close Fei Xiaotong's perspective on “cultural self-consciousness” is contributing to the construction of the theory on the subjectivity in China's sociology. With Yang he raised the concept of social ground, which refers to these “unchanged/stable subjects” in the history of Chinese society. In a non-Western approach the studies of social self-production in China and the social ground are part of efforts of sociological work on cultural consciousness in China. Yee Jaeyeol (Chapter 18) introduces located knowledge with a new theory of publicness in the context of the

COVID-19 pandemic. Disaster provides an opportunity to observe the hidden weaknesses of a society. Traditionally, West and East have been regarded as opposites in all three dimensions, and Western ideals, such as democracy and the market, have been regarded as superior models to social issues modernities. In a framework based on the concepts of the community and the individual an alternative epistemic perspective is used: publicness as a measure of *the social*, combining the degree of public interest, fairness, civic participation, and transparency. Jang Wonho (Chapter 19) purposes a local theory on glocal culture in demonstrating that the Korean Wave is an exemplary of glocal culture, in which the global culture, mixed with Korean culture, has produced a creolized culture that can be consumed transnationally. The glocalizing dynamics of the Korean Wave can be seen in the creation of transnational cultural communities sharing cultural identities based on the Korean Wave and developing a sense of mutual understanding. Hallyu is not really about Koreanness or Asianness, but instead entails the global cultural values of female universalism and gender fluidity. Deguchi Takeshi (Chapter 20) reconsiders the “colonization of the lifeworld” reconsidered from the perspective of “Galapagosized” sociology in Japan. He shed light on one of the influential critical sociologists in Japan, Akira Kurihara, and his theory of *yasashisa no sonzai-shomei* (identity of tenderness) to elucidate contradictions in the reproduction process of personal identity and society at large—namely, how this dysfunction of identity formation generates the mentality of tenderness, which is opposed to values of productivism. In his article Kikutani Kazuhiro (Chapter 22) illustrates the essential difference in the notion of society between France and Japan by comparing two epoch-making affairs of false charges, one of which, referred to as the Dreyfus Affair, occurred in France, and the other, called the Taigyaku Affair, occurred in Japan. He intends to propose a new way of understanding “the social” that surmounts the distinction that lies between Western and Eastern recognition of society. For He Rong (Chapter 23), after an absence of half a century, Max Weber stepped back into the Chinese academic community during the 1980s. Three main themes are of importance: the motivation and values behind contemporary economic endeavors in comparison with the Protestant Ethic; economic strategy as a way of state-building; and the world’s vision of China since *Confucianism and Taoism*. Classical paradigms offered by Max Weber could be further developed in combination with Chinese experience. A post-Western sociology should be local and down-to-earth as well as global with open views.

Part 2, *Translation and Ecologies of Knowledge: Dialogues East–West*, will be organized around 10 chapters that show how to produce non-hegemonic and post-Western knowledge.

- Section 5: Globalization and Social Classes
- Section 6: Youth and Education
- Section 7: State and Governance
- Section 8: Ethnicity and Space
- Section 9: Social Movements and Collective Action
- Section 10: Gender and Inequalities
- Section 11: Environment and Mistrust Crisis
- Section 12: Individuation, Self, and Emotions
- Section 13: Cities, Migration, and Work
- Section 14: Global Health and New Future

In the post-Western sociology doing with or doing together still looks to be central in the fabric of sociological knowledge in taking account of the alternative political economy of knowledge. In post-Western sociology we will be considering both the local and transnational dimensions of academic research in different fields as part of our attempt to analyze the effects of societal context on the production of theoretical methodologies based on local research situations. However, we will also be analyzing transnational flows between the various contexts of knowledge linked to research methodologies and considering both the processes involved in the production of sociological knowledge and cultural variations in research practices. Theories, knowledge, and methods cannot circulate until these equivalences have been established and appear to be relatively stable, and a framework based on common conventions and norms governing academic research have been put in place. Practices give rise, in these very different contexts, to sociological knowledge obtained in response to questions that are similar but “situated” in sociologists’ own societal experiences; we will be posing questions about the universal value of sociological knowledge.

In order to move forward in the production of the paradigm of post-Western sociology, we have shared common and local knowledge by producing cross-sociological perspectives on common topics, by working together in the fields in Europe and Asia, by comparing our ways of conducting quantitative and qualitative research in different research programs. We will analyze how research practices and sociological knowledge are constructed by looking at different and similar forms of experience in Chinese, Japanese, Korean, and European research fields. Crossed views are produced by European and Asian sociologists, allowing us to highlight important differences in the conditions of production of sociological knowledge and to explore their relations with the paradigms developed in Europe and in Asia.

In Section 5 on *Globalization and Social Classes*, Li Chunling (Chapter 24) introduces an important change in the social stratification of China that has

occurred over the past 20 years, with the rapid expansion of the middle class that is changing the social structure of China, from a pyramid-shaped structure to an olive-shaped one. Western sociologists' theories about the middle class, such as arguments from C. Wright Mills, Seymour Martin Lipset, or Samuel Huntington, encounter many problems when they are applied to the definition and analysis of the Chinese middle class. In a very close perspective Louis Chauvel (Chapter 25) is proposing a sociology of social stratification, "occupational classes" based on jobs worked that must be understood within a context of wealth-based domination. Over the last three decades, the wealth-to-income ratio (WIR) in many Western countries, particularly those in Europe and North America, increased by a factor of two. This represents a defining empirical trend: a rewealthization (from the French repatrimonialisation)—or the comeback of (inherited) wealth primacy since the mid-1990s. Shin Kwang-Yeong (Chapter 26) explores how class relations are related to income inequality and wealth inequality in South Korea. There are competing arguments concerning the effect of class on income and wealth inequality. One is the weakening thesis in which the effect of class on income and wealth inequality has been diminishing due to the employment system's flexibility. Another is the opposite thesis, which accentuated the polarization of income and wealth due to the differential return rate to capital and labor for the last decades. For Sato Yoshimichi (Chapter 27) globalization does not directly affect social inequality in each country. Globalization is said to increase the flexibility of labor markets. However, regular workers at the core of the labor markets in Japan are still enjoying a high level of job security because they are protected by strong employment legislation. Thus, globalization has increased inequality not only between social classes but also between regular and non-regular workers in Japan, and it has transformed gender relationships in labor markets.

In Section 6 on *Youth and Education*, Wu Yuxiao (Chapter 28) introduces educational expansion and its impacts on Chinese youth in post-reform China. The past four decades since the market reform have witnessed the tremendous achievement of China's educational development. The rapid educational expansion is accompanied by a widening class gap and urban-rural gap in higher education. The increasing class-based inequality in educational opportunities may lead to furious competition in educational attainment and labor market outcomes among Chinese youth. Agnès Van Zanten (Chapter 29) is reviewing Western research on the sociology of education, mostly conducted in the United States, the United Kingdom and France. She first analyzes how lower-class and upper-class students' identities are both reinforced and transformed by the different curricular contents, pedagogy, and evaluation processes to which they are subjected, and how educational institutions characterized

by high concentrations of either lower-class or upper-class students channel them through different mechanisms. Asano Tomohiko (Chapter 30) provides an overview of the historical landscape of youth in Japan as well as sociology of youth and education. In the 1960s the Japanese system of transition was established through the period of postwar high economic development. In the late 1970s and through the 1980s, the transition system worked well, and in the early 1990s the “bubble economy” ended and Japan went into a long period of recession. This brought the old topics like labor, class, and inequality to the center of youth studies, focusing on the transformation of the transition system. Kim Byoung-Kwan (Chapter 31) is reviewing some of the accomplishments of Korean sociology of education in recent decades in demonstrating Korean sociology as a whole has long passed the earlier phase where the de facto role of most sociologists was to “import” the concepts, theories, and methodologies from the main, in this case “Western”, sociology to apply them in Korean contexts. As long as sociology keeps distancing itself from exclusive and hegemonic practices, it gives us a chance to make a more meaningful contribution to the betterment of social and human beings.

In the Section 7 on *State and Governance*, Agnès Deboulet (Chapter 32) builds a parallel between two case studies in France and in Egypt to underline the persistent presence of a Western paradigm within urban planning practice. In both cases, a post-Western analysis invites us to draw some parallels in situations often deemed as very different because of the nature of the state, the construction of citizenship, and furthermore the complete alterity that is attributed to “South” planning by contrast with planning in the North. Shi Yunqing (Chapter 33) is introducing a theory on the state and the individual in urban renewal and social governance during the social transition in China. The production of citizens and society in the Chinese model has been developed in two processes; the first one started from the society and tried to appeal for legitimacy from the state, while the second one originated from the state and tried to call for an echo from society. In these processes of Chinese society production, located knowledge from the post-Western sociology perspective could be produced. Yamamoto Hidehiro (Chapter 34) is analyzing the development of local governance in Japan and the relationships between the state, civil society, and individuals. The State has withdrawn from the social sphere, and instead various stakeholders, such as businesses, civil society organizations, and local communities, are involved in public services and local management. Japanese civil society organizations have been under strong administrative control, which has prevented them from fully advocating for and making demands on the government.

In the Section 8 on *Ethnicity and Space*, for Ahmed Boubeker (Chapter 35) the interactionist approach of ethnicity has its roots in Western sociology and galvanized academic research in the English-speaking world. In contrast, the concept of ethnicity in France still comes into conflict with a tradition that views it either as an ideological weapon to revive racial theories, or a localized concept in the context of relations between groups in the United States. Here is introduced a reflection on the notion of worlds of ethnicity articulating a view of social worlds specific to the symbolic interactionism of different regimes of historicity. In a close perspective Fan Ke (Chapter 36) is defining ethnicity as a social and political phenomenon, or a subjectively social action, concerning boundaries. Accordingly, in recent years, together with nationalism, ethnicity is suggested to be a phenomenon of intersubjectivity. This is true if one has thought about the emergence of ethnicity as a consequence of interactions among the state and its policy toward cultural or ethnic diversities, local elites, neighboring groups of ethnicities, the mobility of people, and even the impacts of globalization, among many other things. For Tarumoto Hideki (Chapter 37), East Asia might not have a position at the core or the periphery but rather in the semi-periphery of the world system of academic knowledge production. East Asian sociologies might suffer from epistemic injustice such that their capacities to develop their own frameworks are discouraged. East Asian academics can examine and overturn Western theoretical assumptions with reference to East Asian theories and/or empirical cases, for example in examining a Western theoretical concept in migration studies, that is, *super-diversity*. For Choi Jongryul (Chapter 38), in South Korea, migrant workers are not considered as future citizens or long-term residents; they are not considered as fellow humans who can construct a cosmopolitan society together. A grotesque mixture of racialism and modernism is underpinning Korea's imaginary of the social, the question of ethnicity is a very important scientific and political issue. Even though various disciplines are actively discussing multiculturalism, the fundamental reflection on the frame of the nation-state does not seem to be sufficient.

In Section 9 on *Social Movements and Collective Action*, Hasegawa Koichi (Chapter 39) discusses the historical outline of social movements, especially environmental movements, focusing on four major topics in four stages of the movements: (1) political movements of class struggle centered around labor movements by the Socialist and Communist party in 1945–1965; (2) citizens' movements and residents' movements in 1965–1975; (3) the end of the conservative-progressive ideological framework, especially in 1989; and (4) the collapse of the Japanese-style system: institutionalized movements and

diversifying activities, including environmental NGOs and other NPOs. For Lilian Mathieu (Chapter 40) the Western sociology of contentious movements has developed decisively during the 1960s and 1970s with the emergence of a wide range of mobilizations among students, feminists, pacifists, gay men and lesbians, ecologists, etc. However, two analytical traditions have developed to study them. One was initiated by the work of Mancur Olson, who has focused on the resources, organizations, cognitive frames, and opportunities afforded to protesters. Then, mainly represented in France by Alain Touraine, the so-called new social movements approach was really influential but criticized by Bourdieusian sociologists. For Feng Shizeng (Chapter 41), in contemporary China, the presumed collective action and social movements tend to be labeled by the official as a “group event”. The author traces the historical change of the state’s conception of “group event” from 1949 to show that whereas China’s regime has transitioned from an ideocracy to a technocracy, the state’s conception of social conflicts is undergoing a reverse change from technical to political. This chapter offers a post-Western sociological perspective by highlighting a crucial element understudied in Eurocentric tradition: state-targeting social movements in interaction with the technocratization of a post-revolutionary regime.

In Section 10 on *Gender and Inequalities*, Christine Détérez (Chapter 42) demonstrates how sociologists took up the notion in a constructivist perspective: genders are constructed, and they designate the place and expectations that each society assigns to individuals, according to whether they are men or women. These places, on the other hand, are hierarchical, and gender is a system of classification and power. The last few years have seen the emergence of a new research perspective, based on questions of identity and the fluidity of gender, inspired by Queer Studies from Judith Butler. Ji Yingchun (Chapter 43) is introducing the process of theorizing the above dynamics concerning gender, family, and modernity in contemporary China. The above localized theorizing and conceptualization regarding the separation of the two-spheres public/private, mosaic gender ideology, mosaic familism, and mosaic modernity are directly based on Chinese people’s daily practices. This pluralistic and dynamic process of knowledge production and reproduction vividly embodies the essence of post-Western sociology. Nemoto Kumiko (Chapter 44) reviews the historical and contemporary roles of the state and the market economy in upholding or transforming gender inequality in the areas of work and family as well as in reaction to the feminist movement; she focuses on institutional obstacles to gender equality in Japan and China. Here the purpose is not to categorize China as fitting into one of the various theoretical models but to highlight the status of gender equality in Japan and China in the areas of work, family,

markets, and the feminist movement, in comparison to that of other Western countries. Shim Young-Hee (Chapter 45) is dealing with gender relations in the family in Korean society, focusing on the individualization and community issues in the situation of deepened inequality since the COVID-19 pandemic, to conclude that there coexist two contradictory trends in Korea: one is what she calls the “condensed radicalization of individualization”, a Western trend, and the other is “community orientation”, an Eastern trend. This coexistence indicates a post-Western tendency in the sense that it goes beyond the “East” and the “West”.

In the Section 11 on *Environment and Mistrust Crisis*, Wang Xiaoyi and Anier (Chapter 46) demonstrate how in China, as well as in other industrial societies, food safety became a serious problem for most consumers. Food production has taken place far away from consumers, which brought about mistrust regarding the food production. Consumers do not trust the food, and the movement of new agriculture, including urban agriculture, CSAs, and organic farming, is emerging for analysis. The main concepts in the paper are industrialized agriculture, mistrust, and food safety. For Paul Jobin (Chapter 47) an overwhelming proportion of authors who discuss the Anthropocene, both advocates and opponents of the notion, are from Western Europe, North America, and Australia. For some authors, the anthropos of the Anthropocene discourse is another version of the capitalist white male who finds in this narrative a renewed way to impose his neo-colonial domination. Departing from the domination of Western paradigms in the Anthropocene literature, a few Asian scholars have therefore deemed it necessary to redefine the concept from the angle of postcolonial criticism. Keiichi Satoh (Chapter 48) considers ecological modernization theory (EMT) one of the major environmental theories/discourses among scholars and policymakers. EMT draws its perspective mainly from the Western countries that experienced the set of the characteristics of late modernity, such as post-industrialization and severe environmental degradation. By contrast, the East Asian countries generally have experienced the modernization and the second modernization that have resulted in East Asia's unique response to the environmental crisis. The East Asian response to environmental risk is based on the modern, authoritarian, and technological perspective and not from the reflexive modernity. Hong Deok-hwa and Ku Dowan (Chapter 49) are revealing the characteristics of Korean environmental sociology by reviewing major studies in Korean environmental sociology. Korean environmental sociology can contribute to broadening the understanding of the relationship between ecological transition, environmental movement, state, and democracy. Through the development path of the Korea's environmental movement, it is also possible to trace another historical

path of environmentalism in social conditions different from those of Western environmentalism or environmentalism of the poor.

In Section 12 on *Individuation, Self, and Emotions*, Chen Boqing and Wang Jiahui (Chapter 50) are producing the theory of emotional regimes in referring to individual feelings, social structure, and emotions. With the structural changes happening in contemporary Chinese society, three emotional regimes have emerged correspondingly, that is, the managerial regime in the field of work, the experiential regime in consumption, and the performative regime in social interaction. There are tensions and overlaps between the three regimes, which gives rise to a variety of complex situations. This theory of emotional regimes provides sociological insights for understanding contemporary social issues. François Dubet (Chapter 51) has produced the sociology of experience; through the lens of individuals' experiences, his goal is to develop a sociology of the "nature" of inequalities through a two-pronged approach. First, by trying to understand how individuals' subjectivities and emotions are the product of a "system". Second, by identifying how they simultaneously distance themselves from, cultivate, and struggle against the same system. The sociology of experience aims to be a general sociological theory applied to specific subjects, in an effort to stem the endless division in sociology between different paradigms, subjects, and studies. Yazawa Shujiro (Chapter 52) analyzes why the issue of emotion and self has become one of the most fundamental and important issues in Japanese sociology. The autonomous individual is no longer the Subject of the society; the Subject must be made out of the subjective as the collective. The cognitive framework and interpersonal relations are a battleground of deciding characteristics of the society. The author introduces several Japanese theories on the relationships between emotion and the creative subject. Kim Wang-Bae (Chapter 53) attempts to touch on the social conflicts in contemporary Korean society as have occurred in the forms of "emotionalized selves". The social conflicts intermingled with emotions such as fear, anger, and hatred (or disgust) have been emotionalized social conflict. The author shows how the emotions of fear, hatred, and anger are constructed and mixed into the emotionalized subjects. Those emotional energies have mobilized the radically polarized social conflicts. Bourdieu's conceptualization of *habitus* is reinterpreted in the context of emotions.

In Section 13 on *Cities, Migration, and Work*, for Machimura Takashi (Chapter 54) in the intensification of hyper-urbanization, circulations, and migrations in Asia and Africa, it is becoming more and more difficult to distinguish between those who migrate and those who settle. Cities are beginning to have the characteristics of a "dull place" that remains rugged in a "smooth space". How do we capture the process of restructuring cities, labor,

and mobility, starting from the difference between the West and the non-West, and then beyond that? With the expansion of cyberspace represented by the Internet, the life of urban citizens has changed significantly, so how should the experience of Asia be incorporated into migration and urban studies that have been developed based on the experience of Europe and the United States for a long time? Laurence Roulleau-Berger (Chapter 55) invited us to recognize that the migration issue for European and Chinese sociologists is a major scientific issue. The process of urban and economic integration is often related to the question of migration, but the assimilation's theory appears to be limited to explain the migratory circulations the process of globalization "from above" and "from below". She is using the concepts of structural processes, individuation, subjectivation, agency, and capabilities to understand the migratory experience. Social and economic inequalities appeared *multisited* in migratory careers, revealing the differentiation and cosmopolitization of migratory biographies around strong injunctions to self-government. In a close perspective for Wang Chunguang and Lu Wen (Chapter 56) the social integration of immigrants has always been a classic problem in sociology. In the late 1990s and early 2000s, there have been many studies and debates in academia and policy around the problem of rural migrants. Compared with immigrants from other countries, especially developed countries, the rural migrants in China, known as "rural-urban migration", have met with some different fusion. In a word, the citizenization and social integration of rural migrants is constantly evolving and expanding.

In Section 14 on *Global Health and New Future*, Hosoda Miwako (Chapter 58) analyzes how people deal with health and illness, focusing on the differences and similarities between the East and the West, including Japan. The medical community, public health community, and others are advocating measures to eliminate health disparities from an institutional perspective based on Western medicine, and to consider the Eastern culture of "living together" with nature, including people; this concept of "living together" is called "Kyosei" in Japanese. It is hoped that the dialogue between the East and the West toward a society where we can live together will continue. Zhao Yandong and Hong Yanbi (Chapter 57) show theories in the sociology of health are mainly based on the experiences of Western developed countries, which should be complemented by more studies on the traditions and patterns of non-Western countries. In the context of infectious diseases, like SARS in 2003 and COVID-19 in 2020, the Chinese experience encouraged reflection on the traditional theories of sociology of health based on Western experience, and to explore the possibility of constructing a post-Western theory of sociology of health in the future. For Frédéric Le Marcis (Chapter 59) the COVID-19 pandemic and its aftermath

in terms of global vaccine policies provides an opportunity to question the hegemonic logic of global health. While the continents of Asia, Europe, and the Americas have been severely impacted by the epidemic, Africa, which is much less affected, seems to be following suit, despite a very different epidemiological situation. Local arguments are most often either ignored or silenced by local mediators of the global health hegemonic discourse due to international diplomatic–scientific stakes that are difficult to negotiate. By analyzing these descriptions, critical anthropology thus helps to shed light on what really matters to populations. Cho Byong-Hee (Chapter 60) demonstrates that since the outbreak of COVID-19, people around the world have been fearing death and experiencing hardships. The author will focus on the deep-seated marketization of Korean health care and the doctors trying to maintain their vested interests. As COVID-19 had a severe impact on economic, social, and psychological aspects, the global community began to reflect on the crisis of human civilization and the disturbed ecosystem, which is believed to have caused it, and raised concerns that returning to the pre-pandemic lifestyle is not possible.

Bibliography

- Beck, U., and E. Grande. 2010. "Varieties of Second Modernity: The Cosmopolitan Turn in Social and Political Theory and Research". *The British Journal of Sociology* 61 (3): 409–444.
- Bhargava, R. 2013. "Pour en finir avec l'injustice épistémique du colonialisme". *Socio* 1: 41–77.
- Brisson, T. 2018. *Décentrer l'Occident*. Paris: La Découverte.
- Connell, R. 2007. *Southern Theory*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Hanafi, S., and C.C. Yi. 2020. Introduction. In *Sociologies in dialogue*, edited by S. Hanafi and C.C. Yi, pp. 1–13. London: Sage.
- Patel, S. 2003. "Beyond Binaries: A Case for Self-Reflexive Sociologies". *Current Sociology* 51: 7–26.
- Rouleau-Berger, Laurence. 2016. *Post-Western Sociology. From China to Europe*. Leiden and Boston: Brill Publishers.
- Rouleau-Berger, Laurence, and Peilin Li, eds. 2018. *Post-Western Sociology—From China to Europe*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Xie, Lizhong, and Laurence Rouleau-Berger, eds. 2017. *Construction of Sociological Knowledge: An Exploration of Post-Western Sociology* (in Chinese). Beijing: Press of Peking University.