



HAL
open science

Conclusion

Laurence Roulleau-Berger, Li Peilin, Kim Seung Kuk, Yazawa Shujiro

► **To cite this version:**

Laurence Roulleau-Berger, Li Peilin, Kim Seung Kuk, Yazawa Shujiro. Conclusion. Roulleau-Berger, Laurence; Li Peilin; Kim, Seung Kuk; Yasawa, Shujiro. Handbook of Post-Western Sociology: from East Asia to Europe, Brill, pp.978-994, 2023, 978-90-04-52931-1. 10.1163/9789004529328_063 . hal-03931229

HAL Id: hal-03931229

<https://hal.science/hal-03931229>

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.

Conclusion

Laurence Roulleau-Berger, Li Peilin, Kim Seung Kuk and Yazawa Shujiro

1 Traveling in the Post-Western Space

At the end of this handbook, the co-production of post-Western sociology invites us to return to the traditions and histories of non-Western sociologies, to put them in motion and in dialogue with the Western thoughts that have ignored them.

In *A History of Sociology in China in the First Half of the Twentieth Century*, Li Peilin, Qu Jingdong and Yang Yabin (2009) demonstrated how Chinese sociology flourished in a context of intellectual blossoming comparable to that of the spring and autumn periods and to that of the warring states. In 19th-century China Yan Fu and Liang Qichao contributed the most to the emergence of Chinese sociology, the academic thought of gregariousness, transforming Western sociology with their indigenous knowledge; Liang Shuming deeply studied cultural differences between Eastern and Western cultures; Fei Xiaotong, in contributing to the world social sciences, has described the foundations of Chinese society in considering localized knowledge is not confined to local areas and in producing post-Western sociology (cf. Chapter 2 from Li Peilin). Fei Xiaotong used a traditional Confucianist perspective and modern social science theory to explore the way of modernization for traditional China's society; Liang Shuming believed that China's society and its culture have their own value and vitality, but he has suggested the introduction of Western science and democracy into Chinese society (cf. Chapter 21 from Sun Feiyu).

In Japan modern Western social science was introduced at the beginning of the Meiji period; many pre-modern Confucian scholars of the early modern period have produced thoughts comparable to those of Western sociology; for example, the Confucian concept of "Michi" means social order is produced in every human relationship (cf. Chapter 7 from Yama Yoshiyuki). The history of Japanese sociology gives important resources to Western-West sociologies from a reevaluation of the discipline in the Eastern-East world. For example, in prewar Japanese sociology Fukuzawa Yukichi played a major role in a theory of society and the individual, and Yasuma Takada produced a theory of social relations and of social establishment in distinguishing three types of *direct and indirect societies*: the first is a society in which kinship-based connections are

AQ 22

predominant; the second is based on the territory; and the third is based on indirect connections (cf. Chapter [No.] from Yazawa Shujiro).

The tense relationship between the West and postcolonial sociology cannot be found in the Chinese context. In contrast, Japan has a responsibility regarding the colonization of Taiwan and the Korean Peninsula, and tried to colonize China, so Japanese sociologists are thinking of the global society as a global civil society (cf. Chapter 9 from Shoji Kōkichi). For Korean sociologists, to understand the development of Korean society, they have to take into account Sinicism, Japanese occupation, imperialism, the Cold War, American influence, etc. Today, some Korean sociologists are adapting Western theories to understand Korean society and some others are looking for new ways to reappropriate traditional thoughts (cf. Chapter 10 from Lim Hyun-Chin); they are struggling to emphatically display the possibility of the balance of the body of knowledge developed and accumulated globally, with Korean society as a part of it, even though a hugely disproportionate contribution comes from Western contexts (cf. Chapter 31 from Byoung-Kwan Kim). We could consider the paradoxical characteristics of modernity, the limits and the crisis of “hegemonic modernity” in developing sociological imaginations (cf. Chapter 15 from Han Sang-Jin). Or if Western culture looks hegemonic in the process of globalization, glocal cultures—for example the Korean wave—are an influential concept to demonstrate glocalization and refer to a hybridization of global and local culture that circulate through transnational spaces, even those of the hegemonic culture (cf. Chapter 19 from Jang Wonho).

The post-Western sociology is redefined and based on diverse theories, shared methods, and historical/political/civilizational context; conversations between Western and non-Western theory mean their mutual and reciprocal transformation, their non-reproduction. To deconstruct the universality of Western sociology, non-Western sociologists are invited to emphasize local experiences (cf. Chapter 6 of Li Youmei). From a post-sociology and *re-Easternized East* perspective, in his chapter Xie Lizhong developed a theory of discursive pluralism, distinct from geographic pluralism. While geographic pluralism favors the indigenization of sociological thought by producing a discourse in a specific time and space, discursive pluralism appears to be linked to a form of universalism containing a wide range of discourses that may be applied to any time and space. Post-Western sociology could enable us to view the intersection, overlap, and blending of sociologies constructed in the diversity of the Wests and the Easts which is producing localization or expanded localization (cf. Chapter 8 from Zhou Xiaohong and Feng Zhuqin). Furthermore, Max Weber’s “fever” in China was particularly distinctive and

has promoted fruitful academic exchanges between European and Chinese sociologists by giving to Weberian study a position of post-Western sociology (cf. Chapter 23 from He Rong). Japanese sociologists like Akira Kurihara highlighted the uniqueness of Japanese critical sociology that developed under the influence of German critical theory, especially under the influence of Erikson and Habermas; he demonstrated how the concept in Japanese sociology of tenderness (*yasashisa*) is *galapagozed*—*galapagosization* being used to refer to a Japanese product that is too local and unusual to be available outside Japan—and argued the sense of ego identity is closely related to change in historical society (cf. Chapter 20 from Deguchi Takeshi). Chinese sociologists also have analyzed the transformations of socialist countries like China, the Soviet Union, and those in Eastern Europe after the 1980s and they have been inspired by the “New Budapest School” created by Ivan Szelenyi and Gil Eyal. It is not appropriate to be caught up in dichotomized ideas such as the West or the East. Western elements have already been incorporated as an important part of the process of change in the non-Western world; secondly, the non-Western world is diverse, and the simple contrast scheme of Western versus non-Western has already collapsed (cf. Chapter 54 from Machimura Takashi).

Traveling through the post-Western space means the transgression of the boundaries dividing “the West” and the “rest of the world” in avoidance of consolidating the hegemony of existing modernization theory and not using Confucian or Islamic theories to overcome the limitations of Western centrism; if the cosmopolitan turn in sociology is a significant step, it could not be the final task for Post-Western sociology (cf. Chapter 11 from Kim Mun Cho). It also means to examine the instances of clashes between Western ethos and non-Western ethos based on unique experiences, for example, the developmental trajectory in post-war Japan and the production of a new collective memory; the question becomes how the voices of the citizens of Hiroshima influenced the sense of sociology and the fabric of a non-Western ethos in civil society and social sciences (cf. Chapter 14 from Nomiya Daishiro). There has been introduced the ontological state of the Oneness, which, in the general East Asian social theory based on the unity between the heaven, earth, and the human, this conception of the Oneness differs widely from the ways of thinking of the Oneness in the Western theories which do not include Sunism, Confucianism, Daoism, and Buddhism (cf. Chapter 4 from Kim Seung Kuk).

In China, Japan, and Korea, different forms of cosmopolitan imaginations are developing, translating differences and diversities of traditions and cultural influences. The political, historical, social, and economic contexts affect the production of intellectual epistemic autonomies that defend positions, sensibilities, and relationships to different worlds in the scientific field

and depending on margins of action and liberty that vary from one country to another. Finally, the issue of producing a transnational public sociology is posed from the position of social science and knowledge in non-Western societies, the connections between common knowledge and scholarly knowledge, where the bearers of Post-Western sociology are located (cf. Chapter 16 from Okumura Takashi). Furthermore, in a post-Western space, the production of multiple narratives on contemporary societies depends on the individual and collective competencies of action, reflexivity, and subjectivity. To bridge time and space in sociology, the production of knowledge imposes, in a structural analysis, an exploration of all the transformation through narration and events in using multisited ethnographies, individual or collective biographies, or even the autobiography that could bear the nature of life course study (cf. Chapter 17 from Qu Jingdong). So, if sociology is a practice of creating society, if sociology could be a narrative of human life, in post-Western sociology we can come back to fundamental issues, for example how the social precedes or not what makes “Western” and “non-Western” societies (cf. Chapter 22 from Kikutani Kazuhiro).

In this handbook post-Western theory is produced in a pluridimensional and polycentric space. Post-Western sociology is constructed from connections between knowledge spaces in dialogue and mutual learning. The theoretical and epistemological polyphony is a way to develop a new non-hegemonic global sociology and to hear from new voices speaking together. Even Western-Wests are reimagined, and even the issue of Western hegemonies continues to be active; we are becoming able to produce a new geography of a plurality of epistemic autonomies and new assemblages of “Western” and “non-Western” knowledge, to improve a methodological cosmopolitanism (cf. Chapter [No.] from Laurence Roulleau-Berger). From the non-Western traditions different approaches of post-Western sociology invite us to change the globalized hierarchies into social sciences, to come back to the issue of “what is sociology?”

AQ 23

2 Sociologies in Dialogue

We have shown in a constructed dialogue how “Western” and “non-Western” theories meet, how shared sociological knowledge and situated knowledge cohabit and become embedded. From the crossed perspectives, we have seen the emergence of continuous and discontinuous continuities between Chinese, Japanese, Korean, and French sociologies that open up a transnational space on central issues in the discipline:

- youth and education
- ethnicity and space
- migration and cosmopolitanism
- labor and economic uncertainty

2.1 *Youth and Education*

About the topic of “youth and education” the four essays focus on class-based inequality in educational attainment and how education, as an institution, shapes the life chances of youth in different social contexts. In the Chinese case we can see how educational expansion during the post-reform stage influenced the pattern of educational inequality and school-to-society transition for young people, and how it has important implications for the changes of gender and class structure (cf. Chapter 28 from Wu Yuxiao). In the French case, in using two ideal typical American models from Y. Hasenfeld and Ralph Turner, we discuss school socioeconomic segregation and its effects on class identity among students from lower-class or upper-class families, by reviewing empirical research on the sociology of education conducted in Western societies, such as the United States, the United Kingdom, and France; there are multiple societal effects of the internal dynamics of the French educational system (cf. Chapter 29 from Agnès Van Zanten). In the Japanese case the question of who “youth” are may serve as a starting point for “East–West” dialogue; we analyze how the patterns of school-to-work transition in Japan changed in different historical stages and produced social and economic inequalities (cf. Chapter 30 from Asano Tomohiko). From the perspective of a non-Western sociology in the Korean context, we review sociological works on the topic of youth and education in Korea, focusing on the educational institutions, the characteristic features and practices in the production/reproduction of social and gender inequalities, and the strategic choice in the family (cf. Chapter 31 from Kim Byoung-Kwan).

It is common sense that different countries have their unique educational institutions and labor market structures. However, due to the trend of globalization, we also see quite a few things in common between Western societies and societies in East Asia on the issues of youth and education, such as increasing educational inequality, school socioeconomic segregation, and patterns of school-to-work transition. It is of great value to promote comparative studies that may shed light on the theoretical dialogue of post-Western sociology.

In the way of dealing with the issue of youth and education the question of the production and reproduction of social inequalities in the school space appears to be common to European, Chinese, Japanese, and Korean sociologies, more

precisely with increasing school socioeconomic segregation in elementary and middle schools, the rising class gap in higher education (in particular in elite universities). Of course, contextual effects inform this process of production and reproduction of social inequalities, such as the urban–rural gaps in China and Japan. Furthermore, the issue of youth and education has been articulated in European, Chinese, Japanese, and Korean sociologies to the question of the relationship between training and employment in the transition from school to work. For French, Chinese, Korean, and Japanese sociologists, education in the age of globalization must produce and reproduce individuals who can get information and organize it into knowledge, individuals able/constrained to be autonomous in order to adapt to radically changing societies. That is why inequality, discrimination, and segregation matter.

The sociology of education clearly shows at the international level theoretical continuities between European, Chinese, Japanese, and Korean thinking and in this way could actively participate in post-Western sociology.

2.2 *Ethnicity and Space*

About the problematic “ethnicity and space” French sociologists provide a theoretical concept of ethnicity, the phenomenon of which is accordingly understood in a French context. The notion of “worlds of ethnicity” is articulating a view of “social worlds” specific to the symbolic interactionism of different regimes of historicity (cf. Chapter 35 from Ahmed Boubeker).

In Chinese sociology, just as in European sociology, the deconstruction of the ethnic entity should take societal and historical contexts into account, such as colonialism and nationalism, which produce classifications and fixed moral and social borders. This signifies the deconstruction of ethnic categorizations and classifications in a constructivist approach, interethnic relationships according to Frederic Barth, as well as ethnic boundaries, globalized religions, and transnational spaces. Many scholars in China conceptualized the dynamic relationships between ethnicity and cultural identity to study ethnic interactions, the relationships between ethnic groups, and the state and the moral boundaries of ethnic groups (cf. Chapter 36 from Fan Ke). So, the constructivist approach appears to be a common heritage for European and Chinese sociologists. In Korean cases “the social”, constructed with the building of the nation-state, is being deterritorialized through globalization. In another constructivist perspective, Korean sociologists are more focused on the theory of multiculturalism to overcome the reflection on the nation-states and territorialization of the social and to develop further the problematic on globalization and deterritorialization of the social. In post-Western

sociology we could be able to articulate ethnicity and multiculturalism in a new Western/Eastern perspective.

2.3 *Migration and Cosmopolitanism*

Since the 1990s, the issue of migration has become a major scientific and political challenge, a global turning point in the social sciences. Although globalization continues to advance, the problem of the social integration of migrants is becoming more and more complicated and diversified. Within the West and the East, there are many obvious differences in the ways, paths, mechanisms, and policies of immigration integration in various countries. When migrant workers enter Korea or Japan, they appear “to be far too ‘traditional’, too ‘backward’, too community-oriented, too little educated, and unskilled”; they are not considered as future citizens or long-term residents; they are invited to work in menial dead-end jobs, not fellow humans who can construct a cosmopolitan society together (cf. Chapter 38 from Choi Jongryul). At same time, the social integration of the rural floating population also shows complexity in China and it is very difficult to generalize in one pattern. In other words, there are many patterns of social integration for the rural floating population, including the assimilation, segregation, interactions between them and original citizens, urban and rural “amphibious” actors, etc. (cf. Chapter 56 from Wang Chunguang and Lu Wen).

Intracontinental and international mobility has continued to accelerate, and circulation has intensified in recent years. More and more migrants move, circulate, return, and take different migratory routes; they work, live, and acquire plural experiences in a multiplicity of urban and rural spaces and temporalities, and are often challenged in their social, ethnic, and gender identities (cf. Chapter 54 from Machimura Takashi). Therefore, the existing paradigm of immigration sociology is increasingly lacking in explanatory power for such complexity. And the new migration research paradigm is in great demand. This may provide an important opportunity for the development of Western sociological theory. Migrants have been increasingly constructed as actors endowed with individual and collective capacities for action, their mobile skills, their reflexivity, their subjectivity; cosmopolitanisms show how “regimes of Otherness” become more complex and multiply, producing forms of unequally legitimized recognition of the place of migrants in different societies (cf. Chapter [No.] from Laurence Roulleau-Berger).

AQ 24

We are today widely invited to rely on a new theory of transnationalism methodological cosmopolitanism to move towards a post-Western sociology that opens new perspectives on intracontinental and international migration,

to grasp how accelerations and telescopes of intracontinental and international mobility inform the production of urban, social, economic, and ethnic inequalities; the construction of migratory careers; and the processes of subjectivation in European and Asian societies, in the world society. With reference to the Japanese experience, the Western theoretical concept of “super-diversity” has been proposed to create intercultural spaces for active dialogue between East Asian and Western sociologies and to contribute to an understanding of unprecedented social change and social transformation under globalized migration. Moreover, it must lead to the advancement of the intervals between East Asian and Western sociologies to create post-Western sociology (cf. Chapter 37 from Tarumoto Hideki).

2.4 *Labor and Economic Uncertainty*

Granovetter will appear as the main architect of the revival of economic sociology in the world. The revival of economic sociology is largely related to the development of network analysis that finds its main source in the work of Harrison White. In the course of this work, Granovetter in *Getting a Job* (1974) developed the famous thesis of “the strength of weak links” in access to employment—a thesis still very widely used in a lot of European empirical research—based on articulation between networks of sociability and social capital.

Economic sociology was born in the late 19th century and, after being forgotten, reappeared in the early 1980s, especially in Europe. Philippe Steiner and François Vatin (2009), authors of the *Traité de sociologie économique*, consider economic activity to be a dimension of social activity, the economic fact as a social fact. Chinese economic sociology has been directly affected by the renewal of economic sociology in Western sociology. There is a long and important tradition of studying economic phenomena in Chinese sociology, especially before the abolition of the discipline in the 1950s. The theory of transformation of social structure by Li Peilin, the theory of social capital and *guanxi* by Bian Yanjie (1997), and the theory of property rights, over the Western property rights theory, by Yang Dian and Liu Shiding have been produced in China (cf. Chapter 12 of Yang Dian) and do represent a trend in Chinese sociology. But besides these theories in labor sociology Shen Yuan (cf. Chapter 13 from Shen Yuan) has produced the concept of the production system of migrant workers and has demonstrated how the subjectivity of labor is one of the most important fields in labor sociology, how the concept of the “politics of production” put forward by Burawoy in the Chinese context has been transformed into the “politics of life”.

AQ 25

These perspectives are opening a dialogue with French, Korean, and Japanese sociology about migrant workers. In different societies migrants are analyzed as subjects to dominations, symbolic and identity-threatening violence, and discrimination—even racism—in their respective labor markets; symbolic violence is constructed in professional relationships by means of phenomena of horizontal and vertical social disqualification, alienation of identities, and contempt and humiliation (cf. Chapter [No.] from Laurence Roulleau-Berger). Here, sociologists converge in saying that the less endowed migrants in terms of social capital and economic and symbolic resources are subjected to the forces of political and economic measures; those who are well endowed in terms of social and economic resources have at their disposal networks of trust and can rely upon community solidarities and will also be able to develop strategies to divert these measures and find social and spatial anchorage in economic spaces.

If in the EU countries sociologists are conducting research on a double process of economic insecurity and ethnic discrimination, in Asian countries sociologists have in common the study of the proliferation of precarious forms of employment due to the plurality and flexibility of transitional employments. The rise of non-regular and precarious employment definitely contributes to the rise in wage inequality in the labor markets (cf. Chapter 27 by Yoshimichi Sato). For some two decades, intermittence and discontinuity of work have permeated all modes of production, thus signaling the weakening of the so-called Fordist salaried employment, and the institutionalization of the “precariat” (Castel 2009).

3 Distances, Dissonances, and Discontinuities

We have shown how “Western” and “non-Western” theories could coexist in relationships of distance and dissonance. From the crossed perspectives, we have seen the emergence of continuous and discontinuous discontinuities between Chinese, Japanese, Korean, and French sociologies that produce local knowledge on two central issues in the discipline:

- globalization and social stratification
- state, society, and collective action
- gender and inequalities
- individuation, self, and emotions
- environment and global health

3.1 *Globalization and Social Stratification*

No country in the contemporary world can be immune from the impact of globalization and also recent de-globalization. Economic globalization, as well as the global financial crisis of 2008, has led to the increase in income and wealth inequalities, the fluctuation of the middle class, and the flexibility of employment and work in many countries, which has brought about a challenge to the originally occupation-based class structure. However, globalization has also had different influences on social class and social stratification in various countries with different economic, political, cultural, and institutional contexts. While European and North American countries have suffered a shrinking of the middle class, China, as a major new emerging economy in the age of globalization, has achieved an extensive poverty reduction and fostered a growing middle class (cf. Chapter 24 from Li Chunling). Japan and South Korea also have demonstrated some differences in changes in class and social stratification from European and North American countries. These particularities displayed in China, Japan, and South Korea have prompted sociologists to rethink theories from Western sociology.

The relationship between globalization and societal singularities plays on the ways in which Western class theories are or are not adjusted to analyze non-Western configurations. If the phenomenon of the formation of the middle class and its multiple segmentations in China appears to be linked to the uniqueness of the Chinese experience, it is easy to understand why Chinese sociologists are elaborating on a located theory of social classes in a globalized context, but in which sense are they connected or not connected with Western theories? Similarly, the phenomenon of rewealthization as a major factor in class transformation could characterize many Western countries, while globalization has increased income inequality, wealth inequality, and inequalities between regular and non-regular workers in Europe and in Asia (cf. Chapter 25 from Louis Chauvel). The diversification of income and wealth in South Korea comes from the class formation trajectory that is different from that in other East Asian countries, such as Japan and China. Although South Korea has shown rapid industrialization, the occupation-based social stratification fails to capture the dynamics of the rising inequality (cf. Chapter 26 from Shin Kwang-Yeong). So, from a perspective of post-Western theory, the issue is how international sociologists could mix or not mix the Western and non-Western theories to explain quite similar processes about globalization and new social inequalities.

3.2 *State, Society, and Collective Action*

From a post-Western sociology perspective we are invited to enlarge the diversity considering the relationship between the state and individuals, touching upon different patterns of governance. The diversity could be expressed in two aspects. The first one is the intermediary agent between the state and the individual, shown as collective organizations on different scales, urban social movements, families, civil society organizations, etc. The second aspect leads to the boundary between the state and society during their interaction, which changes from a distinct and clear one to something more vague and permeated, caused by the inner tension between the legacy of authoritarian governance and the rising social participation driven by neoliberal globalization, especially in non-Western countries.

States and local governments produce differentiated models of participatory governance under political control that produce discrimination, marginalization, and exclusion. Some European sociologists are focusing on the issue of what really makes popular politics and local ties and resists the tyranny of urban renewal in the “South” and the “North” in taking distance with a Western theory of urban politics (cf. Chapter 32 from Agnès Deboulet). However, in the European, Chinese, Japanese, and Korean contexts intermediate actors and forms of citizen mobilization are pluralized and also develop “from below” from different forms of local solidarities. The individual and collective practices for distancing public policies are based on societal constraints and capabilities located in the different contexts. Discussing the relationships between the state, the society, and the local governance appears as an important theoretical perspective to introduce “citizen participation” (cf. Chapter 34 from Yamamoto Hidehiro). For example, in China, individuals still remain highly dependent on the authoritarian state and continue to think of themselves as part of the state even when they develop strategies for individual or collective emancipation (cf. Chapter 33 from Shi Yunqing). But neoliberal globalization, especially during the COVID-19 pandemic, reduced the function of the states on the one hand and maximized the role of non-state actors in the market on the other.

To develop post-Western theory on the relationships between state and society invites us to introduce the issue of the collective action that is constructed differently in France, China, Japan, and Korea. In his chapter Lilian Mathieu reminds us the United States approaches with the concepts of the “repertoire of collective action” by Tilly, of “political opportunity structure by Tilly and Tarrow”, and “the frame analysis” by Goffman have become internationally dominant since the 1990s. In the French tradition, some research is on the side of the sociology of “new social movement” elaborated by Alain

Touraine or the dispositionalist sociology inspired by Pierre Bourdieu; others have been inspired by interactionist and pragmatist theories. French and Japanese sociologists focus on the diversity of protests and mobilizations by students, feminists, pacifists, and ecologists, bearing in mind that the sociology of social movements in Japan is mainly centered on ecological movements. In his chapter Koichi Hasegawa demonstrated Japanese environmental sociology has developed many original perspectives: (1) pollution, local development, the social mechanism of suffering victims; (2) intersections of daily life, culture, and ecology; (3) disaster effects and the recovery process; and (4) environmental justice, social discrimination, and social disparity. He proposed the sociology of environmental issues should be a “sociology of the downstream perspective” to develop a reinterpretation of the conception of a “risk society”. In China the control of collective actions is really important in the technocratization of an authoritarian political regime; Chinese sociologists are using the American theories of collective action and the notion of “mass incident” (*quntixing shijian*) to analyze how the Chinese state perceives social movements and their politization in the past and in the present (cf. Chapter 41 from Feng Shizeng).

It is clear here that one can appreciate how the question of historical and political legacies deserves to be addressed in the production of a post-Western sociology. But the singularity of societal and political configurations favors the formation of niches of knowledge rather than the production of shared knowledge.

3.3 *Gender and Inequalities*

International sociology has been very much marked in the last decade by gender studies. About the problematic of “gender and inequalities” the French sociologists emphasize women’s agency and keep a distance from the deterministic Western tradition evolving around structure and power where the male domination and the struggle for the place of men and women in the domestic and professional spheres are central (cf. Chapter 42 from Christine Détrez). While East Asian sociologists are cautious of the Western-centric, value-loaded terms of “modernization” and “modernity”, they carefully investigate gender and family dynamics in the East Asian institutional configuration and local culture, in order to map out both similarities to and differences from the gender dynamics in the West. In China the theory of mosaic modernity has been developed to understand how tradition and modernity is interwoven (cf. Chapter 43 from Ji Yingchun). China and Japan follow different paths from Western societies, considering different economic institutions, welfare policies, and culture. Japanese family sociology now regards how to analyze

the transformation of the traditional nuclear family into new types of family; and American positivistic family sociology has been influential on Japanese sociology (cf. Chapter 44 from Nemoto Kumiko). In Japanese and Korean sociologies gender inequalities are worked through family/intimacy-related conflicts based on the historical processes of modernization and democratization, and demographic transitions. With regard to women and the family in the situation of deepened inequality since the COVID-19 pandemic, Korean sociologists have described a *condensed radicalization of individualization*—about individualization, that is to say emancipation from tradition, with the other being emancipation from the group—and *family-oriented individualization or community orientation*—this theory indicates a post-Western trend in following the individuation trend of Western society on the one hand, and another one based on community orientation in East Asia (cf. Chapter 45 from Shim Young-Hee).

This reflection on and critique of Western-centric knowledge and modernization simultaneously comprise knowledge production in the West. This pluralistic and simultaneous way of interrogating gender inequality in different societies constitutes the essential logic of post-Western sociology.

3.4 *Individuation, Self, and Emotions*

In French, Chinese, Japanese, and Korean sociologies the issue of individuation, self, and emotions is embedded in the problematic of historical and structural processes, “new” inequalities, and social conflicts. So, we can clearly imagine how to produce a post-Western sociology of individuation.

From 1980 to 1995 strong controversies divided French sociologies. There was the Subject, which had been denied in the Marxist and Bourdieu school theories, according to the theory of the *habitus*. Then, Alain Touraine and Michel Wieviorka questioned the Subject, François Dubet produced a sociology of experience to help us better understand the “objective” social structures individuals find themselves trapped in and which they struggle against. After 1990, the Subject has been increasingly defined by her or his capacity to be an autonomous and reflexive actor and to construct his or her experience, but also possessing emotions and feelings. A sociology of ordeals has been produced around the concepts of respect, shame, and contempt (Martuccelli 2006); everyone is required to be both the actor and the author of his or her own life, and the feeling of contempt becomes the fundamental emotion of democratic societies among those who face an impossible-to-achieve trial (cf. Chapter 51 from François Dubet). Quite recently new propositions in sociology of emotions are appearing with the new generation of sociologists.

In Chinese sociology, Yang Yiyin (2012) shows how *we* implies “being one of us”, which is characterized by the permeability of the boundaries of *we*,

the elasticity of the boundaries of *we*, the precise borders of *me*. However, the boundaries of the *self* in Chinese sociology are also conceived in relation to the *guanxi*. We insist on the importance of the *guanxis* in the construction of individual and collective identities by recalling that it is inherent in Chinese civilization both past and present. Chinese sociologists considered that the status of emotions remains strong via the question of social interactions and *guanxis*. Chen Boqing (2013) first combined social interaction, *guanxis*, and *Confucian self* to take into account the transformation of the *modern self*. Second he articulates the *ethical self*, which means the requirements, emotions, and limits in our relationship to others; the *aesthetical self*, which means affections and feelings; and the *transcendental self*. In his chapter according to Chen Boqing and Wang Jiahui (2017), three emotional regimes have emerged correspondingly: *the managerial regime*; *the experiential regime* in consumption; and *the performative regime* in social interaction.

In Japanese sociology the issue of emotion and self has become one of the most important issues since 1980. In the Japanese tradition, the self means seeing one and gradually seeing oneself in an environment surrounding the self; in contemporary society, today's sociologists are invited to study the eruption of emotions and sentiments into various areas, and the production of a transcendental subject (see Chapter [No.] from Yazawa Shujiro). In Korean sociology the relationship between the individual and community is a very important topic. Han and Shim purposed the concept of "postconventional networking individualization"; in his chapter Kim Wang-Bae shows how the emotions of fear, hatred, and anger are constructed and mixed into the emotionalized subjects and in polarized social conflicts; he is reinterpreting Bourdieu's conceptualization of *habitus* in the context of emotions.

AQ 26

So, the cultural variations of the definitions of the concepts of "individuation" and "subjectivation" in Western and non-Western sociologies allow us to see discontinuous continuities between local conceptual spaces and to understand how singular spaces are producing located knowledge and global knowledge.

3.5 *Environment and Global Health*

New environmental and health risks are generating situations of uncertainty, new inequalities, new solidarities, and the production of new public spaces. In East Asia, social inequalities and natural inequalities merge into *compressed modernities* (Chang 2017) linked to spatial and historical processes of ecological and urban change.

Environmental sociology began in the 1980s and 1990s with the emergence of environmental problems. In Europe, the reflexive modernization theories of Anthony Giddens and Ulrich Beck inspired the notion of ecological

modernization. Ecological modernization theory is one of the major environmental theories/discourses among scholars and policymakers in Japan. The concept of *environmental justice*, which emerged in the United States in the 1980s, referred to inequalities in the spatial distribution of risks. Since the 1990s, following various food and sanitary crises, food studies have been developed in sociology of risk. The sociology of food studies shows food anxiety is an anthropological invariant. More recently, in the face of unequal access to food, the *food justice* and *food sovereignty* concepts have emerged.

In China it was after the mid-1990s that the sociology of the environment was introduced as a discipline. A body of research has shown how rapid urbanization, industrialization, and economic liberalization has led to the emergence of environmental problems. Chinese sociologists also deal with environmental inequalities in emphasizing the issue of the reconstruction of trust and the issue of citizen participation in environmental protection. Mistrust, more fundamentally, is one of the great challenges in Chinese society (cf. Chapter 46 from Wang Xiaoyi and Anier). The origin of environmental sociology in Japan was the early 1970s. The pioneer was a female sociologist, Dr. Iijima, who majored in chemistry as an undergraduate and became a sociologist; she had recognized that the Japanese heavy metal and chemical industry destroyed the environment and produced serious pollution. The above process clearly shows us that ecology is not only a natural issue but also a social and cultural one. Environmental sociology must have wider spatial perspectives that extend beyond the damaged areas and peoples. Since the late 1970s environmental sociology has been developed by Funabashi, Kajita, and Hasegawa, and a theory of risk culture after the East Japan Great Earthquake and the tsunami disaster was developed to understand non-institutional, emergent socialization, horizontal orders, and reflexive community.

Concerning present-day East Asia, Ulrich Beck (2013) spoke of a cosmopolitan risk community (or “Cosmo-Climate”). He has distinguished “cosmopolitan empathy” and the subpolitics of “cosmopolitanism from below”. Does this make sense for Chinese, Korean, and Japanese sociologists? In East Asia sociologists consider that we cannot conceive of the risk issue in the same terms in Europe and in Asia because different “compressed modernities” mean multiple modernizations, but also the complexities, diversities, and heterogeneities of risks that people face in East Asia today overtake those faced by the Western world (cf. Chapter 48 from Keiichi Satoh). If today Anthropocene theories appear to be very dominant in Western social sciences, a few Asian scholars have therefore deemed it necessary to redefine the concept from the angle of postcolonial criticism (cf. Chapter 47 from Paul Jobin). In environmental sociology “ecological crisis” is analyzed with the theory of the Anthropocene and the Capitalocene in a context of green capitalisms and de-growth (cf.

Chapter 49 from Hong Deokhwa and Ku Dowan). This question lies at the heart of post-Western sociology about the renewal of neocolonial domination in scientific sphere, and maybe we could deconstruct the Anthropocene from the postcolonial criticism elaborated by Asian scholars.

Existing theories in the sociology of health are mainly based on the experience of Western developed countries, which should be complemented by more studies on the traditions and patterns of non-Western countries in dealing with health problems (cf. Chapter 57 from Hong Yanbi and Zhao Yandong). In Europe as in Asia, although ecologies cover multiple and varied representations of the interface of nature-urban culture, these same ecologies produce environmental and health inequalities and injustices, regimes of action, and individual and collective mobilizations. In his chapter Yee Jaeyeol has reconstructed the concept of “publicness” based on the ideas of the socially embedded self, a hierarchically situated social order, and deeply contextualized social rules to propose, in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic, a theory of risk governance based on the different empirical realities of Western and East Asian countries.

In the context of the COVID-19 pandemic, in his chapter Miwako Hosoda considers the sociological issues of equality and human rights, health disparities between rich and poor, and stigmas and discrimination against those who choose not to be vaccinated; he proposed improving the dialogue between the East and the West in introducing the concept of “living together” with nature (*kyosei*). In a closed perspective in his chapter Frédéric Le Marcis invited us to expand the meaning and practices of epidemic preparedness in articulating the theories of health system and community, the concepts of institutional memory and popular memory to take into account the experience-based knowledge. According to Cho Byong-Hee in his chapter, if COVID-19 was caused by socioeconomic factors associated with an ecological crisis, sociologists are taking into account marketization or neo-liberalism of the health care system in many countries such as Korea, the medicalization of pandemic control, the dispositions of and resistance to overworking doctors, legal and illegal practices in hospitals, and the modes of cooperation between doctors and nurses; but we are invited to mobilize medical sociology and political sociology to understand the risks at work, school, home, etc., and the issue of what makes citizenship in a pandemic context and in a global community.

In a post-Western sociology we are invited to think about a new cosmopolis and how to rebuild the world. If health crises produce situations of great “uncertainty”, multiply societal and international inequalities, and produce paroxysmal figures of dislocation, they also open spaces for the emergence of new figures of social restoration, new processes of reconstruction of Western and Eastern societies in a global world.



Post-Western Sociology is a critical reflection on the imagined orthodoxy and purity of Western Sociology. In its respect for Western sociology, Post-Western sociology aims reinventing it. In its creative construction, however, Post-Western sociology tries to explore new sociological horizon arising from non-Western and post-Modern context. This ambivalence inherent in Post-Western sociology guides us to the world of hybridization, an undeniable nature of human and non-human society. Post-Western sociology must appreciate “purity in hybridity”. Sociologists in the era of artificial intelligence must become new avant-garde full of imagination and self-fulfilling prophecy about cosmological freedom and liberation. Post-Western sociology then may start from a post-human awareness that will be led to “cosmological turn” for building new civilization of “everything-goes-together-peacefully”.

References

- Beck, U. 2013. “Risk, class, crisis, hazards and cosmopolitan solidarity/risk community—conceptual and methodological clarifications”. *Working Papers Series*, no. 31 (April). FMSH.
- Bian, Yanjie. 2010. “Guanxi shehui xue jiqi xueke diwei” [Network sociology and its position among other disciplines]. Xi’an Jiaotong Daxue Xuebao. *Shehui Kexue bao* 5: 1–6.
- Castel, R. 2009. *La montée des incertitudes* [The rise of uncertainties]. Paris: Seuil.
- Chang, Kyung-Sup. 2010. “The second modern condition? Compressed modernity as internalized reflexive cosmopolitization”. *The British Journal of Sociology* 61 (3): 444–465.
- Chen, Boqing. 2013. 情感的社会学意 [The sociological signification of the emotion]. *山东社会科学* [Shandong Social Science] 2013 (03): 42–48. DOI: 10.14112/j.cnki.37-1053/c.2013.03.031.
- Granovetter, M. 1974. *Getting a job*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Li, Peilin, Qu Jingdong, and Yang Yabin. 2009. *An introduction to Chinese sociological classics*. Peking: Social Sciences Academic Press.
- Martuccelli. 2006. *Forgé par l'épreuve. L'individu dans la France contemporaine* [Forged through ordeals. The individual in contemporary France]. Paris: Colin.
- Yang, Yiyin. 2012. “Guanxilization and Categorization: Theoretical Considerations Based on Two Case Studies”. In *European and Chinese Sociologies. A new dialogue*, edited by L. Rouleau-Berger and Peilin Li, 163–177. Leiden and Boston: Brill Publishers.

Author Query

- AQ 1: (p. 56) Unpaired quotation mark
“groups and individuals are two different parties in the West, while the status of family is very low
- AQ 2: (p. 70) Should courtiers be changed to countries in
3 Post-Western Sociologies” in Western Courtiers
- AQ 3: (p. 76) Unpaired quotation mark
“rooted in Chinese history and culture, Chinese literary theories are utterly different from those in Western cultures
- AQ 4: (p. 100) Please provide footnote text for table footnote b.
- AQ 5: (p. 115) Unpaired quotation mark
is a final goal for human action (濟世理化) after establishing the intercommunication between I myself and my original spirit (自性求子 大光明處 性通功完)”
- AQ 6: (p. 262) Please complete the sentence.
understand the behavior of local governments and the developmental
- AQ 7: (p. 311) Unpaired quotation mark
The proposed solutions are so divergent that one is liable to end up highly confusing”.
- AQ 8: (p. 315) Wikipedia is not a credential source, please provide another source.
- AQ 9: (p. 487) Please check title
- AQ 10: (p. 598) (such as employment ou services) and the term “urban renewal” with its dreadly connotation ... : Do you mean employment of/or services? Use of the term “dreadly” correct here? Kindly check
- AQ 11: (p. 693) Two queries
a Please check; tables have either 8 or 10 chapters “Five of its nine chapters”.
b “Degraduation” changed to “Degradation” in Table 39.1a. Change OK?
- AQ 12: (p. 771) With figure call-out but no provided image for Figure 45-5
- AQ 13: (p. 848) Please amend this sentence. For example: “This Japanese word means...”
- AQ 14: (p. 850) Singularity: set as subheading?
- AQ 15: (p. 850) Add or remove “Note 1”.
- AQ 16: (p. 855) “As a result, they called the future of societyreflexive ...” Please check if the terms in this sentence should be retained in closeup form.
- AQ 17: (p. 856) Please remove or amend “note 2”
- AQ 18: (p. 906) Please check the page numbers because these are the same for entry “Zhao, Yeqin”.
- AQ 19: (p. 906) Please check page numbers because these are the same for entry “Tucci, I.”
- AQ 20: (p. 917) 2010? Please amend
- AQ 21: (p. 976) Please check page numbers with entry below.
- AQ 22: (p. 979) Chapter 5 or Chapter 52?
- AQ 23: (p. 981) Chapter 1 or Chapter 55?
- AQ 24: (p. 984) Chapter 1 or Chapter 55?
- AQ 25: (p. 986) Chapter 1 or Chapter 55?
- AQ 26: (p. 991) Chapter 5 or Chapter 52?