

Culture

Section of the American Sociological Association

A Message from the Chair

John Mohr

University of California, Santa Barbara

Volume 17, No. 1 (Autumn 2002)

Globalization and Artistic Creativity: An Exchange

Culture Rocks!

Culture rocked Chicago last August. Cultural sociologist (and teen idol) Bill Bielby, backed up by section members Leonard Nevarez, Craig Rawlings, and John Sutton unofficially kicked off the ASAs on Friday night with a performance of their band "Thin Vitae." Paul DiMaggio (see below), in fine form, sang lead on "Like a Rolling Stone" and a good time was had by all. (For those of you who missed this performance, I have it on good authority that the band will be back for an encore show at the ASA meetings in Atlanta).



(continued, page 2)

Editor's Note

Please let me know your ideas for submissions!

Mark D. Jacobs, Dept. of Sociology, George Mason Univ.
Fairfax, VA 22030
mjacobs@gmu.edu; 703/993-1434

*For two decades, ICARE (the International Center for Art Economics) has provided a valuable forum for multinational and multidisciplinary study of the arts. Not surprisingly, economists comprised most of the participants at ICARE's international workshop on "The Economics of Art Auctions" held in Venice last January. To a cultural sociologist, most of the discourse sounded narrowly instrumental; the evaluation of normative issues was relatively ignored in favor of the more "serious" business of the logics and outcomes of competing investment strategies. However in the course of a spontaneous question-and-answer session, not only did the Australian art historian **Annette Van den Bosch** and the Dutch economic sociologist **Olav Velthuis** engage normative issues concerning the globalization of art markets, they also plumbed the empirical nuance of those issues. I asked them to expand upon their exchange in the pages of **Culture**, by directly addressing the following issues:*

Does globalization expand or limit the creative opportunities of artists in different parts of the world? How does globalization transform the nature of art markets around the world, with what consequences for artists as they seek to make their reputations and careers, and with what consequences for the art they produce?

Arts, Artists, Art Markets: The Effects of Global Change

Annette Van den Bosch

Monash University, Melbourne

Globalisation is a constellation of effects that have a longer history than that evident since the 1980s. In order to answer the question whether globalisation expands or limits the creative opportunities of artists I argue that it is necessary to trace the effects of global change. My research focused on change in the Australian art world and market, but in order to explain those changes I studied the impact of the postwar international market.¹ The relationships that developed between wealthy United States collectors buying at auction in London, Paris and New York, US tax legislation that gives generous tax concessions for donations of works of art to museums, tastemakers

(continued, page 5)

Books of Note.....p. 9
Announcements.....p. 11

Aside from lending personnel and creative energy to *this* cultural extravaganza, the culture section sponsored five lively panels and a dozen roundtables, all of which were well attended and energetic. The membership turned out in force for the business meeting and subsequent culture bash. The section itself continues to grow. The final “year-end” September membership tally showed that with the exception of two new expansion clubs (“Ethnomethodology” and “Animals and Society”) the culture section picked up more new members this year than any other ASA section. Thanks are due to Maria Kefalas, chair of our membership committee, who (lucky for us) has signed on for another year of service.

As the section continues to expand, so does the import of culture to the discipline as a whole. In recognition of this fact, Bill Bielby (who aside from playing a mean lead guitar also happens to be the incoming ASA president) has put “The Question of Culture” on the agenda as the centerpiece of the 2003 ASA meetings. Because it is germane to our interests, I include the official statement here:

Two decades ago, the sociology of culture was a relatively well-defined and insulated subfield, focusing primarily on how collective action and social institutions shape production in the media and the arts. Since then, the study of cultural phenomena has expanded tremendously across subfields sociology. It has also proliferated throughout the humanities via the interdisciplinary field of cultural studies, though with scant participation from sociologists.

The theme of the 2003 Annual Meeting, “The Question of Culture,” is an invitation to critically assess how the concept of culture is used across the full range of areas of social inquiry and to take stock of alternative approaches to theory, method, and explanation developed outside of our discipline. What is the empirical and theoretical status of the concept of culture, not just in fields that deal centrally with symbolic realms such as arts, media, and religion, but also in traditionally more materialist and structuralist subfields such as demography, organizations, and stratification? How has “the cultural turn” changed our understanding of social categories such as gender, race, class and the way we study social processes ranging from identity formation to globalization? How do we address issues of meaning, representation, and interpretation, and what are their implications for sociology as an explanatory science? The 2003 Annual Meeting will be an occasion for lively debate on these and related issues, for sharing new ideas for theorizing and research, and for experiencing first hand the culture of Atlanta, one of the world’s most vibrant multicultural urban centers.

Amen Brother Bill! To my mind, next year’s meetings will be a great opportunity for those of us who do culture to get out in front of this issue and show the rest of the ASA just how it should be done. But, as with most opportunities, so too are there many potential dangers here. I am reminded of the opening remarks that Lyn Spillman made last August at a panel she organized with Mark Jacobs on “Diffusing Cultural Sociology: Intellectual Fields and Institutional Boundaries.”

Lyn explained that she has long thought of cultural analysis as an approach that has the potential to be combined with other research perspectives and applied across a wide variety of subject areas. But she noted that the successful diffusion of cultural analysis has proven to be highly uneven — more clearly evident in the study of social movements than in the study of the family, for example. She then raised a series of vital questions: How might other sociological fields be able to make use of the kinds of research insights that we in culture have been developing over the last generation? How do sociologists in other fields understand culture these days? And, what factors account for the successful diffusion of cultural sociology to other areas of sociological work? Lyn also pointed to two stylistic problems that can pose barriers to successful diffusion. One, which she terms “hand-waving” about culture involves talking about cultural dimensions of a problem without actually specifying any concrete mechanisms of cultural structure, production, or change processes. The other problem she calls “cheerleading” about culture. This is the tendency to expand cultural explanation to the exclusion of all else, such that other social organizational processes are neglected or driven from view.

Hand-waving and cheerleading about culture is a nice summary way of thinking about what we have to be wary of as we approach next year’s ASA meetings. As sociologists across the spectrum try to “get with the program” I expect we’ll see a lot of failed attempts to rename social factors in vaguely cultural ways, a lot of efforts to dredge cultural explanations out of survey data conceived and collected under different theoretical mandates. And probably we’ll witness a lot of cultural straw people dragged roughly across the stage.

With this in mind it behooves us to stop and reflect a moment on just what cultural sociology has to offer to the field, what we do that is distinctive, and how the work that has been accomplished over the last two decades has set out a very different research agenda than what had gone before. And what better way to reflect on these matters than to take a quick look at the papers presented at last August’s culture section ASA panels? Having attended all the panels I can report that I saw no hand-waving or cultural cheerleading at any of these sessions. What I did see was a healthy and vibrant research program that has much to offer the discipline as the Association turns to consider “The Question of Culture.”

The “Diffusing Cultural Sociology” session is a case in point. The four authors on this panel took the distinctive intellectual tools of cultural sociology and applied them to other areas of scholarly research, showing by example just what a contemporary cultural analysis is capable of. Barry Schwartz did this in his paper on “The New Gettysburg Address.” Stimulated by a spate of new interpretations of that venerable eulogy, Schwartz brought the tools of collective memory research to bear on the ways in which various groups at different historical moments re-remember Lincoln’s address at the dedication of the Gettysburg memorial. In the process Schwartz shows how the same text takes on very different meanings to groups whose social and temporal location instills in them widely divergent interpretative frames and scholarly agendas. Historians are the scholars in question here. In spite of their professional dedication to recovering the verities of what went on in the past, Schwarz shows that they are just as susceptible to

discursive distortions, tendencies to creatively reconstruct the past in the service of the present, as any project of collective memory.

Drawing on contemporary understandings of culture as practice, Paul Lichterman presented a paper that fundamentally rethinks the impact that organized religion has on politics. Whereas traditional accounts focused on how religious beliefs and values influenced civic behavior, Lichterman looks instead at the ways in which the cadence of everyday religious life builds up practical orientations towards lived experience, a kind of *habitus* of association, which comes to be expressed in other domains of social action. Using ethnographic data he shows that members of religious communities, trained by experience to embody certain styles of social relations, express those interactional styles in the practical activities they take on in the civic sphere. Thus religion affects politics not by shaping values so much as by altering collective repertoires of action.

On the same panel, Sita Reddy provided a wonderful example of cultural cheerleading gone bad. Drawing on a textual analysis of court cases, Reddy showed how over the last 15 years the concept of culture has found its way into the court system. Culture (especially immigrant culture) is defined as a pathology, an all encompassing, all determining causal factor which leads good people to do bad things. By Reddy's account the "culture made them do it" defense has emerged as one of the standard tools of the legal profession, a tool which might seem potentially progressive but which instead is consistently deployed in a way that brings out the worst kind of crass cultural prejudices and misunderstandings.

The session also had a nice example of how to get beyond cultural hand-waving as an explanatory model. Marion Fourcade-Gourinchas took up the question of how a particular (Western) model of economic theory came to be embraced across the globe. In contrast to widely prevalent explanations emphasizing a generalized hegemony or a disembodied "epistemic community," Fourcade-Gourinchas drew upon DiMaggio and Powell's (1983) theory of institutional isomorphism to show how very specific cultural mechanisms come into play in a global transformation of this sort. Using data on the spread of Western trained economists, university course offerings, association foundings and journal publications, Fourcade-Gourinchas shows how a particular professional community came to colonize this global jurisdictional niche.

The other four panels were equally instructive. Robin Wagner-Pacifici assembled a wonderful session on "Interpretive Studies of Culture" that made it clear just how far we have come in developing sophisticated understandings of cultural meanings. This included a fascinating paper by Andreas Glaeser on the institutional logic of what he calls "state paranoia" in East Germany (in the former GDR), as well as Ruth Simpson's wonderful historical essay on how early modern interpretations of medical epidemics can teach us about the dynamics of cultural discourse systems. Chandra Mukerji dazzled us with her reading of Nicholas de Nicolay's 16th century account of his travels through the Ottoman Empire. The text was widely read at the time and became a critical source for shaping European understanding of non-Western cultures. But its meaning was not open or immediately available at the surface of the text. Rather, Mukerji showed that the most

powerful messages were conveyed in the subtle ironies of the commentary, the juxtaposition of image and narrative, the careful semiotics of native dress and style. Andrew Perrin rounded out the panel with a content analysis of letters to the editor published in major U. S. newspapers after September 11th. This was yet another fine example of how the new cultural sociology is reconceptualizing older sociological problems. Perrin goes back to Adorno's concerns to ask whether there was a discernable rise in authoritarianism after the September 11th attacks. His findings were intriguing. Yes, many letter writers did express more authoritarian sentiments, but there was also a strong manifestation of anti-authoritarianism suggesting a need to re-theorize the phenomena as a tightly coupled structural binary.

The question of how to interpret meanings was also the focus of Ron Breiger's panel on "Formal Methods and Cultural Analysis: Exemplar Studies." Once again, the panel was an invigorating lesson in just how far we have come. John Krinsky opened the panel with another sophisticated content analysis project. Drawing upon Bakhtin's theories of multivocality, Krinsky analyzed claims-making behavior in 256 newspaper articles concerning New York City's workfare project. With remarkable clarity he showed how rhetorical mobilizations are both defined by and constitutive of coalitional politics in urban policy debates. Gregoire Mallard then gave a wonderfully stimulating paper showing how literary theorists have formed alternative interpretations of Balzac. Ann Mische, who is constantly breaking new ground in this area, presented a fascinating and innovative sequence analysis of how Brazilian youth activists construct temporal narratives about the role of politics in their lives. John Martin ended the session with another in what is becoming an increasingly long list of brilliant papers on the relationship between the structure of belief systems and the social organization of power. Drawing on data from 70's era communes, he showed that if you want to understand how belief systems are organized you need to move beyond a Durkheimian analysis of abstract morphological features of social organization toward the lived political experiences of everyday life, or what Martin calls the "I hate your guts" level of social life.

Karen Cerulo brought together a terrific set of papers for a session on "Technology, the Internet, and the Culture of Social Connectedness." The theme in each of these papers was how people use these technologies in their lives, how the internet is experienced as a resource, as a tool, as a means of individual or collective action. Here I was personally most struck by Eszter Hargittai's research design for the paper she co-authored with Paul DiMaggio on social stratification among internet users. Hargittai brought subjects into a lab and asked them to perform a series of five internet search tasks (e.g., find a website that compares different candidate views on the topic of abortion) and had the computer automatically record the procedures each subject deployed and the time it took to complete them. This seemed to be a wonderfully innovative way to ground an interesting empirical study of how people make practical sense out of everyday tasks in a thoroughly precise measurement model.

While many papers highlighted advances in the use of formal methods to study culture, equally important are the advances we have made in the epistemological and political conundrums of professing to know about the 'other.' Sharon Hays

organized a wonderful panel to address these issues, entitled “Queering Cultural Sociology: Innovative Studies of Race, Gender, and Sexualities.” Josh Gamson presented a paper on gay and lesbian media (and the impacts of changing market conditions), Elizabeth Long talked about her research on women’s book groups and Sudhir Venkatesh explained how his informants (in his ethnography of the Robert Taylor housing projects in Chicago) constructed interpretations of him (as ‘academic hustler,’ ‘nigger just like us,’ and ‘Arab’) and how these constructions shaped his identity in the field and influenced his ability to know his informants. This panel became especially lively after Bethany Bryson, in her commentary on the papers, raised the stakes and challenged us all to move away from the comfortable stance of the objective scholar to more fully confront our own complicated complicity in constructing our subjects as objects of study. Pete Peterson, from the audience, rose to the occasion, and kicked off the most rousing and productive audience discussion of any of these panels, as section members struggled to think through the contradictions we all experience as gendered, sexed, classed and racialized human beings striving to construct an objective narrative of cultural forms.

The roundtables, ably organized by Krista Paulsen this year, were exciting (and cacophonous) as always. My experience has always been that it is at the culture roundtable sessions where the future of the sociology of culture is revealed. This year was no exception. Authors, including many of the younger scholars in the section, showed new directions in the study of politics and material culture (Michael Anteby and Amy Wrzesniewski’s paper on “Ashtrays, Rockets, and Love-Letters: Artistic Experiences in Factories” and Chelsea Starr’s essay on “Plop Art?: Political possibilities in Maya Lin’s Public Space”). Practice theory was being practiced in new and interesting ways (Melinda Milligan’s essay on “Preservation in Practice: How Homemakers Decide What to Do” and “Embodied Theories of Mind and the Sociology of Culture by Thomas Medvetz). There were many intriguing applications of culture theory to the study of gender (such as Michelle Durden’s paper on “Reconstruction Humor: American Social Types in Burlesque, 1865-1977,” and Kayo Fujimoto’s “Performance of Genderism: Dramaturgical Approaches to Gender Inequality in Japan’s Female Labor Market.”) The new and intriguing focus on the culture of space and place was present as well (witness Charles Gordon’s paper on “Modes of Shelter” and Thomas Gieryn’s essay on “Chicago as Laboratory.”) There were also a surprisingly large number of innovative papers on the cultural analysis of music this year — Tim Dowd, Kathy Liddle, Robert Gardner, Deborah Rapuano, and Gregory Burkhart all presented new work on the cultural frameworks of musical genres from punk to bluegrass, Irish traditional to American symphony music.

These last two topic areas — music and space — are also growth points within the section. Pete Peterson, the culture section’s own musical icon, has teamed up with Tim Dowd and a number of others to organize a culture section mini-conference on music for next year’s ASA meetings in Atlanta (perhaps we can persuade “Thin Vitae” to do a set for the mini-conference as well!). Bill Holt and David Brain are working on putting together a “space and place” contingent for the mini-conference and I am considering the possibility of bringing to-

gether the meaning and measurement group at the same time. If you have an interest in seeing your network get together in a mini-conference format after the ASAs, you should contact me (mohr@soc.ucsb.edu) or your network chair.

And speaking of upcoming conferences, I would be remiss if I didn’t take this opportunity to invite you all out to Santa Barbara this winter (March 7-8, 2003) for our fourth cultural turn conference (co-organized by myself and Roger Friedland). This year’s theme is on institutions and instituting. As always we are bringing together humanists and sociologists to consider topics that concern them both. The philosopher John Searle will be joining us (thinking about the philosophical basis of instituting), architectural historian Swati Chattopadhyay (on the institutionalization of genres in material forms) as well as the literary theorists Porter Abbott (on narrative forms), Elisabeth Weber (on institutions and discourse) and Chuck Bazerman (on rhetoric and institutionalization). Trevor Pinch (who studies the history of science) and JoAnne Yates (who looks at communication and its material forms in organizations) will speak at the conference. Sociologists on this year’s program include Roger Friedland, John Martin, Dick Scott, Ann Swidler, and Harrison White. We are planning, as always, on pushing pretty hard against the boundaries that separate sociologists and humanists and we would love to include you in the conference. Send an email to ct4@soc.ucsb.edu if you are interested in attending or giving a paper.

References:

- Altheide, David L. 2002. “Mediated Interaction.” Paper presented at ASA meetings, Chicago, Ill.
- DiMaggio, Paul J. and Walter W. Powell. 1983. “The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields.” *American Sociological Review* 48: 147-160.
- DiMaggio, Paul J. and Eszter Hargittai. 2002 “The New Digital Inequality: Social Stratification among Internet Users.” Paper presented at ASA meetings, Chicago, Ill.
- Fourcade-Gourinchas. 2002. “The Internationalization of Economics and the (Re)Construction of the Economics Profession.” Paper presented at ASA meetings, Chicago, Ill.
- Gamson, Joshua 2002. “Gay Media, Inc.: The Internet, Market Concentration, and Lesbian and Gay Culture.” Paper presented at ASA meetings, Chicago, Ill.
- Glaeser, Andreas. 2002. “Revolutionary Intentionality, Synecdochical Mischief, and the Production of State Paranoia: Stasi and the GDR Civil Rights Movement in the 1980s.” Paper presented at ASA meetings, Chicago, Ill.
- Krinsky, John D. 2002 “The Relational Dynamics of Hegemony: Cultural Strategies in the Debates over Workforce Policy in New York City, 1994-2000.” Paper presented at ASA meetings, Chicago, Ill.
- Lichterman, Paul. 2002. “Religion’s Quiet Influence on Civic Engagement.” Paper presented at ASA meetings, Chicago, Ill.
- Long, Elizabeth 2002. “Women’s Book Groups: Reading the Practices of Change.” Paper presented at ASA meetings, Chicago, Ill.

Mallard, Gregoire H. 2002 "Diffusing Literary Theories: Institutional Boundaries, Networks, and Machines." Paper presented at ASA meetings, Chicago, Ill.

Martin, John L. 2002 "A Formal Approach to the Study of Belief Systems and Some Findings." Paper presented at ASA meetings, Chicago, Ill.

Mische, Ann. 2002 "Pathways and Projects: Organizational Trajectories and Narratives of Political Engagement." Paper presented at ASA meetings, Chicago, Ill.

Mukerji, Chandra. 2002. "The Use of Fashion as a Tool of Geography: Nicolas de Nicoloy's Account of his Travels to Turkey in the 16th Century." Paper presented at ASA meetings, Chicago, Ill.

Perrin, Andrew J. 2002. "Public Discourse and National Threat: Authoritarianism, Anti-Authoritarianism, and the September 11 Attacks." Paper presented at ASA meetings, Chicago, Ill.

Reddy, Sita. 2002. "Blaming Culture: Pathologizing Difference in American Criminal Courts." Paper presented at ASA meetings, Chicago, Ill.

Ruane, Janet M. 2002. "Civic Involvement via the Internet." Paper presented at ASA meetings, Chicago, Ill.

Schwartz, Barry. 2002. "The New Gettysburg Address: A Study in Illusion." Paper presented at ASA meetings, Chicago, Ill.

Simpson, Ruth E. 2002. "The Germ Culture: Theories of Epidemics as Latent Social Theories." Paper presented at ASA meetings, Chicago, Ill.

Venkatesh, Sudhir A. 2002. "Doin' the Hustle: Reflections on Fieldwork in the American Ghetto." Paper presented at ASA meetings, Chicago, Ill.

Wellman, Barry, Wenhong Chen, Anabel Quan, and Jeffrey Boase. 2002. "The Global Villagers: The Users and Uses of the Internet." Paper presented at ASA meetings, Chicago, Ill.

Globalization and Artistic Creativity, continued

in New York and the Museum of Modern Art produced a new international art world.² The leading auction houses—Parke-Bernet, Sotheby's and Christie's—were central to the postwar art market, and their expansion as multi-national auction houses established the conditions for a global market. Their published price indexes enabled art to be traded as an investment commodity on a national, international and global basis.

After 1960 the players in the Australian art world and market reproduced international market practices.³ Artists' developed a new model of financial and career success in relation to new dealing practices that were influenced by New York dealers. Collectors were influenced by the rapid rise in prices at international auction sales, as well as the new social status of art. Exhibition and collection in State and National Art Galleries became as important to the establishment of artists' reputations as peer group recognition. Artists and dealers built reputations using the mass media and the enormous growth in the audiences for art rather than relying on art criticism. Reputations became the key process linking the aesthetic and financial value of the work, in the dealers' gallery, the auction sale and the Art Gallery.⁴ As a consequence, the Australian art world changed from state-based communities in which artists sold to local collectors, to a centralized art world in which the majority of artists and dealers were concentrated in Sydney and Melbourne.

The sale of contemporary art at auction by the major auction houses in New York, and other countries, such as Australia, concentrated the market for living artists, and for artists' estates. The sale of the Scull collection of American contemporary art at auction changed the attitudes of collectors to contemporary art.⁵ Scull, Count Panza, and Dr. Ludwig, purchased contemporary art from Castelli at comparatively low prices that appreciated significantly as a result of the mechanisms for price formation and building artists' reputations that he introduced.⁶ The recognition by private collectors, corporations, and even museums, that contemporary art purchased directly from an exhibiting dealer could increase significantly

in price within the artists' lifetime resulted in an investment market for contemporary art in which the relationship between aesthetic and financial values were blurred.⁷

Until the early 1970s the art market in Australia was largely a dealer's market. Australian collectors bought Australian art because they felt confident about their judgment of art in the local tradition. The entry of the multi-national auction houses Sotheby's and Christie's into the Australian art market drew the market into a pattern that was being repeated worldwide. The development of regional and national markets was part of the globalisation of the market in the 1970s, as the multi-national auction houses strove to increase turnover. Sotheby's and Christie's made the market much more competitive than ever before. They were able to market sales, and to build a run on prices that forced the local auction houses to adopt many of their practices in order to compete. The auction houses forced up prices more rapidly than ever before, especially in the boom periods of 1973-4, 1987-9 and 1998-2001. Auction houses actively sought new collectors, many of whom knew very little about art. The speculative markets that developed in boom periods resulted in a dual market by the 1990s. The wealthiest collectors bought blue-chip investments in both the national and global markets, while dealers and collectors bought historic and contemporary Australian art in national auction houses for far more modest prices.

The relationships between the international and national markets were an important part of a process for changing aesthetic values in Australian Art.

Artists working in Figurative Expressionism who made their reputations in London in the 1950s and 1960s became art market leaders in Australia. The values for this work were established at the cost of the exclusion of modernist abstraction and figurative realism, which were also major practices in Australia. Their work constituted the "correct collection" of Australian Art.⁸ The next stage occurred when the reproduction of New York dealing practices in the 1960s produced New York styles in Australia. The practices associated with the new norm for post-

war contemporary art, its scale and its exhibition potential, allowed dealers to establish prices based on size. The introduction of the single size, one price approach to marketing, together with the emphasis on solo exhibitions to establish an artists' signature style established uniformity in the investment potential of works. It diminished the differences in aesthetic value between works in a particular exhibition, or even different periods of an artist's work. The artist's reputation was more closely tied to that of the dealer and other artists represented by that dealer, and the style or aesthetic tendencies defined by the collectors who patronized that gallery.⁹ In the art market that developed, there were a limited number of artists and aesthetic styles that were supported by tastemakers and collectors. The formation of reputations in the Australian market, the increasing penetration of large touring exhibitions celebrating the modern masters of art, and the resistance to exhibiting contemporary women's work were all connected.¹⁰

Australian artists often studied and worked abroad for periods of their career but their market remained predominantly national. Even in the global market for art, Australian dealers will be the principal bidders for the artworks and estates of expatriate artists in Paris or London. From the 1980s Australian artists and their dealers mostly established inter-national connections, with other artists, curators, dealers and sometimes collectors. The Australia Council, Universities and a small number of Foundations support artists' studios and residences in New York, Paris, Rome, Barcelona, Tokyo and Hanoi. Many Australian artists produce cross-cultural work, because they are indigenous or immigrants, and, they live or work in different cultures for some time. In this way, global relationships expand the creative opportunities for Australian artists, and the range of art available for audiences.

However, from the 1980s some Australian artists re-located their art world orientation to Europe, North America or Asia, spending most of their working time abroad. The curator of an exhibition, *Art and the Everyday*, in a Swiss museum was unaware that Tracy Moffat was an Australian Aboriginal artist, although her family and cultural background were the key to the works exhibited. There is a loss of meaning when the curator and the audience do not fully understand the context of artworks. The audiences in a globalised art world do not necessarily gain access to a wider range of art when artists are exhibited under over-generalised curatorial themes, nor do artists develop without meaningful interactions with audiences. As well, much of their career support still comes predominantly from Australian dealers, institutions, and collectors.

The creative opportunities for artists are expanded by inter-national exchange but the globalisation of the investment market for art limited the number of reputations in the market. It is almost impossible for an artist from a smaller art world and market to establish a reputation in the global market. At the same time, the long process of globalisation changed the Australian art world and artists' careers. One of the main consequences of the auction practices introduced by Christie's and Sotheby's was that a small group of Australian artists, only about 120, were sold regularly at auction, establishing their prices in the art sales indexes and making them suitable for investment. The superstar effect that characterizes the international art world had a marked effect on the careers and incomes of the majority of Australian artists.¹¹ Only 11 percent of

Australian artists make their living from their primary creative activity.¹² This is comparable with other art markets, including the United States.¹³

In order to expand the market for contemporary artists, dealers became multi-national, and established international associations and subsidiary dealerships. However, an artist's reputation is still promoted and established in major art market centres before their work can be sold internationally or globally.¹⁴ The limited number of reputations that are circulated in both national and global markets effectively limits the income of the vast number of artists. For example, a few women artists developed their reputations and careers in the 1980s and 1990s when selected women artists were celebrated as part of the superstars of art. In the 1990s there were more female than male artists, but women artists' incomes from both their artwork and their arts-related jobs were lower than those of male artists.¹⁵

The incomes of Aboriginal artists are even lower. The resale of Aboriginal art at Auction by Sotheby's in the 1990s resulted in the establishment of several major reputations whose works sold for six-figure sums. Overseas collectors were prominent in the highest price market for Aboriginal Art.¹⁶ Articles in the media following these sales drew attention to the fact that one of the most prominent Aboriginal artists was living in poverty. The reason is that the prices paid for Aboriginal art bought directly from the artist are often low, and though the work is prized by museums and collectors in Australia and in the global market, very few artists benefit from the investment market.¹⁷

References

- ¹ Van den Bosch, A. *The Australian Artworld: Aesthetics in Global Market*, to be published by Melbourne University Press 2003
- ² A number of contemporary accounts include, Lynes, R. *Good Old Modern: an intimate portrait of the Museum of Modern Art*, NY 1974, pp.36-40; Myers, J.B. *Tracking the Marvellous: A life in the New York art world* NY 1983 Ch. 4; and Taylor, J. R. and Brooke, B. *The Art Dealers*, NY 1969 pp.59-82
- ³ Becker, H.S. *Art Worlds* Berkeley 1982, Ch.1 'Art Worlds and Collective Activity'
- ⁴ *Art Worlds*, Ch. 11, 'Reputation'
- ⁵ Kirschenbaum, B.D. 'The Scull auction and the Scull film' *Art Journal* 39, 1 Fall 1979 pp.50-54
- ⁶ Cummings, P. Interviews with Castelli, Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution; de Coppet, L. and Jones, A. *The Art Dealers* NY 1984 pp. 80-109; and interviews by the author New York, January 1984
- ⁷ Moulin, R. *The French Art Market: a sociological view* New Brunswick and London 1987 pp.97-101; Frey B.S. and Pommerehne, W.W. 'Why is Rauschenberg so expensive?' pp.81-100 in their *Muses and Markets: Explorations in the economics of the arts*, Oxford 1989
- ⁸ Saarinen, A. 'Art Collecting in America', The Voice of America Forum Lectures, Visual Art 5, 1959 *New York art world 1940-1985* Chicago 1987, pp. 110-118.
- ⁹ Bystrin, M. 'Art Galleries as Gatekeepers: the case of the Abstract Expressionists' *Social Research* 45, 2, pp.390-408; and Crane, D. *The Transformation of the Avant-Garde: the*

New York art world 1940-1985 Chicago 1987, pp. 110-118.

¹⁰ For a US perspective see Zolberg, V. 'What price success? *Museum International* no.186 (47,2, 1995) pp.60-63

¹¹ Rosen, S. 'The economics of superstars' *American Economic Review* 71,5 pp.845-848

¹²Throsby, D. and Thompson, B. *But what do you do for a living? A new economic study of Australian artists* Australia Council Sydney 1994 p.21 Table 13

¹³ Jeffri, J. et al *The Artists' Training and Career Project: Painters*, The Research Centre for Arts and Culture, Colum-

bia University, New York 1991 p.11

¹⁴ Singer, L. 'The utility of art versus fair bets in the investment market' *Journal of Cultural Economics* 14,2 pp.1-14

¹⁵ *But what do you do for a living?* Section 9, Table 27 Artists' Incomes by Gender p.46

¹⁶ Ingram, T. 'Obsession with Rarities: Bidding keen for early Papunya boards' *Art and Australia* 36,2 December 1998 p.251

¹⁷ McCulloch, S. *Contemporary Aboriginal Art*, Crows Nest NSW 2001, p.219

Globalization and the Visual Arts

Olav Velthuis

University of Konstanz (Germany)

Globalization in the arts, like globalization in other societal domains, is a multifaceted process (cf. Appadurai 1996). In order to understand its effects on careers of artists and on the market for art, I will first of all try to clarify what globalization amounts to in the arts. By making a threefold distinction between a global system of production, distribution, and consumption, I show in this article that globalization in the arts is far from a new phenomenon. Afterwards, I argue that the corroding effect of globalization is easily overestimated.

(1) In a global system of production, producers of art, either individually or embedded in artistic movements, influence each other on a global scale. This may happen by means of physical travel, such as in the Renaissance, when northwestern European artists traveled to Florence and Rome. At the time, globalization was a partially dialogic process, since these traveling artists not only updated themselves about Renaissance inventions such as perspective, but also carried Northern inventions such as oil paint with them to the South. Other global movements in the production of art, however, such as the adaptation of primitive motives and symbols in modern art of the early twentieth century, were one-way processes rather than mutual artistic exchanges.

The initial incentive for globalization in the production of art need not be artistic. For instance, in the 16th and 17th century, artists engaged in border-crossing activities for economic reasons. They traveled to where the money was and where a reputation could be made. Thus some of them found employment at courts all over Europe. In the 1930s many European artists moved to the United States for political reasons. They influenced American artists of those days and guaranteed the development of abstract, modern art on the American continent. In the end they did not gain a foothold in the new art scene that emerged in New York after the Second World War, and that was dominated by American abstract expressionist painters such as Jackson Pollock or Barnett Newman (Guilbaut 1983).

(2) A global system of distribution is a system in which art is distributed on a global scale. This can take place in two different forms: either global parties such as auction houses and art dealers have regional offices which take care of the distribution of art in different parts of the world, or artworks are transported to global centers of distribution. An example of the former is the French dealership of Goupil, which had agencies in Paris, New York, London and The Hague in the late nine-

teenth century (Rewald 1986). An example of the latter is the present situation on the auction market. Three auction houses dominate the global auction market: Christie's, Sotheby's and the newcomer Phillips, de Pury & Luxembourg. If anywhere in the world an artwork is offered for sale which is considered to be a masterpiece and is expected to sell for a record price, the auction houses will try to induce the seller to sell it with them. If they succeed, the artwork may travel to regional offices in order to interest potential buyers, after which it will be sold in the main office of the auction house. In all three cases, this office is located in New York.

(3) Globalization in consumption means that the art that is consumed in one region is not confined to or does not even include art that is made in that region. Examples are American industrial tycoons like Frick or oil barons like Getty who bought Dutch 17th century masters and French impressionist art and were hardly interested in the American artists of their time. With a normative twist, the art critic and painter John Ruskin evens urged his fellow countrymen to buy Italian artworks in order to rescue them from the deterioration that they would suffer in the land of origin (Ruskin 1904). Patterns in global consumption of art are likely to be matched by patterns in the distribution of art, but not necessarily so. For instance, in spite of the fact that Germany is a leading country when it comes to modern and contemporary art collecting, and has been represented in internationally renowned art movements of the recent past, auction houses play a minor role in the German art market.

In short, globalization in the arts is a complex, multifaceted, and certainly not a new phenomenon. The question is how globalization at the beginning of the 21st century can be characterized and set apart from globalization in the past. Let me focus here on the one feature of globalization that some consider to be detrimental or corrosive with respect to art and artists (Hughes 1990; Watson 1992): the global art market as it is dominated by the auction houses. Supposedly, these auction houses monopolize the art world, inhibit the careers of artists around the world, and affect the quality of contemporary art. I claim, however, that their strength and their contaminating effect are easily overestimated, due to the large amount of media attention which auction sales and auction prices receive. Let me give a number of different arguments to support this claim.

First of all, auction houses hardly have the ability to make or break reputations of artists. The art world of the late nineteenth century, as Harrison and Cynthia White have argued, was by and large a dealer-critic system: art dealers and art critics were decisive in the construction of the value of artworks. In early twentieth century Paris, auctions were influential in the careers of artists (Gee 1981); Deirdre Robson argues, however, that by the time that the center of the art world moved from Paris to New York, auction houses were no longer part of the support system (Robson 1995). Arguably that has been changing recently, but it is too early for definite conclusions about that development.

The structural reason for the inability of auctions to make careers is that they operate on the secondary rather than the primary market: they are only involved in the resale of artworks, and never in the first sale. In fact, only a small percentage of artworks that are created by contemporary artists will ever appear at auction at all since there is no resale market for their work. In spite of that, local art markets flourish all over the world without any interference of auction houses whatsoever (see e.g. Plattner 1996). This means that the most important selections have already been made by the time an artwork arrives at auction. For instance, art dealers who are active on the primary market decide which artists can sell their work in the first place. They make these decisions about who to represent in their galleries by and large on the basis of recommendations of other artists and cultural experts (see Moulin 1992). In short, auction houses do not make a market, but merely respond to it.

That is not to deny that auction results or sales of artworks at a small number of powerful dealers does influence the reputation of artists; nevertheless, in the complex support system of the contemporary global art world, which includes art critics, museums, independent curators, biennial exhibitions in cities all over the world, as well as many other institutions, auctions and dealers constitute only one voice among many others. To put it even more strongly, given the many institutional changes in the art world in the last century and a half, it is conceivable that the current position of auction houses will weaken in the near future.

Secondly, although auction houses seem to be a marketing channel of rich, powerful collectors, influential art dealers, and a small number of celebrity artists, in fact only a minor part of auction sales involves artworks that circulate in such circuits. The majority of artworks that are traded are low-priced artworks of what is considered to be mediocre quality, made by artists with a reputation that is far from solid (see table).

Price range of artworks sold at auctions, world wide (2001)

Price (in €)	% of total sales
Less than 1 000	49,37%
1 000 to 10 000	39,08%
10 000 to 100 000	10,03%
100 000 to 1 000 000	1,40%
More than 1 000 000	0,12%

Source: newsletter artprice.com (ADEC), June 2002.

Thirdly, it needs to be granted that auctions houses are considered influential and auction prices trustworthy by members of the art world, since they are the only places where supply and demand of artworks meet directly. Nevertheless, in my dissertation research on the market for contemporary art in Amsterdam and New York, I found that members of the art world simultaneously consider auction houses to be the parasites of the art market, eager to make a quick profit from the development of an artist's career. Art dealers, by contrast, see themselves as patrons who have an emotional and financial interest in the long-term promotion of the artists they represent. In that capacity the "promoters" seek and mostly manage to protect themselves against the aggressive market practices of the "parasites." For instance, many art dealers discourage the collectors they sell art to from reselling these works at auction, either by means of gentleman's agreements or by means of legal stipulations (Velthuis 2002a).

Fear of the contaminating effects of globalization in the arts is a contemporary manifestation of what Viviana Zelizer has called "hostile worlds" type of reasoning (Zelizer 2000; Velthuis 2002b): the implicit idea is that the market is ever expanding and, in doing so, corrodes the quality of life in an increasing number of societal domains. In my dissertation, I argued that this type of reasoning largely informs the perspective of the humanities on markets for art. The empirical basis for these contaminating effects is yet to be given, however. In fact, I found that art dealers have a rich repertoire of market practices at their disposal to protect artists and artworks against the allegedly corrosive effects of commercial exchange. That is not to deny that structural poverty may exist among contemporary artists, but the causes of this poverty are manifold and are hardly related to globalization (see Abbing 2002). In fact, to blame auction houses and other global players in the art market, would be to give them too much credit.

References

- Abbing, Hans (2002), *Why Are Artists Poor?*, Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Appadurai, Arjun (1996), *Modernity at Large*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Gee, Malcolm (1981), *Dealers, Critics, and Collectors of Modern Painting. Aspects of the Parisian Art Market Between 1910 and 1930*, New York: Garland Publishing.
- Guilbaut, Serge (1983), *How New York Stole the Idea of Modern Art. Abstract Expressionism, Freedom, and the Cold War*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hughes, Robert (1990), *Nothing If Not Critical. Selected Essays on Art and Artists*, London: Collins Harvill.
- Moulin, Raymonde (1992), *L'artiste, l'institution et le marché*, Paris: Flammarion.
- Plattner, Stuart (1996), *High Art Down Home. An Economic Ethnography of a Local Art Market*, Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Rewald, John (1986), *Studies in Post-Impressionism*, New York: Harry N. Abrams.
- Robson, A. Deirdre (1995), *Prestige, Profit, and Pleasure. The Market for Modern Art in New York in the 1940s and 1950s*, New York: Garland Publishing.
- Ruskin, John (1904), *A Joy For Ever*, London: George

Allen.

Velthuis, Olav (2002a), "Promoters and Parasites. An Alternative Explanation for Price Dispersion on the Art Market," paper presented at the ICARE Workshop on Art Auctions.

Velthuis, Olav (2002b), *Talking Prices. Contemporary*

Art, Commercial Galleries, and the Construction of Value, unpublished dissertation, Erasmus University Rotterdam.

Watson, Peter (1992), *From Manet to Manhattan*, New York: Random House.

Zelizer, Viviana A. (2000), "The Purchase of Intimacy," *Law & Social Inquiry*, 25 (3), p. 817-848.

Books of Note

Richard A. Peterson, Vanderbilt University

Thompson, Emily A. *The Soundscape of Modernity: Architectural Acoustics and the Culture of Listening in America 1900-1933*. Cambridge: MIT Press. Thompson shows that a major project of American society in the first half of the 20th century was to break the link between time and space exemplified in Einstein's theory of relativity. At the beginning of the century, she shows, halls large and small were engineered to deliver the cleanest possible "natural sound," but by 1933 with the building of Radio City Music Hall, engineers were constructing halls that absorbed as much sound as possible with the properly balanced volume and quality of sound desired fed to the hall through disguised loud speakers.

Washington, Robert E. *The Ideologies of African American literature: From the Harlem Renaissance to the Black Nationalist Revolt*. Blue Ridge Summit, PA: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers. Washington challenges the widely-held assumption that African American literature reflects black American social consciousness. In his sociological analysis, he shows instead the primitivism of the Harlem Renaissance, the naturalistic protest of the Depression years, the existentialist school of the Cold War era, the moral suasion of the civil rights years, and the cultural naturalist school of the late 1960s.

Altheide, David L. *Creating Fear: News and the Construction of Crisis*. Aldine de Gruyter. Hello Mr. Rehnquist! Altheide tracks the changing use of the word "fear" since the 1980s showing that now there is an expectation that danger and risk lurk everywhere. Case studies show how certain organizations and social institutions benefit from such fear construction.

Moaddel, Mansour. *Jordanian Exceptionalism: An Analysis of State-Religion Relationship in Egypt, Iran, Jordan, Syria*. Palgrave. The Islamic movement in Jordan, Moaddel shows, has been non-violent and defended the state against the radical ideologues. This is because early on the Brotherhood formed a Political Party dedicated to working within the system, thus giving moderate Islamists a voice they have not had in Egypt, Iran, and Syria.

Cook, Daniel Thomas, editor. *Symbolic Childhood*. New York, Peter Lang. Premised on the idea that childhood is a social construct, the twelve chapters explore the ideas of gender difference, sexuality, gifted children, school shootings, videogames, cartoons, adoption, street children, feral children, and the heterosexualization of boyhood.

Vianna, Hermano, edited and translated by John Charles Chasteen. *Samba: Popular Music and National Identity in Brazil. Hermano Vianna*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press. The Samba, once a reviled music of the favelas suppressed by the police, over the 20th century became virtually the national anthem of Brazil. Vianna shows that Samba began as one of many musics and that its authenticity as the heartbeat of Brazil was fabricated as part of the nation-building project.

Bauman, Zygmunt. *Society under Siege*. London: Polity. The nation state, Bauman observes is losing sovereignty and power, but these are not being institutionalized in a new space, which has dire consequences for civilization.

Willis, Paul. *Ethnographic Imagination*. London: Polity. Drawing numerous examples from his own work, Willis shows that ethnographic practice and imagination are essential to understanding contemporary society and culture.

Wellman, Barry and Caroline Haythornthwaite, editors. *The Internet in Everyday Life*. Malden, MA: Blackwell. The authors show the many ways that the internet has become integral to the social lives of millions.

Gendron, Bernard. *Between Montmartre and the Mudd Club*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. While we often see New York of the 1970s as the site of the first welding of fine art and pop music sensibilities, Gendron, in a comparative study of the two movements, convincingly shows that this flowering was preceded by the art and pop of Montmartre a century earlier.

Janssen, S., M. Halbertsma, T. Ijdens and K. Ernst, editors. *Trends and Strategies in the Arts and Cultural Industries*. Rotterdam: Erasmus University and Barjesteh van Waalwijk van Doorn. The thirty chapters presented here report research on topics ranging from the funding of dance companies, the value of avant-garde music and the global music industry in the digital environment to the market for bootleg tapes.

Gebesmair, Andreas and Alfred Smudits, editors. *Global Repertoires: Popular music within and beyond the transnational industry*. Aldershot, England: Ashgate. In twelve chapters ranging from "Globalization and Localization of Music in the Production Perspective" to "Popular Music in Ex-Yugoslavia be-

tween Global Participation and Provincial Seclusion,” the authors probe the interplay between globalizing and localizing influences in contemporary popular music.

Bennett, Andy and Kevin Dawe, editors. Guitar Cultures. Oxford: Berg. The ten chapters focus on blues, rock, and Spanish guitars as social instruments and as icons of desire.

Tierney, William G. Academic Outlaws: Queer Theory and Cultural Studies in the Academy. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. Queer theory is presented as a political agenda rooted in changing the definition of the situation used in analyzing the academic enterprise.

Forman, Murray. The ‘Hood Comes First: Race, Space and Place in Rap and Hip-Hop. Middleton, CT: Wesleyan University Press. MTV once proudly claimed “One music, one world,” but, as Forman shows in elegant detail, hip-hop music has been explicitly rooted in the particular experiences of specific peoples in specific places (be they in Frankfurt or the South Bronx) - a characteristic that mirrors that of all kinds of music in its vital phases.

Bjorn, Lars with Jim Gallert. Before Motown: A History of Jazz in Detroit 1920-1960. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press. A masterful case in point.

Malone, Bill C. Don’t Get Above Your Raisin’: Country Music and the Southern Working Class. Urbana: University of Illinois Press. And another.

Kellner, Douglas. Grand Theft: Media Spectacle and a Stolen Election. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers. Kellner reviews the events following the 2000 presidential election and finds the media to be culpable in the theft of the presidency.

New from Berg, check ‘em out

Attfield, Judy, Wild Things: The Material Culture of Everyday Life. People buy items that express who they are, Attfield argues, “things with attitude.” In this context, authenticity is relativised as material culture moves from meanings embodied in functional objects to disembodied meanings given to objects.

Miller, Daniel, editor. Car Cultures. If you didn’t believe the Wild Things argument, the articles here about road rage in LA and the emergence of Black identity, to the struggles of cab and truck drivers to keep vehicles alive where there are no new parts, may give you a clue.

Edwards, Elizabeth, Raw Histories: Photographs, Anthropology and Museums. Drawing on a variety of examples from the Pacific island peoples, the book shows that the close reading of photographs reveals not only Western agendas, but suggests a wide range of alternative viewpoints.

Sutton, David, Remembrance of Repasts: An Anthropology of Food and Memory. Beginning with the claims of Aegean islanders to remember meals long past – both humble and spectacular—Sutton moves to U.S. and U.K. data to show the central place of food in memory and identity.

Daunton, Martin J. and Matthew Hinton, editors. The Politics of Consumption: Material Culture and Citizenship in Europe and America. From medieval sumptuary laws to recent debates about consumer protection, authorities, religious groups, and health food advocates have struggled to enforce their views of the links between status and taste.

Hendry, Joy. The Orient Strikes Back: A Global View of Cultural Display. A century ago faux Japanese villages were built in Western Worlds’ Fairs, but now, Hendry asserts, this has been turned around. In numerous theme parks Japanese citizens can see a range of Western countries without ever leaving their country, posing a challenge to Western notions of leisure, education, entertainment, and central cultural values.

Reid, Susan E. and David Crowley, editors. Style and Socialism: Modernism and Material Culture in Post-War Eastern Europe. The authors show the diverse ways that people living behind the Iron Curtain appropriated and reinterpreted the objects on offer as a way of resisting official Soviet culture.

Borden, Iain, Skateboarding, Space and the City: Architecture and the Body. Borden discusses the history of skateboarding and shows how skateboarders experience and understand the city through their sport.

Washabaugh, William, Deep Trout: Angling in Popular Culture. The angler’s ability to “commune with Nature” using high tech devices is explored as a paradigm of the contradictions inherent in contemporary values.

Williams, Jack, Cricket and Race. You have seen “Lagaan,” now here’s a chance to see that racism in the sport was not confined to 18th century provincial India but is at the heart of British sports identity to this day.

Cesarani, David and John Milfull, editors. The Portable Jerusalem: The Culture and Politics of the Jewish Diaspora. The authors show the ability of Jewish communities move and to thrive over centuries and ask whether the diaspora or the state of Israel represents the spiritual home of Judaism. They explore the different experiences of Jewish communities around the world.

McVeigh, Brian J., Wearing Ideology: State, Schooling and Self-Presentation in Japan. Uniforms (and uniform-like clothing styles) have served the Japanese state as a means of controlling progress through the life cycle and maintaining the economic and political status quo. Likewise “anti-uniforming” is a recurrent form of resistance to the state projects.

Five from Routledge

Horowitz, Roger, editor. Boys and Their Toys: Masculinity, Class and Technology in America. The authors suggest that masculinity is constructed not through men’s relations with each other but in the things they make for their enjoyment.

Scranton, Philip, editor. Beauty and Business: Commerce, Gender and Culture in Modern America. Ditto women.

Nakamura, Lisa. Cybertypes: Race, Ethnicity, and Identity on the Internet. Nakamura shows what happened to race when it went online, and how our ideas about race continue to be reshaped every time we log on. It is there, Internet advertising to e-mail jokes.

Belasco, Warren and Philip Scranton, editors. Food Nations: Selling Taste in Consumer Societies. Rather than viewing regional foods as nostalgic curiosities, the authors examine the role of food and food marketing in constructing consumer behavior and national identity.

Counihan. Carole, editor. Food in the USA: A Reader. From the invention of the Thanksgiving dinner and the dangers of the meatpacking industry to soul food and anorexia, this anthology presents a view of how and why Americans are what they eat.

Four from Temple

Starr, Jerold. Air Wars: The Fight to Reclaim Public Broadcasting. Starr tells how a grassroots movement of citizens concerned about Pittsburgh public radio station WQED was

able to overcome enormous institutional influence in its quest for public accountability.

Maira, Sunaine. Desis in the House: Indian American Youth Culture in New York City. Focusing on how New York's teen community blend bhangra and techno beats on the dance floor to bridge ethnic authenticity and American cool.

Ono, Kent O. and John M. Sloop. Shifting Borders: Rhetoric, Imagination, and California's Proposition 187. The authors provide a lucid introduction to the techniques of analyzing the spoken and written word that constitutes political debate in the contemporary United States by interrogating the mainstream debate about Proposition 187 and bringing to the fore voices that are often left out of the media discussion.

Gracyk, Theodore. I Wanna Be Me: Rock Music and the Politics of Identity. Gracyk asserts that rock contributes to our cultural capital, because as an art form that proclaims its emotional authenticity and resistance to convention, rock music constitutes part of the cultural apparatus from which individuals mold personal and political identities. A philosopher gets the message!

Announcements and Reminders

Yale and Cultural Sociology

We are proud to announce the formation of a new Center for Cultural Sociology at Yale University. The Center seeks to crystallize the current opening of sociological theory and research to the methods and theories of the other human sciences. Through ongoing colloquia, workshops, and conferences, the center will develop and publicize an interpretive approach to the various social domains. We aim also to provide a welcoming interactive and personal site for cultural sociologists from both the U.S. and abroad. We will provide a website and a listserv and we will also offer visiting fellowships (without funds but with facilities) to colleagues who wish to take their sabbaticals at the CCS.

Jeffrey C. Alexander, Director CCS

Philip Smith, Associate Director CCS

Isaac Reed, Coordinator CCS

The Cultural Turn at UCSB: Instituting and Institutions

Santa Barbara, California—March 7th and 8th, 2003

Co-organized by Roger Friedland and John Mohr, with the support of the Deans of the Social Sciences and the Humanities.

This year the Cultural Turn conference at UC Santa Barbara will explore the theme of institutions and instituting. The biennial conferences are organized under the auspices of the Department of Sociology to explore the shared and contested, and yet still largely unexplored, intellectual zone between the social sciences and the humanities. These conferences are premised on the assumption that a cultural sociology requires a serious re-engagement with the humanities.

Institutions are taken-for-granted and valued ways of acting, making, understanding, organizing, seeing, expressing and living. The institution is an attractive theoretical class of objects for it lies below the social totality and above individuals, groups and organizations. So, too, it demands the conjunction of explanatory and interpretive modalities as it is necessarily a meaningful structure and a material practice, both signifying and materially produced and productive. Intellectual traditions as diverse as deconstruction and the neo-institutionalisms of organizational theory question whether the fact of institution can be derived entirely from individual reason or experience, from collective rationality or market competition. Forms of discourse, regimes of representation, patterns of social interaction, organizational structures, modalities of war, love-making and material practices of all sorts can be institutions. How do we variously construe this theoretical object in different domains and different levels of analysis?

If we have made some progress in the description of institutions, we are still rather backward in our ability to account for instituting, for the formation and transformation of institutions, of their placement and displacement. How, for example, do we approach the heightened authority of the market or religion, and its expansion into domains of activity from which they were once excluded? An institutional theory ultimately requires a theory of instituting, of its failure and its success, and de-instituting and re-instituting, of the transformation of institutional forms, and hence the architecture of the social order. It is these themes, we hope, that will occupy this, the fourth, Cultural Turn conference at UCSB. This year's invitees include: John Searle, JoAnne Yates, Giorgio Agamben, Loic Wacquant, Harrison White, Ann Swidler, Trevor Pinch, Charles Bazerman and others besides.

Please email ct4@soc.ucsb.edu to make a reservation. If you would like to present a short paper in the roundtable session, please send the title and be prepared to send it by February 1, 2003. These papers will be posted on our web page. Conference registration costs \$20. Make checks payable to: UC Regents. Send to: The Cultural Turn, Department of Sociology, University of California, Santa Barbara, CA 93106-9430

ASA 2003--Culture Section Sessions and Organizers

Note: This is a more recent listing than the one included in the ASA's printed "Call for Papers"

Roger Friedland, "When God Says No: Religion Against the State," Open submission. Contact information: Department of Religious Studies, University of California - Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara, CA 93106-3130. Email: roger.friedland@verizon.net

John R. Hall, "Culture in Extremis: Historical and Comparative Studies," Open submission. Contact information: Center for History, Society, and Culture, 2233 Social Science/Humanities Building, University of California - Davis, One Shields Ave., Davis, CA 95616. Email: jrhall@ucdavis.edu

James M. Jasper and Francesca Athene Polletta, "Politics, Strategy, and Culture," Open submission. Contact information: James M. Jasper, 346 West 15th St. New York, NY 10011-5939. Email- jmjasper@juno.com and Francesca Athene Polletta, Department of Sociology, Columbia University, 510 Fayerweather Hall, 1180 Amsterdam Avenue, New York, New York 10027. Email: fap8@columbia.edu

Andrew J. Perrin, "Modes of Cultural Inquiry into Crisis and Transition," Open submission. Contact Information: Department of Sociology, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, 269 Hamilton Hall, Chapel Hill, NC 27599-3210. Email: andrew_perrin@unc.edu

Magali Sarfatti Larson, "The Legitimacy of Institutions: Is It in Crisis or, Do We Still Believe the Reigning Tales?" Open submission. Contact information: 511 Woodland Terrace, Philadelphia PA. 19104. Email: magalisl@temple.edu

Call for Nominations—Section Awards (Deadline for nominations: March 1, 2003)

Best Book: The section seeks nominations of books published in the past two years (2001 - 2003) for the 2003 "Best Book Award." Section members, authors, or publishers may nominate books. Send nominating letters including a description of the book and its significance to the three members of the Best Book Award committee; nominators should ask publishers to send three copies of the books. The award will be announced at the Section Business meeting at the 2003 ASA Annual meeting (winner will be notified in advance). Send materials to: Wendy Griswold (chair), Department of Sociology, Northwestern University, 1810 Chicago Ave., Evanston, IL 60208; w-griswold@northwestern.edu; Jon Cruz, 963 West Campus Lane, Goleta, CA 93117; cruz@mail.lsit.ucsb.edu; Mark A. Schneider, Department of Sociology MC 4524, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale IL 62901; masch@siu.edu

Best Article: Works published in 2000, 2001, and 2002 are eligible for the Best Article Award. Authors can submit their own work or nominations may be made by others. The award will be announced at the Section Business meeting at the 2003 ASA Annual meeting (winner will be notified in advance). Send three copies of the article to committee chair, Tim Dowd, Department of Sociology, Emory University, Tarbuton Hall, Atlanta, GA 30322; 404-727-6259; email: tdowd@emory.edu.

Best Student Paper: Any work (published or unpublished but not previously submitted for the student prize) by someone who is a student at the time of the submission is eligible for the Best Student Paper Award. Authors can submit their own work or nominations can be made by others. This award includes a \$300 prize to reimburse part of the cost of attending the 2003 ASA Annual meeting. Send three copies of the paper to committee chair, Noah Mark, Department of Sociology, Bldg 120, Room 160, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305; 650-725-0052; email: nmark@leland.stanford.edu.

Symbolic Boundaries Network Online Conference, 2/10 - 2/14/03

Following the ideas generated during at the Symbolic Boundaries Network roundtable discussion at the ASA meetings this year, I am pleased to announce that the first Symbolic Boundaries Online Conference will be held the second week of February (2/10 - 2/14/03). It is not necessary to do anything to prepare or register. Just save some room for us on your calendars. We hope to have some rewarding exchanges on the nuts and bolts of working with symbolic boundaries. You may also want to post or update your biographical information on the members directory at <http://symbolicboundaries.net>. (Remember, it's dot-net, for NETwork.)

We're already off to a great start on this project. We have an exciting list of contributors who have agreed to help us launch the conference on the morning of Monday, February 10 with short statements designed to spark conversation. All Culture section members will then be invited to respond on the website. Drop me a line if you'd like to contribute a few lines to the initial conference pages, or if you'd like to join the network.

Bethany Bryson (bryson@virginia.edu)

Remember to **renew your membership to the Section**. You can renew online: <http://www.asanet.org>.