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Introduction
This bibliography curates scholarship around understandings people identify as knowledges – their production and legitimating institutions and their experiences and embodiments, with emphasis on those excluded from the canonizations of knowledge. This knowledge cultural sociology (KCS) recognizes the importance of the Mannheimian tradition, and its extensions, that explain how social relations and positions shape the articulations and validations of knowledge. However, KCS also situates knowledge within systems beyond those who produce and consume it. KCS views knowledge as itself necessarily contested, as struggles over its qualities reflect social locations and articulate social practices. KCS works to understand how knowledges’ symbols, schemas, institutions, and networks shape the terms of social reproduction and transformations; as such, it demands consideration of different kinds of knowledge cultural products and modes of communication. KCS is thus necessarily grounded in the question of what constitutes knowledge, and for whom and with what interests and expectations. This KCS intervention focuses on 21st century work. This decision aims to engage scholarship that extends and challenges a 20th century canon; including works from the prior century signals scholarship yearning for expansion. The bibliography is not comprehensive, though it marks how knowledge is valued and ignored. To focus on this century and move beyond sociology allows engagement with ways of knowing and being that sociology has historically minoritized, moving consideration to structures and processes validating some kinds of knowledge over others. KCS is not canonization, but work towards liberation – a knowledge activism mobilizing knowledge in consequential public ways alongside more familiar scholarly ambitions. KCS seeks to move scholarship beyond familiar networks and self-reproducing knowledge hierarchies grounded in race, gender, sexuality, religion and world region. It seeks to
move dialogue beyond familiar self-referential walls and to identify new and ignored ideas, meanings, references and authorities for constituting knowledges of consequence, reframing contests along the way. For example, instead of asking how excellence and diversity can be combined in knowledge production, KCS asks instead what anti-racist knowledge excellence looks like. Given the politics of epistemology, accounts of epistemology ought to foreground the contexts and power relations in which those sensibilities are formed and communicated; thus, the references below move generally from concept to context. Likewise, sections moving toward global, post-socialist and post-colonial discussions inform ontologies and epistemologies organizing scholarly work and public consequence. But this begins with what might be identified, in this entry at least, as the greatest hits of KCS.

**Greatest Hits**

This KCS greatest hits introduces themes elaborated on throughout later sections. To move knowledge beyond the academy’s walls, this section offers access to this knowledge project for those without access to the full edition, due either to their own membership fee or their institutional affiliation. KCS asks, what shapes knowledge production? Rodríguez-Muñiz 2015 reveals the ontological myopia in scholarship on the poor. Rodríguez-Muñiz provides an analytical, “cultural diagnostics” approach to knowledge production, useful to KCS scholars in reflecting on inherited limitations in disciplinary knowledge production. Like Rodríguez-Muñiz, Turnbull 2003 challenges sociology’s modern epistemological frameworks. Turnbull shows that sociologists impose a universalizing framework in the search for rationality, rather than analyzing a heterogeneous and dynamic social world. They then offer alternative epistemologies decentering rationality to understand the unpredictability of social worlds. Part of Turnbull’s arational heterogeneous social assemblage is the social situatedness of knowledge. The bibliography asks, how is knowledge situated in culture and identity? Wolfe 2016 provides a contextualized history of race as a concept, linking it to its colonial roots as a political project of exploitation. Snorton 2017 builds on this history, illuminating in their racial history of transness how subaltern identities intersect and coarticulate over time to shape current normativities. KCS is committed to understanding how knowledges relate to power. The bibliography throughout explores how power operates in solidifying hegemonic discourses. Fraser 2015 aims to understand how hegemonies and counter-hegemonies are utilized in the struggle for legitimation of advanced capitalism. KCS is always cognizant of the political stakes of knowledge. In Fraser’s piece, they trace how hegemonic discourses constrain the perception of agency within the system. Knowledge regimes have been used to oppress and silence, and knowledge cultures serve as meaningful sites of resistance to hegemonic discourses. This bibliography inquires, how can KCS provide a lens towards social transformation rather than stopping at diagnosis? Nelson 2002, after revealing the white heteronormativity implicit in the “raceless/genderless” world of digital technology, offers a collection of Afrofuturist works reimagining the present, turning the social order on its head. Chari and Verdery 2009 also challenges conventional world distinctions, moving the engagement of a post-Cold War world that joins post-colonial and post-socialist studies. Taken together, these works preview the critical and reflexive diagnostic work of understanding how knowledge is constituted, its situatedness, and both its hegemonic power through institutions and its potentially transformative role in resistance and creations of better futures.

Proposing to liberate each “post” from their respective regional foci, the authors propose a post-Cold War approach to knowledge production. They juxtapose “native” knowledge authorities from post-colonial and post-socialist traditions to recognize the knowledge cultural power of the West’s “privatization,” “marketization,” and “democratization” in their ethnographic present. They invite ethnographers to apprehend traces of the past as they emerge as signs of the tenuous re-workings of empires and their successors.


Fraser refines Habermas’s 1970s argument on Legitimation Crisis by noting both the abiding, and transforming, legitimation crisis of advanced capitalism as a condition wherein public opinion is cast against a system that is not delivering. Fraser elaborates on how hegemonies and counter-hegemonies work in that contest, around suppositions on the subject positions and capacities for agency available to social actors and the structure and operation of the reigning social order.


With this introduction to a special issue of *Social Text*, Nelson marks the assumptions of digital technology’s raceless/genderless fiction. Nelson argues for an understanding on how multiplicity works to deflect and buttress structures of power, and turn oppressive binaries on their head. Finding forms of Black diasporic creation threatening Western knowledge monopolies, the author sets the stage for what has become a major movement of imagining alternative futures.


Rodríguez-Muñiz develops a cultural diagnostics approach to explore the “inherited cultural infrastructures” shaping knowledge production around poverty. They find a kind of “ontological myopia” that limits study of the poor and their lifeworlds, rather than one that could find a more relational and comprehensive approach. More than an analysis of a particular field, this account enhances the discipline’s capacity for more reflexive and cultural work.


Snorton’s narrative of transness and blackness renews the history of transness, often beginning in the middle twentieth century. Snorton interrogates how gender is understood as mutable, and traces how slavery and the production of racialized gender enabled this understanding. Using various archive materials from the mid-nineteenth century to present-day violences, Snorton reconstructs the theoretical and historical trajectories of blackness and traness, showing how the negation of blackness makes transnormativity possible.

In decentering rationality in our modern epistemological framework, sociologists open up the potential of analyzing the messiness of life: that is, the unpredictability and arationality of human action. Turnbull introduces epistemologies alternate to the technoscientific way of thinking that are centered in modernity, to argue for a sociology of knowledge that is locally situated and acknowledged as a heterogeneous social assemblage rather than a coherent, universalizing framework.


Wolfe provides a historically- and contextually-grounded conceptualization of race that improves analyses of neocolonialism. Wolfe’s framework and approach unpacks how race remains a relevant construct bound in exploitation, despite its changing and different meanings throughout history. The articulation of race at once critiques resurgent claims of racial biological essentialism and provides a pathway for understanding how race can be used to continue to exploit.

**Epistemology**

As sociologists studying and producing knowledge, one must explore different modes of thought about what constitutes knowledge, and who holds (or can hold) such knowledge. This collection on “epistemology,” or the theory of knowledge, helps to challenge notions of knowledge as universal or held in institutional power: first through understanding knowledge as socially situated, next by challenging dominant notions of knowledge and gatekeeping, and finally by showcasing alternative, subaltern, and pluralistic epistemologies that acknowledge the limitations of knowledge being defined by those in power. Camic, et al. 2011 and Espeland 1998 offer accounts of how social knowledge is situated within one’s own socially conditioned sense of belonging, culture and identity. Reed 2011 provides three broad epistemological frameworks through which the relationship between the scholar and scholarship can be understood. Then Meadow 2018 challenges the notions of who “knows” gender by centering the experience of trans kids navigating gatekeeping institutions. Mueller 2017 and Zuberi and Bonilla-Silva 2008 challenge the white dominant modes of knowledge production in social situations and in academic contexts, respectively. Leahey 2005 demonstrates how prestige can impact perceptions of what is accepted practice in the academy, and by extension, what constitutes knowledge. Following these limitations on dominant epistemologies are texts that offer possibility and transformation in extant understandings of what knowledge is and who arbitrates what counts. Lizardo 2007 examines the importance of implicit knowledge in cultural forms; Ferguson 2003 offers a queer of color critique as an epistemological framework to challenge existing regimes of knowledge production; and Compton, et al. 2018 introduces a queer lens of knowledge production to sociology.

A critical collection moving a Mannheimian sociology of knowledge toward an approach that both describes and analyzes “the actions, behaviors, subjective states and capacities of human beings and/or about the properties and processes of the aggregate or collective units – the groups, networks, markets, organizations and so on – where these human agents are situated.”


Applying a queer lens on knowledge production in U.S. sociology, the volume explores how queering methods pushes scholars to think about the anti-normative and deconstructionist challenges posed to positivist sociological epistemology. Compton, Meadow, and Schilt bring empirical data to questions on analyses of gender and sexual formations. In doing so, they reveal how queer methods illuminate the hidden workings of power and normativity around racialized gender and sexual categories.


Espeland explores rationality and identity when studying federal agencies attempting to build a dam on the Yavapai people’s ancestral home. Espeland highlights shortcomings in claims of universal rationality by showing how different schemas of rationality operate through one’s own culture and identity. Espeland reveals how the ideology of rationality exists within ongoing processes of power and colonization – not outside them – thus challenging the role that rationality plays in democratic practice.


Ferguson posits queer of color critique (QOCC) as an epistemology challenging the idea of the liberal nation-state and capital as sites of resolution. Culture, within the liberal capitalist economic and social formations genealogy, is the site of non-normative gender and sexual formations. Because liberal ideology occludes the intersecting salience of race, gender, sexuality, and class in forming social practices, QOCC focuses on materiality while refusing ideologies of transparency and reflection.


Leahey traces how standards of statistical significance testing in quantitative sociology developed, spread, and normalized in the twentieth century. Processes of both suitability and contagion grew the general usage of significance testing. Leahey finds that the institutional impact of prestigious departments, graduate training, and editorships shaped the usage of the .05 alpha level. Institutional forces worked to shape normalized knowledge production practices within a field.

Lizardo offers a new linguistic vocabulary that helps one to recognize the importance of knowledge and culture’s implicit forms, where the modality of “how” complements the more symbolically and linguistically accessible declarative mode evident in public culture. Skill acquisition in personal culture is the most obvious expression of this non-declarative form, but it might also be apparent in forms of common sense or doxa.

In the tradition of critical gender theory, Meadow investigates how familial guardians and youth navigate the process of realizing, affirming, and supporting youth gender nonconformity. Situated in how gender has historically been treated medically and in contemporary discourses on nonbinary and transgender identity, Meadow identifies the key institutions trans kids and families navigate. Meadow’s centering of trans kids and their narratives challenges paternalistic epistemological gatekeeping of who “knows” gender.

Mueller examines the formation and reproduction of racial ideology that facilitates the continuation of institutional mechanisms of discrimination. They identify a conditioned social epistemology of white ignorance that facilitates avoidance to the salience of the color line in the lived experience of white social actors. This ignorance of the advantages white privilege affords, as a direct result of racial discrimination, maintains racialized social systems that systematically disadvantage people of color.

Reed puts forth three epistemic modes for interpreting scholarly orientation. While a normative epistemology recognizes the dialogue between a researcher and that which they are studying, with an interpretative epistemology, the scholar is concerned with making sense of layers of social meaning shaping human experiences. With a desire to ascertain causality, through a realist epistemology, the scholar attempts to connect underlying social realities to social phenomena or outcomes through theory.

Zuberi and Bonilla-Silva edit a collection of essays critiquing those social scientific research methods that treat race as a variable rather than a social construction. In particular, the authors in the collection critique the pervasive white assumptions in this treatment of race, which has been the mainstream, hegemonic methodology within the social sciences. The essays reveal the white logics behind taken-for-granted categorizations that social scientists use to interpret the world.

Sensory Knowledges
As KCS considers how knowledge is contested, it is interested in how knowledges relate to lived experience. In attuning to this subjectivity, how do feelings and sensory experience make knowledge? This section considers attention and perception to be a socialized process, as Friedman 2016 highlights perception as a socially constructed filtering process. They show that sensory processes such as seeing and hearing are key in understanding how the social world is constructed. DeNora 2000 then focuses on music as one such sensory event in and of itself to be perceived, stressing the need to understand the texture of the social world and how music is felt in it. The section then turns to how sensory processes impact group knowledge making. Goodwin 2014 discusses how perception and cognition shapes collaboration, while Star 2014 stresses the tendency to invisibilize such collaborations and interdisciplinary impacts that occur through informal exchanges and interactions. The section is also interested in the sensory as possibility. Pendleton-Jullian and Brown 2016 explores the concept of imagination as embodied perception and cognition, as a way to begin to analyze social imaginations. The section also explores the knowledge that arises from understanding emotions and senses on the body, as Ahmed 2014 explores among queer families, as Browne 2015 explores among Black racialized subjects in a surveillance state, as Chow 2014 explores among postcolonial subjects under the influence of linguistic regimes, and as Matlon 2015 explores among unemployed African men, to name a few.

Ahmed considers the relationship between norms and affects in regards to queer families to understand how emotions work to shape the “surfaces” of individual and collective bodies. Arguing that the contact bodies have with objects shape the body, Ahmed examines how heterosexuality becomes a script binding the familial with the global. Ahmed discusses how bodies are ‘impressed upon’ by the world, and how regulative norms serve to create injuries.

Browne takes blackness as a metaphor and as lived materiality to understand surveillance technologies and practices. Moving through spaces (e.g., the airport, the plan of the Brooks slave ship) and times (e.g., period of transatlantic chattel slavery, post-9/11), Browne pushes scholars to consider how blackness is unperceivable in surveillance studies while being the nonnameable matter structuring the racialized disciplinary society.

Chow theorizes racialization as a linguistic operation in the postcolonial landscape, pushing inquiry into the realm of the personal. They interrogate the moment that Fanon was deemed racialized through a declaration by a stranger; Derrida’s own ambivalence about their own Algerian, “impure” French; and self-reflection of African writers in their use of English. Chow places all of these cases in conjunction with the cultural and food politics of Hong Kong.

DeNora explores the importance of studying music as a social actor rather than a symbol or reflection of society. DeNora develops Adorno’s theories on music’s social power with empirically grounded cases, exploring the relationship between music and consciousness, wherein music is also a means of social management and control. DeNora moves from analyzing the society that produces the music to studying a “musical event.”

Friedman, Asia M. 2016. Perceptual construction: Rereading the social construction of reality through the sociology of the senses. Cultural Sociology, 10(1), 77-92. Friedman puts the sociology of perception in conversation with Berger and Luckman’s social construction of reality. Friedman demonstrates that perception is a key part of how humans socially construct their reality. Perception and cognition interrelate, and perception is a filtering process informed by a perceiver’s cultural norms. The sociology of perception is a subfield that deepens our understanding of the social construction of reality through the mechanisms of its construction.

Goodwin, Charles. 2014. Seeing in depth. In Derry, Sharon J, Schunn, Christian D and Morton Ann Gernsbacher (Eds.), Interdisciplinary collaboration: An emerging cognitive science (pp. 85–122). Mahwah, NJ: Psychology Press. Goodwin explores interdisciplinary collaboration and cognition grounded in their ethnography on a research ship. As different disciplinary sciences set up laboratories onboard, it is a site of physical constraint that produces interdisciplinary collaborations; it is a Foucauldian heterotopia, in which there are several different configurations of perception, action, and spatial organization within the ship that shape research, even as the object of analysis is the sea, located outside the ship.

Matlon, Jordanna. 2015. This is how we roll: The status economy of bus portraiture in the Black urban periphery. Laboratorium: Russian Review of Social Research, 7(2), 62–82. Matlon analyzes how some unemployed Black men in Abidjan in Côte d'Ivoire, Africa use alternate modes of masculinity to situate their belonging to masculinity in the larger Black global diaspora. Many unemployed Abidjanais men identify with the media narratives of Black men who have reached global visibility through sports and music; hypervisible figures of Black diaspora featured in bus portraiture provide an image of Black urbanity that shapes such aspirations.

Pendleton-Jullian, Ann, and John Seely Brown. 2016. Pragmatic imagination: Single from design unbound. Blurb. The authors articulate a framework defining imagination as human cognition moving through perception, reasoning, speculation, and experimentation and free play. The authors discuss types of artistic imagination to identify the cognitive processes underlying these innovations, namely marking deductive, inductive, and/or abductive processes as how information is understood. Their cognitive framing of imagination presents scholars an opportunity to refine their understanding of how humans create knowledge.

Star draws on theories of practice and situated cognition to illuminate the interdisciplinarity of disciplinary standards and categories. They provide an overview of their previous research on research settings to show the interdisciplinary work put towards building a disciplinary infrastructure of knowledge practice and classificatory systems. Star stresses the subsequent way this work becomes invisible through incomplete records of how categories are created.

Embodied Knowledges

Intimately related to the sensory, how is knowledge connected to the body? Sensory and embodied knowledges should not be considered so different, but the ease with which the former can be connected to cognition and its associated emotions, and the latter to bodily experience, and its associated affects, marks the different trajectories of scholarship in this domain. Importantly, as not all senses are shared by all, knowledge must necessarily be embodied in some form, as well as sensed. For example, Stoetzler and Davis 2002 builds on feminist standpoint theory to discuss how knowledge and imagination are embodied in particular subjectivities and lived experiences. Puwar 2004 examines how institutions are normed to particular dominant cultures and standpoints, and how subaltern social actors transgress to bring their full selves into the space. Hurston 2018 offers an ethnography of the last slave who survived the Middle Passage in the U.S., published only recently because of Hurston’s insistence of using Cudjo’s own vernacular to honor them and their embodied knowledge. Surak 2012 explores tea ceremony and tradition as embodied knowledge, emphasizing in exquisite detail the performance of knowledgeability through bodily expression and enactment; Winchester 2016 explores religious practices, such as fasting, as a manner of shaping this knowledge of one’s spirituality, authenticating cognitive belief with experiential confirmation; and Wacquant 2006 develops a sociology from the body, rather than of the body in their ethnography of a Black boxing community in Chicago. In this way, Wacquant transcends unproductive oppositions in knowledge, as that between mind and body, if not also soul; boxing demands both thinking, and not thinking, at the same time.


Hurston’s commitment to Oluale Kossula’s – known as Cudjo Lewis – vernacular prevented this text’s publication. Through interviews with Kossula, who experienced the Middle Passage on the last vessel to carry kidnapped Africans into US slavery 50 years after the slave trade’s “abolishment,” Hurston uplifts a survivor’s voice. The history of this text’s creation, Hurston’s methods, and Kossula’s oral history, lay bare the structures silencing the voices, and lives, of the subaltern.

Puwar, Nirmal. 2004. Space invaders: Race, gender and bodies out of place. New York, NY: Berg. Puwar uses the case of Parliamentary proceedings to reveal mechanisms that mark nonwhite and nonmale bodies as racialized, gendered, and deviant through such markers. Among
Puwar’s explorations are the ways in which positions of authority are normed to whiteness and masculinity, as well as how individual social actors navigate this norming. Finally, Puwar offers us a potential to see nonwhite, nonmale bodies as disruptions to a naturalized white heteropatriarchy.

Stoetzler and Yuval-Davis theorize that the feminist standpoint must consist of a “situated imagination” that can both stretch and transcend the very knowledge and meaning that it constructs. In the process, they offer us a review and social history of feminist standpoint theory, which is an alternate theorization – insistent upon the situatedness and embodiment of knowledge – to the prevailing objectivist and positivist approach to social science.

Surak fuses different approaches – phenomenology, history, and ethnography – to nation-making in an explanation of how the tea ceremony came to express the definitive quality of Japaneseness. Acquiring their own expertise in the tea ceremony represents another kind of embodied knowledge underlying an account of a practice itself rife with contradiction – distinctively Japanese yet universal, dependent on artifacts but transcending the material world, scripted but improvised.

Part of a more general move toward embodied knowledge and arguably one of its leading examples, Wacquant uses their own body as both a “tool of inquiry and vector of knowledge” (viii) while moving a Bourdieusian approach in their ethnography of boxing. This account considers how boxing represents a form of thinking and not thinking simultaneously, where conventional distinctions between body and mind, intention and habitual, are erased.

Fasting transforms the body, but by linking that denial to religious meanings, participants in this process find new realities in religious understanding. Winchester analyses the cultural-cognitive processes by which new moral subjectivities are realized; food, hunger and appetite’s metaphorical associations with soul, sin and virtue come to be fused in distinctive awareness. Metaphor is more than rhetoric here; it is basic to cognition, and its embodiment establishes isomorphic meanings.

Subaltern Knowledges
Recognizing how knowledge cultures have historically displaced the knowledge produced and valued by subaltern subjectivities and communities, these authors theorize through subaltern orientations towards knowledge. Freire 2000 [1968] foundationally considers the role of
educational institutions in maintaining subaltern oppression and posits a liberatory, educational pedagogy that locates itself within a minoritized and dialogic praxis. Pushing against the archive’s neutrality, Singh 2017 presents an approach for decolonizing historiography by analyzing the gendered experiences of women of color in decolonial movements. Collins 2000 and Itzigsohn and Brown 2015 illuminate the importance of racialized subjectivities further: Collins provides an overview of Black feminist thought and canon, while Itzigsohn and Brown resituate theories of self through a phenomenological framework. Taylor 2017 intersects these discourses through oral histories with some of the Combahee River Collective’s (CRC) writers and one of the co-founders of Black Lives Matter to reveal how contemporary liberation philosophies must center global subaltern knowledges and experiences to transform societies. The prophetic statement of needing global solidarity in order to counteract global exploitation led the CRC to first coin the concept “identity politics”. Stryker 2006, Johnson 2001, and Johnson 2015 discuss the importance of centering queer and transgender of color subjectivities and communities because these experiences come at the intersection of racial, gender, and sexual structural oppressions. Johnson 2001 puts forth “quare” studies, as an intervention into queer theory, as attuned to racialized and classed processes within queer theory. Stryker provides an abridged history of the field of transgender studies and its contributions to challenging structural oppression, while Johnson 2015 conducts a discourse analysis to reveal gender studies’ limitations, and propose a transfeminist methodology. Together, the authors present theoretical frameworks and methodologies for scholars to understand the role that knowledge plays in liberation movements, and provide a critique of how knowledge cultures are embedded within ongoing exploitations of historically exploited and displaced communities.


In an overview of Black feminist thought, Collins centers Black women in the knowledge production process as a standpoint of and for Black women; Collins re-establishes the importance of key concepts: outsider-within, intellectual activism, matrix of domination, and controlling images. Woven throughout, Collins challenges white feminist domination in feminist theory, delving into topics of Afro-American womanhood and the role of Black feminist intellectuals and writers within and outside the academy.


Envisioning a liberatory pedagogy, Freire challenges modern forms of education, revealing how education is concerned with indoctrination, not humanistic development. Freire posits an educational model grounded in a practice of freedom and discusses the role of dialogue in liberation. Focusing on pedagogy as a critical analytic, Freire situates knowledge and liberation among the oppressed, not with the oppressors, recognizing the transformative role only the oppressed can play.

The authors theorize the phenomenology of the racialized self, given the Du Boisian color line as a mechanism that cuts through U.S. history. There is a divide in the lived experience of social actors within a racialized social system, theorized by Du Bois as Double Consciousness. Double Consciousness addresses gaps of Herbert, Cooley, and Mead by attending to racialization as a formative process in the phenomenology of the self.


Drawing upon theories of the flesh, Johnson posits “quare” theory as a theory incorporating race and class as categories for analysis in sexuality studies. As a strategy for theorizing racialized sexuality, quare theory “quares” “queer” to enable viewing ways of knowing as discursively mediated and historically situated and materially conditioned. Johnson presents an approach for understanding how LGBTQIA+ people of color come to sexual and racial knowledge.

Johnson, Austin H. 2015. Beyond inclusion: Thinking toward a transfeminist methodology. In Demos, Vasiliki and Marcia Texler Segal (Eds.), *At the center: Feminism, social science and knowledge* (pp. 21–41). Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

In an analysis of sociological studies of transgender communities from 1987 until 2014, Johnson examines how transgender people, and transgender as a concept, are treated within the sociology of gender. Through Johnson’s content analysis, there emerges a need to expand existing feminist methodologies, putting forth a new transfeminist methodology that centers transgender perspectives so as to combat the marginalization of lived transgender experiences within gender studies.


Singh engages the decolonial Ghadr movement’s archive to challenge how scholars have produced a masculinist historiography endorsing colonial gender discourse. Singh creates a decolonial historical memory tracing how gendered colonial discourse implants itself into historiography and gathering the traces of ‘gender,’ of the ‘feminine,’ in the movement. Through their analysis, Singh reveals how the subversive colonial subject is written into history as a masculine heterosexual male, silencing the subaltern.


Stryker provides a history for transgender studies and its intersections with feminist and queer theory. Stryker argues how transgender studies is concerned with anything that denaturalizes, rearticulates, and makes visible the normative linkages between biological specificity, societal gender norms, and bodily form. The field is an investigation of embodied difference, analyzing
how differences, as manifestations of systems of power, are transformed in social hierarchies operating on the body.


Through the Combahee River Collective’s (CRC) intellectual genealogy, Taylor re-situates the CRC’s 1977 Statement with the writers’ and contemporary activists’ oral histories. Taylor notes the Statement first articulated the concept of “identity politics” to explain how oppression on the basis of identity was a source of radicalization and how it asked what one could do to confront oppression. Taylor highlights how Black women’s liberation necessitates a reconstruction of American society.

Publics, Institutions, and Knowledges

Knowledge flows through the public sphere, the archive, and the museum, thereby shaping the politics of “facts”. Within the public sphere, Habermas 2001 advocates its new definition given global changes in austerity and the role of the social welfare state. In working through the genealogy of the “public sphere” over time, Habermas shows the concept’s pliability as it carries different meanings across historical contexts. Rios 2011, Dancy, et al. 2018, and Calhoun 2012 provide contemporary examples in which the homogenous “public” is problematized. Rios’ ethnography studies how the state polices Black and Brown youth into criminality through schools and neighborhoods; this reveals how the public presents distinct life trajectories based on social positionality. Dancy, Edwards, and Davis theorize through settler colonialism and anti-Blackness to highlight how institutions of higher education, despite claims of egalitarianism, remain highly imbued with colonial logics that are enacted on Black bodies in the public. Calhoun considers the role of universities on the global stage and follows foreign financial investments in academic institutions and networks to implicate them in complex ethical and practical concerns where money, status, and public relations can be prioritized over core mission. Given these institutions are embedded within social relations and structures, the authors reveal tensions in these institutions’ abilities to be equitable public spheres with scholarly integrity. The archive, as a knowledge institution, presents itself as a repository, but Trouillot 1995 shows this is not the case. In their analysis of the Haitian Revolution and the erasure of enslaved African people’s successful revolts, Trouillot illuminates the role that power plays in archival creation. Brown 2015, in an autoethnographic account of creating a participatory archive, presents the importance of listening to the archived. Similarly, Levitt 2015 situates museums within global shifts towards cosmopolitanism and locates this shift as a movement away from museums’ practice of creating a false vision of a unified nation-state. These three authors lay bare the social constructedness of archives and museums and the power relations that become naturalized and unquestioned in this construction. Latour 2010 and Hirschman 2016 take up the politics of socially constructed knowledge, presenting framings for how knowledge becomes “fact.”


Brown’s auto-ethnographic account of creating the Eastern Kentucky African American Migration Project archive illustrates the importance of institutional archiving previously
invisibilized stories. Using their project about Black Appalachia and its diaspora, from where their own parents migrated, as an example, Brown stressed that the real account of the community history was in the telling of the stories themselves, rather than the uniformization of the data points extracted from the answers.

With the case of Qaddafi’s investments in Western academics and institutions at hand, Calhoun explores the global contexts in which universities come to be implicated in complex ethical and practical concerns where money, status, and public relations overwhelm scholarly mission. Individual mistakes clearly animated this notorious intrusion into institutional responsibility, but Calhoun elaborates more general lessons for universities seeking appropriate definition for core mission around research, teaching, and intellectual debate.

Through theorizations of settler colonialism and anti-Blackness, the authors (re)interpret the structural relations between historically white universities and Black people. The authors challenge framings of diversity by attending to how these institutions engage the Black body as property through colonial arrangements of Black labor, ownership, and education, and the institutionalization of Black suffering. Challenging settler colonial logics in academic culture, the authors argue for an ontological divestment from whiteness.

Habermas updates and amends their original and influential concept of the bourgeois public sphere. Habermas precisely defines the concept of the public sphere and then traces the history of the concept. Next, the entry defines the liberal model of the public sphere before Habermas notes that it is more fitting to use a different definition of the public sphere in the current social welfare state.

Hirschman explores a form of quantitative description in the social sciences that reflects an empirical reality needing explanation. These facts circulate within arenas of canonical social science and in spheres of policy and public debate. The stylized fact is an empirical statistic that describes a social phenomenon without explaining its underpinnings. Hirschman demonstrates how stylized facts interact with the theories already extant in the public sphere to shape political debate.

Latour interrogates the Modern’s fetish of being transcendent or objective through rationality. They question the relationships between knowledge and politics, nature, and religion. Throughout, they juxtapose fetishism, which would seek an objective truth, and iconoclasm, which would reduce this search to futility. They introduce the term factish to understand the area between the two: a reality neither autonomous from the social world nor fully based on a relativistic projection.

Levitt reveals the shift to global cosmopolitanism in the museum space. Institutions are pushing away from the unified vision of a national museum once bound by political borders and implicated in creating a false vision of a unified nation-state. In its place museums grapple with cosmopolitanism and its rise in both Western and non-Western major cities; Levitt explores how this impacts and shapes global inequality.

Through an application of Foucauldian disciplinary power in KCS, Rios makes explicit neighborhoods’ and schools’ social engineering function. Through schools, the state punishment apparatus operates to control the lives of Black and Brown boys, creating pathways directing students into prisons. Rios’ analysis exposes the interlocking disciplinary powers operating through key institutions to racialize youth as criminal. Leveraging their own life history, Rios’ epistemological orientation raises critical questions for scholarly reflexivity.

Trouillot analyzes power in scholarship and archival creation. They introduce the case of the Haitian Revolution, and the erasure of the role of African slaves in successfully organizing and revolting. Dominant historiographers of the time elided mention of slave agency in the revolution. In demonstrating how the most successful and consequential slave revolt was written out of dominant history, Trouillot reveals the silences produced in making archives and history.

**Knowledges and Technologies**

In classical sociologies of social change, technology was frequently considered the most important kind of knowledge determining social possibilities. Lenski 2005 transforms that kind of evolutionary thinking by emphasizing the importance of biophysical and social environments, but even that improvement is challenged by more fundamental transformations through KCS. Rather than consider its independent, or even interactive, significance, scholars increasingly consider how technologies are implicated in power and social relations, contested and shaped by both subaltern communities and institutions, and how technologies shape and legitimate knowledge cultures. With their authors, editors Latham and Sassen (2002) emphasize the relationality of digital technologies and different social logics and practices from finance to
NGOs in more and less authoritarian contexts across the world. Gille 2016 considers that interaction across social practice, various technologies, and materialities to upend the very distinction of global and local. And when technology is viewed in relational terms, its implication in justice struggles also becomes more apparent. Daniels, Gregory and Cottom 2016 overviews digital sociologies grounded in understandings of historically contingent inequalities. With this in mind, Bailey 2015 outlines how Black trans women utilize new digital technologies to create networks of care, illustrating how technologies may foster community support. On the other hand, Grundy 2017 illustrates, through their own reflections as a Black woman in cyberspace, the ways in which digital spaces can work with the agenda of whiteness to stall Black progress and reinforce violent structures of racial domination. As it relates to how justice struggles can be understood through concepts, like race, Roberts 2011 focuses on breakthroughs in genetics testing and these technologies’ role in perpetuating racial essentialism. Frickel 2008 examines how our interpretation of the environmental factors as (un)important shapes and is shaped by existing social inequalities, as they demonstrates that nonknowledge in the research sphere on environmental hazard sites reproduces racially inequitable environmental conditions and inhibits social action.

Bailey, Moya. 2015. “#transform(Ing)DH writing and research: An autoethnography of digital humanities and feminist ethics.” Digital Humanities Quarterly 009 (2). Centering the experiences of Black trans women, Bailey’s autoethnography illustrates the networks that Black trans women create through digital media, identifying this community’s often erased emotional and uncompensated labor. Drawing on Black queer theory, digital humanities, and feminist theory, Bailey uses a new methodology to trace how digital media production redefines representations and produces connections that are a form of health care praxis.

Daniels, Jessie, Karen Gregory, and Tressie McMillan Cottom, eds. 2016. Digital Sociologies. Chicago, IL, USA: Policy Press. As the field of digital sociology grows, scholars identify the need to ground these burgeoning discourses in understandings of inequality as foundational to digital sociology. Connecting existing scholarship on labor, culture, education, race, class, and gender to digital media technologies, the authors provide an orientation and an imperative that the digital must be joined with the social to understand increasing inequality and growing technologies.

Frickel, Scott. 2008. On missing New Orleans: Lost knowledge and knowledge gaps in an urban hazardscape” Environmental History, 13(4), 634-650. Frickel analyzes the nonproduction of knowledge, or knowledge that gets lost, through studies on environmental hazard sites in New Orleans. Gaps in knowledge and knowledge that get lost relate to spatial factors. While pollution is a global issue, it disparately impacts communities by region; New Orleans relatively understudied, is a site of disproportionately high toxic waste. These nonproductions of knowledge constrain possibilities of social action within the environmental policy realm.

Global flows can be understood better by analyzing their frictions, but that, in turn, depends on the particularities of their materialities and local contexts. By helping us recognize the dynamics around the “material standardization of culture and identity”, Gille enables one to appreciate how different scales of governance are made in a substrate of non-human actors and their articulation with technologies of various sorts.


Serving as a corrective to an otherwise theoretically burgeoning scholarship on the digital space, Grundy reflects on her own experiences of being targeted as a Black woman scholar in newly digitized spaces. Grundy lays bare these spaces’ racialized implications due to the formation of digitized mob violence: for Blackness, these spaces serve to terrorize and stall black progress, for whiteness, these spaces provide opportunities to reproduce collective white identities.


As an early and critical contribution to a sociology of digital technology, the authors illustrate how networks and technologies largely constituted in electronic space combine with non-digital social relations to produce various social logics that are derivative, transformative, or constitutive. Sassen compares, for example, digital formations in electronic markets and social movements to argue that technologies don’t determine change, but interact with other social forces to shape change.


Lenski bridges older sociological traditions with those subsequent – less overtly normative – approaches to argue that this knowledge on how to use material resources in the environment shapes, more than any other single variable, other qualities of human life over the history of human societies. However, as technologies develop, the breadth of possibilities in social organization grows, allowing for a greater range of human possibilities – from greater justice to planetary self-destruction.


Political origins of race in the U.S. are obscured by the myth of its genetic bases. This myth helps reconcile ideals of the nation with its racial inequality. Smith connects this myth to the use of breakthroughs in genetics testing technologies, and urges one to rethink the way race is used in our scientific studies on the human body, lest we reify the same trenchant beliefs that falsely separate us.
The Academy

The academy, an institution legitimizing, producing, and controlling knowledge, often escapes critique for its active and complicit role in maintaining hierarchies. Abbott 2001 provides a framework and analysis to understand the role that disciplines play in maintaining stable structures. From that foundation, it becomes necessary to consider how these structures themselves are not inherently equitable or just. Camic 2013 clarifies the tensions within the academic sociology of knowledge, not only by highlighting why both its internal and external conditions of knowledge production need be taken into account, but also why we need to consider their empirical “models in use”. Espeland and Stevens 1998 interrogates a particular process that is at the foundation of academic functioning: evaluation. With their framework of commensuration, Espeland and Stevens lay bare how evaluation can be imbued with ideologies of oppression. In an analysis of Du Bois’ personal and academic displacement and exclusion from sociology, Morris 2017 shows how racist schemas of evaluation intentionally and subconsciously subvert Black scholars, and other scholars of color. Kennedy, et al. 2018 builds on these critiques of evaluation and sociology to implicate how excellence is racialized and gendered when it is viewed in contradistinction with reflexivity in sociology. Lamont 2009, Posselt 2016, and Espeland and Sauder 2016 move beyond sociology to consider the interaction between the academy, different disciplines, and societal inequality. Lamont’s study on grant and fellowship committees reveals epistemological assumptions among evaluators that privilege particular scholars and scholarships, while Posselt similarly illuminates how faculty reproduce racial, gender, and nation-based disparities in doctoral admissions. Espeland and Sauder explicate how seeking external legitimacy through rankings has impacted the organization of and training in law schools; this impacts how the law is practiced, understood, and valued in society. Outside the US context, Fourcade 2009 and Kennedy 2015 conduct transnational relational analyses on how different knowledge cultures manifest and structure knowledge production. Fourcade shows how context conditions the types of knowledge cultures that emerge around disciplines of economics in three different societies. Kennedy explores how globalizing knowledge among intellectuals and their institutions and networks reflect power relations and also bear sufficient contradictions to enable transformative knowledge activism organized around various forms of solidarity. The authors in this section challenge claims of politically value-free, objective scholarship by revealing how the precise processes by which “objectivity” is valued and obtained in the academy are themselves not value-free or objective.

Abbott, Andrew. 2001. *Chaos of disciplines*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press. Exploring the rules of social science and its changes, Abbott uses both fractal analysis and the context of disciplines in labor markets and institutions to explain the stable social structures between disciplines and the mutable cultural structures within them.

moves on to elaborate a dualist approach that emphasizes the fields in which knowledge production takes place. Bourdieu’s “model-in-use”, however, also marks other social spaces than fields, emphasizing how knowledge elements can cross fields, and how this varies over history.

The authors explore external institutional rankings’ impact on law schools and the profession, showing how ideas of valuation and status structure institutions and society. From the admissions process, to coursework taught, and to how students internalize rankings as reflections of self-worth, rankings permeate the entire legal structure. The authors reveal, as legal programs compete for better rankings and become more homogenous, they structurally become less accessible to non-traditional students.

The authors theorize on commensuration, the process of transforming quality to quantity, a fundamental dimension of evaluation. Highlighting the process by which value is assigned, the authors provide a framework to unpack and challenge notions of objective evaluation. The authors argue that commensuration is pervasive in society, and as a result, reveal how processes of evaluation can become naturalized, thereby, embed political ideas in presumed ‘value-neutral’ processes of knowledge production.

Comparing the profession of economics across three societies and over time, Fourcade illuminates the power of context – political, institutional and cultural – for shaping particular articulations of expertise and knowledge cultural authority. In the USA, a scientific and mercantile professionalism, in Britain a public-minded elitism, and in France statist divisions define the authority and practice of economics as discipline.

Kennedy interrogates “globalizing knowledge” as it relates to the push for institutions of higher education to redefine their missions in global terms. They explore how different forms of knowledge are implicated in the reproduction and transformation of power and social relations. Kennedy uses particular empirical cases from across the world to explore intellectual and institutional responsibilities in struggles for greater equality and justice within the academy, and beyond it.

Arguing sociology’s nuclear contradiction is between excellent and reflexive science, the authors use the history of US sociology perpetuating white supremacy as a prompt to reconsider the purpose and meaning of excellence. Drawing upon Du Boisian sociology, the authors ask what sociology’s anti-racist practice would imply for defining an excellence under the conditions of resisting white supremacy. The authors push for a reflection on one’s own sociology of anti-racist excellence.

Lamont, Michèle. 2009. How professors think: Inside the curious world of academic judgment. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. Through a study on how prestigious grant and fellowship committees make decisions, Lamont reveals how evaluation is a multi-stage process by which individual practices can structure the entire evaluation process to privilege particular types of scholars or scholarships. Lamont interrogates the institutions by which knowledge is legitimized and uncovers how these institutions operationalize specific ideas of valuation that can structurally exclude underrepresented, non-traditional, and historically minoritized epistemological approaches to scholarship.


Posselt, Julie R. 2016. Inside graduate admissions: Merit, diversity, and faculty gatekeeping. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. Interrogating the nexus of merit, diversity, and faculty decision-making in doctoral admissions, Posselt explores how logics of valuation for merit can be gendered and racialized. Posselt’s study of faculty across disciplines reveals how subconscious racist, gendered, and nationalist biases are imposed upon candidates to assign worth. Prompting institutions to consider how their actions undergird racist and sexist stereotypes, Posselt problematizes the assumption of a functioning meritocracy in the academy.

Knowledge Activism, Hegemony and Ideas
Knowledge figures in politics through expertise in policy, learnedness in parliamentary procedure, or researching voter preferences, among other practices. Contests over ideas that define the public good are central to KCS. This is apparent in studies of, and contributions to, struggles over hegemony. Scholars and change agents address how to recognize actors’ and groups’ positions, rights, capacities, responsibilities and relations; and how agents are implicated in structures defining order and frames defining justice. These two in combination address normative questions that inform the desirabilities and possibilities of social transformation, as elaborated by Fraser 2015 (cited under *Greatest Hits*). Such an approach to the duality of structure and its normative implications is enhanced by Sewell 2005 and their
terms, especially in their accounts of the polysemy of resources and transposability of schema. This work is sometimes subtle, requiring interpretive work to uncover, as Somers and Block 2005 note in an accounting of “perversity” and its ideational power in structuring centuries of debate about welfare policies. Sometimes it is more direct, as scores of social democrats, Weakliem and Adams 2011, and other scholarly interlocutors, work to explain the declining influence of the working class as such in electoral politics. West 2017, reissued 25 years after its initial publication, illuminates the enduring challenge of how to make race matter in definitions of public good and moral politics, exemplifying knowledge activism in the process. But KCS is not only about enhancing the power of categories and clarifying social relations commonly, if variably, understood. Sometimes it works to disarticulate categorical powers, as Connell 2016 marks the Eurocentrism of global gender discourse with its system-like assumptions about masculinities across the world and over time. Further, the implication of knowledge work in political contest should not only be approached as a superior cognitive understanding of how the world works or is divided. As Garrido 2017 notes, sometimes authority is co-constituted: in this case, the co-production of sincerity between authorities and publics, make authority. Matters of hegemony need not be limited to the state and public sphere; its contests are readily apparent in the academy itself as Muhs et al 2012 elaborates. Reflecting on activism and its presumptions of structure, agency, and norms, as Boggs 2011 offers, center hegemony’s address.


Boggs engages Immanuel Wallerstein, with Kurashige’s moderation, offering reflections on a life of activism begun in Detroit in 1953. Boggs discusses the struggle to create a more participatory democracy vis-à-vis the possible and the necessary, and the systemic and the personal. Engaging with socialism and its location in world historical time, Boggs asks: “How do we create the new ideas that are necessary? How do we create alternatives?”. Knowledge Activism.


Decolonizing the study of masculinity in three steps, Connell illuminates challenges in studying hegemony; figures the relationships between forming masculinities, coloniality, and global power; and posits a decolonizing approach. Connell marks the global gender discourse’s enduring Eurocentrism and its system-like assumptions. However, as metropolitan power moves into transnational institutions, the importance of mechanisms of consent declines even as discontent rises. Hegemony should not be presumed when violence constitutes order.


Existing accounts of populism claim a populist style consists of tactics to gain high popular identification, but there is not a reckoning with the different responses of poor populations depending on which politicians employ these tactics. In this article, Garrido explores populism in Metro Manila and questions this existing framework of understanding populism, as it
grapples with how a public image is co-constituted between the political team diffusing the image and those discerning it.

The volume explores the “presumed incompetence” that women confront along axes of race and class in the academy, challenging the academy’s ontological and epistemological assumptions regarding knowledge production. The authors identify how the devaluation of femininity and valorization of objective, neutral, and “politics-free” knowledge production forces women of color to negotiate their identities and identity performances to avoid formal disciplinary repercussions and to reconcile stereotypes ascribed onto them.

Sewell presents a “duality of structure” approach suitable to KCS’s concern for conditions of social reproduction and transformation. Five qualities – the multiplicity of structures, unpredictability of resource accumulation, intersection of structures, polysemy of resources, and transposability of schemas – organize this work. The approach highlights how the redefinition of sources of power and the translation of rules in one context to others is enhanced with the mobilization of knowledge.

Somers, Margaret R., and Fred Bock. 2005. From poverty to perversity: Ideas, markets, and institutions over 200 Years of welfare debate. American Sociological Review, 70(2), 260–287. Elaborating the causal mechanisms of ideational transformation, the authors ask why market liberalism has become central to public discourse and policy making. The authors mark similarities between the 1834 New Poor Law in England and 1996 Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunities Reconciliation Act in the US, showing how an Anglo-American Lockean heritage is the critical variable moving a causality narrative to wins converts without any necessary connection to reality.

Responding to the crisis of social democracy, and moving beyond questions of working class size or mobilization, the authors mark the importance of defining the working class as such, and whether its politics is itself spontaneous or constructed by intellectual and organizational work. One approach to class politics is most knowledge cultural, where “class is essentially a cultural mechanism rather than a set of pregiven structural locations” (p. 485).

The book’s title indicates what endures across 25 years, but this quotation marks this particular moment of oppression and possibility in this edition. Uplift and honesty in knowledge activism abound here: “We live in... a bleak time of spiritual blackout and imperial meltdown... our last
and only hope is prophetic fightback – a moral and spiritual awakening that puts a premium on courageous truthtelling and exemplary action by individuals and communities” (p. v).

**Translations across Space and Media**

Knowledge travels, and when its movement across contexts takes pride of place, knowledge cultural sociology tends to shift its terms toward its various media and consequent ontologies. It becomes much less feasible to assume stable social positions or relations that influence articulations of knowledge. Among the most prominent perspectives associated with this disposition is Actor-Network Theory (ANT) and other expressions in its universe. Baiocchi et al 2013 in their text’s introduction, and in the special issue associated, illustrates this shift by noting how knowledge is itself usefully seen as an actor network. Saito 2015 elaborates, by contrasting Latour’s work with Beck’s world risk theory. Rather than take for granted how nations and transnational organizations shape cosmopolitanism, as does Beck, Saito invites consideration of ANT’s ontological politics in constituting these transnational relations, and consequently marks the role scholars play through the performance of their own knowledge authority. Sassen 2014 plays that role through their own global engagements, but also through this 2014 effort to center expulsion, rather than inequality, in the global imagination; this reconstitutes how we figure the focus and division of knowledge labor about the world as such. Shohat and Stam 2014 further challenges hegemonic knowledge cultures; the authors reveal the prevalence of media that elevates Eurocentric ideals, proposing in its stead a polycentric approach to cultural analysis. Increasingly common, however, is a focus on the digital, and its presumed erasure not only of distance but also of the body itself. Pioneering work by feminists, such as Travers 2003, and Black scholars, such as Nelson 2002 (cited under “Greatest Hits”), have denuded that latter assumption by studying feminist digital counterpublics and Afrofuturism. The Black Panther film, associated with the Marvel Cinematic Universe which Chambliss et al 2018 analyzes, has put Afrofuturism as reference into the global public sphere in unprecedented fashion. Reinforcing Nelson’s pioneering sociology in the domain, a number of creators have redefined the terms of Afrofuturism most evidently in visual practice, where the opposition between technology and blackness, domination and resistance, finds its visual expression, as in Jennings 2011’s Black Cyborgs. The possibilities and limits of the digital needs be made explicit, however, as Tufekci 2017 marks the effective convening power of social media for networked protest alongside its limited durability in mobilizing change.


This introduction to a journal issue dedicated to Latour’s sociology and its relationship to other approaches not only introduces subsequent articles but offers a productive articulation of the general disposition, with its “skepticism towards taken-for-granted divisions, categories, and concepts; attention to processes of circulation; interest in the relational interface between humans and nonhumans; and appreciation for uncertainty and multiplicity” (335). “Knowledge itself is an actor-network, a compositional entity” (p. 337).

The authors interpret Marvel's superheroes on screen to transform notions of America. From rethinking character and plot continuities across various media to elaborating the public and academic implications of their heroes' experiences, with new musical affect, this collection invites us to consider how to understand superheroes in both popular and public culture. This is critical for sociologists who recognize the power of this modern mythology for public sensibility.

Jennings, John. 2011. "Matterz of the FACT [https://issuu.com/makeprophetz/docs/matterzdoc-2]". Riffing on Fanon’s “The Fact of Blackness”, Jennings illustrates the potentials for a visual knowledge cultural sociology, highlighting how White people’s colonizing power can make the Black Body. Their construction of a constricting space – “an abnormal, animalistic, decadent and wanton dark body in which African Americans are forced to reside” – haunts with Jennings’ 46 images, which draw heavily on a cyborg theme, where the counter-self, despite entrapment, is made.


Moving Beck’s World Risk Society into dialogue with Latour’s Actor Network Theory, Saito illuminates the possibilities and limits of each. Bringing them together, Saito renews critical theory not only by joining politics and ontology but also performative dimensions of social scientists’ engagement. Social scientists must focus less on their “superior knowledge of the world” and more on their institutionalized authority shaping parameters of politics and targets of government intervention.


Sassen notes that we have the tools to analyze exclusion in specific domains, but we lack the framework to see its connections across institutions and geographies. Inequality, they argue, should not be the discipline’s key concept and problem; rather, the focus should be on expulsion: on the ways human and non-human life are expelled from the system, with attendant poverty, death and environmental destruction.


The authors work through the Eurocentric media canon to reconceptualize how we interpret and consume it. The scholars unpack how colonial discourse created the imagined West and East, which are constituted on structural power dynamics rather than geographical divides. They propose a radical polycentric multiculturalism, which would decenter an imagined Western European civilization as the universal and uncover the buried accounts of the subaltern, racialized subject in Eurocentric accounts.
Travers examines how feminist counterpublics organize and continually mobilize identity politics as a tool to challenge the normative and often male-dominated framework of the mainstream public sphere in emerging digital spaces. By asserting their bodies in the space, feminist counterpublics reject the normative male ideal of disembodiment on the web. Travers delineates several manifestations of female visibility on the Internet as a feminist challenge to the male-dominated space.

KCS needs to theorize the significance of medium in knowledge consequential work, especially in publics. Tufekci shows how digital transformations alter social space, and social media alters the possibilities for protest by changing the sense of connectivity. While it may mobilize publics, movements defined by such media make for more horizontal leaderships. Without more formal organizational structures, networked protest may find durability challenging.

**Knowledge, Race and Postcoloniality**

Although sociology and other disciplines developed in Great Britain, France, Germany, Russia and the United States at a time when empire was widely acknowledged to define global order, those imperial origins are often lost, if not denied, especially in the USA. Du Bois marked clearly how race, the focus of much American sociology, and colonialism were mutually constituted. Connell 2007, Bhambra 2014, and Go 2016 are among those who work in this century to bring scholarship and expertise from beyond the Metropole’s assumptions into the heart of sociology, centering the process not only white supremacy but Western presumption in organizing the categories and mechanisms defining disciplinary inquiry. Bhamba et al 2018 then apply this critique to notions of “the university” and its embeddedness in global exploitation. Jung 2015 moves to the ethnocentric heart of American sociology itself, marking how notions of empire help to clarify the articulation of race and democracy in the USA, noting as well that empire’s sense can work within contiguous, and not only transoceanic, forms. Alongside others, Comaroff and Comaroff 2011 argues that the very insights won through research in what some term the “Global South” might help us recognize new forms of social life developing in the Global North. These global categories are themselves, however, also facing challenge. Tlostanova 2018 invites rethinking categories and regional references of power by noting how Soviet and socialist ideologies reproduced racism in different terms, often hard to read by those who wished to believe in that political alternative. Too, as Hoang 2015 exemplifies, to understand the rise of East and Southeast Asia in the global economy not only challenges conventional distinctions of core and periphery, but also invites new forms of scholarship and standpoint to understand the conditions of those transformations. Steinmetz 2007 shows how empire has depended on circulations of knowledge which, in turn, have shaped very different relations between the colonizer and colonized. One might imagine, however, that the world’s reconstitution, not only in terms of south/south relationships but also the constitution of new peripheries within old metropoles ought refashion categories, and questions of our
imagination, as Chari and Verdery 2009 (cited under *Greatest Hits*) suggests in a juxtaposition of post-colonial and post-socialist studies.


Bhambra introduces a special issue drawing attention to the politics of knowledge production as the movement for a global sociology grows. Laying out the contours of global sociology, the issue reveals the deep role power, race and coloniality play in constituting modernity. With the hopes of developing a global sociology, Bhambra contests the dominance of Europe and the US in the production of knowledge.


In an edited volume, the authors map the contours of a burgeoning field of scholarship: decolonization and the university. Moving from historical and disciplinary movements to critiques of the institutions that uphold coloniality in the global stage, the text concludes with reflections on what decolonization could be if taken as an epistemological priority.


As the “North” acquires “south-like” conditions, the authors move that both the methodology, and problem driven focus animating work in the post-colonial world might be developed in application to territories once associated with the Metropole, moving between “the inductive and the deductive, the concrete and the concept, also in a different register, between the epic and the everyday, the meaningful and the material” (p. 48).


Connell discusses theory not only about, but also from, Africa, Iran, Latin America, India and Australia, with particular attention as well to aboriginal and indigenous challenges to modes of northern theory. Among the most familiar are India’s subaltern studies and Latin America’s dependency theory, but among the most compelling and relatively unattended are those which focus on dispossession rather than development as a dominant social dynamic.


Go asserts that mainstream sociology suffers from metrocentrism and analytic bifurcation. Metrocentrism, a focus on the imperial metropoles of the global North, leads to an occlusion of empire as a driving force in the emergence of modernity. Analytic bifurcation separates mutually constituted social situations into unconnected binaries. Go offers techniques throughout the book to overcome mainstream analytic tendencies, allowing social theorists to contend with the impact of colonization on modernity.

Hoang offers a KCS by linking financial transactions to competing technologies of embodiment in Southeast Asia. They explore how sex work provides a context for rational economic exchange in a highly speculative market, a site for the recovery of Western white masculinities, and a chance for women to develop solidarity and entrepreneurial success. Hoang transforms the categories of our work by putting desire to the heart of economic thinking.


Moving through various substantive arenas in US history, the author demonstrates how a different knowledge frame – empire – enables a different theory and interpretation of racism’s core constitution in US democracy, and how the law, as a knowledgeable instrument, helped to legitimate and hide the violence in that empire state’s expansion.


German empire operated very differently in these three spaces: genocide in Southwest Africa, a paternalistic engagement with indigenous culture in Samoa, and in China, alternate practices of cultural exchange and brutal racism. Steinmetz explains this variation with reference to ethnographic knowledge and its implication in status competition among colonial officials and their various identifications with subjects.


Reflecting on the challenge of establishing mutual understanding between those with socialist and Western colonial legacies, Tlostanova puts different understandings of race to the center of this challenge of difference. They argue that Soviet hypocrisy around race is hard to appreciate by those who saw emancipation in the socialist register, which was in turn reinforced by the manipulation of (post) colonial innocents’ experience in the USSR.

**Knowledge, Nation and Contiguous Empires**

Although contiguous empires like the Ottoman, Russian, Soviet and European Union polities engage race in their formation, as their transoceanic kin, nation and religion are more prominent in the proximate knowledge cultural work challenging imperial orders of the former. Simultaneously, the West appears to be a less antagonistic Other in those contiguous empires’ peripheries. That is certainly most evident in the transition culture of the 1990s, which Kennedy 2002 analyzes, when Western experts on markets, democracy and the global order collaborated with authorities and publics of post-communist societies to move their nations away from the oppressions of communist rule. For the newly acceded members of the EU, transition’s practice and outcomes were hardly utopian. By the 21st century, the search for an alternative language of justice within vernacular knowledges became more globally evident, and critical, as the contributors to Kubik and Linch 2013 illustrate. Haller 2008’s account of the European Union anticipates some of the public disenchantment and elite ignorance of that alienation even within the core of the European Union. Nationalism’s various articulations are
one of the most common axes of cultural political contest in contiguous empires and their successors, especially when fused with the most potent religious symbols, as Zubrzycki 2006 demonstrates. Even while these contests over knowledge and authority rage, they are at least globally apparent; other cultural political struggles are not always so visible. Derluguian 2005, for example, brings a region hardly understood not only within sociology but even the region's area studies into focus by asking about the ways in which intellectual work variably shapes post-Soviet war and peace in North Caucasus proximate spaces. Göçek 2014 illuminates how first in the Ottoman Empire, then in the Turkish Republic, violence against Armenians and other minoritized populations was denied even when in possible public view. Glaeser 2011 explains how the German Democratic Republic's secret police was caught in circular validations of errant knowledge that diminished their capacity to save the system they were ostensibly dedicated to preserve. These accounts are made in geographical and historical contexts alien to most knowledge cultural sociology. However, their theoretical implications can illuminate the ways in which knowledge is formed in structure and practice and in global and vernacular forms. In that process, one might fuse different intellectual authorities and modes of understanding and denial with implications for the reproduction and transformation of social relations beyond contiguous empires and their aftermaths.


Using biography to develop a world systems approach to the variable forms of collapse of Soviet-type socialism, Derluguian illuminates the value and meanings of intellectual work, most notably with how Bourdieu helped Musa Shanib make sense of their own leadership of the Mountain Confederation of Peoples in the north Caucasus. Derluguian's work also brings this region's wars into the knowledge culture of post-communist studies.


In this account of the reproduction and transformation of social relations, of actually existing socialism, and of the German Democratic Republic, Glaeser invites us to develop a sociology of knowledge as a sociology of understanding with various modes. This hermeneutic institutionalism elaborates how institutions are processual and dependent on three modes of understanding – discursive, emotive, and kinesthetic. History, within this framework, is made in the slippage between intentions and effects.


Göcek explores how during the Ottoman Empire and subsequent Turkish Republic, collective violence comes to be denied, despite evidence available. They also consider the effects of this process: “collective violence infused into Turkish republic corrupted and undermined public ethics. Unless Turkish state and society come to terms with the collective violence, they will not be able to recover such trust and respect in their own state and society.” (p. 477)

Viewing the European Union as a project driven by political and expert elites, and integrated through a technocratic rationality that denies meaningful political contest within its terms, Haller anticipates the increasingly Euroskeptical rejection of EU values on democratic grounds. The mounds of knowledge – understood as information and expertise – may inform bureaucratic regulation, but is hardly meaningful for public culture’s debate around, and appreciation for, the European Union as such.

Kennedy analyzes the movement from communist rule to market driven democratic societies. With the Wars of Yugoslav Succession threatening, transition culture defined “normality” as destination, but quite distant from the emancipatory possibilities in the critical civil societies driving and/or legitimating communism’s end in Europe. In that transition, rational critical dialogue animated a potentially inclusive public sphere, but only when power was treated innocently, and hegemonic globalizations enabled freedom.

Organized around a search for an alternative language, and method, for envisioning the region’s cultural politics, the authors explore how hegemonies and movements redefine justice. Beginning with publicly perceived social problems, and moving toward struggles over class and gender alongside nationalism, racism and corruption. The volume illuminates how contextual holism and vernacular knowledge in this region, and in others, could refashion an approach to global transformations and critical intellectuality.

The power associated with knowing a religion and a nation finds extraordinary expression in this account of how religious symbols come to be secularized, and then resacralized as national expressions, as hyper-markers of Polishness. Focused on Catholic crosses planted just outside this museum’s on-site articulation of the Nazi Death Camp, Zubrzycki illuminates how reverence before evil might be understood, and contested, across communities of faith and belonging.

Futurity and Liberatory Imaginaries
To envision a liberated future, the knowledge of the oppressed must be centered and uplifted. This can be a project within sociology as such, as past American Sociological Association presidents, Michelle Lamont 2017 and Eduardo Bonilla-Silva 2018 illustrate. Emancipatory knowledge has, however, also been associated with knowledge producers deliberately located beyond dominant institutions. For example, Hardt and Negri 2005, to contend with globalization’s empire, analyzes resistance activities and attempts to articulate emancipation in the 21st century, moving the diversity in forms of resistance to the center of our critical imagination. While emancipation may not be achieved in the 21st century, the capacity for deepening democracy remains in contention. That particularity is, however, limiting without moving toward universality. For example, Butler, et al. 2000 re-articulates the relationship
between the universal and the particular, suggesting that as a political project, rather than a theoretical one, a new universalism is situated in the particular, and can only be recognized through continually dynamic negotiations of difference as the starting point. Du Bois 2007 places this liberation against the historical processes of exploitation, displacement, and erasure through racism, colonialism, and capitalism. While putting forth a global color line, Du Bois 2007 similarly recognizes that liberation is possible through the particular: only if former colonies are not subjected to further exploitation by former metropole nations. Boltanski 2011 and Hammer 2017 move this notion of the particular further. Boltanski argues that the actions of the dominated can mark the falsity of how institutions legitimize norms, and this provides a foundation for an incomplete, though emancipatory, project. Hammer, through Frantz Fanon and Stuart Hall, contends that the lives of colonial subjects enables them to develop anticolonial imaginaries through epistemic ruptures and conjunctural changes in meaning formations. Parreñas 2001 illuminates Hammer’s claims in showing how female domestic workers of the Filipino diaspora used media focused on social issues to collectively transgress their positioning as diasporic to the nation-state. Similarly, relying on theorizing from subjectivities, Muñoz 2009 argues that queerness provides an ideality for imagination. As an aspiration, queerness is a destination, not a present. Alternatively, Gordon 2008 recalls the influence of the past. With their term “haunting”, Gordon provides a lens through which lost subjects in social history, and their knowledges, can be resituated to understand the present and future. The authors illustrative how a liberated future attends to the past and grounds the future within the present’s particularities.

Drawing on Bourdieu’s critical sociology and Boltanski’s work in the pragmatic sociology of critique, Boltanski centers hermeneutic contradiction in an accounting of the institutional powers of domination and abiding possibilities for resistance, beginning with survival. They moves sociology into a critical identification with the capacities and actions of those dominated to mark the falsity of each institution’s legitimating normative claim, providing foundation for an incomplete, but still emancipatory, project.

Continuing the discussion from Lamont’s 2017 Presidential Address regarding the inclusive knowledge communities, Bonilla-Silva charts a path honoring the affective dimensions of race and racialization. Drawing upon the Black Feminist and women of color feminisms, they theorize the materiality of emotions as racialized and emotions’ role in maintaining a racialized social system centered on white supremacy and white emotions.

The authors explore the limits of the universal. They discuss the universal and the particular: while universality is a necessary part of political emancipation, the particular is often seen in opposition to it. They propose a new universalism, situated in the particular. A political project
rather than a purely theoretical one absent of difference, this universalism is realized through continually dynamic negotiations of difference as the starting point.

The combined compilation of two of Du Bois' later works presents a culmination of their scholarly agenda: the global nature of the color line and how it is bound up in racism, colonialism and capitalism. Du Bois presents a new global history that includes Africa’s contributions to world development, and is prophetic in how they contour the future relationship between former metropole nations and the neocolonialist exploitation of former colonies.

Gordon explores haunting as a lens of inquiry for sociologists, arguing that the ghostly matter untraceable through positivist social analysis haunts the present. These lost subjects in our social history are crucial to projects trying to understand contemporary society. To demonstrate this alternate form of sociological imagination, Gordon draws out traces of social dynamics shaped at the intersection of race, class, and gender from literary texts.

Engaging Fanon and Hall, Hammer elaborates how each of their lives as colonial subjects enabled them to develop “anticolonial imaginaries”, which depended on “epistemic ruptures and conjunctural changes in meaning formations”. Fanon offers a theory of racialization, and Hall offers an account of displacement and identity fragmentation. Both illuminate how the work of intellectuals around the cultivation of imaginaries, aids in the struggle against de-humanization and toward an “actional” person.

Among the 21st century’s early and most conspicuous attempts to find resistance and articulate emancipation in globalization’s empire, the authors emphasize growing diversity in forms of resistance while nonetheless finding in their communicative capacities new grounds for democracy’s deepening. The economy’s growing association with virtual production, on the one hand, and resistance to hierarchy, on the other, anticipates a variety of movements from Occupy to the Indignados.

Recalling initiatives undertaken during their presidency of the American Sociological Association, Lamont takes note of how the Trump presidency changes knowledge production,
notably around the creation of a “sociology action network” and promoting inclusion as a mode of knowledge community making.

Muñoz, José Esteban. 2009. Cruising utopia: The then and there of queer futurity. New York, NY: NYU Press. Contemplating on futurity through queerness, Muñoz discusses queerness as an ideality that can be used to imagine a future because the future is queerness’s domain. In this view, the queer citizen subject exists in a present that is affected by state power and sacrifices their liveness to heterosexuality’s “dead citizenship”. As such, Muñoz reveals how queerness is a structuring mode of desiring that enables imagining a liberated future.

Parreñas, Rhacel Salazar. 2001. Transgressing the nation-state: The partial citizenship and "imagined (global) community" of migrant Filipina domestic workers. Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 26(4), 1129-1154. Parreñas examines the partial citizenship faced by female domestic workers of the Filipino diaspora, asking how women collectively negotiate their contradictory positioning to the nation-state. Parreñas contextualizes Filipino diaspora and the legal constraints faced by domestic workers, then analyzes Tinig Filipino, a widely distributed magazine with mostly domestic worker contributors, focused on social issues of the Filipino diaspora, as a transgression of the nation-state through assertion of diasporic Filipino identity.