

V. 19 N. 1
JAN-JUN 2020

ISSN
Versão Impressa 2447-9047
Versão Online 2447-9047

Diálogos
possíveis

1. DOUTORADO EM SOCIOLOGIA.
INST. SUP. DE CIÊNCIAS DO
TRABALHO E DA EMPRESA,
ISCTE, PORTUGAL.

<http://lattes.cnpq.br/5595317611252444>
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5482-6196>

Como citar este artigo:

DORES, A. P. A. Does So-called Society Exist? Globalization and the Updating of the Social Sciences. **Revista Diálogos Possíveis**, v. 19, n. 1, pp. 31-41, Jan/Jun de 2020.

Recebido: 15.04.2020

Aprovado: 28.05.2020

Does So-called Society Exist? Globalization and the Updating of the Social Sciences

EXISTE ISSO A QUE CHAMAM SOCIEDADE? - GLOBALIZAÇÃO É A ACTUALIZAÇÃO DAS CIÊNCIAS SOCIAIS.

António Pedro Dores¹

ABSTRACT

After more than two hundred years of modernization, will there be societies capable of self-organizing to respond to social-natural disasters, such as famines, wars, fires, droughts and other extreme climatic effects? Or is human intelligence just adaptive? How does sociology understand and explain modern society?

Keywords: Society. State. Market. Social Sciences.

RESUMO

Depois de mais de duzentos anos de modernização, haverá sociedades capazes de se auto-organizarem para responder a desastres sociais-naturais, como as fomes, as guerras, os fogos, as secas e outros efeitos climáticos extremos? Ou a inteligência humana é apenas adaptativa? Como a sociologia entende e explica a sociedade moderna?

Palavras-chave: Sociedade. Estado. Mercado. Ciências sociais.

INTRODUCTION

The markets, the nation-states, language, hierarchies, mentalities, - these are not separate and autonomous objects. They are analytical models, ideal forms, which are ready to be dismantled through scientific analysis. But the social sciences have lost the will to become true sciences. These ideal forms and analytical models are treated as if they are a hyper-reality, impervious to all evidence, more real than reality – which is itself accused of being unstable, imperfect and insubordinate.

Society as a concept split up for functional reasons between economists, anthropologists, psychologists, political scientists, sociologists and others who, together, form the social sciences.

Society is for them to sum-total of social problems, to be treated by specialists who observe from a distance – as if they were outside it. As if the reality were the state and the economy, and the people were merely its consequences. As if preserving the concept of modernity was more important than preserving humans.

The definition of modern society as a product of the state-market denies the protective function of the state and the distributive function of the economy, apart from those groups who are specifically

protected and supplied by the market-state. While anthropology is the study of societies which have no state, sociology studies the problems of people who live in a state but with insufficient protection or supply. It is the individuals who must respect the law and provide their work, scarfing themselves to the requirements of the market-state, and not those who promise to be responsible for securing a good life for all.

The social sciences admit doubts about the real or unreal status of society, comparing to the real existence of individual. They do not question the social hierarchy, as if it was a natural and ineluctable phenomenon.

Background

Michael Kuhn (2016) confirms the systematic production of tautological discourses on the part of the social sciences – in sociology, anthropology, psychology, economics, and political science – all incapable of recognizing and abandoning the cognitive ambush in which they are trapped in the service of nation-states (COSER, 1956: 27). The author maintains that after 150 years of social studies, it is simply not enough to say that the knowledge developed in the meantime is not in any way responsible for the ecological, financial, economic, political

Limites e possibilidades das Ciências Sociais

and social disasters which one is now witnessing.

The social sciences reserved for themselves the role of blaming the victims (the natives, the poor, the voters, the excluded) for the problems created by the state-market alliance, as if the oppression and the repression were merely exceptional responses to the violence coming from below (DORES, 2014).

The social sciences have taken it for granted that the state and its political power fundamentally fulfil all the functions necessary for people's existence, beginning with the guarantee of equality and liberty, by the legal system. It implies the opportunity and obligation to create an identity adapted to modern life (through the educational system and professions). This plan of action works well for the totalitarian states. In the case of democratic states, the totalitarian tendencies of the plan are counterbalanced by a self-limiting system of checks and balances. But the conditions for the continued reproduction of elites are maintained.

The concept of “society” maintains the current double meaning of 1) articulated group of people integrated through business, social and political relationships on one hand, and 2) undefined group of people subject to state control, namely in terms of nationality and the administrative and criminal status, as residents and workers or poor immigrants or unemployed.

Concerned with an unquestioned maintenance of the social hierarchy as the natural order of things, the social sciences respond to the egalitarian demands of their readers by offering diagnoses of social inequality. They ignore the differences of quality of human life in the modern societies, such as between those with influence on a macro level (the elites) and those who simply live on a micro (daily) level in the hope of being mobilized for work (mezzo level).

What is missing is a social science capable of reconnecting that which the present social sciences have disconnected, and of thus contributing to the search for initiatives leading to new forms of social organization adequate for the new now a day circumstance.

DOES SO-CALLED SOCIETY EXIST? – GLOBALIZATION AND THE UPDATING OF THE SOCIAL SCIENCES

The rational action of individuals conditioned by the sense of national and working sacrifice has turned modern societies into machines for destruction of the environment – destruction, that is, of the millenary exceptional condition on Earth that supported continued existence of the human species.

What so-called social state (the institutionalized ordering of solidarity, inspired by privatization and nationalization of community initiatives

Limites e possibilidades das Ciências Sociais

for self-subsistence), meanwhile it transformed over the last decades into a security state, continues to be presented as a respecter of human rights – quite separate from the life of other non-social state systems recognizably incapable of protecting their populations, and capable even of attacking them.

References to the social, including those who are involve in the social states, are disqualified as being feminine, emotional, charitable, inferior, voluntary, submissive, discrete practices lacking in initiative or political or strategic relevance. For the time being, the strategic importance of the social lies in the state treating as natural, its coordinated political efforts to downgrade a large section of society, in residential zones, in schools, and healthcare. That is the political meaning of famous Margaret Thatcher's statement "there is no such a thing as society" and of TINA (there is no alternative) speech.

There are two societies: one above and another below. In the middle exists a non-society (GUILLUY, 2019), a space of cooperation, a market, frequented by people allegedly free and equal, stimulated by financial incentives, the volume of whose spoils should determine their hierarchical social status.

ENVIRONMENT, POLITICS, AND PERVERSITY

In Portugal, the president and the government hastened to declare that the

state had failed, in respect to the deadly fires of the summer of 2017. They did not say that it was the state which had caused the disaster in the first place.

Global warming and extreme climatic phenomena caught by surprise the civil protection services, dominated by corruption. This time it was not just a few poor people who died and burnt but many people who imagined themselves to be protected by the state. Their families and friends organized associations, to defend both their rights to compensation and the memory of those who died (something beyond the reach or imagination of those who live in the lower level of society).

In the end-of-year analyses, despite unexpected economic and financial successes announced in Portugal, it was the "fires" (the generalized form of reference to the unprotected dead and wounded) which were chosen by many as the event of the year.

The societies, ideally unified by national markets, end up multiplying into new social orders (of global businessmen at the top, with free movement of clandestine global workers) to respond to global competitiveness which feeds the profits maintained by the market-state alliance. The success of globalization, the division of all territory into nation-states, is overshadowed by the effects in the environment of growing industrialization.

The question - if society exists or not - is a question that whether; a) human solidarity

Limites e possibilidades das Ciências Sociais

about Nature is desirable and necessary; and b) what should be left inside and outside that solidarity: capitalism and exploitation? The sacrificial practices conducted against nature and stigmatized populations?

SOCIAL THEORIES

Social theories are not used to demonstrate the existence of the object of their study – i.e. society.

They are occupied with developing centralized strategies for dispersing studies in the fields of social dimensions, knowledge, politics, economics, culture, and society. These are studies with no mutual communication between them that accept the possibility that society may only be a feminine metaphor, emotional, supportive, unrealistic, the idealization of unattainable notions of equality and freedom.

Cartesian analysis, giving attention to the parts and discarding the whole, is the foundation of present scientific thinking, and its prison (DAMÁSIO, 1994). Such analytical parts/dimensions are presented and studied as if they were solid realities, and the problems of correspondence with reality are solved systematically, through specialization, creation of subdisciplines, and separation between micro, mezzo and macro levels of analysis.

Is it globalization, a political strategy of the 3 or 4 decades, which has created the

world society? Or did globalization begin from the moment when the first humans left the African continent a million years ago?

These are the questions which appear while studying globalization as introductions which serve to define the author's different opinions, independently of any concerted effort to research whether the answers are right or wrong. Is globalization a phenomenon organized by market-states, or is it a social phenomenon?

Modernity encourages a rejection of tradition. On a personal level, some reject their ancestors. On the intellectual level, others tabula rasa of everything that happened before the Modern Revolutionary period, including its remnants which still exist mixed within modern societies. On the political level, some people exist to serve the modern market-state.

From a scientific point of view, it is difficult to maintain that society has been created by the state, for the simple reason that there were societies before there were states. But if one speaks of modern society and individuals, rather than speaking of genetically constituted people, then it becomes possible to imagine that it was the market-state which invented them, free and equal, citizens, just as God made Adam and Eve.

In practice, the social sciences stopped their intellectual path somewhere between

Limites e possibilidades das Ciências Sociais

social philosophy (the rational prediction of what could be the best social organization) and science. They find themselves in a limbo, unconcerned on the one hand with the discussion of what society may be, and on the other hand, resigned to the failure to become true science.

THE FRONTIERS OF THE SOCIAL SCIENCES

The social sciences must touch on the practical disrespect for human rights, and at the same time recognize the resilience (whether resigned or not) of the populations (especially those repressed and excluded from humanity or in risk of exclusion). Society, these terms, treated above all as a people, a part of nature, a rebellious part which can be domesticated and exploited by the states and the economies through the attribution of formal sovereign rights, in the context of the nation state's ideology. The Nation idealized as homogeneous, as they are the individuals, the smallest units of the social sciences. Almost equal between themselves, except for the inequalities and, of course, the nationalities which make of the nations and their sovereignty an internal subject. For the state and the respective society, it practically kidnapped inside physical and mental borders: some give orders and others obey, regardless the extreme risky results.

The ideal society of free and equal individuals is put forward as a norm by law. Society seen and promoted from the top of state organizations corresponds to reality to the same extent as a plan or a map correspond to disciplinary action or territory (FOUCAULT, 1999). That society imagined juridically, is taken as a model.

This has consequences – namely that people are obliged to correspond to the roles attributed to them: to be free and equal, citizens and workers. If they are not, it is because of their incompetence.

The politicians, the citizens, and the jurists think with the predominant ideology and through the fixed separation of disciplines. They think that, in the absence of society, and of acquired habits, rebelling against modernity, the laws, the procedures and rationality itself could come to function correctly, without resistance. The imagination has its known capacity for constructing paradises, celestial societies and utopias: "our" nation-state predestined to be eternal and exemplary. As a counterpoint, of course, associated in Manicheism fashion to these ideas, are the margins of society, the punishments for disobedience, living hell of those who re-offend, and the treachery to which are subjected those who cannot resign themselves to the actual social conditions.

The capacity to abstract from society, separated in practice between normality above and the juridical cases and social

Limites e possibilidades das Ciências Sociais

problems below, is not limited to law and the normative sciences. The social sciences, despite swearing that they combat ideologies, also format ideal societies and complain of people who do not fulfill their function – be it revolutionary functions, in the case of critical social theories, be it functional social performance. Paradoxically, the sharing of the same idealized society, constituting individuals imagined by social movements or by the market state, makes the interdisciplinary articulation between social sciences and law, and other normative fields, impossible.

The different social status, highly hierarchical, between jurists, economists and other social scientists, as well as the fixed hyper-specialization which characterizes the social sciences (LAHIRE, 2012: 319-356), it reveals the symbolic and spiritually subordinate place of society concerning the state and the economy.

This subordinate role of the society, of the common people, has been developed by the social sciences: giving practically exclusive attention to power relations (LAHIRE, 2012: 125; THERBORN, 2006: 3); minimizing the human aspects of production (BERTAUX, 1977), the biological production of people and generations, and the caring work necessary for this purpose.

The reproduction of a discriminatory and “natural” conception of human gender and hierarchical positions is made compatible

with the ideal-type of society, understood as a collection of free and equal individuals, through the connotation and social prestige which creates a distinction between the social sciences, law, and biology – these three being mutually incompatible. That is what it which defines biology as a science excludes the knowledge of social sciences and law. That, which is the field of social sciences excludes law and biology.

THEORETICAL OPPORTUNITIES

Wilkinson and Pickett (2009) have shown how the greatest inequalities of income are associated with more social problems. Gregory Clark (2014) demonstrated the existence of a social resistance to social mobility, that is, a social propensity to maintain social hierarchies. Thus, the market-states interfere with their societies by manipulating incomes on the one hand, and the societies, on the other hand, are preserving the hierarchies which support the market-states.

If rational lawful societies should be using their influence, in the development of hierarchical structures, to reduce the differences in income and thus avoid social problems, this is not happening, as Clark shows. Even the evidence produced by Wilkinson and Pickett shows that freedom and equality come with better lives’ opportunities for individual’s, the now a

Limites e possibilidades das Ciências Sociais

day global political trend goes the opposite direction.

The objective of economic growth is more and more absurd in the face of the environmental problems - faced also with the theoretical possibility of rebelling and, thus, helping humanity to understand what it can do to adapt to present circumstances.

The society we need is one which does not conform but distances itself from the normal, the normalization imposed by the national market-state force which social theory denominates as social structure. We need a society free of the constraints and compromises presented by the goal of economic growth. We need free individuals from this state-market suicidal goal having equal opportunities to develop new goals to human societies. This only would be possible when economic thinking merge with ecological, legal, sociological, health care, and other relevant disciplinary thinking, for the moment incompatible and uncommunicated.

There are clear grounds on which societies base their creeds of freedom (access to work) and equality (access to markets), developed in the context of subordination to the market-state alliance.

The question as to whether society exists could also be the question as to whether, in such a strategic circumstance, it is possible to break out of the straitjacket of economic state forces which so dominates daily life. Or is it possible to do so without provoking a catastrophe (with which revolution,

mutiny, and popular action are sometimes associated)? In other words, is there a practical alternative to develop survival strategies under this regime? Are societies free to decide and equal to follow each one paths?

CONCLUSION

The problem of the social sciences is not in the use of the imagination or of arbitrary models to guide scientific activities: this is done successfully by the sciences. The problem is the treatment of the model as inviolable and, for this purpose, ignoring the empirical evidence which could inform progress and the gathering of knowledge. The problem is treating modernity as a passe-partout notion and ignoring the evidence to the contrary. In the social sciences, the violation of the market laws is felt as a violation of one's own identity, dependent professionally on the internal wars between the social sciences themselves. Without markets, who would the economists be? Without a state, who would the political scientists be? Without the excluded, who would the anthropologists be? Without the poor, who would the social workers be?

REFERENCES

- ALEXANDER, J. C. (1996). The Centrality of the Classics. In S. Turner (Ed.), *Social Theory and Sociology – The Classics and Beyond*

Limites e possibilidades das Ciências Sociais

- (pp. 20–38). Oxford: Blackwell.
- ALEXANDER, J. C. (2011). *Performance and Power*. NY: Polity.
- AMARAL, J. F. do, BRANCO, M., MENDONÇA, S., PIMENTA, C., & REIS, J. (2008, December 3). Ciência económica vai nua. *Público*. Disponível em: <http://www.publico.pt/opiniao/jornal/a-ciencia-economica-vai-nua-286514>, consultado em 13/02/2020.
- ANDERSON, B. (1998). *Imagined Communities* (8th ed.). London and NY: Verso.
- ARCHER, M. S. (2007). *Making our Way through the World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- BERTAUX, D. (1977). *Destins personnels et structure de classe: pour une critique de l'anthroponomie politique*. Paris: PUF.
- BHAMBRA, G. K. (2014). *Connected Sociologies*. London/NewDelhi/NY/Sydney: Bloomsbury.
- BOURDIEU, P., & PASSERON, J.-C. (1970). *La Reproduction: éléments d'une théorie du système d'enseignement*. Paris: éditions de Minuit.
- BURAWOY, M. (2004). For a Sociological Marxism: The Complementary Convergence of Antonio Gramsci and Karl Polanyi. *Politics & Society*, (31), 193–261. Disponível em: <http://pas.sagepub.com/content/31/2/193.full.pdf>, consultado em 11/03/2020.
- CASTEL, R. (1998). *As metamorfoses da questão social - uma crónica do salário*. Petrópoles: Vozes.
- CASTELLS, M. (2012). *Redes de Indignación y Esperanza*. Madrid: Alianza.
- CLARK, G. (2014). *The Son Also Rises*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press.
- COSER, L. A. (1956). *The Functions of Social Conflict*. NY: Free Press.
- DAMÁSIO, A. (1994). *O erro de Descartes: emoção, razão e cérebro humano*. Lisboa: Europa-América.
- DORES, A. P. (2013). A análise jornalística torna irreconhecível a densidade da vida. *Revista Angolana de Sociologia*, (11), 35–50. Disponível em: <http://hdl.handle.net/10071/6782>; <http://ras.revues.org/320>, consultado em 17/03/2020.
- DURKHEIM, É. (1973). *O suicídio: estudo de sociologia*. Lisboa: Editorial Presença.
- ECO, & LUSA. (2017, October 16). Secretário de Estado: “Não podemos ficar à espera que apareçam os bombeiros.” *Eco - Economia Online*.

Limites e possibilidades das Ciências Sociais

- Disponível em: <https://eco.pt/2017/10/16/secretario-de-estado-nao-podemos-ficar-a-espera-que-aparecam-os-bombeiros/>, consultado em 07/04/2020.
- ELIAS, N. (1990). *O Processo Civilizacional (Vol I e II)* (1ª edição). Lisboa: D. Quixote.
- FOUCAULT, M. (1975). *Surveiller et punir : naissance de la prison*. Paris: Gallimard.
- FOUCAULT, M. (1999a). *Les anormaux*. Paris: Gallimard, Le Seuil.
- FOUCAULT, M. (1999b). *Microfísica do Poder*. Rio de Janeiro: Graal.
- GOFFMAN, E. (2004). *Estigma - Notas sobre a Manipulação da Identidade Deteriorada* (1ª ed.1963). Colectivo Sabotagem.
- GUILLUY, C. (2019). *No society - El Fin de la classe media occidental*.
- HABERMAS, J. (1987). Tendencies toward Juridification. In *The theory of Communicative Action* ([1981], pp. 356–373). Cambridge: Polity Press.
- HARARI, Y. N. (2018). *Homo Deus; História Breve do Amanhã*. Lisboa: 20/20 Editora, Elsinore.
- HOLLOWAY, J. (2003). *Change the World Without Taking Power - The Meaning of Revolution Today*. Disponível em: <http://www.endpage.org>, consultado em 03/03/2020.
- JAKOBS, G., & MELIÁ, M. C. (2003). *Derecho Penal del Enemigo*. Madrid: Cuadernos Civitas.
- JIM SCHOFIELD (2018). *The Real Philosophy of Science*. Smashwords.
- KUHN, M. (2016). *How the Social Sciences Think about the World's Social - Outline of a Critique*. Disponível em: <https://www.kobo.com/us/pt/ebook/how-the-social-sciences-think-about-the-world-s-social-1>, consultado em 28/02/2020.
- LACOSTE, Y. (1989). *A Geografia - isso serve, em primeiro lugar, para fazer a guerra*. S. Paulo: Papirus.
- LAHIRE, B. (2012). *Monde pluriel. Penser l'unité des sciences sociales*. Paris: Seuil.
- LYOTARD, J.-F. (1985). *A Condição Pós-Moderna*. Lisboa: Gradiva.
- MALEŠEVIĆ, S. (2010). *The Sociology of War and Violence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- MERTON, R. K. (1948). Discussion. *American Sociological Review*, XIII, 164–168.
- MOUZELIS, N. (1995). *Sociological Theory: What Went Wrong? – diagnosis and remedies*. London: Routledge.
- OBORNE, P. (2008). *The Triumph of the Political Class*. London: Pocket Books.

Limites e possibilidades das Ciências Sociais

- ORWELL, G. (1949). *1984* (first edit). London: Secker & Warburg.
- PALIDDA, S., & Garcia, J. Á. B. (Eds.). (2010). *Criminalización racista de los migrantes en Europa*. Granada: Comares Editorial.
- PARSONS, T. (1948). The Position of Sociological Theory. *American Sociological Review*, XIII, 158–164.
- Polanyi, K. (1980). *A Grande Transformação - as origens da nossa época* (1ª ed. 194). Rio de Janeiro: Editora Campus.
- RAWLS, J. (1993). *Uma Teoria de Justiça*. Lisboa: Editorial Presença.
- REICH, R. B. (1991). *O Trabalho das Nações*. Lisboa: Quetzal.
- SACARRÃO, G. F. (1982). *A Biologia do Egoísmo*. Lisboa: Europa-América.
- SEN, A. (2009). *A ideia de justiça*. Coimbra: Almedina.
- STIGLITZ, J. E., Sen, A., & Fitoussi, J.-P. (2009). *Measurement of Economic Performance and Social Progress*. Paris.
- THERBORN, G. (2006). Meaning, Mechanisms, Patterns and Forces: an Introduction. In G. Therborn (Ed.), *Inequalities of the World – New Theoretical Frameworks, Multiple empirical approaches* (pp. 1–58). London: Verso.
- WIEVIORKA, M. (2005). *La Violence*. Paris: Hachette Littératures.

Diálogos
possíveis

REVISTA DIÁLOGOS POSSÍVEIS

Editor: Professor Doutor José Euclimar Xavier Menezes

Centro Universitário Social da Bahia (UNISBA)

Avenida Oceânica 2717, CEP – 40170-010
Ondina, Salvador – Bahia.

E-mail: dialogos@unisba.edu.br
Telefone: 71- 4009-2840