

**Questions 1 -8; READING PASSAGE 1;**

Based on: *Varieties of second modernity: the cosmopolitan turn in social and political theory and research*, by Ulrich Beck and Edgar Grande; Article first published online: 14 SEP 2010; DOI: 10.1111/j.1468-4446.2010.01320.x; © London School of Economics and Political Science 2010  
<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1468-4446.2010.01320.x/full>

**Questions 1 - 5; 2 points per each correct answer****I. Introduction**

When a world order collapses, that's the moment when reflection should begin. Surprisingly, this has not been the case with the type of social theory dominant today. The mainstream of social theory still floats loftily above the lowlands of epochal transformations (climate change, financial crisis, nation-states) in a condition of universalistic superiority and instinctive uncertainty. This universalistic social theory, whether structuralist, interactionist, Marxist or systems-theoretical, is now both out of date and provincial. *Out of date* because it excludes a priori what can be observed empirically: a fundamental transformation of society and politics *within* Modernity (from First to Second Modernity); *provincial* because it mistakenly absolutizes the trajectory, the historical experience and future expectation of Western, i.e. predominantly European or North American, modernization and thereby also fails to see its particularity.

**Are the following statements True, False, or Not Given, in other words, do they agree with the information given in the reading passage above?**

**Mark True as option A, False as B, and Not Given as C, on the answer sheet.**

- [1]** The type of social theory dominant today is being reflected now because the world order is collapsing.
- [2]** We address the key problem of methodological cosmopolitanism.
- [3]** We seem to approach the great transformation processes of our time applying universalistic superiority and instinctive uncertainty.
- [4]** This universalistic social theory is now outdated because it ignores the on-going shift from the First to Second Modernity.
- [5]** Structuralist, interactionist, Marxist or systems-theoretical, universalistic social theory is provincial because it overgeneralises the trajectory of Western modernization.

**Questions 6 - 8; 2 points per each correct answer****[6]**

It has become a commonplace that national institutions alone are unable to cope with the challenges of regulating global capitalism and responding to new global risks ([Beck 2009](#)). It is no less obvious that there is no global state or international organization capable of regulating global capital and risk in a way comparable to the role played by the 'Keynesian welfare national state' ([Jessop 2002](#)) in industrial society. Instead, we can observe a complex reconstitution of political authority, with which to organize the mechanisms of global economic regulation, risk management and control in ways characterized by new forms of political interdependence ([Grande and Pauly 2005](#)).

**Choose the option which best completes the sentence in agreement with the text above.**

What can be observed now is

- A)** that national institutions alone lack the necessary power and competence to deal successfully with the challenges of regulating global capitalism and responding to new global risks.
- B)** that global capital and risk can only be regulated by global or international organizations.
- C)** the indispensable role of Keynesian welfare national states.
- D)** a complex reconstitution of political authority, with which to organize
- E)** desperate effort of political authorities to conserve the existing mechanisms of global economic regulation, and risk management in the circumstances of growing political interdependence.

**[7]**

At present, the politics of the 'world risk society' ([Beck 1999, 2009](#)) is an extraordinarily intricate terrain, composed, among other things, of co-ordinated national mechanisms, bilateral and multilateral agreements, inter-, trans- and supranational institutions, transnational corporations, private charity foundations, and civil society groups. Despite this rapidly growing number of global organizations and transnational institutions, there is an increasing unease, nourished not least by the hesitant responses to the global financial crisis, the European currency crisis, and the poor results of the last global climate conference at Copenhagen that these institutions are proving unable to address the challenges they were created to meet. Similar developments can be observed at the national level, regarding, for example, democratic institutions, welfare systems, families, etc. Can the World Bank solve the global problem of poverty? Can the Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations (FAO) solve a global food crisis? Can the World Trade Organisation effectively regulate global trade? It seems as if these institutions do not constitute a sufficient basis for managing or controlling the global risks and crises created by the global victory of industrial capitalism. This is exactly what the transformative dynamics of the Second, Cosmopolitan Modernity is about! Isn't there a gulf of centuries between the threats, opportunities and conflict dynamics of border-transcending, radicalized modernization in the twenty-first century and the ideas, institutions and structures of industrial capitalism and national state authority rooted in the nineteenth century?

**Choose the option which best completes the sentence in agreement with the text above.**

The transformative dynamics of the Second, Cosmopolitan Modernity can be characterised by:...

- A)** a neat, transparent, and efficient system of co-ordinated national mechanisms, bilateral and multilateral agreements, inter-, trans- and supranational institutions, transnational corporations, private charity foundations, and civil society groups.

- B)** the global financial crisis, the European currency crisis, and the worsening state of the global environment.
- C)** inability of global and national institutions to fulfil their goals and roles by resolving successfully the problems they are intended to deal with.
- D)** the current threats, opportunities and conflict dynamics of border-transcending, and radicalized modernization.
- E)** the transformation of ideas, institutions and structures of industrial capitalism and national state authority rooted in the nineteenth century.

**[8]**

This introductory chapter will present some of the theoretical and methodological tools needed to answer such questions. It argues that it is impossible to talk meaningfully about methodological cosmopolitanism without pulling down the walls of Euro-centrism. We need to open up perspectives onto the world beyond Europe, onto the entanglements of histories of colonization and domination as well as onto border-transcending dynamics, dependencies, interdependencies and intermingling. How? Through a new conceptual architecture distinguishing two types of social theory: the *singular* and the *plural*. A theory of *the* society in the *singular* means: society neither national nor global but society absolutely understood in universal terms; whereas a theory of *societies* in the *plural*, refers to the very different paths and contexts of modernization processes. Sociological theory from its very beginning has been concerned to formulate a *general* theory of (modern) society in the *singular* (and to identify general concepts, principles, structures, systems, and modes of social action and change). This is no longer sufficient, if it ever was. It inevitably leads to the category error of implicitly applying conclusions drawn from *one* society to society (in general), which then becomes a universal frame of reference. This is exactly the case with most of the dominant theories in contemporary sociology (Bourdieu, Coleman, Foucault, Giddens, Goffman, Habermas, Luhmann, Meyer, Parsons, and even Beck's 'Risk Society'). Confusing a theory of *one* society (*of many*) with *the* theory of society as such is what we call the self-provincialization of social theory. The form of abstraction characteristic of this type of theory is not a sign of professional sophistication but of a failure to reflect upon the transformative dynamics of modern societies in the twenty-first century.

**Choose the option which best completes the sentence in agreement with the text above.**

In the introductory chapter, Beck and Grande...

- A)** reject the impossibility to talk meaningfully about methodological cosmopolitanism from Euro-centrist standpoint.
- B)** urge that the twenty first century sociology has to adopt an open up perspectives onto the world beyond Europe.
- C)** find faults with the newly proposed conceptual architecture of social theory.
- D)** refer to the very different paths and contexts of modernization processes.
- E)** claim that sociological theory concerned to formulate a *general* theory of (modern) society in the *singular* (and to identify general concepts, principles, structures, systems, and modes of social action and change) is not only no longer sufficient, but has never been.

## Reading Passage Two

From **Mobile sociology**, by John Urry  
 Article first published online: 14 JAN 2010  
 DOI: 10.1111/j.1468-4446.2009.01249.x  
 © London School of Economics and Political Science 2010  
<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1468-4446.2009.01249.x/full>

### Questions 9 - 16; 1 point per each correct answer

In this article I show how mobilities' criss-crossing societal borders in new temporal-spatial patterns [9]..... a novel agenda for sociology, of mobility. Much twentieth-century sociology has been [10]..... upon the study of occupational, income, educational and social mobility. This literature [11]..... society as a uniform surface and failed to register the geographical [12]..... of region, city and place, with the social categories of class, gender and ethnicity. Further, there are [13]..... flows of people within, but especially beyond, the territory of each society, and these flows [14]..... to many different desires, for work, housing, leisure, religion, family relationships, criminal gain, asylum seeking and so on. Moreover, not only people are mobile, but [15]..... are many 'objects', 'images', 'informations' and 'wastes'. Mobility is thus to be understood in a horizontal rather than a vertical sense, and it [16]..... to a variety of actants and not just to humans.

*In sociology, actants are the principal concern of the actor-network theory, the activity of which is described as "mediation" or "translation".*

*In sociology, the term "actant" is an approach neither to speak of "actors" (who act) or of "systems" (which behave). It was coined by Bruno Latour.[3]*

*In The Politics of Nature Latour gives a succinct definition of what an actant is. As Latour puts it, actants are anything that "...modifies] other actors through a series of..." actions (75).*

**[9]**

**A)** arrangements    **B)** constitutes    **C)** occurs    **D)** results    **E)** stances

**[10]**

**A)** applied    **B)** based    **C)** concerned    **D)** influenced    **E)**  
involved

**[11]**

**A)** emerged    **B)** focused    **C)** led    **D)** opposed    **E)** regarded

**[12]**

**A)** contravenes    **B)** diasporas    **C)** indicates    **D)** intersections    **E)**  
undermines

**[13]**

**A)** crucial    **B)** fallacies    **C)** intensely    **D)** notwithstanding    **E)** transgress

**[14]**

**A)** attempt    **B)** challenge    **C)** embrace    **D)** face    **E)** relate

**[15]**

**A)** as such    **B)** inasmuch as    **C)** so as    **D)** so too    **E)**  
such as

**[16]**

**A)** applies    **B)** enhances    **C)** determines    **D)** involves    **E)** stems

\* **Questions 17 - 19; 2 points per each correct answer**

I have thus set out some characteristics of global networks and fluids. Because these are inhuman hybrids, conceptions of agency that **[17].....** are inappropriate. This is not to suggest that humans do not do such things, not to suggest that human do not exert agency. But they only do so in circumstances which are not of their own making; and it is those circumstances – the enduring and increasingly intimate relations of subjects and objects – that are of paramount significance. This means that the human and physical worlds **[18].....** and cannot be analysed separately from each other, as society and as nature, or humans and objects. Also agency is not a question of humans acting independently of objects in terms of their unique capacities to attribute meaning or to follow rules. If then there is not autonomous realm of human agency, so there should not be thought of as a distinct level of social reality that is the unique outcome of humans acting in and through their specific powers. Various writers have tried to develop **[19].....** of individuals making society and society making individuals (Berger and Luckmann 1967). But such a dialectic would only be only plausible if we mean by society something trivial, that is pure social interactions abstracted from the networks of intricate relationships with the inhuman.

**Decide which option A, B, C, D, or E best fits into gaps 17, 18, and 19.**

- A)** are elaborately intertwined
- B)** do not deal with the complex consequences of diverse mobilities;
- C)** in certain contexts, order generates chaos
- D)** specifically focus upon the capacities of humans to attribute meaning or sense or to follow a social rule
- E)** the thesis of the dialectic

**AM\_SOC\_13\_B KEY****PASSAGE 1** - 1F, 2NG, 3F, 4T, 5T

1B, 2C,3B, 4A, 5A; 6A, 7C, 8B

**PASSAGE 2** - 9B, 10 B, 11E, 12 D, 13 A, 14E, 15,D, 16A

17D, 18A, 19 E

Číslo otázky	Správná odpověď	Bodové ohodnocení
1	B	2
2	<b>C</b>	2
3	B	2
4	A	2
5	<b>A</b>	2
6	A	2
7	C	2
8	B	2
9	B	1
10	B	1
11	E	1
12	D	1
13	A	1
14	E	1
15	D	1
16	A	1
17	D	2
18	A	2
19	E	2

**Key** 4 Reading passage two

In this article I show how mobilities criss-crossing societal borders in new temporal-spatial patterns **constitutes** a novel agenda for sociology, of mobility. Much twentieth-century sociology has been **based** upon the study of occupational, income, educational and social mobility. This literature **regarded** society as a uniform surface and failed to register the geographical **intersections** of region, city and place, with the social categories of class, gender and ethnicity. Further, there are **crucial** flows of people within, but especially beyond, the territory of each society, and these flows **relate** to many different desires, for work, housing, leisure, religion, family relationships, criminal gain, asylum seeking and so on. Moreover, not only people are mobile, but **so too** are many 'objects', 'images', 'informations' and 'wastes'. Mobility is thus to be understood in a horizontal rather than a vertical sense, and it **applies** to a variety of actants and not just to humans.

I have thus set out some characteristics of global networks and fluids. Because these are inhuman hybrids, conceptions of agency that specifically focus upon the capacities of humans to attribute meaning or sense or to follow a social rule are inappropriate. This is not to suggest that humans do not do such things, not to suggest that humans do not exert agency. But they only do so in circumstances which are not of their own making; and it is those circumstances – the enduring and increasingly intimate relations of subjects and objects – that are of paramount significance. This means that the human and physical worlds are elaborately intertwined and cannot be analysed separately from each other, as society and as nature, or humans and objects. Also agency is not a question of humans acting independently of objects in terms of their unique capacities to attribute meaning or to follow rules. If then there is not an autonomous realm of human agency, so there should not be thought of as a distinct level of social reality that is the unique outcome of humans acting in and through their specific powers. Various writers have tried to develop the thesis of the dialectic of individuals making society and society making individuals (Berger and Luckmann 1967). But such a dialectic would only be plausible if we mean by society something trivial, that is pure social interactions abstracted from the networks of intricate relationships with the inhuman. Since almost all social entities do involve networks of connections between humans and these other components, so there are no uniquely human societies as such. Societies are necessarily hybrids.