

University of East London Institutional Repository: <http://roar.uel.ac.uk>

This paper is made available online in accordance with publisher policies. Please scroll down to view the document itself. Please refer to the repository record for this item and our policy information available from the repository home page for further information.

To see the final version of this paper please visit the publisher's website. Access to the published version may require a subscription.

Author(s): Robbins, Derek

Article Title: French production and English reception: the international transfer of the work of Pierre Bourdieu

Year of publication: 2008

Citation: Robbins, D. (2008) 'French production and English reception: the international transfer of the work of Pierre Bourdieu.' *Sociologica* 2/2008

Link to published version: <http://dx.doi.org/10.2383/27720>

DOI: 10.2383/27720

French production and English reception: the international transfer of the work of Pierre Bourdieu.

Introduction: the implication of Bourdieu's philosophy of social science for the analysis of the trans-national transfer of his work.

Forty years ago, Pierre Bourdieu published "Champ intellectuel et projet créateur" in a special number of Sartre's *Les Temps Modernes* devoted to 'the problems of structuralism' (Bourdieu, 1966). In opposition to Romantic theories of self-expressive creativity, Bourdieu introduced the notion of the 'intellectual field' to describe the reciprocal relationship between intellectual production and reception, arguing that the system of relations was constitutive of meaning. In the first sentence of the article he famously pronounced:

"In order that the sociology of intellectual and artistic creation be assigned its proper object and at the same time its limits, the principle must be perceived and stated that the relationship between a creative artist and his work, and therefore his work itself, is affected by the system of social relations within which creation as an act of communication takes place, or to be more precise, by the position of the creative artist in the structure of the intellectual field (which is itself, in part at any rate, a function of his past work and the reception it has met with)." (Bourdieu, 1971, in Young, M.F.D., ed., 1971, 161).

The article represented a significant critique of the dominant form of structural analysis at the time because Bourdieu was wanting to insist that structuration is the *immanent* achievement of agents within history and is not to be confused with the armchair, *ex post facto* structural explanations fabricated by present analysts in order to sustain their detachment from engagement with contemporary social and cultural events. Bourdieu had simply transposed to the study of cultural history the disquiet he had felt as he had witnessed in Algeria the attempts of Western anthropologists to analyse ethnocentrically the cultural behaviour of indigenous Algerian tribes. The crucial distinction in both cases was between immanent practice and detached theorising. This distinction had been the theme of Bourdieu's work since returning to mainland France at the beginning of the 1960s. The educational research carried out with Jean-Claude Passeron, leading to the publication of "Les étudiants et leurs études" (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1964a) and also of *Les Héritiers* (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1964b) had, amongst other things, sought to analyse the relationship between the practical, cultural dispositions of students – both what they listened to or watched and also what they themselves produced – and the reified or 'consecrated' culture which was transmitted to them in their university courses and on the knowledge or appreciation of which they were tested and, consequently, allocated to social positions. The research on photography which led to the publication of *Un art moyen, essai sur les usages sociaux de la photographie* (Bourdieu, Boltanski, Castel, & Chamboredon, 1965) focused on the social forces which caused a popular, everyday cultural practice to subscribe to, and become subordinate to, socially distinctive aesthetic norms. The research on museums and art galleries which led to the publication of *L'amour de l'art, les musées d'art et leur public* (Bourdieu, Darbel & Schnapper, 1966) analysed attendance at institutions of consecrated culture so as to consider how far they encouraged popular cultural creativity or, conversely, served to consolidate the social exclusion of the culturally uninitiated. In each of these cases, Bourdieu was interested in generating a sociological analysis of the *encounter* between everyday practice and established cultural institutions and discourses, of the mechanisms by which cultural *practices*, understood anthropologically, were changed into cultural *forms*, understood aesthetically.

“Champ intellectuel et projet créateur” relied heavily on L.L. Schücking’s *The Sociology of Literary Taste* for the evidence which led Bourdieu to suggest that, in France, it was in the mid-19th century that there emerged a class of intellectuals which acquired independence of judgement from both aristocratic patronage and Catholic control. Intellectual judgement became autonomous and self-validating, developing both institutional presence through secular media of communication, such as books, newspapers and periodicals, and discursive validity as specific language games established self-regulating codes of meaning and truth. “Champ intellectuel et projet créateur” emphasized the formal distinction between practice and discourse, but Bourdieu was also interested in the competition for legitimacy between different discourses. He was at the time translating Panofsky’s *Gothic Architecture and Scholastic Thought* (Panofsky, 1967) and taking from Panofsky the suggestion that those symbolic forms investigated by Cassirer in a Kantian frame of thinking might be liberated from Kantian *a prioristic* transcendentalism and be understood to be the social products of educational systems. Bourdieu elaborated this view in “Systèmes d’enseignement et systèmes de pensée” (Bourdieu, 1967) arguing that schooling systems contingently generate those categories of understanding which Kant regarded as intrinsic and absolute. Bourdieu was already working out the position which he was to articulate succinctly in a lecture given at Harvard entitled “On Symbolic Power” a few years later. (Bourdieu, 1977)

Bourdieu had already argued, in “Condition de classe et position de classe” (Bourdieu, 1966), that class characteristics, such as those of ‘peasants’, are not universal but, instead, the distinctive products of distinctively different social, economic, cultural or political systems. Comparison between systems of education (and, *a fortiori*, between systems of thought) could not be achieved by assigning them an artificial autonomy. To seek to extract these systems from their total contexts would be to attempt to deny that they were the constructs of self-determining social agents. (See “La comparabilité des systèmes d’enseignement”, Bourdieu & Passeron, 1967). It was within this frame of thinking that Bourdieu and Passeron attempted to represent their own social scientific activity. “Sociology and Philosophy in France since 1945: Death and Resurrection of a Philosophy without Subject” (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1967) was an attempt on the part of Bourdieu and Passeron to situate their own particular conditions of intellectual production, in part patriotically against *American* neo-positivism, in part intranationally in class terms in alliance with intellectuals of provincial origin, such as Canguilhem, against cosmopolitan Parisians, such as Aron, and, in part, as a manifesto for empirical philosophy against the self-indulgent existential philosophy that they thought had been induced by the experience of Resistance and Liberation.

The tension involved in seeking to reconcile a prescriptive account of recommended sociological methodologies with a social historical recognition of the socially contingent origins of such an account became intense in the co-authored production of *Le métier de sociologue* (Bourdieu, Chamboredon, & Passeron, 1968). Passeron had already established a Department of Sociology at the University of Nantes and, in 1968, was to accept the post of Head of Department of Sociology in the newly established University of Paris VIII, at Vincennes. Bourdieu remained Director of Studies in the Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales, concerned with the reactive guidance of research students rather than with the transmission of institutionalised rules of sociological method. It followed that Bourdieu was interested in the sociology of sociology as much as of any other intellectual field. Bourdieu deployed the language of sociology to achieve a phenomenological reduction, bedding all intellectuality in the pre-predicative ontology of the life-world, whereas Passeron restricted himself to the attempt to refine the epistemology of the social sciences.

It should be clear from this introduction that an analysis of the transfer of Bourdieu's work between nation-states and between national intellectual traditions has to be undertaken in a particular way if it is to remain true to those ideas whose transfer is under consideration. The conditions in which Bourdieu lived and worked caused him to identify specific social phenomena to be analysed. Notably, as is clear from passages in his posthumously published *Esquisse pour une auto-analyse* (Bourdieu, 2004) schooling painfully detached him from the shared culture of his family home. He succeeded educationally but viewed that success with distaste. He became socially mobile, moving away from his Béarnais origins, but he constantly eschewed Parisian 'distinction'. Conscription to serve in the army in Algeria after completing his studies at the Ecole Normale Supérieure oddly gave him the opportunity to experience anew the world which he had lost in the Béarn. He reflected on these experiences in conceptual terms derived from his philosophical training – seeing, for instance, 'acculturation' in terms of the 'phenomenology of affective relations'. At first he was forced to articulate his responses to these experiences within existing discourses, using existing channels of communication. As his career developed, Bourdieu gradually constructed objectified contexts within which his own self-expression could be generated. He moulded a research group to be a means for self-constitution or self-consolidation. After 1975, he edited a journal which became his personal intellectual field. In the late 1980s he founded another, less 'academic' journal, *Liber*, and in the 1990s he established his own publishing house – *Raisons d'Agir*. These were devices to resist the censure of a public intellectual sphere which might exert influence beyond his control. Bourdieu regarded the translation of his work with acute ambivalence. On the one hand, he was planting his thoughts in fields or national sub-fields which might evade the supposed censorship of his enemies in France but, on the other hand, he was conscious that he was also forfeiting his own control over the texts which were cast loose in the international ether. This ambivalence was most acute in respect of the translation of his work into English. Bourdieu felt that he was supping with the devil. The growing international linguistic domination of English seemed to offer him an incipiently universal field of reception within which his works could circulate, but the a priori existence of an English-language international book market suggested that his subversive intentions would be neutralised as they were appropriated by commercial interests analogous to those aristocratic and ecclesiastical interests against which the emergent intellectual field had struggled in the 19th century. This paper cannot attend to the wider implications of Bourdieu's reception in the English-language international field, but it attempts to chart the interaction between Bourdieu's French production and the English-language reception within the United Kingdom. It does so by following his production in chronological sequence and by attempting to insert the emergence of his 'English identity' into the same biographical time-line, focusing on successive decades.

1960s.

Bourdieu's projects and the French intellectual fields in which his findings were disseminated.

The French field of 'anthropology'.

The research which Bourdieu undertook in Algeria was a form of philosophically inspired empiricism which he subsequently called 'Fieldwork in Philosophy' (Bourdieu, 1987). Bourdieu needed a discourse within which to communicate his findings. The cultural 'otherness' of the location enabled him to present his work as neither 'philosophy' nor 'sociology' but, initially, as 'anthropology' or 'ethnography'. His first publication was *Sociologie de l'Algérie* (Bourdieu, 1958). It was published in the Que Sais-je collection (No. 802) of the Presses Universitaires de

France¹. As such, it constituted a short introduction to indigenous Algerian society for general readers. It was only in the revised and corrected second edition (Bourdieu, 1961) that Bourdieu indicated that the book was part of a larger scientific project, or, as he put it, that his study was “...a conceptual outline of more extensive analyses ...” (Bourdieu, 1961, 5; 1962, xi). He was referring to the fact that his ‘sociology’ of Algeria was not to be taken at face value as an account of the objective reality of Algerian society so much as a ‘baseline description’ to be used to analyse the processes of cultural adaptation from traditional to modern social organisation and values which were largely the consequence of French colonial presence and military aggression. On the basis of research already completed, Bourdieu was, in 1961, clearly anticipating the publication, in 1963, of the two-volume *Travail et travailleurs en Algérie* (Bourdieu, Darbel, Rivet, & Seibel, 1963) and the subsequent publication, in 1964, of *Le déracinement, la crise de l’agriculture traditionnelle en algérie* (Bourdieu & Sayad, 1964). The first was published by Mouton, which was to publish the early working papers of the Centre de Sociologie Européenne, and the second was published by Editions de Minuit. It was only the English-language translation of the second edition of *Sociologie de l’Algérie*, published in the U.S.A. as *The Algerians* (Bourdieu, 1962) that the text introduced detailed figures, either representing diagrammatically the spatial organisation of tribal villages and domestic dwellings or schematically representing genealogical relations. This American text would seem to have been absorbing Bourdieu’s work into an interpretative framework reminiscent of the work of Lévi-Strauss, whose research seminar Bourdieu attended in 1961. At the same time, published in the year in which Algeria achieved independence, the American edition emphasized the political context. It changed the title, removing the notion that it was a ‘sociology of’ Algeria, added a Preface by Raymond Aron², and inserted, as the last chapter, an article, “Révolution dans la révolution” which Bourdieu had published in *Esprit* in 1961 (Bourdieu, 1961). In France, however, the political dimension of Bourdieu’s work would at first have become most known through the publication of a chapter entitled “De la guerre révolutionnaire à la révolution” in a book dedicated to consideration of the post-independence prospects for Algeria. (Bourdieu, 1962) as well as through an article on the Algerian sub-proletariat which appeared in *Les Temps modernes* (Bourdieu, 1962). Otherwise, Bourdieu extracted articles from his field work which related to the thematic concerns of several new journals. One of these was *Etudes rurales* in which Bourdieu published an article related to the theme of *Le déracinement* (Bourdieu, 1964) as well as an account of the research which he had undertaken in 1962 in his native Béarn (Bourdieu, 1962). Another was *Sociologie du travail* in which Bourdieu contributed articles which highlighted attitudes to work, unemployment, and time in traditional society (Bourdieu, 1962 and 1963). By this choice of journals, Bourdieu was relating his analyses of Algerian society to more general issues concerning the transition from traditional to modern – issues which were not presented as of ‘universal’ relevance but of particular relevance to the analogous transition in French society³.

¹ *Sociologie de l’Algérie* was finally replaced in the Que Sais-je series after the eighth edition of November, 2001.

² Although Aron had been appointed Professor of Sociology at the Sorbonne in 1955, he was most known internationally in the early 1960s for his political commentaries and for his contributions to the analysis of international relations. Earlier he had himself published *La Tragédie algérienne* (Aron, 1957) and *L’Algérie et la République* (Aron, 1958) in which he evaluated, in political and economic terms, the pros and cons of the continuing French presence in North Africa. In 1960, Aron had invited Passeron to become his research assistant at the Sorbonne and Bourdieu to become secretary to the newly established Centre de Sociologie Européenne, Paris.

³ Bourdieu’s representation of peasant society and its values can be seen to have been in direct opposition to the kind of modernisation perceived and advocated by Henri Mendras in *La fin des paysans*, 1961 (Mendras, 1961).

The British field of anthropological reception.

In the United Kingdom, however, there was no comparable sense of affinity between the condition of British society and that of ex-colonial societies. E.P. Thompson's contemporary *The Making of the English Working Class* (Thompson, 1963) was an account of the emergent self-consciousness of artisans rather than peasants and, in apologising for failing to treat Scottish and Welsh histories in his book, Thompson commented explicitly that "We had no peasantry in England comparable to the Highland migrants." (Thompson, 1963, 14.). The British interest in traditional societies, therefore, was much less self-regarding than the French. In his account of British Anthropology, Adam Kuper identified three distinct generations of leaders – the founders around the First World War, their successors who dominated the profession after the Second World War, and the new generation which entered the profession in the late 40s and early 50s who now faced the problem of reconstructing functionalist anthropology 'in a post-imperialist world' (Kuper, 1973, 10). Julian Pitt-Rivers was one of the new generation of anthropologists. His *The People of the Sierra* had been endorsed in a Foreword by the most significant second-generation English anthropologist – Evans-Pritchard – who recognized that Pitt-Rivers "was determined to show that the methods and concepts which have been so successfully employed in studies of primitive societies could equally well be used in the study of the social life of our own civilization" (Evans-Pritchard in Pitt-Rivers, 1954). This was, however, only half true. The relevance of anthropological methods to the study 'of our own civilization' hardly extended to the study of British society. Instead, the study of 'Mediterranean' society became a surrogate for the study of colonial societies. Bourdieu's earliest articles had been published in the *Revue de la Méditerranée* (Bourdieu, 1959) and *Etudes méditerranéennes* (Bourdieu, 1960). He had, therefore, acquiesced then in the impression that the defining interest of his work related to the geographical region. If the slightly later contributions to *Etudes rurales* and the *Sociologie du travail* were attempts to break this mould, the endeavour was not successful in respect of Bourdieu's reception in the UK. A revised version of his article for *Sociologie du travail* was published in 1964 as "The attitude of the Algerian peasant toward time" (Bourdieu, 1964) in a collection edited by Pitt-Rivers with the title *Mediterranean countrymen* and, significantly, published in Paris and The Hague by Mouton (Pitt-Rivers, ed., 1964). The following year, Bourdieu's "The Sentiment of Honour in Kabyle Society" (Bourdieu, 1965) (an article never published in French) was published in a collection edited by J.G. Peristiany, entitled *Honour and Shame. The Values of Mediterranean Society* (Peristiany, ed., 1965).

In spite of the research which Bourdieu was undertaking within the Centre de Sociologie Européenne throughout the 1960s, involving publications - already detailed - transmitting the findings of projects on education, photography and art galleries, his reputation in the UK was limited. He was seen as an adjunct to what Mary Douglas was retrospectively to call the 'new young field of Mediterranean anthropology' (Douglas, 1980, 118). In the late 1960s only four bi-products from these projects might have been known to English readers unable to read the main texts in French. No coherent intellectual identity would have been apparent from these bi-products. Two articles (Bourdieu, 1967 and 1968) were published bi-lingually in the *International Social Science Journal*, and the other two were never published in French but only in English in the *American Journal Social Research* (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1967, and Bourdieu, 1968b). Of these four articles, the first and second show the influence of Bourdieu's reflection on the work of Ernst Cassirer which must have been the consequence of his translating from English into French the work of Cassirer's disciple, Erwin Panofsky: *Gothic Architecture and Scholastic Thought*. (see Panofsky, trans. Bourdieu, 1967). The former (Bourdieu, 1967) concentrated on the ways in which the art forms of any society are immanently constructed in harmony with school-induced processes of thinking, and the second (Bourdieu, 1968) took further Panofsky's analysis of perspective to propose a sociology of art perception. The third

and fourth articles clearly arose out of the juxtaposition of the ideas expressed in 'Champ intellectuel et projet créateur' (Bourdieu, 1966) with the epistemological reflections contained in *Le métier de sociologue* (Bourdieu, Chamboredon & Passeron, 1968). In the third (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1967), the authors sought to situate their own practice as a creative project within the French post-World War II intellectual field, whilst in the fourth (Bourdieu, 1968), Bourdieu perhaps began to articulate what would soon become distinctive about his epistemology as opposed to that of Passeron. It was only the first of these four articles which assumed great prominence in the UK in the 1970s.

The 1970s.

The logic of Bourdieu's production.

It is possible retrospectively to offer an account of the logic of Bourdieu's work in France in the 1960s. However much his work was, as he would sometimes imply, reactive, contingent, conjunctural, or strategically responsive to random chance or accident, it seems clear that he and Passeron were taking up the challenge issued to them by Aron – to investigate empirically the extent to which socio-economic processes operate independently of state control and, therefore, with some degree of autonomous uniformity without reference to variations in political systems or systems of nation-state governance. Aron was most interested in comparing the phenomenon of capitalism in democratic and communist political systems or in comparing the political determinants of market or command economies. For Bourdieu and Passeron, the question became: how far do educational and cultural processes have the capacity to transcend the state mechanisms which sponsor or regulate them?⁴ The sub-text of the research on students and their studies related, for Bourdieu and Passeron, to their own educational experiences and aspirations, and, for Bourdieu, related to his observations of the suppression of indigenous culture in Algeria: how far can institutional contexts in education and culture be developed which allow learning and creativity to be self-expressive in such a way that people construct the framework of the state within which they live in opposition to the status quo in which the *politically* dominant determine the curriculum by which citizens are judged and determine what constitutes the proper taste for art? The research was stimulated by opposition to what was perceived as the pseudo-social democracy of the centrist state education system in spite of its apparently socialist, republican *bona fides*, and it was stimulated by opposition to the centrist imposition of 'consecrated' state art as evidenced in André Malraux's establishment of *Maisons de culture* throughout France. In terms of Aron's problematic, it was clear that there was little to choose between the situations in 'democratic' or 'communist' states and that there was little to choose between de Gaulle and other contemporary autocrats such as Franco or Tito. If Bourdieu sought to liberate culture and education from state hegemony, it was ironic, of course, that Aron had been a member of the Gaullist *Rassemblement du peuple français* (RPF) between 1947/8 and 1952⁵ and continued through the 1960s to favour constitutional reform in opposition to social movements, notably those of May, 1968. The important point is that Bourdieu's research in the 1960s was not seeking to contribute to the development of the academic sociology of either education or culture. Sociology itself had only gained full institutional recognition in French higher education in 1955 and sub-divisions of 'sociologies of' were barely in existence. The motivation for Bourdieu's work was the desire to disclose by analysis the potential for the emergence of a genuinely participatory social democratic state.

⁴ The relationship between Aron's agenda and the orientation of Bourdieu and Passeron is most evident in the publication of 1967 (Castel & Passeron, eds) which collected papers given at international conferences organized by the Centre de Sociologie Européenne in Madrid in 1964 and in Dubrovnik in 1965)

⁵ To be fair to Aron, he admitted his retrospective embarrassment at his proximity to de Gaulle at this period in his *Mémoires* (Aron, 1983).

A.H. Halsey has recorded an anecdote about Raymond Aron. According to Halsey, Aron was visiting Oxford from Paris in 1967. Some of Halsey's contemporaries who had graduated from the London School of Economics in the early 1950s and were now distributed around the country in chairs of sociology in universities, were, as Halsey continues:

“... gossiping in Halsey's room at Nuffield College about the state of the British sociological art. Aron suddenly cut in to exclaim, ‘The trouble is that British sociology is essentially an attempt to make intellectual sense of the political problems of the Labour Party’” (Halsey, 2004, 70)

Aron's supposed interjection is simultaneously perceptive about the situation of British sociology at the time and indicative of his normal inclination to emphasize the primacy of the political, subordinating sociology to the role of mere rationaliser of the political. The observation is important because it sets the scene for the subsequent competition in the UK for appropriation of the work of Bourdieu which itself had always possessed an intent oriented towards the encouragement of an alternative, socialist politics.

The British field of the sociology of education.

In an article which I first wrote in 1986, I analysed the reception of Bourdieu's work in the UK from the early 1960s through to 1977.⁶ I revised my earlier reading in an article which I wrote for a special number on Bourdieu produced by the *British Journal of the Sociology of Education* after Bourdieu's death (Robbins, 2004). In the earlier article I highlighted two phases of what I called the ‘appropriation’ of Bourdieu's work by the sociology of education. In the later article, I recognised the additional significance of a third strand of educational response, associated with the work of Margaret Archer. It was this third strand which actually had chronological priority. Margaret Archer had been familiar with the work of Bourdieu and Passeron as it was published in French in the 1960s (discussing it on the basis of untranslated French texts). This is apparent from her article of 1970 entitled “Egalitarianism in English and French Educational Sociology” (Archer, 1970). There is an Aronian flavour to her comment that political commitment to egalitarianism had led to research which had been

“... almost exclusively concerned with the distribution of education, ignoring issues about its content and procedures, which may be affected by distribution, but are not justified by it.” (Archer, 1970)

This Aronian affinity arises from a common methodological allegiance to Weber. With Michalina Vaughan, Archer published a Weberian historical study of educational change which sought to be comparative and macrosociological – *Social conflict and educational change in England and France, 1789-1848* (Archer & Vaughan, 1971), and in 1972 she edited *Students, university and society* (Archer, 1972). Based at the University of Reading and then of Warwick, through the 1970s Archer tried to develop macrosociological studies which would situate educational research within a comparative framework. Under the auspices of the Graduate School of Contemporary European Studies, Giner and Archer organised a series of seminars which brought together colleagues who dealt with various aspects of European society on a country-by-country basis. The outcome of this first series of seminars was *Europe: Class,*

⁶ Robbins, 2000 in Robbins, ed., 2000, vol. 3. The circumstances which led to the writing of this article (first published as Robbins, 1989) are described in detail in Robbins, 2006, 50-3. In brief, it was a paper which I wrote for discussion with Bourdieu at my first meeting with him in October, 1986. I comment further on the content of that first discussion and its relation to Bourdieu's own developing interest in the trans-national transfer of his concepts in Robbins, 2004.

Status and Power (Archer & Giner, 1971). This was followed by a further one-day seminar as a result of which it was suggested that the contributions and discussions should

“... eventually be published as a new symposium which would look at European societies across state frontiers, isolating emerging structures, international cultural patterns, and shared institutions, cleavages and conflicts.”

The final outcome was *Contemporary Europe. Social Structures and cultural patterns* (Archer & Giner, 1978) for which Margaret Archer herself contributed the first, methodological chapter entitled “The theoretical and comparative analysis of social structure”. Here she suggested that recent tendencies – in the ‘new sociology’ – towards ‘methodological individualism’ had served to generate a convergence, through common opposition, between Marxist and functionalist views of structure which were, in any case, theoretically compatible:

“... developments of the phenomenological tradition with their rejection of objective structural and cultural properties and (concomitant) neglect of macroscopic problems have prompted a closing of ranks among macro-sociologists. For the position taken by both ethnomethodologists and the tougher versions of symbolic interactionism constitute an attack on the problems, subject-matter and methodology which are central to the latter.” (Archer & Giner, 1978)

The published collection of *Contemporary Europe* included an article which had been published in French in 1973 by Bourdieu, Boltanski and Saint-Martin entitled: “Les stratégies de reconversion. Les classes sociales et le système d’enseignement.” (Bourdieu, Boltanski & Saint-Martin, 1973). The translation of the text – rendered as “Changes in social structure and changes in the demand for education” – also included a translation of the first footnote in which the authors had sought to locate their new article alongside their other recent researches. The footnote ran:

“The analyses presented here are based on a body of empirical research, the findings of which (particularly the statistical findings) have been published in detail elsewhere. See especially P. Bourdieu, ‘Reproduction culturelle et reproduction sociale’, *Informations sur les sciences sociales*, Vol X, no.2, 1971, pp. 45-79⁷; P. Bourdieu, L. Boltanski, P. Maledidier, ‘La Défense du corps’, *Informations sur les sciences sociales*, vol X, no. 4, 1971⁸; L. Boltanski, ‘L’Espace positionnel. Multiplicité des positions institutionnelles et habitus de classe,’ *Revue française de sociologie*, Vol XIV, 1973, pp. 3-26⁹...” (Archer & Giner, 1978, 197)

The effect of the reproduction of the footnote in the English translation was to emphasize the Frenchness of the analyses and findings. Archer wanted to use Bourdieu’s work not so much in itself but as, instead, a phenomenon which could be absorbed into a more general, structuralist account of the relations between education and occupational structure. She aspired to produce an analytical model which, recognizing the cultural specificity of Bourdieu’s work, would potentially transcend it.

Archer’s article of 1970 had cited “Les étudiants et leurs études” (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1964) and *Les Héritiers* (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1964), but the selection of “Les stratégies de reconversion” in the 1978 collection, including its account of its own genealogy, was significant in highlighting the absence of Passeron from the list of co-authors. Whereas Archer’s article of 1970 had attacked the primary emphasis of the researches of Bourdieu and Passeron on egalitarianism, the later objection was more to the concentration on social agents as instruments of their own reproduction. This was an orientation which Passeron did not share and which Bourdieu heralded in “Les stratégies de reconversion” in collaboration with new associates. The

⁷ Bourdieu, 1971.

⁸ Bourdieu, Boltanski, & Maledidier, 1971.

⁹ Boltanski, 1973.

epistemological differences between Bourdieu and Passeron which caused a rift between them in about 1972 were not recognised in the UK. In France, Bourdieu began to consolidate his differentiated position, developing his notion of ‘strategic action’ primarily in *Esquisse d’une théorie de la pratique, précédé de trois études d’ethnologie kabyle* (Bourdieu, 1972) but also in critiques of Weber (Bourdieu, 1971a and 1971b) and in accounts (Bourdieu, Boltanski & de Saint Martin, 1973, and Bourdieu & Boltanski, 1975) of findings of a research project on ‘Le Patronat’ which were finally to be published in full in *La noblesse d’état* (Bourdieu, 1989). As the sub-title of *Esquisse* suggests, Bourdieu developed his theory of practice by reflecting on his Algerian ethnology. In the UK, the translation of a revised version of *Esquisse* was published in 1977 as *Outline of a Theory of Practice* (Bourdieu, 1977) by Cambridge University Press in the Cambridge Studies in Social Anthropology under the general editorship of Jack Goody. Based substantially on fieldwork in Ghana undertaken in the late 1950s, Goody had contributed many Cambridge papers in Social Anthropology which were in accord with Bourdieu’s interpretations of Algerian society, including his *Production and reproduction: a comparative study of the domestic domain* (Goody, 1976), but the fields of anthropological and educational discourse were sharply segregated. The Paris/Cambridge connection in anthropology was sustained with the joint publication, in 1979, by the Cambridge University Press and the Editions of the Maison des Sciences de l’Homme, of a translation of *Bourdieu’s Algérie 60, structures économiques et structures temporelles* (Bourdieu, 1977) with the plain title, *Algeria 60* (Bourdieu, 1979). As far as I am aware, no connection was made across discourses and institutional barriers between the four important translations of Bourdieu’s work which appeared in the UK in the late 1980s – *Outline of a Theory of Practice* (Bourdieu, 1977), *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture* (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1977), *The Inheritors* (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1979) and *Algeria 60* (Bourdieu, 1979). One connection, to which I shall return, was that all four were translated by Richard Nice.

Bourdieu’s “Reproduction culturelle et reproduction sociale” (Bourdieu, 1971) was his representation of the significance of the book which he and Passeron had just co-authored, entitled *La reproduction*. (Bourdieu and Passeron, 1970). The published book had been sub-titled ‘Eléments pour une théorie du système d’enseignement’. It was Bourdieu who chose to emphasize the correlation between cultural and social reproduction which, subsequently, appeared to legitimise the title adopted for the English translation. It was a reading of their text with which Passeron has subsequently expressed his disagreement¹⁰. Bourdieu presented “Reproduction culturelle et reproduction sociale” at a conference of the British Sociological Association held in Durham in April, 1970. It was at this conference and shortly afterwards that the publication took shape which Michael F.D. Young was to edit with the title: *Knowledge and Control. New directions in the sociology of education* (Young, ed., 1971). Two articles by Bourdieu were included in this collection – the first English translations of “Champ intellectuel et projet créateur” (Bourdieu, 1966) and “Systèmes d’enseignement et systèmes de pensée” (Bourdieu, 1967) – and the publication of the Durham paper was delayed until the more official publication of its proceedings – in *Knowledge, Education, and Cultural Change* (Brown, ed., 1973). These three articles were reprinted several times in the UK during the 1970s both in collections which were associated with the implementation of the ‘New directions in the sociology of education’ in teacher training contexts such as the Institute of Education, London and the Open University, and also in collections which were more concerned to establish the academic legitimacy of the sociological analysis of education. Fuller detail about these competing responses in the educational field can be found in my article of 1986 to which I have already referred. For current purposes, the important point is that by the end of the 1970s the radical (essentially Althusserian) educational appropriation of Bourdieu’s work was exhausted.

¹⁰ See, for instance, Passeron, 1986.

The impetus given to the educational reception of Bourdieu's work by the 'New directions' movement was in decline. Mrs Thatcher became Prime Minister in 1979.

The 1980s.

The British field of Cultural Studies.

It was the influence of Richard Nice that effected the transition of the reception of Bourdieu's work from the field of education to the emerging field of Cultural Studies. Nice translated two short articles of Bourdieu in 1977 when he was working at the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies in the University of Birmingham, in the same year as the publication of his translations of *La Reproduction* and *Esquisse*. Stuart Hall discussed Bourdieu's work in his *On Ideology* (Hall, 1978) whilst the new journal *Media, Culture and Society* carried the first translated extracts from *La Distinction* in its second number (1980) with an introductory article on Bourdieu written by Nick Garnham and Raymond Williams entitled 'Pierre Bourdieu and the sociology of culture' (Garnham & Williams, 1980). The origins of this reception of Bourdieu's work in the new field of 'cultural studies' lay in the work of Richard Hoggart who had published the *Uses of Literacy* in 1957 (Hoggart, 1957) and had subsequently founded the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies in 1964. This newly institutionalised academic subject had become politicised as a consequence of the influence of Stuart Hall and Raymond Williams. Hoggart had reviewed Williams's *Culture and Society* (Williams, 1958) in 1959 and Williams had published *The Long Revolution* in 1960 (Williams, 1960). The New Left Review had been established in 1960 under the editorship of Stuart Hall. E.P. Thompson had written a two-part review of *The Long Revolution* in The New Left Review in 1961. These were the key components of the movement of the 'New Left' which had culminated in the production of a May Day Manifesto (Williams, ed., 1968) criticizing from a far-left position the policies of the Harold Wilson Labour government. The May Day Manifesto movement lost momentum after 1968. In that year the new editor of the New Left Review, Perry Anderson, regretted the theoretical inertia in England and cited Williams as the most promising English social theorist of his generation. However, the New Left English theorists had all come from intellectual backgrounds in the Arts and Humanities and History. The work of Bourdieu seemed to provide a near-Marxist cultural theory which could strengthen the endeavour of the English 'New Left'. The impact of Richard Nice's earlier translations was multiplied by his translation of Bourdieu's *La distinction* (Bourdieu, 1979), first of all in pre-publication extracts in *Media, Culture and Society* (Bourdieu, 1980) and then the complete text in paperback in England as *Distinction* (Bourdieu, 1986), published by Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Transformation of the British institutional field of reception.

During this same post-1960 period, the structure of the British intellectual field had been transformed. Following the Robbins Report on Higher Education of 1963, new universities had been established in the decade, following a traditionally liberal model, and some colleges of advanced technology were up-graded to university status, but the greatest transformation was the introduction of a 'binary system' of higher education by the Labour government which led to the establishment in 1969/70 of about 30 Polytechnics all of whom were to seek validation for their degree courses from a National Council for National Academic Awards (CNAA). This Council established Subject panels to validate the curriculum innovations proposed by the new institutions. Through the 1970s these panels became the locus for struggles for domination and legitimacy between the censors who were primarily office holders in the established universities and applicants from the Polytechnics. The political or ideological ambivalence of the

educational reform became increasingly apparent in the period between 1970 and 1990. Administered by coalitions of local authorities rather than by a central University Grants committee, the Polytechnics had been established by a Labour government with a technocratic orientation and the new institutions struggled to generate innovative courses which were simultaneously seeking to be responsive to the needs of an expanding student population, to the needs of industry for trained employees, as well as seeking to demonstrate their equivalent status alongside traditional universities¹¹. For some, the presentation of Bourdieu's work offered by *Knowledge and Control* (Young, ed., 1971) provided a blueprint for the way in which the British higher education system could, through curricular change in the Polytechnics, be transformed to become a mass system rather than one arranged to sustain the power of a ruling elite. Instead, however, the Conservative governments of the 1970s and 1980s gradually hi-jacked the intentions of the Labour government and began to use the Polytechnics to encourage a neo-liberal agenda of enterprise and market competition within the whole higher education system. In 1989, the Polytechnics were taken out of local authority control and made corporate institutions and then, in 1991, were designated new universities and expected to compete for students and funding within an unitary system.

The impact of postmodernism.

It is no accident that this institutional development between 1970 and 1990 coincided with the publication in France of Lyotard's *La condition postmoderne* (Lyotard, 1979) and of its translation in England as *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge* (Lyotard, 1984). 'Post-modernist' fever spread in Britain during the 1980s. One of the effects was to legitimate the rejection of sociologies of education and culture as both sadly 'modernist'. The vogue for Postmodernism not only had the effect of discrediting analyses of education and culture which sought to relate these practices to class background. It also had the effect of discrediting institutional attempts to make the content of education responsive to the social and cultural characteristics of the student population. In short, *The Postmodern Condition* had the effect of appearing to discredit both the theories which Bourdieu had advanced in his work of the 1960s (notably the concepts of habitus and cultural capital) and also, perhaps more importantly, the attempts of higher education institutions to fulfill any kind of *Bildung* function for the general benefit of a social democratic society.

The four Bourdieu texts published in English in the late 1970s were almost stillborn. They were recording French thinking of the 1960s at a time in the UK when the possibility of any implementation of policy following their principles had just passed. Bourdieu liked to quote Durkheim's comment that sociological research is of no worth unless it has social use and, unhappily, it was the case that these first English texts were doomed to be rendered inoperable. In the booming postmodern knowledge market, however, Bourdieu's work was about to become hot property. In my contribution to the special number on Bourdieu published by the *British Journal of the Sociology of Education* (Robbins, 2004), I traced the responses to Bourdieu's work in that journal from its first number in 1980 until the present. My argument was that Bourdieu's work had been incorporated into a discourse on education which was intellectually self-indulgent, denying the implications of his thinking for the radical transformation of institutions and systems. A similar argument could be advanced in relation to the reception of Bourdieu's work in the field of Cultural Studies.

The journal *Theory, Culture and Society* was established in 1982, primarily by staff based in one of the Polytechnics. Its title was significant in that it inherited the orientation of the New Left to

¹¹ See Robinson, 1968.

pursue enquiries concerning ‘culture and society’, following the title of Williams’s book, but proposed to do so in a way which was specifically ‘theoretical’ rather than sociological. In this respect it reflected the postmodern shift towards the theoretisation of Cultural Studies and away from the empirical studies of culture that had been pioneered by the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies. As early as the second volume in 1983, *Theory, Culture and Society* carried a translation of Bourdieu’s short tribute in *Le Monde* (Bourdieu, 1982) on the death of Erving Goffman – “Erving Goffman, Discoverer of the Infinitely Small” (Bourdieu, 1983). This was followed, in 1986, by the publication, as “The Struggle for Symbolic Order”, (Bourdieu, 1986) of a translation of the German text of the interview between Bourdieu, Honneth, Kocyba and Schwibs of 1985 which was later published in French in abbreviated form in *Choses Dites* (Bourdieu, 1987) and translated into English in *In Other Words* (Bourdieu, 1990) as “Fieldwork in Philosophy”. The journal continued this role in making Bourdieu’s work accessible in English by publishing, as “Thinking about Limits” (Bourdieu, 1992), a paper which Bourdieu had given in Amsterdam in 1989, and by publishing a year later, as “From Ruling Class to Field of Power” (Bourdieu, 1993b), an augmented and modified version of an interview between Bourdieu and Wacquant which had first been published in German in *Die Intellektuellen und die Macht* (Dölling, ed., 1991). The journal later carried Bridget Fowler’s translation of and commentary on the last chapter of *La misère du monde* (Bourdieu, 1993a) entitled “Comprendre” – “Understanding” (Bourdieu, 1996a) - and, in the same year, a translation, as “On the Family as a Realised Category” (Bourdieu, 1996b), of an article, “A propos de la famille comme catégorie réalisée” (Bourdieu, 1993c) which had appeared in the 100th edition of *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales*. More recently, the journal carried a translation, as “On the Cunning of Imperialist Reason” (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1999), of “Sur les ruses de la raison impérialiste” (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1998) and, subsequently, issued a number which continued the debate started in that article¹².

Since inception, *Theory, Culture and Society* has become steadily more concerned with globalisation as a theoretical issue and has also increasingly situated itself within a global intellectual market, celebrating, for instance, its 25th anniversary with an international conference held in Tokyo. Its role in relation to the work of Bourdieu has, therefore, been ambivalent in that it has projected Bourdieu’s work internationally whilst tacitly regarding Bourdieu’s specific attitude towards universalisation¹³ as modernist. The same ambivalence has been apparent in the mediation of Bourdieu’s work effected by Polity Press. This publishing house was established in Cambridge in 1984 by Anthony Giddens, David Held and John Thompson. It was a bold venture – which has been hugely successful – to launch a publishing house which would be committed to the dissemination of grand social and political theory, but it was also a venture which was closely linked to the personal intellectual agendas of the founding editors, particularly of Giddens. In its early years, Polity Press established its reputation through its publication of translations of the work of Bourdieu and Habermas. Bourdieu always took the view that the deficiency of the work of Habermas was that he had never been involved in any

¹² *TCS* 20, 6, 2003. Most recently, *Theory, Culture and Society* issued a special number on Bourdieu which I edited (23,6, 2007). Before and since, I have published pieces on Bourdieu in this journal (Robbins, 2003 and 2007). My Introduction to the special number was an attempt (with which the editorial board was not entirely sympathetic) to offer a sociological account of the conditions of its own production and therefore to subvert the theoretisation of its normal discourse. (Robbins, 2007). For a discussion of this attempt, see the web-site account of a discussion of the special number, sponsored by TCS:

<http://www.uel.ac.uk/ssmcs/staff/documents/CollatedcontributionstoTCSdiscussionJan19th.doc>

¹³ As expressed, for instance, in Bourdieu, 1989.

empirical research, and he held the same view of the work of Giddens. Polity Press projected Bourdieu's work internationally but it contributed to what Bourdieu was to describe as the de-temporalisation and de-contextualisation of his publications¹⁴. Bourdieu tried to counteract the distorted transnational communication of his meaning by writing an 'English Preface' to the translation of the first of his texts to be published by Polity – *Homo Academicus* (Bourdieu 1984, 1988), but, as we shall see, there followed a flow of translations in the 1990s all of which contributed both to the growth of Bourdieu's international reputation and to the deconstruction of the logical sequence of their production.

Arguably the most important feature of Bourdieu's work was that he anticipated theoretically the outcome which I have just described. Published in France in the same year as *La condition postmoderne*, Bourdieu's *La Distinction* can be interpreted as an attempt to reconcile the legacy of modernist sociology with Lyotard's phenomenologically-inspired account of the contemporary social and intellectual situation. Bringing together the concepts of 'habitus', 'field', 'cultural capital' and 'strategic practice' which he had begun to elaborate in the early 1970s after first developing them in the 1960s, Bourdieu was able to suggest that social actors (softly determined in their actions by reference to values which they have inherited) strategically manoeuvre into modified social positions by making choices in relation to fields or markets of symbolic goods which, in postmodern fashion, operate autonomously and without pre-existing or intrinsic value orientations. Bourdieu tried to argue, in other words, that values are established in exchange within autonomous fields which have no referentiality beyond their own activities, but that our social behaviour vis-à-vis these objectivities is still partially dictated by our inherited dispositions which retain reference to socially embedded values and attitudes.

This was the position which Bourdieu tried to maintain when he found that the international market of book publication was generating a meaning for his work which was at odds with the political agenda which had consistently motivated him in his researches. As we shall see, it was the attempt to communicate this position which caused Bourdieu to turn in the 1990s towards direct political action in France and to offer increasingly revelatory autobiographical accounts of the origins of his thinking. At the same time, the gradual appearance of translations into English of Bourdieu's texts generated the emergence of new criticisms, appreciations, and evaluations of his work.

The 1990s.

The politically neutralising effects of dissemination in the anglophone international market of intellectual goods.

The sequence of the publication of Bourdieu's texts in English in this decade was as follows. I give the English title followed, in parenthesis, by its date and by the title and date of the original French texts:

The Logic of Practice (1990; *Le sens pratique*, 1980); *In Other Words. Essays towards a Reflexive Sociology* (1990; *Choses dites*, 1987); *Photography. A Middle-brow Art* (1990; *Un art moyen, essai sur les usages sociaux de la photographie*, 1965); *The Love of Art. European Museums and their Public* (1990; *L'amour de l'art, les musées d'art et leur public*, 1966); *The Craft of Sociology* (1991; *Le métier de sociologue*, 1968); *Language and Symbolic Power* (1991; partial translation of *Ce Que Parler Veut Dire*, 1982); *The Political Ontology of Martin Heidegger* (1991; *L'ontologie politique de Martin Heidegger*, 1988); *An invitation to Reflexive sociology* (1992; *Réponses. Pour une anthropologie réflexive*, 1992); *The Field of Cultural*

¹⁴ See Bourdieu, 1993.

Production. Essays on Art and Literature, edited and introduced by R. Johnson (1993; a collection of articles previously published, some in English and some in French, between 1977 and 1987); *Sociology in Question* (1993; *Questions de Sociologie*, 1980); *Academic discourse* (1994; papers published in French in 1965); *Free Exchange* (1995; *Libre-Echange*, 1994); *The State Nobility. Elite Schools in the Field of Power* (1996; *La noblesse d'Etat. Grandes écoles et esprit de corps*, 1989); *The Rules of Art* (1996; *Les règles de l'art. Genèse et structure du champ littéraire*, 1992); *Practical Reason* (1998; *Raisons pratiques. Sur la théorie de l'action*, 1994); *Acts of Resistance. Against the New Myths of Our Time* (1998; *Contre-feux*, 1998); *On Television and Journalism* (1998; *Sur la télévision*, 1996); *The Weight of the World. Social Suffering in contemporary society* (1999; *La misère du monde*, 1993).

All of these were published by Polity Press with the exception of *Sociology in Question* (Sage) and *On Television* (Pluto). It would be possible to analyse these textual transfers in great detail. I must limit myself to a few points which relate to my overall argument. Firstly, the texts were de-contexted in the sense that very few were situated by introductory prefaces – the main exceptions being John Thompson's introduction to *Language and Symbolic Power* (1991) and Randall Johnson's introduction to *The Field of Cultural Production* – but also in the sense that no attempt was made to convey the specificity of the French conditions which were under scrutiny, as, for instance, the peculiar phenomenon of the French Grandes Ecoles which are universalised as 'Elite Schools'. Secondly, the texts were de-temporalised in the sense that, for instance, the sequence of translations randomly juxtaposed presentations of the pedagogical research undertaken by Bourdieu and his colleagues in 1965 (*Academic Discourse*, 1994) with presentations of more recent concerns such as with academic philosophy as evidenced in the 1988 book on Heidegger, although, of course, again, there is no emphasis in the English presentation either of the fact that the book was a revised version of a paper written in 1975, nor that it was published specifically in the context of other Parisian contributions to the 'Heidegger debate'. There was no indication that *Academic Discourse* related chronologically to the research which had led to the publication of *Les Héritiers*. These processes of de-contextualising and of de-temporalising had the effect of denying the social and political engagement which was integral to the production of the texts. The English title of *La noblesse d'état* removed the engagement of the text with the relationship between modern society and the social organisation of the Ancien Regime which was present in Bourdieu's choice both of his title and of the date of publication in the bi-centenary year of the French Revolution. They were processes of de-activation and de-politicisation. Importantly as well, they involved a process of de-disciplining. This is no more clearly obvious than in respect of the representation of *Réponses. Pour une anthropologie réflexive* (1992) as *An invitation to Reflexive sociology* (1992) where Bourdieu's attempt to raise phenomenological questions going to the foundations of human rational endeavour (as he confirmed in the opening chapter of *La noblesse d'état*, 1989) becomes appropriated as an instrumental method for the preservation of sociology.

My general point is that these were not merely accidents of the process of trans-national transfer of texts. Rather, it was a feature of the field of reception that texts which had been generated in engagement with particular social problems at particular times were neutralised by presentations which denied their specificity, absorbing them into a self-validating and self-gratifying intellectual discourse operating in complacent detachment from material conditions of suffering and disadvantage. What, in 1968, had been a text to emphasize intellectual labour – *Le métier de sociologue* – became a statement about an abstraction – the *Craft of Sociology*. What, in 1993, had been a plea to Mitterrand not to neglect the suffering of the French underclass – *La misère du monde* (referred to in the serious pun of the sub-title, *La souffrance*) – became, in 1999, an apparently detached universal commentary on 'Social Suffering in Contemporary Society'. My argument is that this process coincided with the marketisation of UK higher

education and, concomitantly, with the position-taking of institutions of higher education and publishing houses within a commercialised international field.

It would be invidious to try to detail the way in which I have tried to steer my course since I first met Bourdieu in 1986. I have recently attempted to write an autobiographical account of my place in the English field of reception of Bourdieu's work (Robbins, 2006). In terms of the account I have given above, I should simply say that I believe that my response to Bourdieu has been the consequence of an almost unique trajectory. I studied English Literature as an undergraduate at Cambridge in the 1960s and was supervised for my doctoral research by Raymond Williams. In 1969, I was appointed to a post at one of the newly established polytechnics – North East London Polytechnic – where I have remained. My response to Bourdieu has been the consequence of my attempt to adapt the cultural materialist theory which I absorbed in privileged circumstances in Cambridge to the conditions of an institution which, at inception, strove to actualise cultural materialism through its relations with its local community and its local students. My intellectual training should have led me towards Cultural Studies but my institutional position led me towards the sociology of education and the pedagogical innovations which were the logical consequences of the 'new directions in the sociology of education'.

The 2000s.

The struggle to control post mortem appropriation.

My work on Bourdieu has always been an attempt to re-insert his intellectual labour into the conditions which generated it. Just as Bourdieu realised that he had to return to direct political involvement in France during the second half of the 1990s, so I have been conscious of the systemic pressures causing my work *on* Bourdieu to lose contact with the social injustices with which he was most concerned. It would be equally invidious to attempt to analyse directly the contemporary field of English response to Bourdieu within which I am a participant or competitor. I can, however, suggest some broad outlines for consideration. These should be viewed in the context of my recent discussion of the ways in which Bourdieu's concepts should be deployed in current research, exposing particularly the shortcomings of what I called 'academic exploitation' and 'nominal appropriation' (Robbins, 2007).

The background to the British reception of Bourdieu in the last few years is not just the sequence of translations of primary texts which began in the mid-1980s and continues to the present, but the new feature of the emergence of a secondary literature. An important question – which applies no more to the work of Bourdieu than to the work of any other canonical thinker – is how far historical texts need to be understood historically or whether, alternatively, they can be plundered for ideas and concepts which can be deployed instrumentally and justified in terms of an achieved relevance to contemporary issues. The question therefore is whether there is an absolute requirement that the attempt should be made to clarify the original meaning of texts or whether it is legitimate to respond pragmatically. The earliest books in English about Bourdieu illustrate this problem. Three secondary texts were published in 1990/1. The first – *An Introduction to the Work of Pierre Bourdieu. The Practice of Theory* (Harker, Mahar, & Wilkes, eds., 1990) was the product of discussions which had been taking place regularly at Massey University, New Zealand since 1982 between seven academics about the work of Bourdieu. The exegesis of Bourdieu's work to date was the result of collaboration between social

anthropologists, educationists and sociologists. Published in the UK by Macmillan, it was manifestly not the product of the British field of reception and the team of academics was not particularly equipped to be sensitive to the French context of Bourdieu's production. My *The Work of Pierre Bourdieu: Recognizing Society* (Robbins, 1991) was the first book in English to attempt to present a systematically chronological account of the development of Bourdieu's thought. It sought to explicate Bourdieu's thought without being constrained by the discipline discourses within which his work was communicated and, similarly, without being constrained by commitment to any discourse within the field of reception. It was published by The Open University Press which had a strong educational list. The publication by The Open University Press was the logical continuation of its publication of my account of the innovation in higher education practice with which I was involved (Robbins, 1988). The text emphasized the connection between Bourdieu's developing social theory and movements for radical educational change, but its message did not significantly impinge on educational practice nor challenge the developing tendency to respond to Bourdieu within the frameworks of pre-established discourses. The superior capital of Routledge as a publishing house in comparison with The Open University Press meant that the introduction to the work of Bourdieu by Richard Jenkins which it published in 1992 (Jenkins, 1992) had more impact amongst academic sociologists. By training, Jenkins was a Cambridge social anthropologist who had been introduced to the work of Bourdieu by Jack Goody. At the time of writing the book, however, he was a lecturer in Sociology at the University of Swansea and was shortly to become Professor of Sociology at the University of Sheffield. Since its publication it has become a standard university textbook and has been re-printed. In spite of Jenkins's background, the book was weak in respect of the Algerian origins of Bourdieu's thought and, again, relatively insensitive to, not to say hostile to, Bourdieu's specifically French intellectuality. It considered Bourdieu's work from within the field of sociological discourse without seeking to understand the extent to which Bourdieu's philosophy of social science questioned the validity of that discourse.

Subsequent secondary texts of the 1990s sustained this basic division between educational and sociological responses. In the mid-1990s, Mike Grenfell emphasized the importance of Bourdieu's work at conferences of the British Educational Society and organized a conference at his university – Southampton – on Bourdieu on Education and Language. These activities led respectively to the publication by the Falmer Press of *Bourdieu and Education: Acts of Practical Theory* (Grenfell & James, 1998), and, by Peter Lang, Berne, of *Pierre Bourdieu: Language, Culture and Education. Theory into Practice* (Grenfell & Kelly, 1999). Grenfell sought to remain loyal to Bourdieu's radical pedagogy in spite of the competing tendency to see Bourdieu as predominantly a theorist of culture. This increasing cultural orientation was apparent in the publication by Sage in its Theory, Culture & Society book series (associated with the journal of the same name) of Bridget Fowler's *Pierre Bourdieu and Cultural Theory. Critical Investigations* (Fowler, 1997). Fowler wrote as a sociologist of culture and she also organized a conference on Bourdieu at her university – Edinburgh – which led to the publication of *Reading Bourdieu on Society and Culture* (Fowler, ed., 2000). 2000 was also the year in which Sage published both my *Bourdieu and Culture* (Robbins, 2000) and my edition of four volumes of secondary articles on Bourdieu (Robbins, ed., 2000).

During this period there were several new dimensions to the response to Bourdieu. Although the response seemed to be confined to the fields of education and sociology, it was also the case that interest in Bourdieu's work was developing in university departments of French. Institutionally these departments often fostered interest in French philosophy and sociology as elements in the contextual study of language in ways which were not the case in departments of Philosophy or Sociology. Grenfell was based in a French department and benefited from association with a new journal – French Cultural Studies – provided by his colleague, Mike Kelly. Jeremy Lane's *Pierre*

Bourdieu. A Critical Introduction (Lane, 2000) was the product of a PhD which he had written as a student in the department of French at the University of Aberdeen and he is currently writing a book on Bourdieu and Politics from his position as a lecturer in the department of French at the university of Nottingham. A second dimension was the increasing interest in Bourdieu's work shown by academic feminists. They gradually found an affinity with Bourdieu's emphasis of the power of the habitus, but the translation into English of *La domination masculine* (Bourdieu, 1998) as *Masculine Domination* in 2001 (Bourdieu, 2001) generated a critical response which is best reflected in the contributions to *Feminism after Bourdieu* (Adkins & Skeggs, 2004).

These developments have to be set in the context of political change in Britain from the mid-1990s, notably associated with the new Labour government under Tony Blair from 1997. The Thatcherite stigma attached to social science research was removed and the marginal position of research in the arts and humanities was counteracted with the formal establishment of a funding council – the Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC) – possessing comparable status with other funding councils such as the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC). Nevertheless, the recognition given to academic research in these areas became tinged with uncertainty about the neo-liberal tendencies of the new government. There was a sense in which the new status of the AHRC benefited the consolidation of the control of culture by a state committed to the economic exploitation of cultural commodities and industries. There was also a sense in which social science received state support in as much as it instrumentally facilitated the government's policy making without challenging its assumptions. In the UK, Anthony Giddens acted as a sociological advisor to the government, supporting 'third way politics' whilst, in France, Bourdieu became aggressively active in opposing neo-liberalism. Inevitably there was tension as the publishing house launched by Giddens – Polity Press – retained a virtual monopoly over the publication of translations of Bourdieu's texts. The consequence has been that there has been some attempt on the part of small, radical publishing houses, to 'save' Bourdieu from the misappropriation of Polity or of a globalising publishing house such as Sage. Verso books and Pluto Press, operating in the tradition of *The New Left Review*, have published some of the overtly political works of Bourdieu's late period which he had himself published in his own publishing project of *Liber. Raisons d'agir*. This is part of a largely non-academic attempt to resurrect or find a Marxist orientation in Bourdieu's work. *Contre-feux* (Bourdieu, 1998) was published in English by Polity in 1998, but *Sur la télévision* (Bourdieu, 1996) was published in English by Pluto in 1998 and *Contre-feux II* (Bourdieu, 2001) by Verso in 2003.

Apart from these publishing ventures, it is possible to conclude that the popularity of Bourdieu's work in British academia at present is indicative of an appropriation which has neutralised his subversive political commitment to social movements and to social democracy. Since about 2004, the ESRC has funded a large research project on contemporary culture which has been jointly run by the university of Manchester and the Open University. Associated with this project have been publications by Alan Warde, Mike Savage, and Tony Bennett, some of which were assembled in a special number of the *British Journal of Sociology* in 2005 (Vol 56, No.1). The outcome of this project will itself give an indication of the extent to which intellectual autonomy remains possible within the UK at present as well as a precise indication of the current use of the work of Bourdieu in balancing the competing analytical claims of Sociology and Cultural Studies. The jury is out. What seems clear is that the interest in Bourdieu's educational research is weak at present and that there is little inclination to embed his vision of socio-analytic encounter in egalitarian educational institutions.

- Adkins, L., & Skeggs, B., eds., 2004, *Feminism after Bourdieu*. Oxford, Blackwell.
- Archer, M.S., 1970, "Egalitarianism in English and French Educational Sociology", *European Journal of Sociology*, XI, 1.
- Archer, M.S., ed., 1972, *Students, university and society*, London, Heinemann.
- Archer, M.S., & Giner, S., eds., 1971, *Europe: Class, Status and Power*, London, Weidenfeld & Nicolson.
- Archer, M.S., & Giner, S., eds., 1978, *Contemporary Europe. Social Structures and cultural patterns*, London, Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Archer, M.S. & Vaughan, M., 1971, *Social conflict and educational change in England and France, 1789-1848*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Aron, R., 1957, *La Tragédie algérienne*, Paris, Plon
- Aron, R., 1958, *L'Algérie et la République*, Paris, Plon
- Aron, R., 1983, *Mémoires: 50 ans de réflexion politique*, Paris, Julliard. –translated as Aron, 1990.
- Aron, R., 1990, *Memoirs. Fifty Years of Political Reflection*, New York/London, Holmes & Meier.
- L. Boltanski, 1973, 'L'Espace positionnel. Multiplicité des positions institutionnelles et habitus de classe,' *Revue française de sociologie*, Vol XIV, 3-26.
- Bourdieu, P. 1958 *Sociologie de l'Algérie*, Paris, PUF. – translated as Bourdieu, 1962.
- Bourdieu, P. 1959 "Tartuffe ou le drame de la foi et de la mauvaise foi", *Revue de la Méditerranée*, 4-5, (92-93), July – October, 453-458.
- Bourdieu, P. 1960 "Guerre et mutation sociale en algérie", *Etudes méditerranéennes*, 7, Spring, 25-37.
- Bourdieu, P. 1961 *Sociologie de l'Algérie*, 2nd edition, Paris, PUF.
- Bourdieu, P. 1961 "Révolution dans la révolution", *Esprit*, 1, January, 27-40.
- Bourdieu, P., 1962, "De la guerre révolutionnaire à la révolution", in Perroux, F., ed.
- Bourdieu, P. 1962 *The Algerians*, Boston, Beacon Press.
- Bourdieu, P. 1962 "Les relations entre les sexes dans la société paysanne", *Les temps modernes*, 195, August, 307-331.

- Bourdieu, P. 1962 “Célibat et condition paysanne”, *Etudes rurales*, 5-6, April-September, 32-136. – republished in Bourdieu, P (2002) and translated into English in Bourdieu, P (2006)
- Bourdieu, P. 1962 “La hantise du chômage chez l’ouvrier algérien. Prolétariat et système colonial”, *Sociologie du travail*, 4, 313-331.
- Bourdieu, P. 1962 “Les sous-prolétaires algériens”, *Les temps modernes*, 199, December, 1030-1051 – translated into English as Bourdieu, P (1973), ed. I.W. Zartman.
- Bourdieu, P. 1963 “La société traditionnelle. Attitude à l’égard du temps et conduite économique”, *Sociologie du travail*, 1, January – March, 24-44.
- Bourdieu, P. 1964 “Paysans déracinés, bouleversements morphologiques et changements culturels en Algérie”, *Etudes rurales*, 12, January – March, 56-94.
- Bourdieu, P., 1964, “The attitude of the Algerian peasant toward time”, in J.Pitt-Rivers, ed.
- Bourdieu, P., 1965, “The Sentiment of Honour in Kabyle Society”, in J.G. Peristiany, ed.
- Bourdieu, P. 1966 “Champ intellectuel et projet créateur”, *Les temps modernes*, 246, November, 865-906. – translated as Bourdieu, P (1971) in M.F.D. Young, ed.,
- Bourdieu, P. 1966 “Condition de classe et position de classe”, *Archives européennes de sociologie*, VII, 2, 201-223.
- Bourdieu, P. 1967 “Systèmes d’enseignement et systèmes de pensée, *Revue internationale des sciences sociales*, XIX, 3, 367-388./ “Systems of Education and Systems of Thought”, *International Social Science Journal*, XIX, 338-358, – English reissued as Bourdieu, P (1971) in M.F.D. Young, ed.
- Bourdieu, P. 1968 “Eléments d’une théorie sociologique de la perception artistique”, *Revue internationale des sciences sociales*, XX, 4, 640-664./ “Outline of a sociological theory of art perception”, *International Social Science Journal*, XX, 589-612.
- Bourdieu, P. 1968 "Structuralism and Theory of Sociological Knowledge", *Social Research*, XXXV, 4.
- Bourdieu, P. 1971 “Une interprétation de la théorie de la religion selon Max Weber”, *Archives européennes de sociologie*, XII, 1, 3-21. – translated into English as Bourdieu, P (1987) in Whimster, S & Lash, S., eds. 1987.
- Bourdieu, P. 1971 “Genèse et structure du champ religieux”, *Revue française de sociologie*, XII, 3, 295-334. – translated into English as Bourdieu, P. (1991) in Calhoun, C., ed. 1991.
- Bourdieu, P., 1971, “Reproduction culturelle et reproduction sociale, Information sur les sciences sociales, X, 2, 45-99 – translated in Brown, R., ed., 1973; Karabel & Halsey, eds, 1977.
- Bourdieu, P. 1971 “Systems of education and systems of thought”, in Young, M.F.D., ed. 1971
- Bourdieu, P. 1971 “Intellectual field and creative project”, in Young, M.F.D., ed., 1971.

- Bourdieu, P. 1972 *Esquisse d'une théorie de la pratique*, Geneva, Droz. – translated as Bourdieu, 1977.
- Bourdieu, P. 1977 *Outline of a Theory of Practice*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Bourdieu, P., 1977, “Sur le pouvoir symbolique”, *Annales*, 3, 405-411. – translated in Bourdieu, P., 1991, 163-170.
- Bourdieu, P. 1979 *La distinction. Critique sociale du jugement*, Paris, Ed de Minuit. – translated as Bourdieu, 1986.
- Bourdieu, P., 1980, “The aristocracy of culture”, *Media, Culture and Society*, 2, 3, 225-254.
- Bourdieu, P., 1982, “Goffman, le découvreur de l’infiniment petit”, *Le Monde*, 4 Dec., 1 and 30. – translated as Bourdieu, 1983.
- Bourdieu, P., 1983, “Erving Goffman, Discoverer of the Infinitely Small”, *Theory, Culture and Society*, 2, 1, 112-113.
- Bourdieu, P. 1984 *Homo Academicus*, Paris, Ed de Minuit. - translated as Bourdieu, 1988.
- Bourdieu, P. 1986 *Distinction. A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*, London & New York, Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Bourdieu, P., 1986, “The Struggle for Symbolic Order”, *Theory, Culture, and Society*, 3, 3, 35-51.
- Bourdieu, P. 1987 *Choses dites*, Paris, Ed. de Minuit. – translated as Bourdieu, 1990
- Bourdieu, P. 1988 *Homo Academicus*, Oxford, Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, P. 1989 *La noblesse d'état. Grandes écoles et esprit de corps*, Paris, Ed. de Minuit. – translated into English as Bourdieu, 1996.
- Bourdieu, P. 1989 “The Corporatism of the Universal: the role of Intellectuals in the Modern world”, *Telos*, 81, Fall, 99-110.
- Bourdieu, P. 1990 *In Other Words*, Oxford, Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, P., 1991, *Language & Symbolic Power*, Oxford, Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, P. 1992, “Thinking about Limits”, *Theory, Culture and Society*, 9, 37-49.
- Bourdieu, P., 1993, “From Ruling Class to Field of Power: an Interview with Pierre Bourdieu on La noblesse d'état”, *Theory, Culture and Society*, 10, 1, 19-44.
- Bourdieu, 1993, “Concluding Remarks: for a Sociogenetic Understanding of Intellectual works”, in Calhoun, C., LiPuma, E., & Postone, M., eds.
- Bourdieu, P., 1993, “A propos de la famille comme catégorie réalisée”, *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales*, 100, 32-36. – translated as Bourdieu, 1996.

- Bourdieu, P., 1996, *The State Nobility. Elite Schools in the Field of Power*, Oxford, Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, P., 1996, "Understanding", *Theory, Culture and Society*, 13, 2, 17-37.
- Bourdieu, P., 1996, "On the Family as a Realised Category", *Theory, Culture and Society*, 13, 3, 19-26.
- Bourdieu, P., 1996, *Sur la télévision*, Paris, Raisons d'agir. – translated into English as Bourdieu, P., 1998.
- Bourdieu, P., 1998, *On Television and Journalism*, London, Pluto Press.
- Bourdieu, P., 1998, *Contre-feux*, Paris, Raisons d'agir. – translated into English as Bourdieu, P., 1998.
- Bourdieu, P., 1998, *Acts of Resistance. Against the New Myths of Our Time*, Oxford, Polity.
- Bourdieu, P., 2001, *Contre-feux 2. Pour un mouvement social européen*, Paris, Raisons d'agir. – translated into English as Bourdieu, 2003
- Bourdieu, P., 2003, *Firing Back. Against the Tyranny of the Market 2*, London, Verso.
- Bourdieu, P. 2004 *Esquisse pour une auto-analyse*, Paris, Raisons d'Agir.
- Bourdieu, P., with Boltanski, L., 1975 "Le titre et le poste. Rapports entre le système de production et le système de reproduction", *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales*, 2, 95-107. – translated as Bourdieu & Boltanski, 1977, and in Lemert, C., ed., 1981.
- Bourdieu, P., & Boltanski, L., "Formal Qualifications and Occupational Hierarchies: the Relationship between the Production System and the Reproduction System", *Reorganizing Education*, Sage Annual Review, Social and Educational Change, 1, 61-69.
- Bourdieu, P., with Boltanski, L., Castel, R., & Chamboredon, J.-C., 1965 *Un art moyen, essai sur les usages sociaux de la photographie*, Paris, Ed. de Minuit. – translated as Bourdieu, Boltanski, Castel, Chamboredon, 1990.
- Bourdieu, P., with Boltanski, L., Castel, R., & Chamboredon, J.-C., 1990 *Photography. A Middle-Brow Art*, Oxford, Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, P., Boltanski, L & de Saint Martin, M., 1973 "Les strategies de reconversion. Les classes sociales et le système d'enseignement", *Information sur les sciences sociales*, XII, 5, 61-113 – translated in Giner, S. & Scotford-Archer, M., 1978.
- Bourdieu, P., Boltanski, L., & Maldidier, P., 1971, 'La Défense du corps', *Informations sur les sciences sociales*, vol X, no. 4, 45-86.
- Bourdieu, P., with Chamboredon, J.-C. and Passeron, J.-C., 1968 *Le métier de sociologue*, Paris, Mouton-Bordas. – translated as Bourdieu, Chamboredon, & Passeron, 1991.

- Bourdieu, P., with Chamboredon, J.-C. and Passeron, J.-C., 1991 *The Craft of Sociology*, New York, Walter de Gruyter.
- Bourdieu, P., with Darbel, A., Rivet, J.-P., & Seibel, C., 1963 *Travail et travailleurs en Algérie*, Paris-La Haye, Mouton.
- Bourdieu, P., with Darbel, A. and Schnapper, D., 1966 *L'amour de l'art*, Paris, Ed de Minuit. – translated as Bourdieu, Darbel & Schnapper, 1990.
- Bourdieu, P., with Darbel, A. and Schnapper, D., 1990 *The Love of Art*, Oxford, Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, P., with Passeron, J.-C., 1964 *Les étudiants et leurs études*, Paris-La Haye, Mouton.
- Bourdieu, P., with Passeron, J.-C., 1964 *Les héritiers, les étudiants et la culture*, Paris, Ed de Minuit. – translated as Bourdieu & Passeron, 1979
- Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J.-C., “La comparabilité des systèmes d’enseignement”, in Castel, R., & Passeron, J.-C., eds., 1967.
- Bourdieu, P., with Passeron, J.-C., 1967 “Sociology and Philosophy in France since 1945: Death and Resurrection of a Philosophy without a subject”, *Social Research*, XXXIV, 1, 162-212.
- Bourdieu, P., with Passeron, J.-C., 1970 *La Reproduction. Eléments pour une théorie du système d’enseignement*, Paris, Ed de Minuit. – translated as Bourdieu & Passeron, 1977.
- Bourdieu, P., with Passeron, J.-C., 1977 *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture*, London-Beverly Hills, Sage Publications.
- Bourdieu, P., with Passeron, J.-C., 1979 *The Inheritors, French Students and Their Relation to Culture*, Chicago-London, University of Chicago Press.
- Bourdieu, P., with Sayad, A., 1964 *Le déracinement, la crise de l’agriculture traditionnelle en Algérie*, Paris, Ed. de Minuit.
- Bourdieu, P., & Wacquant, L., 1998, “Sur les ruses de la raison impérialiste”, *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales*, 121-122, 109-118. – translated as Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1999.
- Bourdieu, P., & Wacquant, L., 1999, “On the Cunning of Imperialist Reason”, *Theory, Culture and Society*, 16, 1, 41-58.
- Brown, R., ed., 1973, *Knowledge, Education, and Cultural Change*, London, Tavistock.
- Calhoun, C., ed. 1991. *Comparative Social Research*, 13.
- Calhoun, C., LiPuma, E., & Postone, M., eds., 1993, *Bourdieu: Critical Perspectives*, Oxford, Polity Press.
- Castel, R., & Passeron, J.-C., eds, 1967, *Education, développement et démocratie*. Paris-La Haye, Ed. Mouton.

- Dölling, I., ed., 1991, *Die Intellektuellen und die Macht*, Hambourg, VSA-Verlag.
- Douglas, M., 1980, *Evans-Pritchard*, Fontana/Collins, London.
- Fowler, B., 1997, *Pierre Bourdieu and Cultural Theory. Critical Investigations*, London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi, Sage Publications.
- Fowler, B., ed., 2000, *Reading Bourdieu on Society and Culture*, Blackwell Publishers, Oxford,
- Garnham, N., & Williams, R., 1980, "Class and culture, the work of Bourdieu", *Media, Culture and Society*, 2, 245-6.
- Goody, J.R., 1976, *Production and Reproduction: a comparative study of the domestic domain*, XXXX, XXXX
- Grenfell, M., & James, D., eds., 1998, *Bourdieu and Education: Acts of Practical Theory*, Falmer Press
- Grenfell, M., & Kelly, M., eds. 1999, *Pierre Bourdieu: Language, Culture and Education. Theory into Practice*. Peter Lang, Berne.
- Hall, S. 1978, *On Ideology*, London, CCCS/Hutchinson.
- Halsey, A.H., 2004, *A History of Sociology in Britain*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Harker, R., Mahar, C., & Wilkes, C., 1990, *An Introduction to the Work of Pierre Bourdieu. The Practice of Theory*. London, Macmillan,.
- Hoggart, R., 1957, *The Uses of Literacy*, Harmondsworth, Penguin.
- Jenkins, R., 1992, *Pierre Bourdieu*, London, Routledge.
- Karabel, J., & Halsey, A.H., eds., 1977, *Power and Ideology in Education*, New York, Oxford University Press.
- Kuper, A., 1973, *Anthropologists and Anthropology. The British School 1922-1972*, Allen Lane.
- Lane, J., 2000, *Pierre Bourdieu. A Critical Introduction*, London, Pluto.
- Lemert, C., ed., 1981. *French Sociology, Rupture and Renewal Since 1968*, New York, Columbia University Press.
- Lyotard, J.-F., 1979, *La Condition Postmoderne*, Paris, Minuit. – translated as Lyotard, 1984.
- Lyotard, J.-F., 1986, *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*, Manchester, Manchester University Press.
- Mendras, H., 1961, *La Fin des Paysans*, Paris, Seis.

- Panofsky, E., 1967, (translated by, and with a Postface by Bourdieu, P.,) *Architecture gothique et pensée scolastique*, Paris, Ed. de Minuit.
- Passeron, J.-C., 1986, "Theories of Socio-Cultural Reproduction", *International Social Science Journal*, 38, 4, 619-629.
- Peristiany, J.G., ed., 1965, *Honour and Shame. The Values of Mediterranean Society*, London, Weidenfeld & Nicolson.
- Perroux, F., ed., *L'Algérie de demain*, Paris, PUF.
- Pitt-Rivers, J.A., 1954, *The People of the Sierra*, London, Weidenfeld & Nicolson.
- Pitt-Rivers, J.A., ed., 1964, *Mediterranean Countrymen*, Paris-La Haye, Mouton.
- Robinson, E., 1968, *The New Polytechnics. The People's Universities*, Harmondsworth, Penguin.
- Robbins, D.M., 1988, *The Rise of Independent Study. The Politics and the Philosophy of an Educational Innovation, 1970-1987* (Open University Press, co-published with the SRHE).
- Robbins, D.M., 1989, "Bourdieu in England, 1964-1977", *Higher Education Policy*, Vol 2 No 2, 40-46.
- Robbins, D.M., 1991, *The Work of Pierre Bourdieu: Recognizing Society*, Open University Press.
- Robbins, D.M., 2000, *Bourdieu and culture*, Sage, London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi,
- Robbins, D.M., ed., 2000, *Pierre Bourdieu*. 4-volumes, Sage, London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi
- Robbins, D.M., 2002, "Pierre Bourdieu, 1930-2002", *Theory, Culture and Society*, 19 (3), 113-116.
- Robbins, D.M., 2004, "The transcultural transferability of Bourdieu's sociology of education", *British Journal of the Sociology of Education*, 25, 4, 415-430.
- Robbins, D.M., 2006, *On Bourdieu, education and society*, Oxford, Bardwell Press,
- Robbins, D.M., 2007, "A social critique of judgement", *Theory, Culture and Society*, 23 (6), 1-24.
- Robbins, D.M., 2007, "'Sociology as reflexive science: on Bourdieu's project", *Theory, Culture and Society*, 24 (5), 57-78.
- Schücking, L.L., 1966, *The Sociology of Literary Taste*. London, Routledge.
- Thompson, E.P., 1968, *The Making of the English Working Class*, Penguin, Harmondsworth.
- Whimster, S & Lash, S., eds. 1987, *Max Weber, Rationality and Modernity*, London, Allen & Unwin.
- Williams, R., 1958, *Culture and Society, 1780-1950*, Harmondsworth, Penguin.

Williams, R., 1960, *The Long Revolution*, Harmondsworth, Penguin.

Williams, R., ed., 1968, *May Day Manifesto 1968*, Harmondsworth, Penguin.

Young, M.F.D., ed., 1971, *Knowledge and Control. New directions for the Sociology of Education*, London, Collier-Macmillan.