

ProtoSociology

An International Journal of Interdisciplinary Research

... ist seit E. Durkheim, den wir als einen Begründer des
Fachs Soziologie einstufen, ein relevanter Schwerpunkt des
Fachs Soziologie. Das führt die Mitglieder dazu zu stellen:

The Joint Commitment Account: Critical Essays on the Philosophy of Sociality of Margaret Gilbert

Edited by Gerhard Preyer and Georg Peter

... ist, die soziale Integration als eine Differenzierung
von Mitgliedschaftsbedingungen eine bestimmte allgemeine
Theorie voraussetzt. Unter „Bedingungen“ sind dabei die Be-
dingung der Mitgliedschaftsbedingung und damit die Teil-
nahme an Kommunikationssystemen in der Ausübung von
bestimmten Rollen und Statuspositionen zu verstehen.
Die Mitgliedschaftstheorie fasst die System-Umwelt-Relati-
on nicht als unkonstitutiert (Niklas Luhmann), sondern als
die selbstreferenzielle Entscheidung über Mitgliedschafts-
bedingungen und ihre Selektion, die keine Resonanz in der
nicht-sozialen Umwelt hat. Der Verweigerungszusammenhang
von Sinn, wenn wir das einmal unterstellen, ist in diese Dif-
ferenzstruktur einzuordnen. Gehen wir von der mitglied-
schaftstheoretischen Selbstkonstitution sozialer Systeme
aus, so sind soziale Systeme zu verstehen. Damit geht einher,
dass die soziologische Theorie die folgenden

Volume 35, 2018

© 2018 Gerhard Preyer
Frankfurt am Main
<http://www.protosociology.de>
peter@protosociology.de
Erste Auflage / first published 2018
ISSN 1611-1281

Bibliografische Information Der Deutschen Bibliothek

Die Deutsche Bibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über <http://dnb.ddb.de> abrufbar.

Alle Rechte vorbehalten.

Das Werk einschließlich aller seiner Teile ist urheberrechtlich geschützt. Jede Verwertung außerhalb der engen Grenzen des Urheberrechtsgesetzes ist ohne Zustimmung der Zeitschrift und seines Herausgebers unzulässig und strafbar. Das gilt insbesondere für Vervielfältigungen, Übersetzungen, Mikroverfilmungen und die Einspeisung und Verarbeitung in elektronischen Systemen.

Bibliographic information published by Die Deutsche Bibliothek

Die Deutsche Bibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available in the Internet at <http://dnb.ddb.de>.

All rights reserved.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without the prior permission of ProtoSociology.

ProtoSociology

An International Journal of Interdisciplinary Research

Volume 35, 2018

The Joint Commitment Account:
Critical Essays on the Philosophy of Sociality of
Margaret Gilbert with Her Comments

Edited by Gerhard Preyer and Georg Peter

CONTENTS

Introduction: Social Ontology Revisited..... 7
Gerhard Preyer, Georg Peter

PART I

JOINT COMMITMENT, OBLIGATIONS AND RIGHTS

Steps to a Naturalistic Account of Human Deontology 21
Antonella Carassa and Marco Colombetti

Joint Commitment..... 38
Thomas H. Smith

PART II

COLLECTIVE BELIEF, CONVERSATION, AND TELLING

Joint Commitment Model of Collective Beliefs: Empirical Relevance in
Social Science 55
Alban Bouvier

Remarks on Conversation and Negotiated Collective Belief 74
Frederick F. Schmitt

Telling and Mutual Obligations in Communicative Action 99
Marija Jankovic

PART III
COLLECTIVE EMOTIONS AND EMOTIONAL SHARING

How We Feel: Collective Emotions Without Joint Commitments.....	117
<i>Felipe León and Dan Zahavi</i>	
Collective Emotions and Normativity	137
<i>Mikko Salmela</i>	

PART IV
PLURAL SUBJECTS, “WE”, COORDINATION AND CONVENTION

Social Complexes and Aspects	155
<i>Donald L. M. Baxter</i>	
We are no Plural Subject	167
<i>Ludger Jansen</i>	
Coordination and Hyperrationality	197
<i>Paul Weirich</i>	

PART V
PROMISING AND PATRIOTISM

The Bounds of Morality: Gilbert on Promissory Obligation	217
<i>Jeffrey S. Helmreich</i>	
Patriotism: Commitment, not Pride	235
<i>Maura Priest</i>	

PART VI
REPLIES AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

Further Reflections on the Social World	257
<i>Margaret Gilbert</i>	
Margaret Gilbert: Bibliography of Works in the Philosophy of Social Phenomena and Related Fields	285

ON CONTEMPORARY SOCIOLOGY
AND PHILOSOPHY

From Multiple Modernities to Multiple Globalizations	295
<i>Eliezer Ben-Rafael</i>	
The Meaning(s) of Structural Rationality.....	314
<i>Rebecca Gutwald and Niina Zuber</i>	
Building bridges within and across Husserlian phenomenology	322
<i>Joonas Taipale</i>	
Contributors	327
Impressum	329
On ProtoSociology.....	330
Subscription – Single Article	331
eBooks and Books on Demand	332
Published Volumes	333
Bookpublications of the Project	339

STEPS TO A NATURALISTIC ACCOUNT OF HUMAN DEONTOLOGY

Antonella Carassa and Marco Colombetti

Abstract

In this paper we outline a theory of human deontology from a naturalistic perspective. In doing so we aim to explain how human beings deal with deontic relations (like obligations and rights) thanks to a specialised psychological infrastructure, which evolved to support human cooperation. This infrastructure includes a repertoire of emotions that play a crucial role in evaluating the conformity of actions relative to a deontic relation, in displaying an agent's attitude toward their own actions or those of their deontic partners, and in motivating suitable behavioural responses. Finally we discuss the special case of interpersonal deontology, analysing its properties and relating it to Gilbert's concept of joint commitment.

I. Introduction

Human beings have the capacity to create elements of social reality in ways that are considered exclusive of our species. An important component of most (possibly all) social reality is *deontology*, that is, the complex network of obligations, permissions, rights, and so forth, that people accrue due to a variety of reasons. Part of human deontology, that we label *collective*, derives from large-scale, relatively stable sources like shared moral principles, laws, religious codes, local regulations, and social etiquette. Another part, that we call *interpersonal deontology*, is created by people in their everyday small-scale interactions, examples of this being the obligations that stem from promises, agreements, and the like.

In this paper we sketch a theory of human deontology in general, and then analyse in greater detail the case of interpersonal deontology. We find interpersonal deontology particularly interesting because, in spite of being ubiquitous in human life, it remains somewhat elusive. The main problem is to explain how it is possible for people to create such things as obligations and rights simply by interacting with other people, and to understand what types of interactions may have these effects. Most theories dealing with interpersonal deontology tend to concentrate on promises, analysed from a moral perspective: promissory obligations are thus regarded as moral obligations of some sort

JOINT COMMITMENT

Thomas H. Smith

Abstract

I defend some of Gilbert's central claims about our capacity jointly to commit ourselves, and what follows from an exercise of it. I argue that, to explain these claims, we do not need to suppose, as Gilbert does, that we ever are jointly committed, that is, jointly in a state of being committed. I offer a diagnosis of why the gratuitousness of this supposition has been overlooked.

Gilbert's Guiding Idea

Gilbert's guiding idea is that a plurality of parties can jointly commit themselves to doing something.

When we talk of commitment, we might mean something normative: obligation, roughly. Or something psychological: resolve, roughly. While the two things may often go together, they can easily come apart. Gilbert uses 'commitment' and its cognates for the normative phenomenon:

...the notion of commitment at issue here is a normative notion, not a psychological or causal one. The broadest such notion is simply this: one is committed in some way if and only if there is something that, all else being equal, one ought to do. (Gilbert 2018, 161–2).

For Gilbert, once parties have jointly committed themselves, each is committed, hence obligated, to the others, to do her part of, or something towards, what they have jointly committed themselves to doing. She thinks, too, that once parties have jointly committed themselves, none can unilaterally relinquish her own commitment or obligation. She must do this jointly, with the others. (Gilbert 2013, *passim*).

This much is true, isn't it? I would say, indeed, that it is *straightforwardly* true (which is not to deny that it is a truth of importance to philosophers). Consider an everyday exchange such as:

A: 'Shall we go to Liverpool, then?'

B: 'Ok, let's'.

JOINT COMMITMENT MODEL OF COLLECTIVE BELIEFS: EMPIRICAL RELEVANCE IN SOCIAL SCIENCE

Alban Bouvier

Abstract

*For almost three decades, Margaret Gilbert has introduced a new account of social facts taking “joint commitments”, not only explicit but also implicit, as the cement of sociality properly understood. Gilbert has used this original account of collective phenomena to clarify a variety of issues, both in the philosophy of rights and in the philosophy of the social sciences. This paper focuses on the latter domain; it argues that although Durkheim and Mauss are central references in her pioneering work, *On Social Facts*, Gilbert’s model has been underestimated in the fields of sociology and anthropology. This may come from the fact that Gilbert provides the reader with only imaginary examples. To overcome this difficulty, Bouvier investigates several historical examples in two related domains: the political and the religious. Another reason for this relative lack of interest may come from Gilbert’s very unconventional interpretation of the Durkheimian explanation of social beliefs. Although, on the one hand, her “contractualist” (or Rousseauist) interpretation permits a sharp illumination of certain social facts, it may, on the other hand, impede the recognition of the specificity of other kinds of beliefs, which sociologists and anthropologists—including Durkheim—usually consider as collective beliefs. Bouvier, by contrast, introduces alternative models, illustrating them with similar, although ultimately distinct from previous, historical examples.*

Introduction

One of Margaret Gilbert’s main explicit ambitions is to reformulate Emile Durkheim’s intuitions regarding the specificity of the *properly collective* (as she calls it) dimension of the social facts in a more analytical way. Gilbert thinks that Durkheim was deeper in his understanding, although often more obscure than Max Weber, on this specific point. However, unlike Durkheim, who strongly rejected “pre-notions” of sociality, Gilbert’s other important ambition and likely more important than the first I mentioned, is to clarify the everyday intuitions of social collective phenomena. Among the main issues that Durkheim and his nephew, Marcel Mauss, as well as the other members of the French School of Sociology founded by Durkheim, addressed was, indeed, the specificity of *collective beliefs*, although they did not use this particular word-

REMARKS ON CONVERSATION AND NEGOTIATED COLLECTIVE BELIEF

Frederick F. Schmitt

Abstract

Gilbert (1989) and Gilbert and Priest (2013) have argued that paradigmatic conversations involve a collectivity of the conversers who participate in the conversation, in the sense that the conversers put forth and negotiate proposals of propositions to be collectively believed by them. Here I explore the plausibility of this Negotiated Collective Belief (NCB) thesis. I begin by supporting a more basic claim, that the nature of conversation itself entails that a conversation always involves a collectivity of the conversers. I then endorse and supplement Gilbert and Priest's argument for the NCB thesis. I trace resistance to the thesis to the view that collective belief plays no important role in two primary social ends of conversation, exchanging information and making personal connections. I concede that this is so, but I endorse the view (with roots in Taylor 1985) that collective belief does play an important role in a different primary social end of conversation, the creation of a public space of thought. Thus, the NCB thesis is supported by argument and contributes to an explanation of how conversation fulfills one of its primary social ends.

Remarks on Conversation and Negotiated Collective Belief

A conversation is patently a social activity in the sense of entailing that at least two conversers make utterances or communicative gestures, grasping the meaning of these utterances and recognizing the others' communicative intentions. But is it a social activity in some stronger sense than merely entailing that at least two individuals act with mutual recognition? In *On Social Facts* (1989), Margaret Gilbert argued that in a paradigmatic conversation the conversers "are doing something like negotiating a position they can jointly accept" (Gilbert 1989: 295). She has developed this argument in recent work with Maura Priest: "in a paradigmatic conversation, whatever else is going on, *the parties are negotiating the establishment of one or another collective belief on the basis of proposals put forward by one or another interlocutor*" (Gilbert and Priest 2013: 14). I will follow Gilbert and Priest (2013) in calling this the Negotiated Collective Belief (NCB) thesis. On this view, a paradigmatic conversation is social in a sense that goes beyond a mere plurality of participants engaged in mutual recognition. It involves a collectivity of the conversers in two ways: a negotiation

TELLING AND MUTUAL OBLIGATIONS IN COMMUNICATIVE ACTION

Marija Jankovic

Abstract

In telling the utterer enters into a relationship with an addressee. This relationship appears to be a normative one, i.e., it entails that an utterer has certain obligations to the addressee. But how can an act of telling create such obligations? In this paper, I propose what I call a collectivist account of telling. On this account, the core notion of telling is that of an utterer's contribution to a joint action. Margaret Gilbert's rich work on joint action emphasizes the obligations agents of joint action have to one another. This normatively robust view of joint action, coupled with the conception of core telling as a participatory act, points toward the possibility of explaining the obligations speakers have to their addressees as, at least in some cases, the sort of obligations participants in joint action quite generally have to each other to act in a way appropriate to the joint activity.

Possibly someone will say, perhaps to me, 'There are no plural subjects *really*. It is a human *fiction* that there are.' What should I say? Am I to play ball and listen to this person? What's playing ball? What's listening to this person? *Is there such a thing?* You cannot *tell me* there are no plural subjects and be right. You cannot sensibly set out to tell me that. What is telling?

(M. Gilbert, *On Social Facts*)

Introduction

It's been widely observed that in telling the utterer enters into a distinctive relationship with an addressee. He undertakes a "commitment to the truth of a proposition" (Searle 1969, 29) or "makes [himself] responsible for its truth" (Peirce 1934, 384) and gives the addressee "the right of complaint" should what he said turn out false (Moran 2005b, 22). This relationship appears to be a normative one, i.e., it entails that an utterer has certain obligations to the addressee. But how can an act of telling create such obligations? In this paper, I propose what I call a *collectivist* account of telling. On this account, core telling is an utterer's contribution to a joint action. Margaret Gilbert's rich work

HOW WE FEEL: COLLECTIVE EMOTIONS WITHOUT JOINT COMMITMENTS

Felipe León and Dan Zahavi

Abstract

This article engages critically with Margaret Gilbert's proposal that joint commitments are necessary for collective emotions. After introducing Gilbert's concept of joint commitment (Section 2), and the joint commitment account of collective emotions (Section 3), we argue in Section 4 that research from developmental psychology challenges the necessity of joint commitments for collective emotions. In that section, we also raise a more principled objection to Gilbert's account, independently of developmental considerations. Section 5 develops a complementary line of argument, focused on the notion of mutual recognition. While we agree with Gilbert that mutual recognition has an important role to play in an account of collective emotions, we take issue with her attempt to analyse face-to-face based mutual recognition in terms of the concept of joint commitment. We conclude by sketching an alternative analysis of collective emotions that highlights the role of interpersonal identification and socially mediated self-consciousness.

I. Introduction

In the past decades, Margaret Gilbert has developed a distinctive philosophical approach to the analysis of a wide range of social phenomena, taking as the cornerstone of her analysis the concept of *joint commitment* (Gilbert, 1989, 2013, 2018). The range of phenomena analysed by Gilbert is impressive. It includes not only collective belief and collective action, but also collective emotions, mutual recognition, joint attention, promises, social conventions, and agreements (Gilbert, 2013). If, as argued by Gilbert, joint commitment is the “structure of the social atom” and the “foundation of human social behaviour” (Gilbert, 2003, p. 39), the concept of joint commitment would have a pervasive explanatory power, and be of obvious significance for understanding the structure of sociality. Without aiming at a comprehensive assessment of Gilbert's rich and wide-ranging approach, in the following we will mainly focus on the case of *collective emotion*, a topic that Gilbert has engaged with over the years. There is a remarkable continuity in Gilbert's treatment of collective emotions, in that she has throughout sought to account for them by means of her concept of joint commitment (Gilbert, 2000a, 2000b, 2002, 2014). Our main aim will

COLLECTIVE EMOTIONS AND NORMATIVITY

Mikko Salmela

Abstract

There are two opposite views about the relation of collective emotions and normativity. On the one hand, the philosopher Margaret Gilbert (1997, 2002, 2014) has argued for years that collective emotions are by constitution normative as they involve the participants' joint commitment to the emotion. On the other hand, some theorists especially in sociology (Durkheim 2009, 2013a; Collins, 2004) have claimed that the values of particular objects and/or social norms originate from and are reinforced by collective emotions that are intentionally directed or associated with the relevant objects or actions. In this chapter, I discuss these opposing views about the relation of collective emotions and normativity, defending the latter view. While collective emotions typically emerge in situations in which some shared value or concern of the participants is at stake, I suggest that collective emotions may also ontologically ground norms in the manner suggested by Durkheim. I present support for this view from a recent sociological case study on the emergence of punitive norms in the social movement Occupy Geneva.

I. Introduction

There are two opposite views about the relation of collective emotions and normativity. On the one hand, the philosopher Margaret Gilbert (1997, 2002, 2014) has argued for years that collective emotions are by constitution normative as they involve the participants' joint commitment to the emotion. On the other hand, some theorists especially in sociology (Durkheim 2009, 2013a; Collins, 2004) have claimed that the values of particular objects and/or social norms originate from and are reinforced by collective emotions that are intentionally directed or associated with the relevant objects or actions. In this chapter, I discuss these opposing views about the relation of collective emotions and normativity, defending the latter view. While collective emotions typically emerge in situations in which some shared value or concern of the participants is at stake, I suggest that collective emotions may also ontologically ground norms in the manner suggested by Durkheim. I present support for this view from a recent sociological case study on the emergence of punitive norms in the social movement *Occupy Geneva*.

SOCIAL COMPLEXES AND ASPECTS

Donald L. M. Baxter

Abstract

Is a social complex identical to many united people or is it a group entity in addition to the people? For specificity, I will assume that a social complex is a plural subject in Margaret Gilbert's sense. By appeal to my theory of Aspects, according to which there can be qualitative difference without numerical difference, I give an answer that is a middle way between metaphysical individualism and metaphysical holism. This answer will enable answers to two additional metaphysical questions: (i) how can two social complexes have all the same members and (ii) how can there be a social complex of social complexes?

Is a social complex identical to many united people or is it a group entity in addition to the people? I incline to the former because I assume with Ockham that it is ontologically preferable to avoid positing additional entities if possible.¹ For specificity, I will assume that a social complex is a plural subject in Margaret Gilbert's sense (1996, 348).² Two or more people form a plural subject when they are jointly committed to acting, believing, feeling, or such, as a body. Thus, I incline to the view that a social complex is identical to the many people united by a joint commitment.³ Gilbert herself inclines the same way, I think. She writes,

In some places I have written that a joint commitment is the commitment of 'two or more individuals considered as a unit or whole'. I do not mean to introduce the idea of a new kind of entity, a 'unit' or 'whole'. I could as well have

- 1 Wikipedia gives this citation for Ockham: 'Sentences of Peter Lombard' (*Quaestiones et decisiones in quattuor libros Sententiarum Petri Lombardi* (ed. Lugd., 1495), i, dist. 27, qu. 2, K), and suggests that the classic formulation of Ockham's Razor is found in Johannes Poncius's commentary on John Duns Scotus's *Opus Oxoniense*, book III, dist. 34, q. 1, in John Duns Scotus *Opera Omnia*, vol.15, Ed. Luke Wadding, Louvain (1639), reprinted Paris: Vives, (1894) p.483a. My guess is that a violation of Ockham's principle is what Sheehy has in mind when he attributes "metaphysical spookiness" to views that "[s]ocial groups are entities over which we quantify in the set of our best descriptions and explanations of the social world" (2006, 74).
- 2 I leave for future work extending the account to the kind of groups emphasized by Epstein "that are grounded by facts unrelated to group members" (2015, 257).
- 3 Even if they are now "we*" in the special sense Gilbert elucidates (1989, 152, 167–203), "we*" is still plural.

WE ARE NO PLURAL SUBJECT

Ludger Jansen

Abstract

In On Social Facts (1989) and subsequent works, Margaret Gilbert has suggested a plural subject account of the semantics of 'we' that claims that a central or standard use of 'we' is to refer to an existing or anticipated plural subject. This contrasts with the more general approach to treat plural pronouns as expressions referring to certain pluralities. I argue that (i) the plural subject approach cannot account for certain syntactic phenomena and that (ii) the sense of intimacy, which Gilbert cites as evidence for her plural subject account, has a different source than the existence of joint commitments constituting a respective plural subject. Moreover, (iii) there is a wide variety of phenomena in the linguistic record, which, while not constituting conclusive evidence against the plural subject account, nevertheless, are dealt with better by the plurality account. 'We' thus refers to pluralities, which may or may not be plural subjects. The precise analysis of 'we' thus reveals a multi-layered ontology of groups.

I. Introduction

Starting with Descartes' *cogito* argument, the first person singular has held central position in modern philosophy. In the last decades, however, there has been a certain shift of focus towards social perspectives, not only in ethics, action theory and social philosophy, but also in disciplines like epistemology and ontology. This shift of focus comes along with an increased interest in the word 'we', or, more generally, in the first person plural. As part of her seminal contribution to social ontology, Margaret Gilbert has suggested a plural subject account of the semantics of 'we' (Gilbert 1989). While acknowledging that 'we' is ambiguous, she points out that a central or standard use of 'we' is to refer to an existing or anticipated plural subject. While Gilbert's social ontology has been widely received and discussed, there is virtually no discussion of her semantic claims. The exception that proves the rule is a paper by Boudewijn de Bruin (2009), in which de Bruin argues that Geoffrey Nunberg's theory of indexicals (Nunberg 1993) deals better with the actual use of 'we' than Gilbert's plural subject account. In the present paper, I add a broader basis of evidence to the critical discussion of Gilbert's semantic account of 'we'. Moreover, while

COORDINATION AND HYPERRATIONALITY

Paul Weirich

Abstract

Margaret Gilbert (1990) argues that although the rationality of the agents in a standard coordination problem does not suffice for their coordination, a social convention of coordination, understood as the agents' joint acceptance of a principle requiring their coordination, does the job. Gilbert's argument targets agents rational in the game-theoretic sense, which following Sobel (1994: Chap. 14), I call hyperrational agents. I agree that hyperrational agents may fail to coordinate in some cases despite the obvious benefits of coordination. However, I add that fully rational agents, who rationally exercise rationality's permissions, may coordinate in these cases without jointly accepting a principle of coordination. I make this point using a model that adopts common simplifying assumptions about agents and their coordination problems.

I. Introduction

Game theory takes a game as a situation involving agents or players who interact. The players make decisions that together settle the outcome of each player's decision. The players each adopt a strategy, and their profile of strategies (a list with exactly one strategy for each player) settles their profile of utilities (a list with exactly one utility for each player). A coordination problem is a type of game. For example, the players in a coordination problem may want all-things-considered to meet at noon, and, because of their circumstances, they meet at noon if and only if they go to the meeting room at noon. They coordinate by all going to the meeting room at noon. Whether they coordinate depends not only on their rationality but also on their information about their coordination problem and about each other.

A table or matrix represents, for each profile of strategies, the outcome for each player. Suppose that there are only two players wanting to meet at noon, and rows represent strategies for player 1, and columns represent strategies for player 2. A cell of the table represents the outcome of a strategy profile, a combination of a strategy of player 1 and a strategy of player 2. The cell contains two numbers forming a utility profile; the first number indicates the utility of the outcome for player 1, and the second number indicates the utility of the outcome for player 2. In the example, only two strategies are salient

THE BOUNDS OF MORALITY: GILBERT ON PROMISSORY OBLIGATION

Jeffrey S. Helmreich

Abstract

Margaret Gilbert's 'Three Dogmas about Promising' is a paradigm-shifting contribution to the literature, not only for its account of promissory obligation based on joint commitment, but for its equally important focus on two properties of such obligation, which her account uniquely and elegantly captures: first, that the duty to keep a promise is necessary—the obligation stands regardless of the content or morality of the promise—and, second, that it is directed, with the promisee having unique standing to demand performance. A related point, implied by Gilbert's argument, is that moral requirements, alone, can never have those properties. Here I challenge that point, arguing that moral requirements, under the right circumstances, can give rise to necessary and directed obligations, after all, and I propose one such moral obligation of which the duty to keep a promise may well be an instance. Nevertheless, I conclude, it may not provide as plausible a basis of promissory obligation as joint commitment.

Margaret Gilbert's "Three Dogmas about Promising"¹ marks a transformative turn in the contemporary debate about promissory obligation that began in earnest some 30 years ago.² Among other things, it makes at least two path-breaking contributions. First, it identifies distinctive features of promissory obligation that any philosophical account should explain or at least accommodate, even as many don't try. One is that, as Gilbert sees it, promises necessarily obligate, no matter their content. If I promise to Φ , I am in at least some sense obligated to Φ , no matter what I've promised. Call it the Necessary

1 Margaret Gilbert, "Three Dogmas about Promising," in Hanoch Sheinman, ed., *Promises and Agreements* (Oxford: 2011), pp. 80–108 (hereafter Gilbert (1) followed by page numbers).

2 The literature began, arguably, with David Hume, *A Treatise of Human Nature*. 2nd ed., L. A. Selby and P. H. Nidditch, eds. (Oxford: 1978) p. 455, but the debate about how to ground promissory obligation enjoyed a resurgence beginning in the 1990s. In addition to T.M. Scanlon's "Promises and Practices," *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 19 (3):199–226 (1990), see also Niko Kolodny and R.J. Wallace, "Promises and Practices Revisited," *Philosophy & Public Affairs* 31 (2003), pp. 119–54; David Owens, "A Simple Theory of Promising," *Philosophical Review* 115 (2006), pp. 51–77; Seana Valentine Shiffrin, "Promising, Intimate Relationships and Conventionalism," *Philosophical Review* 117(4) (2008); Daniel Friedrich and Nicholas Southwood, "Promises and Trust" in Sheinman ed. (2011), pp. 277–90; and Abraham Roth, "Intention, Expectation and Obligation," *Ethics* 127:1 (2016), pp. 88–115.

PATRIOTISM: COMMITMENT, NOT PRIDE

Maura Priest

I. Introduction

This paper is about patriotism, what it is and whether it is good (morally and practically). I am working under the assumption that we might understand the term, “patriotism”, “patriotic”, and “patriot” in various ways. I doubt there is one “true” meaning to the term and its cognates. However, some descriptions better fit the word’s use in common discourse, and some descriptions are ethically and practically preferable. My concern is to argue for a conceptual understanding that meets two criteria. First, the description should latch on to a broad intuitive use of the term as is common in public discourse. In other words, I do not want to describe “patriotism” as stipulated out of thin air. That said, because the word is used in several ways, the use discussed is by no means exhaustive of how “patriotism” and its cognates might be understood. Second, the one of many definitions discussed is chosen normatively, i.e., both moral and practical reasons support this description.

The sense of patriotism defended is based on Margaret Gilbert’s conceptual analysis. Gilbert has written two pieces (one co-authored with Itzel Garcia) defending a joint commitment account of patriotism (2009 and 2018). She admittedly grounds her account in her own intuitive understanding of the term.¹ What she finds intuitive, however, is something I find intuitive as well, and something others have good reason to find intuitive too. This paper explains her account, but the greater focus is on defending the account in the two respects mentioned earlier, i.e., that it matches well with the common (broad) understanding of the term, and more importantly, that it proves morally sound and practically useful.

The plan going forward runs as follows. The next section describes a barebones account of patriotism. I then overview potential objections to patriotism itself, given that barebones definition. Section 3 describes Gilbert’s account of patriotism. Section 4 explains how her account overcomes the previously mentioned objections. Section 5 explains why Gilbertian patriotism not only

1 In her own words, “The primary basis of the claims about intuitiveness I make here is my own sense of the matter in hand: Would I myself judge that such-and-such is a patriotic act, and so on?” (2009:320).

FROM MULTIPLE MODERNITIES TO MULTIPLE GLOBALIZATIONS

Eliezer Ben-Rafael

Abstract

We draw from Eisenstadt's (2002) conceptualization of multiple modernities which he proposed to analyze processes marking modernity and their different versions in contemporary societies. These processes do not delete all pre-existing orientations, value affinities and social arrangements, and while modernity is recognizable everywhere, modern societies also differ at other respects. We formulate a similar contention for globalization. We point to three interacting and intermingling movers of social reality—globalization, multiculturalism and the national principle—which concretize everywhere, and according to contexts and a priori features, specific models qualifying for the notion of multiple globalizations. Beyond the variety of multiple globalizations, this notion underlines the newness of our time and hints the “next society”.

S.N. Eisenstadt's conceptualization

S.N. Eisenstadt passed away on September 2nd, 2010, in Jerusalem. His disappearance left a great void in the global community of social scientists. His ideas on the plurality of both the origins and the outcomes of trajectories of modernity in the world attracted the attention of social scientists. His contentions began with a strong argument against the linear teleological narrative of modernization, which equates it with Westernization: he pleaded for the recognition of the symbolic and institutional variability of modernity. Any study of modernity, he contended, must acknowledge its multiple potential paths and patterns and that it may also include violent and repressive sequences.

Reflecting on Jaspers (1953), Eisenstadt saw a major breakthrough in human history in the crystallization of Axial Age civilizations and the emergence of new ontological conceptions of transcendental and mundane orders bearing potential for further transformations. One such transformation—the most dramatic—was the growth of modernity that entered the world, in many cases, through spectacular revolutions. Eisenstadt was convinced that new types of elites were the source of Axial transformations and further changes. In his mind, social change is not bound exclusively to conflict. Change may also be

THE MEANING(S) OF STRUCTURAL RATIONALITY

Rebecca Gutwald and Niina Zuber

Abstract

Julian Nida-Rümelin's philosophical approach to rationality is radical: It transcends the reductive narrowness of instrumental rationality without denying its practical impact. Actions exist which are carried out in accordance to utility maximizing or even self-interest maximizing. Yet not all actions are to be understood in these terms. Actions that are oriented around social roles, for example, cannot count as irrational just because no underlying maximizing heuristics are found. The concept of bounded rationality tries to embed instrumental rationality into a form of life to highlight limits of our cognitive capabilities and selective perceptions. However, the agent is still situated within the realm of cost-benefit reasoning. The idea of social preferences (e.g. Rabin, Fehr and Schmidt) or meta-preferences (Sen) is insufficient to reflect the plurality of human actions. According to Nida-Rümelin, those concepts ignore the plurality of reasons which drive agency. Hence, they try to fit agency into a theory which undermines humanity. His theory of structural rationality acknowledges daily patterns of interaction and meaning.

In philosophy, questions about rationality and its normative character can be situated within two theoretical debates which have largely evolved separately from each other. First, rationality is a central topic in the philosophy of action. Prominent authors such as Thomas Scanlon, Christine Korsgaard, Michael Bratman or Joseph Raz have debated why we should be rational, how rationality constrains our beliefs, intentions and attitudes, or whether we have any reason to be rational at all. Second, rationality is a central concept in the discussion of so-called rational choice theory (RCT) in economics and classic game theory. A central question, which most authors in these areas answer affirmatively, is whether rationality is purely instrumental or whether there are forms of rationality which cannot be explained by this standard model. According to the standard model, rationality is nothing more than a tool to find the best means to one's end(s).

This text serves two purposes. First, we present Julian Nida-Rümelin's work on the concept of "structural rationality", which expands the instrumental model without denying its importance. Thus, he also criticizes theories of reason which neglect or ignore the importance of instrumentality in various aspects. We argue that his model of rationality is philosophically superior to

CONTRIBUTORS

Donald L. M. Baxter, Professor of Philosophy, Department of Philosophy, University of Connecticut, Storrs, CT, United States of America.

Eliezer Ben-Rafael, Professor Emeritus, Department of Sociology, Tel-Aviv University, Tel Aviv, Israel.

Alban Bouvier, Institute Jean Nicod, Ecole Normale Supérieure, Paris cedex, France.

Antonella Carassa, Professor, Faculty of Communication Science, University Lugano, Lugano, Switzerland.

Marco Colombetti, Professor, Department of Electronics, Information, and Bioengineering, Politecnico di Milano, Milano, Italy.

Margaret Gilbert, Melden Chair in Moral Philosophy and Distinguished Professor of Philosophy, University of California, Irvine, United States of America.

Rebecca Gutwald, Dr., Promotionskolleg, Hochschule für Philosophie, München, Germany.

Jeffrey Helmreich, Assistant Professor of Philosophy and Law Director, Center for Legal Philosophy, University of California, Irvine, CA, United States of America.

Marija Jankovic, Assistant Professor, Department of Philosophy, Davidson College, Davidson, North Carolina, United States of America.

Felipe León, Dr. (Postdoc), Centre for Subjectivity Research – Department of Media, Cognition and Communication, University of Copenhagen, Copenhagen, Denmark.

Ludger Jansen, PD Dr., Institute of Philosophy, Rostock University, Rostock, Germany.

Georg Peter Dr., ProtoSociology, Institute of Sociology, Goethe University – Campus West, Theodor W. Adorno Platz 6, Frankfurt am Main, Germany.

Gerhard Preyer, Professor of Sociology, Institute of Sociology, Goethe University – Campus West, Theodor W. Adorno Platz 6, Frankfurt am Main, Germany.

Maura Priest, Assistant Professor of Philosophy, Arizona State University, Tempe, United States of America.

Mikko Salmela, Senior Researcher, Adjunct Professor, Center for Philosophy of Social Sciences (TINT), Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland.

Frederick F. Schmitt, Department of Philosophy, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana, United States of America.

Thomas Smith Dr., Lecturer in Philosophy and Director of Postgraduate Taught Programmes in Philosophy, Department of Philosophy, School of Social Sciences, Humanities Bridgeford Street, Room 2.41, The University of Manchester, Oxford Road, Manchester, Great Britain.

Joona Taipale, Senior Lecture, Department of Social Sciences and Philosophy, University of Jyväskylä, Jyväskylä, Finland.

Dan Zahavi, Professor of Philosophy, Dr. phil. PhD, Director of Center for Subjectivity Research (CFS), University of Copenhagen, Copenhagen, Denmark.

Nina Zuber, Lehrstuhl für Philosophie und politische Theorie, Ludwig-Maximilian-Universität München, Germany.

IMPRESSUM

ProtoSociology:

An International Journal of Interdisciplinary Research

issn 1611–1281

Editor: Gerhard Preyer

Goethe-Universität Frankfurt am Main, Institute of Sociology, Dep. of
Social Sciences

Editorial staff: Georg Peter

Project Multiple Modernities: Reuß-Markus Krauß (East-Asia Representa-
tive)

Layout and digital publication: Georg Peter

Editorial office: ProtoSociology, Stephan-Heise-Str. 56, 60488 Frankfurt am
Main, Germany, phone: (049)069–769461,

Email: preyer@em.uni-frankfurt.de, peter@protosociology.de

Die Zeitschrift soll 1/2jährlich erscheinen. Die Anzahl der jährlich erscheinenden Hefte
und Sonderhefte bleibt jedoch vorbehalten.

Copyright: Die in dieser Zeitschrift veröffentlichten Beiträge sind urheberrechtlich
geschützt. Alle Rechte sind vorbehalten. Übersetzungen, Nachdruck, Vervielfäl-
tigung auf fotomechanischem oder ähnlichem Weg oder im Magnettonverfahren,
Wiedergabe durch Vortrag, Funk- und Fernsehsendungen sowie Speicherung in
Datenverarbeitungsanlagen, auch auszugsweise, sind nur mit Genehmigung des
Herausgebers möglich. Für eingereichte Beiträge wird keine Haftung übernom-
men. Weitere Publikationsrechte von Artikeln bleiben vorbehalten. Für unaufge-
fordert eingesandte Manuskripte wird keine Haftung übernommen. Gerichtsstand
ist Frankfurt am Main.

Copyright: All rights reserved. This publication may not be reproduced, stored or
transmitted in any form or by any means without the prior permission in writing
of the publisher. Additional publications of the articles are reserved. Authorization
to photocopy items for internal or personal use, or the internal or personal use of
specific clients is granted by *PROTOSOCIOLOGY*, provided that the base fee is
paid directly to VG Wort, Goethestr. 49, 80336 München RFA. The publisher ac-
cepts no responsibility for submitted manuscripts.

ON PROTOSOCIOLOGY

Protosociology plays an important role among philosophy journals with connected contributions on important and breaking topic – such the nature and special features of collective cognitive state – that do not receive such generous attention in other journals. It is worth serious consideration for inclusion in a library's philosophy collection.

Margaret Gilbert, Storrs (USA)

The journal Protosociology has become an important forum for discussion in the philosophy of social science and of sociality and, more broadly, for theoretical discussion in social science. It is especially interesting and important that such new fields as social metaphysics and social epistemology as well as research related to collective intentionality and its applications have acquired a prominent place in the agenda of Protosociology.

Raimo Tuomela, Finland

Protosociology occupies an important position in the European intellectual scene, bridging philosophy, economics, sociology and related disciplines. Its volumes on rationality bring together concerns in all these topics, and present an important challenge to the cognitive sciences.

Donald Davidson, Berkeley (USA)

Protosociology publishes original papers of great interest that deal with fundamental issues in the human and social science. No academic library is complete without it.

Nicholas Rescher, Pittsburgh (USA)

Protosociology has been remarkably successful in publishing interesting work from different tradition and different disciplines and, as the title signals, in giving that work a new, eye-catching slant.

Philipp Pettit, Canberra, Australia

Protosociology is a truly premier interdisciplinary journal that publishes articles and reviews on timely topics written by and for a wide range of international scholars. The recent volumes on rationality are remarkable for their breadth and depth. Protosociology would be a great addition to any library.

Roger Gibson, St. Louis (USA)

SUBSCRIPTION – SINGLE ARTICLE

ProtoSociology cooperates with the *Philosophy Documentation Center*. The PDC provides worldwide access to our collective edition, especially for institutional subscribers but also for individuals. Single access and subscription is possible. Also every article – starting with vol. 1 (1991) – can be ordered separately: <https://www.pdcnet.org/protosociology>

EBOOKS AND BOOKS ON DEMAND

In principle ProtoSociology is an electronic journal. But with our new *Books on Demand* service we are starting to offer volumes worldwide as books: High quality printing and binding on special paper with a professional layout.

The ebooks and books can be ordered directly through around 1000 shops worldwide.

Vol 34, 2017

Borders of Global Theory – Reflections from Within and Without,
ISBN 9783744838924, 49,50.-€

Vol 33, 2016

Borders of Global Theory – Reflections from Within and Without,
ISBN 9783744838924, 49,50.-€

Vol 32, 2015

Making and Unmaking Modern Japan,
ISBN 9783837077780, 32.-€

Vol. 31, 2014

Language and Value,
ISBN 9783739258904, 32.-€

Vol. 30, 2013

Concepts – Contemporary and Historical Perspectives,
ISBN 9783738641653, 32.-€

Vol. 29, 2012

China's Modernization II,
ISBN 9783739258966, 32.-€,

Vol. 28, 2011

China's Modernization I,
ISBN 9783734761270, 32.-€,

ProtoSociology

An International Journal of Interdisciplinary Research

Volume 34, 2016

The Borders of Global Theory – Reflections from Within and Without

Edited by Barrie Axford

Contents

Meaning and Publicity: Two Traditions

Richard Manning

PART I

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Speaking Your Mind: Expression in Locke's Theory of Language

Lewis Powell

Meaning, Communication, and the Mental

Patrick Rysiew

Intentionality and Publicity

Madeleine Arseneault

PART II

MEANING AND INTERPRETATION

Quine, Publicity, and Pre-Established Harmony

Gary Kemp

Reflections on Davidsonian Semantic Publicity

Richard Manning

Meaning, Publicity and Knowledge

Marija Jankovic and Greg Ray

PART III

CONTEMPORARY CRITICISMS AND DEVELOPMENTS

A Puzzle about Context and Communicative Acts

Daniel Harris

The Publicity of Meaning and the Perceptual Approach to Speech Comprehension

Berit Brogaard

Local Meaning, Public Offense

Robert Shanklin

ON CONTEMPORARY LINGUISTICS AND SOCIOLOGY

Analyses on Arbitrariness of Chinese Characters from the Perspective of Morphology

Feng Li

Formal Semantics of English Sentences with Tense and Aspect.

Wenyan Zhang

The Axial Age and Modernity: From Max Weber to Karl Jaspers and Shmuel Eisenstadt

Vittorio Cotesta

ProtoSociology

An International Journal of Interdisciplinary Research

Volume 33, 2016

The Borders of Global Theory – Reflections from Within and Without

Edited by Barrie Axford

Contents

Introduction: Global Scholarship from
Within and Without
Barrie Axford

THINKING GLOBALLY – WHAT DOES IT MEAN TODAY?

Reflections on “Critical Thinking” in Global
Studies
Manfred B. Steger

Globality and the Moral Ecology of the
World: A Theoretical Exploration
Habibul Haque Khondker

Real Leaps in the Times of the Anthro-
pocene: Failure and Denial and ‘Global’
Thought
Anna M. Agathangelou

On the Possibility of a Global Political
Community: The Enigma of ‘Small Local
Differences’ within Humanity
Heikki Patomäki

INSIGHTS FROM THE GALAXY OF SCHOLARSHIP

Geohistory of Globalizations
Peter J. Taylor

Autonomy, Self-determination and
Agency in a Global Context
Didem Buhari Gulmez

The Neglect of Beauty: What’s In and
What’s Out of Global Theorising and Why?
Heather Widdows

Mastery Without Remainder? Connection,
Digital Mediatization and the Constitution
of Emergent Globalities
Barrie Axford

Global Theory – To be Continued
Whither Global Theory?
Jan Aart Scholte

eBook, ISBN-13: 9783744860666, 17,99 €

Book on Demand, ISBN-13: 9783744838924, 49,50 €

ProtoSociology

An International Journal of Interdisciplinary Research

Volume 32, 2015

Making and Un-Making Modern Japan

Edited by Ritu Vij

Contents

Making and Un-Making Japanese Modernity: An Introduction

Ritu Vij

PART I

THE VICISSITUDES OF JAPANESE MODERNITY

Naturalized Modernity and the Resistance it Evokes: Sociological Theory Meets

Murakami Haruki

Carl Cassegard

Ethno-politics in Contemporary Japan:

The Mutual-Occlusion of Orientalism and Occidentalism

Kinhide Mushakoji

PART II

CITIZENSHIP, MIGRANTS AND WELFARE IN MODERN JAPAN

A Dilemma in Modern Japan? Migrant Workers and the (Self-)Illusion of Homogeneity

Hironori Onuki

Pretended Citizenship: Rewriting the Meaning of Il-/Legality

Reiko Shindo

What Japan Has Left Behind in the Course of Establishing a Welfare State

Reiko Gotoh

PART III

RISK, RECIPROCITY, AND ETHNO-NATIONALISM: REFLECTIONS ON THE FUKUSHIMA DISASTER

The Failed Nuclear Risk Governance: Reflections on the Boundary between Misfortune and Injustice in the case of the Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Disaster

Hiroyuki Tosa

Ganbarō Nippon: Tabunka Kyōsei and Human (In)Security Post 3–11

Giorgio Shani

Reciprocity:

Nuclear Risk and Responsibility

Paul Dumouchel

ON CONTEMPORARY PHILOSOPHY AND SOCIOLOGY

Civil Religion in Greece:

A Study in the Theory of Multiple Modernities

Manussos Marangudakis

Underdetermination and Theory-Ladenness Against Impartiality.

Nicla Vassallo and M. Cristina Amoretti

The Challenge of Creativity: a Diagnosis of our Times

Celso Sánchez Capdequí

eBook, ISBN-13: 9783741218866, 17,99 €

Book on Demand, ISBN-13: 9783738622478, 32,- €

ProtoSociology

An International Journal of Interdisciplinary Research

Volume 31, 2014

Language and Value

Edited by Yi Jiang and Ernie Lepore

Contents

Introduction

Ernest Lepore and Yi Jiang

I. SEMANTICS AND ONTOLOGY

The Relation of Language to Value

Jiang Yi

Refutation of the Semantic Argument
against Descriptivism

Chen Bo

Semantics for Nominalists

Samuel Cumming

Semantic Minimalism and Presupposi-
tion

Adam Sennet

Compositionality and Understanding

Fei YuGuo

Values Reduced to Facts: Naturalism with-
out Fallacy

Zhu Zhifang

II. WORD MEANING, METAPHER, AND TRUTH

Philosophical Investigations into Figura-
tive Speech Metaphor and Irony

Ernie Lepore and Matthew Stone

Norms of Word Meaning Litigation

Peter Ludlow

The Inconsistency of the Identity Thesis

Christopher Hom and Robert May

Describing I-junction

Paul M. Pietroski

Predicates of Taste and Relativism about
Truth

Barry C. Smith

Mood, Force and Truth

William B. Starr

A Semiotic Understanding of Thick Term

Aihua Wang

III. FEATURES OF CHINA'S ANALYTICAL PHILOSOPHY

An Echo of the Classical Analytic Philoso-
phy of Language from China: the Post-
analytic Philosophy of Language

Guanlian Qian

The Chinese Language and the Value of
Truth-seeking: Universality of Metaphysi-
cal Thought and Pre-Qin Mingjia's Philoso-
phy of Language

Limin Liu

Mthat and Metaphor of Love in Classical
Chinese Poetry

Ying Zhang

eBook, ISBN-13: 9783739258904, 17,99 €

Book on Demand, ISBN-13: 9783738622478, 32,- €

ProtoSociology

An International Journal of Interdisciplinary Research

Volume 30, 2013

Concept – Contemporary and Historical Perspectives
Contents

CONCEPTS, SENSE, AND ONTOLOGY

What Happened to the Sense of a
Concept-Word?

Carlo Penco

Sense, Mentalese, and Ontology
Jacob Beck

Concepts Within the Model of Triangulation

Maria Cristina Amoretti

A Critique of David Chalmers' and Frank
Jackson's Account of Concepts
Ingo Brigandt

The Influence of Language on Conceptualization: Three Views

Agustin Vicente, Fernando Martinez-Manrique

REPRESENTATIONS, CONTENTS, AND BRAIN

Views of Concepts and of Philosophy
of Mind—from Representationalism to
Contextualism

Sofia Miguens

Changes in View: Concepts in Experience
Richard Manning

Concepts and Fat Plants: Non-Classical
Categories, Typicality Effects, Ecological
Constraints

Marcello Frixione

Concepts in the Brain: Neuroscience,
Embodiment, and Categorization
Joseph B. McCaffrey

RECALLING HISTORY: DESCARTES, HUME, REID, KANT, OCKHAM

Conceptual Distinctions and the Concept
of Substance in Descartes
Alan Nelson

The Concept of Body in Hume's Treatise
Miren Boehm

Conceiving without Concepts: Reid vs. The
Way of Ideas
Lewis Powell

Why the "Concept" of Spaces is not a
Concept for Kant
Thomas Vinci

Ockham on Concepts of Beings
Sonja Schierbaum

ON CONTEMPORARY PHILOSOPHY

Paradoxes in Philosophy and Sociology
Note on Zeno's Dichotomy
I. M. R. Pinheiro

The Epigenic Paradox within Social Development
Robert Kowalski

eBook, ISBN-13: 9783739258973, 17,99 €
Book on Demand, ISBN-13: 9783738641653, 32,- €

ProtoSociology

An International Journal of Interdisciplinary Research

Volume 29, 2012

China's Modernization II –

Edited by Georg Peter and Reuß-Markus Krauß

Contents

ON CONTEMPORARY THEORY OF MODERNISATION

Multiple Modernities and the Theory of Indeterminacy—On the Development and Theoretical Foundations of the Historical Sociology of Shmuel N. Eisenstadt

Manussos Marangudakis

CHANGING CHINA: DEALING WITH DIVERSITY

Dissent of China's Public Intellectuals in the Post-Mao Era

Merle Goldman

Modernization of Law in China—its Meaning, Achievements, Obstacles and Prospect

Qingbo Zhang

China's State in the Trenches: A Gramscian Analysis of Civil Society and Rights-Based Litigation

Scott Wilson

Manufacturing Dissent: Domestic and International Ramifications of China's Summer of Labor Unrest

Francis Schortgen and Shalendra Sharma

NEOLIBERALISM AND THE CHANGES IN EAST ASIAN WELFARE AND EDUCATION

Business Opportunities and Philanthropic Initiatives: Private Entrepreneurs, Welfare Provision and the Prospects for Social Change in China

Beatriz Carrillo Garcia

Time, Politics and Homelessness in Contemporary Japan

Ritu Vij

Educational Modernisation Across the Taiwan Straits: Pedagogical Transformation in Primary School Moral Education

Textbooks in the PRC and Taiwan

David C. Schak

Is China Saving Global Capitalism from the Global Crisis?

Ho-fung Hung

ON CONTEMPORARY PHILOSOPHY

International Development, Paradox and Phronesis

Robert Kowalski

Précis of "The World in the Head"

Robert Cummins

Communication, Cooperation and Conflict

Steffen Borge

eBook, ISBN-13: 9783739258966, 17,99 €

Book on Demand, ISBN-13: 9783738641646, 32,- €

ProtoSociology

An International Journal of Interdisciplinary Research

Volume 28, 2011

China's Modernization I
Contents

CHANGING CHINA: DEALING WITH DIVERSITY

Class, Citizenship and Individualization in China's Modernization
Björn Alpermann

Chinese Nation-Building as, Instead of, and Before Globalization
Andrew Kipnis

Principles for Cosmopolitan Societies: Values for Cosmopolitan Places
John R. Gibbins

ON MODERNIZATION: LAW, BUSINESS, AND ECONOMY IN CHINA

Modernizing Chinese Law: The Protection of Private Property in China
Sanzhu Zhu

Chinese Organizations as Groups of People—Towards a Chinese Business Administration
Peter J. Peverelli

Income Gaps in Economic Development: Differences among Regions, Occupational Groups and Ethnic Groups
Ma Rong

THINKING DIFFERENTIATIONS: CHINESE ORIGIN AND THE WESTERN CULTURE

Signs and Wonders: Christianity and Hybrid Modernity in China
Richard Madsen

Confucianism, Puritanism, and the Transcendental: China and America
Thorsten Botz-Bornstein

China and the Town Square Test
Jeffrey N. Wasserstrom

Metaphor, Poetry and Cultural Implicature..
Ying Zhang

ON CONTEMPORARY PHILOSOPHY

Can Science Change our Notion of Existence?
Jody Azzouni

The Epistemological Significance of Practices
Alan Millar

On Cappelen and Hawthorne's "Relativism and Monadic Truth"
J. Adam Carter

eBook, ISBN-13: 9783739258928, 17,99 €

Book on Demand, ISBN-13: 9783734761270, 32,- €

Social Ontology and Collective Intentionality

Critical Essays on the Philosophy of Raimo Tuomela with His Responses

Gerhard Preyer and Georg Peter (Eds.)

Introduction:

Raimo Tuomela's Philosophy of Sociality,

Gerhard Preyer and Georg Peter

I COLLECTIVE INTENTIONALITY, MEMBERSHIP, AND REASONING,

Kirk Ludwig

Methodological Individualism, the We-mode, and Team reasoning

Response by Raimo Tuomela

Michael Schmitz

What is a Mode Account of Collective Intentionality?

Response by Raimo Tuomela

Hans Bernhard Schmid

What Kind of Mode is the We-Mode?

On Raimo Tuomela's Account of Collective Intentionality

Response by Raimo Tuomela

David Schweikard

Voluntary Groups, Noncompliance, and Conflicts of Reasons: Tuomela on Acting as a Group-Member.

Response by Raimo Tuomela

Raul Hakli, Pekka Mäkelä

Planning in the We-mode

Response by Raimo Tuomela

II SOCIAL ONTOLOGY AND SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Arto Laitinen

We-mode Collective Intentionality and its Place in Social Reality

Response by Raimo Tuomela

Martin Rechenauer

Tuomela meets Burge. Another Argument for Anti-Individualism

Response by Raimo Tuomela

**SPRINGER INTERNATIONAL
PUBLISHING AG, 2017**

Bookpublications of the Project (extract)

Sociology

Ohnmächtige Weltmacht China: Modernisierung ohne Harmonie, Gerhard Preyer, Reuß-Markus Krauß, Springer VS Verlag Sozialwissenschaften, Wiesbaden 2017.

Struktur und Semantic Map Zur soziologischen Theorie Shmuel N. Eisenstadts, Gerhard Preyer, Springer VS Verlag, Wiesbaden 2016.

Varieties of Multiple Modernities: New Research Design, Gerhard Preyer and Michael Sussman (eds.). Brill Publisher, 2015.

Hybridisierung China – Modernisierung und Mitgliedschaftsordnung der chinesischen Gesellschaft. Reuß-Markus Krauß. Springer/VS Verlag, 2015.

Chinas Power-Tuning: Modernisierung des Reichs der Mitte, Gerhard Preyer, Reuß-Markus Krauß, Springer/VS Verlag 2013.

Rolle, Status, Erwartungen und soziale Gruppe. Gerhard Preyer. Springer/VS Verlag. 2012.

Selbstbeobachtung der modernen Gesellschaft und die neuen Grenzen des Sozialen. Georg Peter und Reuß Markus Krauß (Hrsg.). Springer/VS Verlag. 2012

Zur Aktualität von Shmuel N. Eisenstadt—Eine Einleitung in sein Werk. Gerhard Preyer. VS Verlag 2011.

In China erfolgreich sein—Kulturunterschiede erkennen und überbrücken. Gerhard Preyer, Reuß-Markus Krauß. Gabler Verlag 2009.

Borderlines in a Globalized World. New Perspectives in a Sociology of the World System. Gerhard Preyer, Mathias Bös (eds.). Kluwer 2002.

Philosophy

Beyond Semantics and Pragmatics, Gerhard Preyer (ed.), Oxford University Express 2018.

Social Ontology and Collective Intentionality Critical Essays on the Philosophy of Raimo Tuomela with His Responses, Gerhard Preyer, Georg Peter (eds.). Springer Academic Publishers 2017.

Prereflective Consciousness – Sartre and Contemporary Philosophy of Mind, Sofia Miguens, Clara Morando, Gerhard Preyer (eds.). Routledge 2015.

From Individual to Collective Intentionality—New Essays, edited by Sara Rachel Chant, Frank Hindriks, and Gerhard Preyer. Oxford University Press 2013.

Consciousness and Subjectivity. Sofia Miguens, Gerhard Preyer (eds.). Ontos Publishers 2012.

Triangulation—From an Epistemological Point of View. Maria Cristina Amoretti, Gerhard Preyer (eds.). Ontos Publishers 2011.

Intention and Practical Thought. Gerhard Preyer. Humanities Online 2011.

Context-Sensitivity and Semantic Minimalism—New Essays on Semantics and Pragmatics. Gerhard Preyer and Georg Peter (eds.). Oxford University Press 2007.

Contextualism in Philosophy. Knowledge, Meaning an Truth. Gerhard Preyer, Georg Peter (eds.). Oxford University Press 2005.

Concepts of Meaning. Framing an Integrated Theory of Linguistic Behavior. Gerhard Preyer, Georg Peter, Maria Ulkan (eds.). Kluwer 2003. Rep. Springer Verlag, Wien.

Logical Form and Language. Gerhard Preyer, Georg Peter (eds.). Oxford University Press 2002.