

Doctoral Programme Humanities and Social Sciences 2024/25

THEORIES OF SOCIETY

Schedule of Lectures and Seminars

Weekly sessions: Tuesdays, 17-20h

Location: for up-to-date class location, please see [My FDV Timetables](#)

Lectures

October 29, 2024

**Prof. dr. Aleksandra Kanjuo Mrčela, prof. dr. Igor Lukšič, prof. dr. Marko Milosavljević,
prof. dr. Peter Stanković**

Introduction to the Course

Meeting with four course coordinators.

November 5, 2024

Igor Lukšič (University of Ljubljana)

Igor Lukšič is Professor of Political Science at the Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Ljubljana. He is head of the Department of Political Theory at the Faculty of Social Sciences. His research includes political theory, political anthropology and history of political ideas.

Apolitical Democracy

Democracy has always been a political project with a great goal to widen emancipation of the individual and of the people. Neoliberalism transformed that project in a-political or even anti-political with making democracy just a formal technique. The lecture will present contradictions of the democratic project in a modern period through ideas of Kant, Hegel and Marx. From the

introduction of capitalism, the process of concentration of capital has always required a concentration of political power: at the beginning on the level of nation-state, in some cases in the form of state-capitalism and dictatorship, today more and more in the hands of different institution of the “international community”. Can democracy as emancipatory and political project survive?

Reading:

Charles S. Maier: Democracy since the French Revolution. In: Dunn, John. 1992. (ed.) *The Unfinished Journey 508 BC ad 1993*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, New York, Cape Town. (125-151) (Text is available at Study Materials section of the course at Web Office)

November 12, 2024

Aleksandra Kanjuo Mrčela (University of Ljubljana)

Aleksandra Kanjuo Mrčela is a professor of the Sociology of Work and Economic Sociology at the University of Ljubljana's, Faculty of Social Sciences. Her teaching and research activities are in the fields of industrial relations, work and organisation, gender. From 1999-2001 she was a visiting scholar at the London School of Economics and Political Sciences. Since 2003 she is the coordinator of the national center for Eurofound at UL. Since 2004 she is a member of the Network of Experts in the Fields of Employment, Social Inclusion and Gender Equality Issues (European Commission). From 2011 she is an associate editor and from 2015 an editor of *Social politics: International Studies in Gender, State and Society* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994).

The Past and the Future of the Post-socialism

The scope and importance of the economic, political, and social changes that occurred in the countries of former socialist Europe at the end of the 20th and beginning of the 21st century is staggering. Different accounts of these colossal changes are showing how the transition affected economic structures as well as the economic lives of men and women in post-socialist Europe. It shows that the transitions in the region paved the way to and are connected to full-blooded neoliberalism. Likewise, the post socialist pathways in the region profoundly impacted gender arrangements. All these changes have had an impact in other parts of the world. The collapse of the old system has influenced discussions and transitions in Latin America and Africa. There is a need to recognise the lost emancipatory potential of socialist projects, using the transition as a fertile soil for new deliberations and growth of new groups and movements

that would support a struggle for a radically democratic vision of society surpassing the neoliberal “übercapitalism”.

Readings: Kanjuo Mrčela, A. 2024. The Re-organisation of Economy, Politics and Gender Equality in Post-socialist Europe. In Hassim, S. and Korteweg, A. (2024, Ed.): *Handbook on Politics and Society*. London: Edward Elgar Publishing Ltd (Text is available at Study Materials section of the course at Web Office)

November 19, 2024

J. Tuomas Harviainen (Tampere University)

J. Tuomas Harviainen (PhD, MBA) is Professor of Information Studies and Interactive Media at Tampere University, Finland. He has published over 80 peer reviewed works, as well as several books. Harviainen mostly teaches future librarians and archivists, but his own main subjects of study include cooperative information sharing between game development companies, harm reduction in the online trading of illegal narcotics, and the information practices of marginalized communities.

Ludic society: Cultures of play and the play element in culture

Since Johan Huizinga's *Homo Ludens* in 1938, we have been discussing the play element not just *of*, but *in* culture. Play is what teaches us in childhood and what keeps us entertained during our lives, but being playful is also the enabler of many processes important to societies and organizations. A playful mind allows us to make hypotheses on futures that have not yet taken place and thereby allow us to strategize. It creates moods befitting of sex. And it allows us to engage with and enjoy gamification, which adds game-like traits to non-play contexts. In this lecture, we discuss how the playful mind works, how it has historically affected and empowered us, and how we engage with it nowadays in ways that may be far less social, such as the ubiquitous gameplay happening on our mobile devices.

Reading:

Harviainen, J. T. & Stenros, J. (2021). Central theories of games and play. In Vesa, M. (ed.), *Organizational gamification: Theories and practices of ludified work in late modernity* (pp. 20-39). New York: Routledge.

November 26, 2024

Tihomir Cipek (University of Zagreb)

Tihomir Cipek, Ph.D., a political scientist, is a full-time professor in tenure at the Faculty of Political Science in Zagreb. He won twice the Croatian National Award for Science. He served as the president of the Croatian Political Science Association. He was a visiting professor and researcher at the universities in Austria, Brazil, Germany, Slovakia, and Slovenia, as well at IWM institute in Vienna. He was a member of the International Editorial Board of The International Encyclopaedia of Political Science published by APSA. The subject of his research interests are political ideologies, comparative politics, and European studies.

The New American Nationalism. Globalism and the rise of Donald Trump

The lecture will compare two concepts of the American nation. The first based on the idea of a “melting pot” and the second based on the concept of a “salad bowl“. This will be done by analysing Samuel Huntington's theory of the American nation. Initially, Huntington started from the ideology of “Americanism“. This ideology is based on freedom, equality before the law, individual responsibility, republicanism, representative democracy, and laissez-faire economics. Subsequently, faced with the “salad bowl” doctrine based on multiculturalism and globalism, he changed his mind and began to search for the “true” roots of the American nation. In his book *Who Are We? The Challenges to America's National Identity* (2004) he advocates the thesis that the USA is determined by the White Anglo-Saxon Protestants (WASP) formula. Carlos Lozada described Huntington's works as “anticipating America's political and intellectual battles -- and pointing to the country we may become.” Huntington's theory hence anticipated future events in America and announced the appearance of Trump. The lecture will try to show why today's America started voting for Trump. The thesis that fundamental reason for this lay in a conflict between globalists and sovereigntists will be defended. Based on the messages used in the elections and their results, it will be shown that support for certain political options depends on the interpretation of the features of American nation.

Readings:

1. [The Hispanic Challenge - By Samuel P. Huntington | Foreign Policy \(archive.org\)](#)
2. [Samuel Huntington, a prophet for the Trump era - The Washington Post](#)

December 3, 2024

Adriana Zaharijević (University of Belgrade)

Adriana Zaharijević is a Principal Fellow at the Institute for Philosophy and Social Theory, University of Belgrade. Her work combines political philosophy, feminist theory, and social history. She is the author of four monographs, the latest being *Judith Butler and Politics* (Edinburgh University Press, 2023). She has published in *European Journal of Women Studies*, *Signs*, *East European Politics and Societies: and Cultures*, *Redescriptions*, *Women's Studies International Forum*. Her texts have been translated into Albanian, German, Hungarian, Italian, Macedonian, Portuguese, Slovenian, Turkish, and Ukrainian, and she has actively translated feminist theory and philosophy into Serbian for two decades. Adriana Zaharijević is the 2022 Emma Goldman Snowball awardee.

A Livable World

What is it to live a livable life? What would be a life that is livable? Is this a 'good life' in (post)modern wording? Can one live a livable life in an unlivable world, to reverse Adorno's phrase according to which there is no good life in a bad one? Ultimately, do we speak about an ethical or a political problem and how do we know? Judith Butler's political philosophy revolves around the issue of livable life. There are many names for unlivability in Butler's work, but livable life remains the normative horizon of their philosophy. It is uncommon to claim that Butler is a biopolitical thinker, but I wish to take us in this direction and ask if anyone can truly live a livable life in an unlivable world, thereby opening questions on a differently conceived biopolitics, ethics that cannot do without politics, and a necessity of a good world for a good life.

Readings:

Judith Butler, 'Can one lead a good life in a bad life?', *Notes Toward a Performative Theory of Assembly*, Harvard UP, 2015, p. 193-220.

www.radicalphilosophyarchive.com/issue-files/rp176_article1_judith_butler_adorno_prize_lecture.pdf

Adriana Zaharijević and Sanja Bojanić, The trajectories of the concept of life in Judith Butler's Philosophy. *Isegoria. Revista de filosofia moral y politica*, 2017, 56, 169-185.

<https://core.ac.uk/reader/230188530>

December 10, 2024

David Ellerman (UC Riverside, USA; UL Ljubljana)

David Patterson Ellerman is a philosopher and author who works in the fields of economics and political economy, social theory, quantum mechanics, and mathematics. He has written extensively on workplace democracy based on a modern treatment of the labor theory of property and the theory of inalienable rights as rights based on de facto inalienable capacities. His PhD thesis was titled *Sheaves of Relational Structures And Ultraproducts*, and was advised by Rohit Jivanlal Parikh. After his PhD, Ellerman remained teaching at Boston University in the mathematics and then the economic department until 1976. He then taught economics at the University of Massachusetts, Boston until 1982, then at Boston College until 1987, and finally at Tufts University until 1990. In 1990, he moved to Ljubljana, Slovenia, where he started a labor consulting firm. From 1992 until 2003, he worked at the World Bank as an economics advisor to the Chief Economist (Joseph Stiglitz and Nicholas Stern). From 2003 to 2020, he was a visiting scholar at the University of California, Riverside and since 2020, he is an associate researcher at the University of Ljubljana.

Classical Liberalism, Democratic Theory, and Workplace Democracy

- *Classical liberalism* frames the political question in terms of the binary: Consent or coercion.
 - Non-democratic or autocratic government is seen as based on coercion.
 - Democratic government is government based on the consent of the governed.
- But that ignores the whole history of political thought where autocratic government was supposed to be legitimated by the social contract by which the people consented to be subjects in the *pactum subjectionis* from the Roman *Lex Regia* onward.
- The actual development of democratic theory was thus based not on the mere advocacy of consent but on the distinction between:
 - consent to alienate (*translatio*) governance rights to the sovereign (e.g., Hobbes) versus
 - consent to only delegate (*concessio*) rights to the rulers as recallable representatives or delegates (e.g., Otto von Gierke and Quentin Skinner).
- Then the critique of the alienation contracts was based on the theory of inalienable rights starting with Spinoza and Hutcheson converting the Reformation's "inalienability of conscience" into a political doctrine.
- The inalienable rights argument formed the basis for:

- the abolition of contracts of voluntary servitude (Abolitionist Movement),
- the abolition of contracts of political subjection (Democratic Movement), and
- the abolition of the coverture marriage contract (Feminist Movement).
- That history of political theory is then supplemented with the history and analysis of corporations.
- The reframing of the political question using the binary between consent alienation versus delegation *cannot* be accepted by conventional liberal social science (political science or economics) since the contractual basis for the current economic system, the employment contract, is clearly an alienation contract. No one claims that the employer is the representative or delegate of the employees.
- Then the necessary blindness of several contemporary classical liberals is demonstrated as a necessary form of thought control in "social science."
- The reorganization of economic firms on the democratic basis of contracts of delegation is described and situated in the Slovene context.
- The abolition of the employment system in favor of workplace democracy is Neo-Abolitionism, the topic of my book of that name.

Readings:

Ellerman, David. Chapter 4 Governance: The Case Against the Employment System Based on Democratic Theory.

(The whole book is accessible on the course web page)

December 17, 2024

Marko Milosavljević (University of Ljubljana)

Marko Milosavljević is a Full Professor, Ph.D., at the Department of Journalism at the Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia. He was a Head of the Department from 2008 until 2012. He is a Vice-Chair of the Committee of Experts on Media Environment and Reform (MSI-REF) at the Council of Europe, the chair of Communications Law and Policy section of European Communication Research and Education Association (ECREA) and a member of the Core Experts Group for Media and Culture (EENCA), advising European Commission on culture and media policy (2016-2020). He was interviewed and quoted in publications such as The New York Times, Financial Times, Reuters, Al Jazeera English, Euronews, Le Monde, Liberation, La Croix, Radio France, Deutsche Welle, ARD, ZDF, Der

Standard, Falter, Politico, Euractiv, Bloomberg, L'Espresso, Balkan Insight, Polish digital Višegrad Insight, Czech daily Britske Listy, Swedish public radio, Swedish commercial television TV4, Swedish daily newspaper Dagens Nyheter, Dutch newspaper de Volkskrant, and others. He is a member of Horizon2020 project EMBEDDIA, researching artificial intelligence in the media and newsrooms, where he takes the position of manager for Ethics & Policy, Dissemination and journalism. He spoke at the conferences and as keynote speaker at conferences at MIT Boston, National Press Club in Washington D.C., Ryerson University Toronto, St. Johns University New York, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, London School of Economics, Central European University Budapest, Munich LMU University, Complutense Madrid, Lusofona Lisbon, Lund University, at conferences by European Commission, UNESCO, ECREA, IAMCR, ICA, the Council Of Europe, European Parliament and others.

Journalism and Artificial Intelligence - key issues, potential and threats

One of the key developments of journalism in the digital age is the use of Artificial Intelligence (AI), algorithms, automation and related tools within the journalistic gathering of information, verification, production, distribution, and promotion. Some assessments of AI in newsrooms state that AI and particularly automation brings the potential to augment journalism by freeing journalists up from routine tasks and saving time for creative work, by aiding newsrooms to find relevant stories in large data that might be overlooked by human agency, and by tailoring news to be of interest and relevance to the public. There are also concerns exemplifying the deskilling and increased layoffs, legal and ethical problems, further commodification of news through mass personalization, and greater degradation of professional journalism as opposed to either automation or mass amateurisation. The lecture focuses on epistemological implications for each stage of journalistic creation and potential challenge for “the ideal-typical values” in journalistic professional ideology, and is based on research in newsrooms and with key editors and directors of newsrooms and digital at media companies such as New York Times, Bloomberg, Associated Press, AFP, BBC, The Guardian, Der Spiegel, L'Express, ARD, and Financial Times. On the basis of these interviews the assessment of journalism and professional values are analyzed with respect to future developments of news institutions.

Reading:

. Milosavljevič, Marko, Vobič, Igor. Human still in the loop: editors reconsider the ideals of professional journalism through automation. Digital journalism. 2019, vol. 7, iss. 8, str. 1098-1116. (Text is available at Study Materials section of the course at Web Office)

. Milosavljevič, Marko, Vobič, Igor. "Our task is to demystify fears": analysing newsroom management of automation in journalism. *Journalism*. 2019, vol., no., 19 (Text is available at Study Materials section of the course at Web Office)

January 7, 2025

Gonzalo Hernández Gutiérrez (Jesuit University in Guadalajara)

Gonzalo Hernández Gutiérrez holds a Ph.D. in Advanced Management of Organizations and Social Economy from the University of Mondragon, Spain. He has a Master's degree in development studies from the Université catholique de Louvain, a Master's in Social Economy from the University of Mondragon, and a Master's in Management of Social Economy Organizations from the Universidad Iberoamericana de Puebla. Currently, he is a researcher and professor at ITESO Jesuit University in Guadalajara, Mexico, where he coordinates the Academic Unit of Economics. Additionally, he is a fellow and researcher at Rutgers University in the United States and a visiting professor at various national and international universities. With over twenty years of experience in projects, teaching, and research related to the social economy, his research interests include employee ownership and purpose-driven businesses from a social economy perspective.

Expressions, tensions, and potentialities of Social Economy movements in Latin America.

In this lecture, we will explore alternatives and expressions of the Social Economy by examining specific cases in both thought and collective action. Our focus will be on two case studies: fair trade and the worker-owned movement within certified B corporations. Through these examples, we will analyze Latin American realities and the potential for transformative change and genuine shared democracy.

Readings:

Audebrand, L. K., & Pauchant, T. C. (2009). Can the fair trade movement enrich traditional business ethics? An historical study of its founders in Mexico. *Journal of business ethics*, 87, 343-353.

<https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/document?repid=rep1&type=pdf&doi=19cc19c0f9026fcef99cacbc05fac55e6b8ec20>

Gigliotti, M., & Runfola, A. (2022). A stakeholder perspective on managing tensions in hybrid organizations: Analyzing fair trade for a sustainable development. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 31(7), 3198-3215. <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdfdirect/10.1002/bse.3071>

Hernández, G. (2023). B Corps and Employee Ownership Evidence and Complexity of the Phenomenon. In Hernández and Zuloaga (Ed) *Employee Ownership in the Americas, A path to Shared Prosperity* (209-245pp). ITESO. <https://editorial.iteso.mx/index.php/PI/catalog/book/18> or https://play.google.com/store/books/details?id=wGvmEAAAQBAJ&rdid=book-wGvmEAAAQBAJ&rdot=1&source=gbs_vpt_read&pcampaignid=books_booksearch_viewport

January 14, 2025

Maria Michalis z University of Westminster

Maria Michalis is Professor of Communication Policy and Deputy Director of the Communication and Media Research Institute (CAMRI, University of Westminster), a world leading center in the study of media and communication. She is the Co-President (with Alessandro D'Arma) of the International Association of Public Media Researchers (IAPMR). She is author of *Governing European Communications* (Lexington 2007) and has published numerous book chapters and refereed academic articles in prestigious journals. She worked on the EU-funded project NetCommons (2016-2018), which examined network infrastructure as commons and looked into Internet community networks. Her current work focuses on digital governance, the future of public service media, and digital sustainability.

Maria makes regular submissions to policy consultations, some of which are quoted and referenced in follow-up policy documents, for instance in Ofcom (2021) *Small Screen: Big Debate. Recommendations to Government on the Future of Public Service Media*, and the House of Lords report (2019) *Public Service Broadcasting: As Vital as Ever*. In 2020, Maria was a Member of the Advisory Board of IMPRESS (the only Leveson compliant press regulator in the UK) on the review of its regulatory scheme. Until recently, she was a Trustee on the Board of the Voice of the Listener and the Viewer (VLV) in the UK where she served for 6 years (the maximum allowed). Maria sits on the Advisory Committee of the European Audiovisual Observatory (Council of Europe) representing the European Alliance of Listeners and Viewers' Associations. She has presented her research at European and international policy fora including the European Parliament and UNESCO.

Media Policy: What is it and why should we care?

This session considers what media policy is and why it matters. It assesses whether the aims and instruments of policy have changed in response to the rise of online, platformised and transnational media and communication. The session moves on to explain the role of competition policy in the media markets, and how AI ethics and policy link to the media.

Readings:

van Cuilenburg, J. & McQuail, D. (2003). Media policy paradigm shifts: Towards a new communications policy paradigm. *European Journal of Communication*, 18 (2), 181-207 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0267323103018002002>

Freedman, D. (2010). Media Policy Silences: The Hidden Face of Communications Decision Making. *The International Journal of Press/Politics*, 15(3), 344-361. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1940161210368292>

Michalis, M. (in press) "Competition Law and Regulation." In M. Puppis, R. Mansell and H. Van den Bulck (Eds.), *Handbook of Media and Communication Governance*, Edward Elgar. Publication date: 2024. Available at: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/377226982_Michalis_M_2024_forthcoming_Competition_Law_and_Regulation_In_M_Puppis_RMansell_H_Van_den_Bulck_Eds_Handbook_of_media_and_communication_governance_Elgar

January 21, 2025

Peter Stanković (University of Ljubljana)

Peter Stanković (1970) is Professor at Department of Cultural Studies, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia. He specializes in cultural studies, film studies, popular music, food studies and identity politics. His recent publications include a monograph on the history of Slovenian cinematography and several articles on popular music heritage, food as a medium of cultural exchange, and mechanisms of symbolic exclusion of immigrants from the other former Yugoslav republics in Slovenia.

Rancière and the Politics of Aesthetics

After Bourdieu's critique of art as a mechanism of reproduction of class differences, art has become almost something like an opponent in the critical project of cultural studies. In recent

years, however, there is a notable surge of voices that argue that art could be understood as an important tool of emancipatory politics as well. One of the most important theorists, who think in this way, is Jacques Rancière. His work is based on a synchronic and diachronic analysis of three different regimes of art that constitute three different relationships toward society. These regimes are ethical, representative in aesthetic. According to Rancière, it is only the aesthetic regime that is connected to life and therefore capable of changing it (together with wider social circumstances).

Reading:

Jacques Rancière (2006): *The Politics of Aesthetics: The Distribution of the Sensible*. London: Continuum. Str.20–30.

<https://selforganizedseminar.files.wordpress.com/2012/10/rancic3a8re-jacques-politics-aesthetics-distribution-sensible-new-scan.pdf>

Seminars

January 28, 2025

Igor Lukšič

Reading:

. Pierre Rosanvallon (2008): *Counter-Democracy. Politics in an Age of Distrust*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (Book is available in our library of online through COBISS+ portal)

February 4, 2025

Marko Milosavljević

Reading: Victor Pickard (2020): *Democracy Without Journalism? Confronting the Misinformation Society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. (Book is available in our library of online through COBISS+ portal)

February 11, 2025

Peter Stanković

Reading:

. Chris Barker (2002): *Making Sense of Cultural Studies. Central Problems and Critical Debates*. London, Sage, pp. 45–85 in 108–175. (Book is available in our library of online through COBISS+)

. Smith, Philip in Riley, Alexander (2009): *Cultural Theory: An introduction* (Second Edition). Malden: Blackwell, pp. 195–206 in 262–279. (Book is available in our library of online through COBISS+ portal)

February 18, 2025

Aleksandra Kanjuo Mrčela

Reading:

Jones, Pip in Bradbury, Liz (2018): *Introducing social theory. Third Edition*. Cambridge: Polity Press. (Book is available in our library of online through COBISS+ portal)

Exam Readings:

1. Jones, Pip; Bradbury, Liz (2018): *Introducing social theory*. Third Edition. Cambridge: Polity Press. (Book is available in our library of online through COBISS+ portal).
2. Pierre Rosanvallon (2008): *Counter-Democracy. Politics in an Age of Distrust*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (Book is available in our library of online through COBISS+ portal)
3. Chris Barker (2002): *Making Sense of Cultural Studies. Central Problems and Critical Debates*. London, Sage, pp. 45–85 in 108–175. (Book is available in our library of online through COBISS+ portal)
4. Smith, Philip in Riley, Alexander (2009): *Cultural Theory: An introduction* (Second Edition). Malden: Blackwell, pp. 195–206 in 262–279. (Book is available in our library of online through COBISS+ portal)
5. Victor Pickard (2020): *Democracy Without Journalism? Confronting the Misinformation Society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. (Book is available in our library of online through COBISS+ portal)

6. Victor Pickard: Democracy Without Journalism? Confronting the Misinformation Society (Oxford University Press, 2020).

Course Requirements and final examination:

The course is structured in four lectures by four course coordinators, invited guest talks and four concluding seminars with coordinators. The course outline indicates the required readings for each meeting. Each class meeting will combine lecture, discussion and students' responses to the readings. All readings listed above are required readings and are to be read prior to the class meeting. Students can use their initiative and seek out additional scholarly and non-scholarly resources. Students are expected to attend all lectures and seminars and each student should respond to the weekly readings by contributing a position paper - between 300-400 words and send it to the study coordinator at igor.luksic@fdv.uni-lj.si no later than Monday each week.

Evaluation is based on the participation and a final examination. In the two-hour exam, students will receive four problem questions. Performance evaluation will be based on four short essays that respond to four questions referring to the assigned readings. We expect students to demonstrate a knowledge and understanding of the required texts and exhibit a method of critical analysis at an advanced level. Each of the four essays will be graded separately by four coordinators of the course. Students are required to perform satisfactorily in all four essays and receive a minimum grade 6 at each of the four short essays.