

obligation to abstract entities such as “the people” (collective and individual). Group life is intrinsic to individual welfare and precedes it both in practical and in ideal terms. Both Cole and Laski endeavored to show how state power could be dispersed to reflect not only territorial but also functional needs at all levels of the life of society in ways that reflect the specific and diverse interests of citizens.

British pluralism, as a movement and research program, was obliterated in the 1920s and 1930s partly because of its own failed experiments in guild socialism and social credit schemes, but also by the Great Depression and the rise of communist, fascist, and social democratic ideologies and governments. It remained in obscurity until the late twentieth century, when the Oxford political scientist, Anglican priest, and Christian socialist David Nicholls (1994 [1975]) first began to recover its arguments. It was Paul Q. Hirst, the post-Marxist social and political theorist at Birkbeck College, London, however, who most clearly developed political pluralism for contemporary reappraisal in the last two decades of the twentieth century. After putting the first generation of British pluralists back into print in *The Pluralist Theory of the State* (1989), Hirst developed a political pluralist critique of representative democracy in *Representative Democracy and its Limits* (1990), and then constructed a positive set of principles, policies, and programs for developing political pluralism as a viable and workable option in modern complex societies in *Associative Democracy* (1994; see also Cohen & Rogers 1995). In this retrieval and extension of the arguments of the first generation of British pluralists, we have the agenda of a theory and research program that is ripe for development, but – in the absence of a contemporary equivalent of labor and cooperative and mutualist associations – it is still a program without agents and institutions.

SEE ALSO: Civil Society; Democracy; Nation-State; Pluralism; Pluralism, American; State

REFERENCES AND SUGGESTED READINGS

Cohen, J. & Rogers, J. (Eds.) (1995) *Associations and Democracy*. Verso, London.

Hirst, P. Q. (Ed. & Intro.) (1989) *The Pluralist Theory of the State: Selected Writings of G. D. H. Cole, J. N. Figgis, and H. J. Laski*. Routledge, London.

Hirst, P. Q. (1990) *Representative Democracy and its Limits*. Polity Press, Cambridge.

Hirst, P. Q. (1994) *Associative Democracy: New Forms of Economic and Social Governance*. University of Massachusetts Press, Amherst.

Nicholls, D. (1994 [1975]) *The Pluralist State: The Political Ideas of J. N. Figgis and his Contemporaries*, 2nd edn. Macmillan, London.

poetics, social science

Ivan Brady

Poetics in an Aristotelian sense is a system of normative rules for composition. A more practical and theoretically useful definition is to see poetics as a collection of choices concerning style, composition, and thematics made at different levels by an author or a group (Hallyn 1990: 14). These choices help to determine (and are determined by) aesthetic and related representational interests in speech or writing, or both, that is, by *poesis* – the cognitive process of “being” and “doing” in variable contexts, a dynamic and reflexive process of construction, selection, and representation. The composite is an action plan for constructing the work. Putting it into place in the social sciences begs several problems simultaneously, including the place of aesthetic interests in the subject matter traditionally corralled by social scientists, the points of entry into research, and the visibility of the authors in representations.

A careful study of both conventional scientific inquiry (with its distancing methods) and the more immersive and subjective techniques of artisan frameworks, including poetics, shows that nothing we say can be nested in the entirely new; that the field of experience and representation is by definition both culturally cluttered and incomplete for all of us at some level. Scientific inquiry can help us sort this clutter more or less dispassionately, giving us a glimpse of patterned relationships among things and behaviors. But even when that is done to the best advantage, the results are still in the last analysis plural, imperfect, and

impermanent. Meanings change with changing perceptions of environmental circumstances, and science does not cover that well. Science does not give us ordinary reality, the world we live in *as* we live it through our senses and our culturally programmed intellects. Self-conscious immersion has a better chance of getting at a realistic account of such experiences primarily because of its devotion to sensuous particulars. Poets are potentially expert *re*-presenters who offer comparative experiences in a commonly held domain, that of the active body itself, and the ultimate aim of poetic expression is to touch the universal through the particular – to evoke and enter into discourse about the sublime, to move the discourse to what defines us all, what we share as human beings. Poetry is necessarily about all of us.

Poetry is also perhaps the most conspicuous or unexpected form for representing aesthetic, social, and ethnographic concerns in the social sciences. It can be verse or prose, of course, and it is not by any means confined to entertainment interests. No subject is beyond its reach, internal or external, in the life of the mind or the quotidian realities of whole societies (e.g., see Brady 2003a; Hartnett 2003; Hartnett & Engels 2005). This argument applies to everything we think and do – to every interpretation (and therefore every representation), from the maskings of rituals to the revelations of things in dreams – from cradle to grave, everything, every waking moment. Bracketed against more scientific modes of inquiry and representation, poetry shows itself as another way to encode and share the foundations of such experiences. It can ground theories of the world that actually involve interactions with it, not just abstractions from it. Instead of writing or talking exclusively about their experiences through abstract concepts, as one might do in applying productive scientific theory, trying to make language as invisible as possible while focusing on the objects of scientific expressions, poets report more concretely, *in* and *with* the facts and frameworks of what they see in themselves *in relation to* Others, in particular landscapes, emotional and social situations. They aim for representation from one self-conscious interiority to another in a manner that flags the language used as proprietary, finds the strange in the everyday, and takes us out of ourselves for a

moment to show us something about ourselves in principle if not in precisely reported fact, thereby contributing at one level or another to the whole of our knowledge about any experience.

Because multiple interpretations of the same phenomena are always possible, it follows that any theory that purports to explain or predict everything about particular human behaviors is not actually attainable, at least not by consensus. Methodological pluralism is the key to robust accounts in the social sciences today, especially where an exclusive focus on behavior gives way to the relationship between behavior and meaning as the object of study (Brady 1998). There will always be a plurality or “surplus” of meaning in what we experience, classify, or otherwise try to explain. We can also come to know these things in many ways (Brady 1991, 2003a, 2004, 2005). No single method or genre of thought can conquer it all. The problem is choosing among the alternatives – or worse, having someone choose for you, as a matter of convention, applying political pressure to standardize your work according to the “received” view of social science methods, journals, and funding agencies. That undermines creativity by setting arbitrary limits on both research and reporting modes. Moreover, since every newly established interpretation becomes in its appearance and recognition a source for a new reading, a reopening, the role of the observer (reader, interpreter, writer) in the analytic equation cannot realistically be avoided.

It follows that close interpretations of speech, written texts, or whole societies must be infused at some level with self-conscious accountability for satisfactory results, that is, with *more than* scientific forms of interpretation. Among other considerations, there is a need for cultivating the actor’s point of view, ours as observers and participants, and, insofar as it can ever be ascertained, that of the people we study. This is consistent with the need to discover and examine critically all of the ways a subject can be represented. In that diversity the social science poet finds a measure of truth. Unafraid of sensual immersions, subjectivities, mutual constructions of meaningful relationships, political accountability, authorial presence in texts, and sometimes deliberately fictionalized realities

that “ring true,” poetic rendering is more than another way of telling (writing or speaking). It is another way of interpreting and therefore of knowing the nature of the world and our place in it, some of which is not available to the same extent, in the same form, or at all through other means (Brady 2003a, 2003b, 2004). Privileging one form to the exclusion of the other as Truth for all purposes is to be satisfied not only with one tool for all jobs, but also with the politics of the moment, in and out of the academy. Softening or solving such problems (e.g., by reaching beyond analytic categories whose only reality lies in the minds and agreements of the researchers themselves) matters if we are ever going to get a handle on the realities of the people we study – the universe *they* know, interpret, and act in as sentient beings. These things escape only at great cost to understanding ourselves, how we are articulated socially and semiotically, how we construct our Selves as meaningful entities, in our own minds and in relation to each other, and what that contributes to acting responsibly on a shrinking planet.

For these reasons and others, the entrance point for modern ethnography and related kinds of studies is probably best served by some combination of humanistic and scientific designs – in the realm of “artful science” (Brady 1991, 2000, 2004). At the center of this methodological pool are two prospects put nicely in a plea from cognitive scientist Raymond Gibbs, Jr., namely, learning to recognize the poet in each of us and cultivating the simple fact that “*figuration is not an escape from reality but constitutes the way we ordinarily understand ourselves and the world in which we live*” (1994: 454, emphasis added), no matter what the discipline. Conjectural mentalities and metaphor itself, the raw material for poets everywhere and a tool of and for discovery in what we study, are fundamental to human life, including all of our arts and sciences.

SEE ALSO: Culture; Investigative Poetics; Theory; Theory and Methods

REFERENCES AND SUGGESTED READINGS

- Brady, I. (Ed.) (1991) *Anthropological Poetics*. Rowman & Littlefield, Savage, MD.
- Brady, I. (1998) Two Thousand and What? Anthropological Moments and Methods for the Next Century. *American Anthropologist* 100(2): 510–16.
- Brady, I. (2000) Anthropological Poetics. In: Denzin, N. K. & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, 2nd edn. Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA, pp. 949–79.
- Brady, I. (2003a) *The Time at Darwin's Reef: Poetic Explorations in Anthropology and History*. AltaMira, Walnut Creek, CA.
- Brady, I. (2003b) Poetics. In: Lewis-Beck, M., Bryman, A. E., & Futing Liao, T. (Eds.), *The Sage Encyclopedia of Social Science Research Methods*. Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA, pp. 825–7.
- Brady, I. (2004) In Defense of the Sensual: Meaning Construction in Ethnography and Poetics. *Qualitative Inquiry* 10(4): 622–44.
- Brady, I. (2005) Poetics for a Planet: Discourse on Some Problems of Being-in-Place. In: Denzin, N. K. & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, 3rd edn. Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA, pp. 967–1014.
- Brady, I. (2006) Greg Denning's *Islands and Beaches*: Or, Why Some Anthropological History is Suspected of Being Literature. In: Lal, B. V. & Munro, D. (Eds.), *Texts and Contexts: Essays on the Foundational Texts of Pacific Islands Historiography*. University of Hawaii Press, Honolulu.
- Gibbs, R. W., Jr. (1994) *The Poetics of Mind: Figurative Thought, Language, and Understanding*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Hallyn, F. (1990) *The Poetic Structure of the World: Copernicus and Kepler*. Zone, New York.
- Hartnett, S. J. (2003) *Incarceration Nation: Investigative Prison Poems of Hope and Terror*. AltaMira, Walnut Creek, CA.
- Hartnett, S. J. & Engels, J. D. (2005) “Aria in Time of War”: Investigative Poetry and the Politics of Witnessing. In: Denzin, N. K. & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, 3rd edn. Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA, pp. 1043–67.

pogroms

Joanna Michlic

The term pogrom came into widespread use in Russia in the late nineteenth century. Originally it defined an organized massacre for the destruction or annihilation of any group of people. Since 1905–6, in the English-speaking world, it evolved into a term chiefly used to describe any riots directed against Jews in the