Humans are unique in cooperating extensively with non-kin, in the variety and
generativity of their cooperation, and in their dependence on cooperation. Underlying
the complexity and cultural diversity of human cooperation, are there a limited set of
ways of cooperating? If so, what are the basic forms of human sociality?

From their beginning, anthropology, sociology, social psychology, and allied social
sciences have aimed to characterize the basic forms of sociality. Initially, this was partly
motivated by the need to understand the rapid changes occurring in the West during the
Industrial Revolution, along with the differences and similarities between the West and
the rest of the world. With vastly increased scope of social interaction across cultures
today it has become more urgent to understand what aspects of sociality are common
to all humans and the nature of cultural differences. This course provides an overview
of the history of conceptualizations of the basic forms of social coordination.

This course is appropriate for all highly motivated social science, psychology, history,
and philosophy students. Readings consist of original works by the leading theorists,
comprising the foundations of all social science. The concepts we will explore are
exciting in their fundamentality, but quite challenging. So this is a demanding course.
However, the insights it offers are proportionate to the difficulties. You are not likely to
get everything the readings have to offer by reading them just once; plan on rereading
them and discussing them with a study group.

Each week, students will write a roughly 700 – 1000 word comment on the readings,
submitted through CCLE by 8:00pm Mondays. An elegant, apposite, substantive title
is an effective place to start. The purpose of these essays is for you to dig deep into the
concepts and begin to use them as tools to think with.

Spellcheck and carefully proofread your essay. Diction matters: use every word
precisely and accurately. Exposition matters: careless rhetoric reflects sloppy thinking,
confuses and distracts the reader, and undermines the reader’s confidence in the ideas.
(If English is not your native language or you want to improve your writing, write your
essay early and make an appointment with the Writing Center to go over each essay –
or at least have it checked by a good writer.)

Final grades will be based on the mean of the ten reading comments (70%), together
with attendance and participation in sections (30%). There will be no exams. There will be
no extra credit or make-up work. There is no curve; you are not competing with your peers – everyone can get an A. So study together, helping each other out.

However, your essays must be your own original, individual writing. It is plagiarism to use any text written by anyone else without fully citing the source. Any plagiarism will result in a zero for the essay and referral to the Dean for disciplinary action.

The readings are in a reader available at the Ackerman ASUCLA BookZone textbook section, or from the BookZone as a PDF. The required book is Fiske, *Structures of Social Life*. It is available on paper at Ackerman, on Kindle, and on Nook.

I welcome students to office hours or to make appointments to discuss the course, anthropology, graduate school, the Peace Corps, careers, or whatever!

## Calendar

**Tuesday 7 January:** Introduction, and the use of law to identify social systems  
(no reading for the first class; read Maine before Thursday’s class)

**Thursday 9 January:** Maine – Ancient Law

Due Monday, Jan 13, by 8:00pm: Compare and contrast Maine’s conceptualizations of the two stages of society with Engels’ conceptualization of the stages of society.

**Tuesday 14 January:** Marxist Materialism: Leacock, Engels

**Thursday 16 January:** Tönnies – *Gemeinschaft* and *Gesellschaft*

Due Monday: Compare and contrast Maines’ use of two types of law (status vs. contract) to identify two forms of society with Durkheim’s use of two types of law (repressive vs. restitutive) to identify two forms of solidarity in a society.

**Tuesday 21 January:** Durkheim – mechanical solidarity

**Thursday 23 January:** Where is Mechanical Solidarity in Contemporary Society?

Due Monday: Compare and contrast Tönnies’ concepts of *Gemeinschaft* and *Gesellschaft* with Durkheim's concepts of mechanical and organic solidarity.
Tuesday 28 January:  Weber  – Economy and Society

Thursday 30 January:  Weber – Economy and Society
Due Monday: Compare and contrast Weber’s concept of charismatic organization and its legitimation with his concept of rational-legal organization and its legitimation.

Tuesday 4 February:  An example of traditional authority / mechanical solidarity
(no reading)

Thursday 6 February:  Anonymous – Non-state and state societies;
Joyce Markus  – Bands, Tribes, Chieftainships, and States
Due Monday: Compare and contrast Weber’s concept of traditional authority with Joyce Markus’s concept of chieftainships.

Tuesday 11 February:  Hofstede – The Dimensions of Culture

Thursday 13 February:  Triandis – Horizontal and Vertical Individualism and Collectivism
Due Monday: Compare and contrast Hofstede’s concept of Individualism—Collectivism with either Durkheim’s theory of types of social organization.

Tuesday 18 February:  Hazel Markus and Kitayama – Independent and Interdependent Selves

Thursday 20 February:  Coase – The Nature of the Firm
Due Monday: Compare and contrast Triandis’s concepts of individualism and collectivism with Markus and Kitayama’s concepts of independence and interdependence.

Tuesday 25 February:  Ouchi – The Market, the Firm, and the Clan

Thursday 27 February:  Fiske, Preface to Part I & Chapters 1–3; attend carefully to Table 1
Due Monday: Compare and contrast Coase’s concept of the firm and the conditions under which it arises with Ouchi’s concept of bureaucracy and the conditions under which it arises.

Tuesday March 3:  Fiske, Preface to Part II, Chapters 4–6, and Coda
Thursday March 5: Fiske, Preface to Part III, Chapters 7–9, Preface to Part IV, & Chapter 10
Due Monday: Compare and contrast Fiske’s theory of market pricing with one more or less similar concept of another theorist we have read.

Tuesday March 10: Fiske, Chapters 11 – 13

Thursday March 12: Fiske, Chapter 14, Preface to Part V, Chapters 16, & 17, and Epilogue
Due Monday: Fiske conceptualizes relational models rooted in the mind, yet a ‘relationship’ (in his technical sense) is a property of a system of coordination, not of a person as such. How do these aspects of relational models theory, together, enable relational models theory to explain aspects of human sociality that previous theories could not explain?