Conference Program
Programme de la conférence

June 3 - June 7
3 juin - 7 juin

June 17 - June 21
17 juin - 21 juin

The Annual Canadian Sociological Association (CSA) Conference makes it possible for our members to meet and discuss academic, research, educational and administrative matters. CSA Conference delegates benefit from the opportunity to learn from, and engage with, scholars and practitioners working within the discipline of sociology.

La conférence annuelle de la Société canadienne de sociologie (SCS) permet à nos membres de se réunir et de discuter de sujets traitant de l'enseignement supérieur, de la recherche, de l'éducation et de l'administration. Les délégués à notre conférence ont l'occasion de s'informer auprès d'universitaires et de praticiens travaillant en sociologie et d'échanger avec eux.

www.csa-scs.ca

(Ingold 2006, Sheets-Johnstone, 2009), I will argue for a reconceptualization of materiality as active and forceful, a reconceptualization which seeks to restore the nonhuman as a forceful and central actant in processes of creation and becoming. This reconceptualization of materiality entails an equally significant repositioning of the human and a reimagining of the nature of the relationship between human and nonhuman. Building on these theoretical preliminaries, I will develop, using Barad's concept of intra-action, a thoroughly relational understanding of creativity. I will argue that from an intra-active perspective, creativity takes place as a process of affective attunement between a person and a structured medium (or materiality). Significantly, this process of attunement works both ways in the creative intra-action meaning that both the person and the material medium actively and forcefully fashion one another. This relational and intra-active approach to creativity therefore entails a radical reconceptualization of the affective force of materiality in the creative process as well as a displacement of the individual as the as the sole 'agent' of creation. Ultimately, by foregrounding processes of attunement and accommodation, this relational approach to creativity sheds a clarifying and correcting light on the conventional black box theories that otherwise explain creativity in terms of some inborn and ineffable gift or talent. Creativity, I argue is not principally a gift or an ability localized in individualities, but rather an intra-actional relation of attention, attunement, and becoming that implicates human and nonhuman in a constitutive relation. This view cast creation in a very different light that that prominent in the modernist view which situates creativity as an elite ability.

3. Yanki Doruk Doganay, York University

4 Lacanian Discourses: Feminist Contentions within the Dichotomy between Theoretical and Empirical Agents

The contemporary debates within the left academia and politics revolve around the debates of identity, emancipation, universality, and contingency. One of the roots of this debate can be found in the book Feminist Contentions: A Philosophical Exchange [1], which includes discussions between Butler, Benhabib, Cornell, and Fraser. Although many reviews and interpretations of this book exist, I approach it not as a philosophical text but as a social phenomenon. By adopting a Lacanian psychoanalytic perspective, I aim to show common governing principles and shared themes in the authors' seemingly antagonistic texts. All of the four authors present a meticulous critique of the contemporary patriarchal and capitalist structures. However, I argue that these authors also reproduce certain dichotomies anchored in these structures. I argue they reproduce the Cartesian dichotomy in the guise of the dichotomy between the theoretical or political agent and the empirical agent. The dichotomy is based on the one between the theorizing subject, namely the feminist theory, and the theorized object, the oppressed subjects waiting to be included by the feminist theory. The main motor behind the debate is based on the question of which theory is more inclusionary for the subjects who wait out there. In other words, I argue that, in the text, the struggle of women is assumed to be simply there, and the only aim of the feminist theory is to include this struggle. To demonstrate my argument, I employ Lacanian understanding of four discourses and show the coexistence of the discourse of the university and the discourse of the hysteric in all of the texts. Both the discourse of the hysteric and the discourse of the university cofunction in the debate between Butler, Benhabib, Fraser, and Cornell. Within the discourse of the hysteric, I argue that feminist theory constitutes the agent of hysteric (the barred subject) either in the form of

universality (Behabib and Fraser) or contingency (Butler and Cornell). The feminist theory defines women as the agents of theory and political struggle either by identifying them with contingency or with universalist attributes like autonomy. The position of truth within the hysteric's discourse (object a), on the other hand, is occupied by feminist theories reformation of the existing structure by way of the inclusion of empirical women as such, which is supposed to exist in empirical reality. Within the discourse of the university, I assert that the agent (knowledge or signifying chain) of feminist theory is the dichotomy between the entities and their attributes. In the case of Butler and Cornell, these entities refer to subjects with different identities. In the case of Benhabib and Fraser, the entities refer to women as political subjects and their various political attributes like autonomy, agency, and emancipatory potential. The truth of the discourse is that this dichotomy is based on the one between the theorizing subject, namely the feminist theory, and the theorized object, the oppressed subjects waiting to be included by the feminist theory. I conceptualize this dichotomy as the one between women as a theoretical or political category and the empirical existence of women as such. The debate revolves around the correspondence between the former and the latter. To summarize, I argue that this debate between the four theorists aims not to revolutionize the system but instead calls for the reformation of it from the perspective of the hysteric. This reformation necessitates a correspondence between the political category of women and empirical women. This urge to reform does not overthrow the system. Instead, it contributes to the Master signifier in the manner of solidification of Cartesian cogito toward strengthening the dichotomy between the empirical women as such and the theoretical conceptualization of women as political agents.

4. Mariana Pinzon-Caicedo, Simon Fraser University

Realignment, Calibration and Exclusion Following Familial Crises

Nearly every household and individual encounter family crises at some point in life, yet the study of the social implications of these events has been lacking. We know from extensive research in social sciences and economics that familial crises (e.g. death of a parent, divorce/separation of parents, severe life-threatening illness/accident, job/income loss) can have long-lasting effects on households' economic prospects and subjective well-being. We know from extensive research in social sciences and economics that familial crises (e.g. death of a parent, divorce/separation of parents, severe life-threatening illness/accident, job/income loss) can have long-lasting effects on households' economic prospects and subjective well-being. On one hand, public policy and poverty scholars agree that the strategies used to mitigate the economic hardships derived from these shocks may deplete assets, worsen health and nutritional conditions, and increase rates of school drop-outs (Dercon 2002; Brown and Churchill 1999; Fiszbein, Giovagnoli, and Aduriz 2010; Kochar 1995; Pradhan and Mukherjee 2018), many times leading households to chronic poverty (Hallegatte et al. 2020). Additionally, social scientists have shown that these types of crises increase stress, reduce happiness, and affect overall subjective well-being (Harriss-White et al. 2013; Leopold and Lechner 2015; Ronen et al. 2016; Kuhn et al. 2021), leading to a downward trajectory that is difficult to recover from (Amato 2000). Within this research, some scholars have come to recognize that access to strong social support can cushion the negative effects of these crises on people's lives (Reeskens and Vandecasteele 2017; Ronen et al. 2016). Previous research, however, assumes that group participation and social relations remain unchanged in the event of familial crises. Conceptualizing familial crises as disruptions to social interactions, I propose that these unforeseen