

## **The Preamble to the Research Committee 28: Sociology of Everyday Life**

The **Sociology of Everyday Life** aims to study the banal, recurrent and quotidian socialities to explore and unravel the embedded institutional processes of social life. The resolve is to rediscover the unfamiliar dimensions of the so-called familiar life, and “the magical” that lie hidden behind the mundane. The core presumption is that an individual’s everyday being and praxis in lifeworld centre around four universal concerns, namely, (1) existential and technological, (2) social and moral, (3) aesthetic, and (4) ethical-political. These concerns are drawn from the famous dictum of Socrates which is: “We come to the world not only to live but to live a good life”. “Good life” here would mean a life of dignity and freedom, a socially responsible, moral and ethical life. In quest for a “good life” individuals confront dilemmas and constraints of different kinds; (1) that between selfish material interests vs. empathy (Rousseau, Weber), (2) exploitation (and alienation) vs. freedom (Marx, Lukacs, Lefebvre), (3) semiotic or prelinguistic impulses vs. disciplining symbolic order (Freud, Kristeva), (4) structure vs. agency (Foucault, Butler), (5) discursive violence vs. freedom of thought (Foucault, Derrida, Kristeva). Following Henri Lefebvre’s insights (the volumes on *The Critique of Everyday Life*) the core objective of this sub-field of sociology, therefore, would be to unravel the dialectics between the forces of alienation and the differentially located individuals’ struggle for a good life, and possibly reorient social realities in the communicative process (Goffman, Habermas). Drawing from the rich theoretical/philosophical traditions of social sciences (including psychology, literature, fine arts, and performance arts) this RC envisages (1) to finetune its eclectic methods to study the subjective and social life beyond the obvious, taken-for-granted and mundane, and (2) to study the generally ignored nuances of the fluid “being and becoming” of the individual and collective selves as they dialogically and dialectically negotiate the traditions and forms, deconstruct them, and engage, subjectively and collectively, to create alternative forms of social life and institutions.