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This twelfth volume of *Schutzian Research* begins with Alexis Gros’s “The Reification of the Other as a Social Pathology.” In 2019, this paper won the Ilse Schutz Prize, awarded by the International Alfred Schutz Circle for Phenomenology and Interpretative Social Science for the best paper submitted by a junior scholar for the biennial Schutz Circle meeting. That meeting, scheduled to meet in June 2019, was cancelled due to the pandemic. Gros argues that what he considers to be Michael Barber’s Levinasian reading of Alfred Schutz’s corpus, which focuses on the ethical obligations to understand another accurately, provides a possibility for bridging the historical gaps between phenomenology and Frankfurt School critical theory. Gros demonstrates how such a convergence might take place through a careful consideration of the work of Hartmut Rosa.

Max Gropper, in his essay “On Anonymity and Appresentation,” shifts from Schutz’s focus on the subjective meaning of the Stranger in his essay by that name, to the objective perspective of those inhabiting the culture, the in-group, that the stranger approaches. Relying on Thomas Eberle’s concept of the “irreciprocity of perspectives” and the notion of “appresentation,” Gropper demonstrates the limits of the in-group’s understanding of the stranger whose meanings often remain anonymous. Gropper concludes by utilizing Erving Goffman’s notion of virtual social identity to show how members of an in-group can themselves be converted into strangers within their own culture.

Karsten Krampe, Svenja Reinhardt, and Sebastian Weste have authored “Choosing to Wait,” in which they build on the work of Andreas Göttlich
on waiting and suggest an addition. While for Göttlich waiting occurs when one’s subjective time process is interrupted (e.g. by waiting for a bus), our three authors consider the case of a mother whose son’s leg is injured in a football game but not so badly that he would be unable to play in the last few minutes of the game. The mother weighs choices of projects of action, whether to intervene and help her son immediately or to wait until after the game to attend to him, either of which choice will affect the network of social relationships (with other parents, team players) in which she is involved. The insertion of a *voluntative fiat* before her waiting to attend to him after the game makes such waiting not only a matter of time but of action.

In “The Stranger in Immigrant Integration,” Ellen Jacobsson draws on her own expertise as an immigration counselor in Stockholm who is responsible for implementing recent governmental policy changes that attempt to be more hospitable to strangers and to integrate them better within Swedish society. Profiting from insights of Sara Ahmed, Jacobsson believes that the institutionalization of integration procedures establishes a reference system by which the societal in-group still interprets and typifies strangers, thereby concealing, without eliminating, the problem of the “unintegrable stranger.” Jacobsson’s article reveals the inevitability of typifications even when one seek to modify, eliminate, or mute them, as well as the limitations inherent in typifications themselves.

The essay “A Phenomenological Approach Towards the Analysis of Politics” by Christian Etzrodt, entertains the criticism that phenomenological approaches have little to contribute to the analysis of political processes, and he criticizes previous attempts to show phenomenology’s relevance by focusing on the nature of the polity. Etzrodt, though, thinks that Ilja Srubar’s view that in moments of political crises the everyday communicative and cooperative processes that sustain political life become visible. At those moments, Schutz’s description of motivation and the strategies of persuading others developed by Peter Berger and Thomas Luckmann provide important tools that phenomenology could properly make use of to analyze political processes.

Jochem Kotthaus in his piece, “The Religious Experience of Setting Off Emergency Flares?,” examines a widely spread view that participants watching professional sports events, which consist in their own forms of aesthetics, group-behavior, and liturgical action, are engaging in a kind of religious experience. For Kotthaus, those who argue for this common view often portray religion as fulfilling a structural-functional role in the tradition of Emile Durkheim, but Kotthaus turns to Thomas Luckmann’s account of religion as
making it possible for a Self from its subjective point of view to come to terms with the great transcendences and to form an identity giving significance to the entirety of one’s life. While traces of Luckmann’s account can be found among audiences to professional sports, they fall short of the comprehensive experiences that constitute religious participation, and, therefore, Kotthaus categorizes the audience experiences of sports as a matter of “mimicry religion.”

Jerry Williams, in his essay entitled “Considering Finite Provinces of Meaning: The Problem of Communication in the Social Sciences,” imagines how the work of the social sciences might be seen as part of “finite province of meaning,” as Schutz describes the concept in “On Multiple Realities.” Following Schutz’s suggestion that communication between various provinces of meaning and the province of everyday life must be “indirect,” Williams explores the difficulties of communication between social scientists and everyday life. These difficulties are accentuated insofar as the language of social scientists might not be as technical and specialized and hence the gaps not as easily recognized as is the case with natural scientists seeking to communicate with everyday actors.

The editor would like to express his gratitude to Montaque Reynolds for his excellent editorial assistance in bringing this volume to fruition.

Michael Barber