



## Working Group 02

# Historical and Comparative Sociology

*President:* Stephen Menzell  
*Vice-President:* Willfried Spohn  
*Secretary/Treasurer:* Manuela Boatcă

*Members of the Board:*  
Nina Baur  
Fumiya Onaka  
Robert van Krieken  
Ewa Morawska  
Elisa Reis  
Jiří Šubrt

## Newsletter 1 – December 2011

### CONTENTS

Willfried Spohn	<i>Towards a global historical sociology</i>	2
Stephen Menzell	<i>'Figurational sociology' – whatever is that?</i>	4
	<i>Human Figurations – a new online journal</i>	5
	<i>Conference: Norbert Elias and figurational sociology: prospects for the future – Copenhagen, 2–4 April 2012</i>	6
	<i>Recently published: Norbert Elias and Figurational Sociology</i>	8
	<i>The Collected Works of Norbert Elias in English</i>	9
Säid Amir Arjomand	<i>What happened to the 'comparative' in comparative and historical sociology?</i>	11
Jiří Šubrt	<i>Historical Sociology as a university subject</i>	14
	<i>Conference Report: Civilisational Dynamics of Contemporary Societies – St Petersburg, 23–24 September 2011</i>	16
Ruslan Braslavsky and Yulia Prozorova	<i>Statutes and by-laws of ISA Working Group 02 Historical and Comparative Sociology</i>	20

## TOWARDS A GLOBAL HISTORICAL SOCIOLOGY

**Willfried Spohn**

*Willy Brandt Centre, University of Wrocław*

With the foundation of WG02, Historical and Comparative Sociology, within the International Sociological Association three distinct currents within historical sociology have come together: historical and comparative sociology, civilisational analysis and figurational sociology. All three currents represent different approaches in historical sociology. They share the epistemological and methodological premise that the ‘social’ can only be theoretically conceptualised and analytically grasped in its motion and flux, dynamics and processes, structure and agency, determination and openness and hence sociology has to focus on the historicity – the past, presence and future of social reality. Thus, they share a common critique of ahistorical conceptions of sociology in functionalist–evolutionist modernisation, globalisation and world-system theories.

At the same time, the three currents in WG02 have different traditions and visions of historical sociology. Figurational sociology is based on the legacy of Norbert Elias, envisioning a particular focus on the varying configurational flows of civilising and de-civilising processes in combining macro-processes of state formation and nation-building with micro-foundations of everyday practices and mentalities. Historical and comparative sociology, inspired by the revival of classical historical sociology in the USA and Great Britain, developed programmatically a meso- and micro-analytical research strategy to explain and interpret large-scale socio-cultural and processes. Civilisational analysis promoted particularly by Shmuel Eisenstadt and his worldwide collaborators has concentrated on the comparative historical sociology of civilisations as varying bases of multiple traditions and modernities.

If one wants to locate these three WG02 currents within the encompassing field of historical sociology, it makes sense to use the periodisation of historical sociology in three waves as proposed by J. Adams, E. Clemens and A. Orloff (2005) but to complement it with a fourth wave. Figurational and civilisational analysis belong to the first wave of the renewal of classical sociology after World War II and, since then, have developed on their own distinct trajectories. Historical and comparative sociology or the new historical sociology originated in the vision of developing a more systematic social scientific form of historical sociology (Skocpol 1984, Tilly 1984), constituting a second wave of historical sociology in close cooperation with social history (Mahoney and Rueschemeyer 2003). With the cultural turn, the social scientific variety of the new historical sociology became contested, crystallising in a third-wave cultural-scientific mode of historical sociology, though sharing the same idea of understanding and explaining macro-processes through systematic meso- and micro-analysis (Adams, Clemens, Orloff 2005). However, a fourth wave should be added: a trans-disciplinary reflexive form of historical sociology taking up the renewal of the classical traditions of historical sociology in the first wave, confronting it critically with the social- and cultural-scientific versions of the new historical sociology of the second and third wave, and reflecting the implications of the historical-sociological directions in figurational sociology and civilisational analysis (Delanty and Isin 2003).

The basic challenge for historical sociology, and particularly felt in the International Sociological Association, is the increasing and intensifying globalisation of the world in the contemporary era. All the three varieties of historical sociology present in WG02 'Historical and Comparative Sociology' have taken up this basic challenge in differing ways, often modifying their scientific legacies but all of them should synthesise their efforts in closer discussion and cooperation within and beyond WG02 towards a global historical sociology. The most forceful orientation to a global historical sociology has been developed in the field of civilisational analysis. Here, the traditional focus of historical sociology on Europe and North America has been transcended by the conscious inclusion of non-Western civilisations and the interrelationships between Western and non-Western civilisations. On this basis, new research directions in the relations between multiple modernities and globalisation have also emerged (Spohn 2011). Less forcefully, but in similar directions, figurational sociology has transcended the classical focus on Europe in an attempt to apply the macro-micro-analytical direction of Elias's historical sociology to other parts of the world. In so doing, the analysis of civilising and decivilising processes are extended to the world scale and can be combined with a comparative civilisational and multiple modernities perspective on the varying processes of civilising and decivilising processes in a globalising world. Historical-comparative sociology in its social and cultural scientific modes has also moved its traditional European and North American focus to other civilisations and nation-states worldwide. Though often analytically limited to nation-state units, it can fruitfully complement in its systematic meso- and micro-analytical orientation the primarily macro-analytical focus of civilisational analysis as well as the particular macro-micro-mode of figurational sociology.

At the same time, even taking into account the innovative directions in each form of historical sociology, there is still a certain gap to the ways in which globalisation has become research foci in the two sister disciplines of historical sociology: globalisation, world-system and world-society theories and analyses in sociology and political science on the one hand, and world history, global history and transnational history in the historical sciences on the other. Here, a global historical sociology should combine civilisational analysis in its comparative and figurational modes and a systematic meso- and micro-analytical research in the social and cultural directions of the new historical sociology, in order to analyse in paradigmatic and explorative ways the historically developing local, regional, national, civilisational and global constellations. To fill this gap, a particular effort should be made to focus, more than the sociology and the history of globalisation do, on the Global South in its interrelation with the Global North. And finally, this effort should also concentrate to include the historically changing interrelationships between the Global North and the Global South through one constitutive process of globalisation: the growing processes of international migration and their impact on sending and receiving societies.

In these directions, several tasks come to mind. Firstly, a particular effort should be made to analyse and compare the differing glocal configurations between different civilisations. Secondly, this can be complemented by *longue durée* comparative analyses of these global configurations between past periods and the present. Thirdly, there should be a special effort to shift the historical sociological research agenda more forcefully to the varying glocal interconnections between the various regions of the Global North, between those of the North and the South, and different regions of the Global South. Fourthly, this also includes an historical sociological approach to the developing post-colonial world (Boatca and Spohn 2010). And last and not least, this could also contribute to integrating the research on international migration as one of the most forceful factors of globalisation. On

the bases of such innovations in empirical research on the dimensions and varieties of global constellations in global historical sociology, there will also develop new grounds to further the reflexive, trans-disciplinary orientations in historical sociology in a cosmopolitan, cross-civilisational and *glocal* perspective.

WG02 invites different ways of doing historical sociology that share the vision to promote such a global orientation and attempt with joined forces to materialise in one way or another this common vision.

#### *References:*

- Adams, Julie, Clemens, Elizabeth and Orloff, Ann (eds)(2005), *Remaking Modernity: Politics, History, Sociology*, Durham, NC: Duke UP.
- Boatcă, Manuela and Willfried Spohn (eds)(2010), *Globale, multiple und postkoloniale Modernen*, München: Hampp.
- Delanty, Gerard and Engin Isin (eds) (2003) *Handbook of Historical Sociology*, London: Sage.
- Mahoney, James and Dietrich Rueschemeyer (eds)(2003) *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Skocpol, Theda (ed.)(1984) *Vision and Method in Historical Sociology*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Tilly, Charles (1984), *Big Structures, Large Processes, Huge Comparisons*, New York: Fertig.

## **‘FIGURATIONAL SOCIOLOGY’ – WHATEVER IS THAT?**

**Stephen Mennell**

*University College Dublin*

Some members of WG02 may be puzzled by the title of the ‘figurational sociology’ group, which combined with the old Thematic Group 02 at the 2010 ISA World Congress in Göteborg to form the upgraded Working Group 02. It denotes a group of scholars who take particular inspiration from the work of Norbert Elias (1897–1990). Elias is most famous for the *magnum opus*, *Über den Prozess der Zivilisation (The Civilizing Process)*, which languished in neglect for three or more decades or more after its original publication in 1939 until its significance was recognised in the 1970s and 1980s. But Elias wrote much more than that, developing an approach to the social sciences that is thoroughly processual, historical and comparative, with a particular focus on power relations and the growth of knowledge – and with marked hostility to ‘philosophoidal’ thinking. He advanced a trenchant critique of conventional habits of thought and concept formation in the social sciences, attracting a select group of followers in other social science disciplines, history and the humanities, apart from narrowly in sociology. He preferred to write in as nearly an ‘everyday’ vocabulary as possible, but one of his conceptual innovations was ‘figuration’, and that was seized upon – whether by his followers or his opponents is not entirely clear! – as a label for his style of thinking.

It is easy to perceive the ‘figurationists’ as a peculiar sect, but they try to remain

open-minded, tolerant and un-sect-like. They hope that other members of WG02 will attend their conferences and contribute to the new online journal *Human Figurations* mentioned below. The Norbert Elias Foundation, based in Amsterdam, publishes a twice-yearly newsletter, *Figurations* (the two titles promise endless confusion), which is distributed free (in hard copy) on request to [elias@planet.nl](mailto:elias@planet.nl). Back numbers of *Figurations*, and other useful information, can be found online at [www.norberteliasfoundation.nl](http://www.norberteliasfoundation.nl), where there is also a blog.

## HUMAN FIGURATIONS – A NEW ONLINE JOURNAL

We are delighted to announce a new online journal, *Human Figurations*, for which we hope members of WG02 will submit articles.

*Human Figurations*, with its strapline ‘Long-term perspectives on the human condition’, will be published – initially twice a year – starting in January 2012.

The first issue will set out our stall as an *interdisciplinary* journal, focusing especially on the value of long-term (and integrated or synthesising) perspectives across disciplines. While not discouraging reference to Norbert Elias, we want to avoid the impression of being a journal devoted entirely to ancestor worship and to one sect of social scientists. The editor’s introduction to the first issue will set out the synthesising instincts of Elias and the ways in which this has motivated the establishment of a journal with these broad objectives.

In an age when the social sciences are disastrously over-specialised and fragmented, we aim to help in a small way to bring together the many scholars in a whole range of disciplines and sub-disciplines whose work shares the common thread that they are developing long-term perspectives on the human condition in all its aspects.

The journal is sponsored by the Norbert Elias Foundation, Amsterdam. It has entered into an agreement with MPublishing, the imprint of the Scholarly Publishing Office at the University of Michigan for the publication of *Human Figurations*, which will – like all MPublishing publications – be rigorously peer-reviewed. In the long run, we may also begin to publish in hard copy too.

Katie Liston (University of Ulster, Northern Ireland) has been appointed Editor, and Stephen Mennell will act as a Chairman. They have assembled a provisional Editorial Board, and will be putting together an Editorial Advisory Board.

The first issue will contain invited essays stressing the importance of long-term comparative perspectives, by representatives of a whole range of disciplines – including Peter Burke (history), Andrew Linklater (International Relations), Peter Westbroek (earth sciences), Olle Edström (musicology), Johan Goudsblom (sociology, environment), Joseph Maguire (sport and migration), Gary Wickham and Barbara Evers (sociology). The second issue will centre on international relations. But there will, of course, also be general issues containing a variety of articles submitted to the journal in the normal way.

We envisage that the *Figurations* newsletter will continue to be published, though perhaps in slimmed-down form, with book reviews in particular being transferred to the *Human Figurations* journal.

Start thinking now about your contributions to *Human Figurations*! Contact Katie Liston ([editorhumanfigurations@gmail.com](mailto:editorhumanfigurations@gmail.com)) for further information.

The initial Editorial Board consists of:

*Editor:* Katie Liston

*Journal Manager:* Clare Spencer

*Board Members*

Joop Goudsblom (Amsterdam)

Jose Esteban Castro (Newcastle-upon-Tyne)

Robert van Krieken (Dublin/Sydney)

Stephen Vertigans (Aberdeen)

Barbara Evers (Perth, Australia)

Andrew Linklater (Aberystwyth)

Giselinde Kuipers (Rotterdam)

Florence Delmotte (Brussels)

Paddy Dolan (Dublin) – *Co-ordinating Reviews Editor*

Stephanie Ernst (Hamburg)

Tatiana Savoia Landini (São Paulo)

Stephen Mennell (Dublin) – *Chairman*

We shall also be recruiting many others to assist the journal as members of the Editorial Advisory Board.

**CONFERENCE: NORBERT ELIAS AND FIGURATIONAL SOCIOLOGY:  
PROSPECTS FOR THE FUTURE**

**Department of Political Science & Department of Sociology, University of Copenhagen,  
Denmark, 2–4 April, 2012.**

*Call for papers*

The focus of this two-day conference will be on the development of figurational sociology in relation to other disciplines. In *What is Sociology?*, Elias argues that sociology needs to develop new ways of ‘thinking’ about its relationship with other disciplines like biology and physics. Since that time, we have seen a rapid expansion of these academic disciplines, yet there has not been sufficient time to consider the theoretical implications of what this would mean for the future development of a figurational sociology.

This conference will bring together sociologists, together with other important and relevant cognate disciplines – such as history, political science and economics – to explore attempts that integrate different disciplinary perspectives. Keynote speakers include Richard Kilminster, University of Leeds, Abram de Swaan, University of Amsterdam, Stephen Mennell, University College Dublin, Andrew Linklater, Aberystwyth University, Nina Baur, TU Berlin, Institute of Sociology, Stefanie Ernst, Universität Hamburg, Stephen Quilley, Keele University.

It will address these issues by focusing on the following themes:

The first day will explore the ‘boundaries’ and relationships between figurational sociology and the following disciplines:

- 1) Politics
- 2) Economics
- 3) History
- 4) Psychology
- 5) Biology
- 6) Anthropology

The second day will further discuss the major themes that emerge from this ‘boundary’ work across disciplines, considering some of their strengths and limitations in relation to the following:

- 1) Survival Units
- 2) Organisational Sociology and Economic Sociology
- 3) Civilizing Processes
- 4) Informalising Processes
- 5) The expanding Anthroposphere (environmental issues)

The conference will consist of plenary sessions with keynote speakers, followed by themed parallel sessions. The deadline for submitting abstracts of papers is 16 December 2011. These should be no more than 150 words and submitted to the conference email address: [mcs@ifs.ku.dk](mailto:mcs@ifs.ku.dk).

*Lars Bo Kaspersen*, University of Copenhagen, [LBK@ifs.ku.dk](mailto:LBK@ifs.ku.dk)

*Norman Gabriel*, University of Plymouth, [norman.r.gabriel@plymouth.ac.uk](mailto:norman.r.gabriel@plymouth.ac.uk)

### *Practicalities and formalities*

Registration: Please, register by sending a mail to Mette Cruse Skou [mcs@ifs.ku.dk](mailto:mcs@ifs.ku.dk) with your name, affiliation, address, phone number and email address.

Conference fee: 50 euro covering lunches, coffee/tea and fruit. Students: 15 euro. The conference fee needs to be paid at the conference venue /registration desk when the conference starts.

Venue: University of Copenhagen, CSS (Social Science campus), Øster Farimagsgade 5, Copenhagen K – see [http://polsci.ku.dk/english/contact/How\\_to\\_find\\_us/](http://polsci.ku.dk/english/contact/How_to_find_us/)

Accommodation: There are plenty of hotels in Copenhagen. However, we have reserved rooms at two hotels close to the venue and the city. You need to book your own hotel room by mail or phone.

Ibsens Hotel  
 Vendersgade 23  
 DK-1363 København K.  
 T: 33 13 19 13  
 F: 33 13 19 16  
 E: [hotel@ibsenhotel.dk](mailto:hotel@ibsenhotel.dk)  
 Reservation: +45 33 95 77 44

Prices:

Single Room: 985 DKK per room per night (includes breakfast).  
 Double Room: 1.240 DKK per room per night (includes breakfast).

Hotel Kong Arthur  
 Nørre Søgade 11  
 DK-1370 København K.  
 T: +45 33 11 12 12  
 F: +45 33 32 61 30  
 E: [hotel@kongarthur.dk](mailto:hotel@kongarthur.dk)  
 Reservation: +45 33 95 77 22

Prices:

Single Room: 1.225 DKK per room per night (includes breakfast).  
 Double Room: 1.520 DKK per room per night (includes breakfast).

Don't forget to mention that you are participating in conference organized by University of Copenhagen (Department of Political Science/ Sociology)

Organizers:

The Norbert Elias Foundation, Amsterdam  
 The Department of Sociology, University of Copenhagen  
 The Department of Political Science, University of Copenhagen

## RECENTLY PUBLISHED

**Norman Gabriel and Stephen Mennell** (eds), *Norbert Elias and Figurational Sociology*, Sociological Review Monograph (Oxford: Wiley–Blackwell, 2011). vi + 265 pp.

The recently published volume in the Sociological Review Monograph series, edited by Norman Gabriel and Stephen Mennell is an up to date addition to the growing body of international research flowing from Elias's thinking. This collection of original papers, says the blurb on the back of the book, 'represents the scope and vitality of figurational or process sociology, spanning the first and second generation of scholars concerned with both Elias's own work and its application and extension to other areas of research. Representing the best of the Eliasian research tradition, it is theoretical and empirical in orientation, focusing on the international and multi-disciplinary implications of his work.' Contents are:



- 1 Introduction: Handing over the torch: intergenerational processes in figurational sociology  
*Norman Gabriel and Stephen Mennell*
- 2 Three faces of civilization: ‘In the beginning all the world was Ireland.’  
*Robert van Krieken*
- 3 Process sociology and International Relations  
*Andrew Linklater*
- 4 Entropy, the anthroposphere and the ecology of civilization: An essay on the problem of ‘liberalism in one village’ in the long view  
*Stephen Quilley*
- 5 Norbert Elias’s post-philosophical sociology: from ‘critique’ to relative detachment  
*Richard Kilminster*
- 6 Towards a process-oriented methodology: modern social science research methods and Norbert Elias’s figurational sociology  
*Nina Baur and Stefanie Ernst*
- 7 How civilizing processes continued: towards an informalisation of manners and a third nature personality  
*Cas Wouters*
- 8 Sport and leisure  
*Katie Liston*
- 9 A land of a hundred thousand welcomes? Understanding established and outsiders relations in Ireland  
*Steven Loyal*
- 10 Norbert Elias and developmental psychology  
*Norman Gabriel*
- 11 Norbert Elias, the civilizing process and penal development in modern society  
*John Pratt*
- 12 Meetings: the front-line of civilization  
*Wilbert van Vree*

## THE COLLECTED WORKS OF NORBERT ELIAS

The Collected Works of Norbert Elias are being published in English in 18 handsome hardback volumes by UCD Press (Dublin), under the General Editorship of Stephen Mennell. The texts have been heavily corrected, often augmented, and explanatory notes and cross-references provided to help the reader navigate through Elias’s extensive writings. These volumes also contain many writings not previously published in English (and a few that have not been published at all). Copies may be ordered online at a discount of 20 per cent, post

free, direct from the publishers, at [www.ucdpress.ie](http://www.ucdpress.ie).

*Volumes published to date*

- 1 *Early Writings*, edited by Richard Kilminster (Dublin: UCD Press, 2006). xx + 136 pp.
- 2 *The Court Society*, edited by Stephen Mennell (Dublin: UCD Press, 2006). xvi + 331 pp.
- 4 *The Established and the Outsiders*, edited by Cas Wouters (Dublin: UCD Press, 2008). xx + 244 pp.
- 6 *The Loneliness of the Dying AND Humana Conditio*, edited by Alan and Brigitte Scott (Dublin: UCD Press, 2009). xxii + 250 pp.
- 7 *Quest for Excitement*, by NORBERT ELIAS and ERIC DUNNING, edited by Eric Dunning (Dublin: UCD Press, 2008). xvi + 320 pp.
- 8 *Involvement and Detachment*, edited by Stephen Quilley (Dublin: UCD Press, 2007). xvi + 252 pp.
- 9 *An Essay on Time*, edited by Steven Loyal and Stephen Mennell (Dublin: UCD Press, 2007). xvi + 172 pp.
- 10 *The Society of Individuals*, edited by Robert van Krieken (Dublin: UCD Press, 2010)
- 12 *Mozart, and Other Essays on Courtly Culture*, edited by Eric Baker and Stephen Mennell (Dublin: UCD Press, 2010).
- 13 *The Symbol Theory*, edited by Richard Kilminster (Dublin: UCD Press, 2011).
- 14 *Essays I: On the Sociology of Knowledge and the Sciences*, edited by Richard Kilminster and Stephen Mennell (Dublin: UCD Press, 2009). xxviii + 316 pp.
- 15 *Essays II: On Civilising Processes, State Formation and National Identity*, edited by Richard Kilminster and Stephen Mennell (Dublin: UCD Press, 2008). xxii + 288 pp.
- 16 *Essays III: On Sociology and the Humanities*, edited by Richard Kilminster and Stephen Mennell (Dublin: UCD Press, 2009). xxiv + 312pp.

*Forthcoming volumes*

- 3 *On the Process of Civilisation*, edited by Stephen Mennell, Eric Dunning, Johan Goudsblom and Richard Kilminster (April 2012)
- 5 *What is Sociology?*, edited by Artur Bogner, Katie Liston and Stephen Mennell (September 2012)

- 11 *Studies on the Germans*, edited by Eric Dunning and Stephen Menell (2013)
- 17 *Interviews and Autobiographical Reflections*, edited by Edmund Jephcott and Stephen Menell (2013)
- 18 *Appendices and Index to the Collected Works* (including unpublished essay ‘Freud’s concept of society and beyond it’), edited by Stephen Menell (2013)

*Supplementary volume*

*The Genesis of the Naval Profession*, by Norbert Elias. Dublin: UCD Press, 2007 (co-edited with René Moelker, with an Introduction by the editors). xii + 172 pp.

## **WHAT HAPPENED TO THE ‘COMPARATIVE’ IN COMPARATIVE AND HISTORICAL SOCIOLOGY?**

**Saïd Amir Arjomand**

*State University of New York at Stony Brook*

[NOTE: This article originated as a letter to the Editor of *Trajectories*, the newsletter of the Comparative and Historical Sociology Section of the American Sociological Association. It was printed in the Spring 2011 issue (vol. 22, no. 2) of *Trajectories*, and is reprinted here by permission of the author.]

In the 1980s, I eagerly participated in the foundation of our ASA Section, and served as its Secretary–Treasurer from 1987 to 1990. In that period, I made a plea in one of the Section’s sponsored publications for the study of culturally-specific developmental patterns while referring to my work on the political ethic of Shi’ism (Arjomand 1985). The subsequent drift of our Section’s development has been in the opposite direction, however, and I have increasingly pursued my comparative interests within the framework of the ISA rather than ASA, serving as Editor of *International Sociology* from 1999 to 2005 and helping organise the thematic plenaries on ‘Worlds of Difference’ at the July 2010 World Congress of Sociology in Gothenburg, Sweden. Needless to say, I remain a member of the ASA Comparative and Historical Sociology community, and am therefore writing to reiterate my plea of a quarter of a century ago, and to urge my fellow members to rectify the increasing neglect of comparative sociology.

The full plea for a return to comparative sociology and civilisational analysis to fulfil its original promise after intermittent progress through three generations has been made elsewhere (Arjomand 2010). Here I wish to complain about the failure of the sociological community in the United States to take up the challenge. My original plea for comparing culturally specific patterns of social change was made shortly after the ‘historical turn’ in social theory in the mid-1970s (Tilly 1975) that, to many of us, signalled the fall of the modernisation theory. This turned out to be cold comfort to comparative sociologists, however. The ‘historical and comparative sociology’ that has developed since the 1980s in

the United States as an alternative to modernisation theory curiously succumbed to the same temptation of regarding the Western patterns as paradigmatic. The revisionist Marxists and Weberians who founded it followed Barrington Moore's, Reinhard Bendix's and Charles Tilly's heavy reliance on the Western historical experience for analysis and in forming concepts. Moore (1966), for example, forged his key concepts to trace the origins of democracy and dictatorship to the class-coalition in the course of commercialisation of agriculture in the West, and then extended its class analysis to India and Japan. The application of the concepts formed out of the Western historical experience to other cases is an imposition, as is most evident in Moore's analysis of the inter-war Japanese 'fascism' as the 'labour-repressive' outcome of the Japanese class alignment during the critical transition. (See Skya 2009 for a culturally specific alternative.) The same imposition of metropolitan categories on the periphery is true of Rueschemeyer, Stephens and Stephens (1992), who extend Barrington Moore's class analysis to highlight the contribution of the working class and its organisation to the development of democracy. Despite their extensive coverage of the Caribbean, it is hard to detect any acknowledgement of the one significant attempt at theorising on the basis of the historical experience of a specific world region, namely M.G. Smith's (1965; 1974) periphery-derived conceptualisation of plural societies distinctive of the Caribbean region.

Indeed it is more accurate to describe this flourishing school of macrosociology simply as 'historical sociology' (Adams, Clemens and Orloff 2005). What progress has been made by members of our Section has been largely driven by methods appropriate for historical sociology – analyses of temporal sequences, path dependency and rational choice in institutional development, and network analysis. The comparative element has, by and large, remained limited to those implicit in case studies. It is unmistakably anaemic and at best a secondary feature, expressed in *ad hoc* explanatory parallels and contrasts adduced in case studies, which Mahoney and Rueschemeyer (2003: 14) call 'contextualised comparison.' Both the metropolitan bias and the inordinate privileging of the historical over comparative sociology is evident in Mahoney and Rueschemeyer's state of the art volume which identifies 'Otto Hintze, Max Weber and Marc Bloch' as the founding figures and hardly mentions diversity, referring to 'area studies' only once and quite dismissively (Mahoney and Rueschemeyer 2003: 3, 11–12). Even the so-called 'cultural turn' in historical sociology was largely methodological and historiographic, entailing understanding of patterns meaning with little or no attention to cultural comparisons.

To the extent that the periphery was not ignored, its experience was fitted into the straightjacket of allegedly universal processes such as modernization and development. These generalized what was taken as the dominant Western pattern into a universal teleology. I have traced the line of theoretical development as viewed from the centre as a universal pattern of value-rationalisation spreading from the centre to the periphery. This development was characterised as a discontinuous process of expansion of the scope of rational judgment driven by periodic shifts in dominant value-ideas in the course of the twentieth century (Arjomand 2004). The view from the periphery was different, however. It was from the periphery that challenges to the dominance of metropolitan theory and its claim to universality originated. These challenges sought to rectify the denial of diversity implicit in the putatively universalistic Western-based categories and patterns of the modernisation theory. This amounted to provincialising the metropolitan theory through studies on different regions of the world, seeking to correct what Raewyn Connell (2007: 46) has described as 'the erasure of the experience of the majority of humankind from the foundations of social theory'. Without wishing to minimise the achievement of my colleagues in developing

institutional historical sociology in the last quarter century, I wish to contend that the acknowledgement of the challenge to recognise the distinctive experience of the periphery through comparative sociology and comparative study of civilisations is imperative in this global age.

### *References*

Adams, Julia, Clemens, Elisabeth S. and Orloff, Ann S. (2005) 'Social Theory, modernity, and the three waves of historical sociology,' in Adams, Clemens, and Orloff (eds), *Remaking Modernity: Politics and Processes in Historical Sociology*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Arjomand, Saïd A. (1985) 'Religion, political order and societal change with special reference to Shi'ite Islam,' *Current Perspectives in Social Theory*, 6 (1985), pp. 1–15.

Arjomand, Saïd A. (2004) 'Social theory and the changing world: mass democracy, development, modernisation and globalisation', *International Sociology*, 19: 3, pp. 321–53.

Arjomand, Saïd A. (2010) 'Three generations of comparative sociologies', *Archives européennes de sociologie/European Journal of Sociology*, 51: 3 (in press).

Connell, R. (2007) *Southern Theory: The Global Dynamics of Knowledge in Social Science*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Mahoney, James and Rueschemeyer, Dietrich (eds) (2003) *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Moore, Barrington, Jr. (1966) *Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy: Lord and Peasant in the Making of the Modern World*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Rueschemeyer, D., Stephens, E. H. and Stephens, J. D. (1992) *Capitalist Development and Democracy*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Skya, Walter (2009) *Japan's Holy War: The Ideology of Radical Shinto Ultra-nationalism*, Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Smith, M.G. (1965) *The Plural Society in the British West Indies*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Smith, M.G. (1974) *Corporations and Society*. London: Duckworth.

Tilly, Charles (ed.) (1975) *The Formation of National States in Western Europe*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

## HISTORICAL SOCIOLOGY AS A UNIVERSITY SUBJECT

**Jiří Šubrt**

*Charles University Prague*

In 2009 the Faculty of Humanities at Charles University, Prague, began teaching a master's degree study programme in historical sociology. The aim of this programme is to provide training for specialists with a focus on long-term social processes and trends in relevant research activities. Thematically, it deals with modernisation and social change, religious and cultural pluralism, globalisation trends and effects, and integrating and disintegrating processes. The study programme is a two-year one and applications are accepted from those with Bachelor degrees, following a written entrance examinations.

The commencement of teaching followed a two-year preparatory phase during which a thorough debate was undertaken on the nature of the new programme. This debate began 2007 with Johann Pall Arnason, Milos Havelka and Jiří Šubrt, and gradually included other specialists (Willfried Spohn, Miroslav Hroch, Jan Horsky, Bohuslav Salanda). The preparatory period coincided with the bringing to publication of a 500-page textbook, *Historical Sociology: Theories of Long-term Development Processes* (edited by Jiří Šubrt), combining texts from leading Czech sociologists and historians. A little later the Historical Sociology Section at Masaryk Czech Sociological Society was founded (chaired by Karel Cerny), which over the next few years organised several colloquia. Another development was the founding of the journal *Historická sociologies* (edited by B. Salanda), which publishes contributions in Czech and English.

The newly formed study programme has been conceived to reflect the contemporary state of its field, react to ongoing academic controversies and monitor current research trends. It was shaped through discussions that were often highly polemical and sometimes rather escalatory. Just as there is no consensus about the nature of the subject of historical sociology among world experts, there is also no consensus in the understanding of this field among Czech researchers. The original ideas about the content of this specialisation, from which the final version of the study programme gradually crystallised, were very diverse. Among them was the idea that the study of historical sociology should be a kind of hybrid of historical and sociological subjects, and the view that historical sociology is substantively identical to the social history. Step by step however the view prevailed that historical sociology is a sociological way of thinking (rather than a mix of sociology and history), based on the assumption that the general subject matter of sociology is historical, time-space determined social reality. Accordingly, historical sociology does not understand itself as a special sociological discipline, but as a theoretical and methodological perspective emphasising the issue of long-term developmental processes. This conception of historical sociology was elaborated in 2008 into a teaching curriculum, which then became part of the accreditation documents on which the onset of teaching in 2009 was based.

Roughly half of the subjects in the curriculum are theoretical; the other half focus on learning research methods and techniques, both from quantitative and qualitative methodology. The study is not too closely professionally oriented, and is not based on any one theory or method. In the theoretical part there is a constant emphasis on the multi-

paradigmatic character of the field, and equally in the research area on the plurality of methodological approaches. In the subjects taught, a number of overlaps with other disciplines are given recognition, primarily with history, but also with anthropology, political science or economics. The aim of this education is not to produce narrowly focused specialists, but individuals educated in the humanities, with a relatively wide range of knowledge and skills.

The courses taught can be divided into three basic blocks. The first *theoretical–historical* block offers courses dedicated to general theoretical conceptions of historical sociology and civilising analysis, and also to the perspectives of historical sociology on the issue of knowledge, culture, religions, nations, nationalism, economics, politics, law, democracy and everyday life. The core subjects include courses in *Comparative Historical Sociology* and *Introduction to civilising analysis* taught by J. P. Arnason. Other lecturers include M. Havelka (the sociology of knowledge and religion), M. Hroch (the formation of nations and nationalism), Nicolas Maslowski (the historical sociology of politics and international relations), Karel Muller (economic processes) B. Salanda (everyday life) and Jiří Šubrt (the civilising theory of Norbert Elias). The teaching in this block may also periodically include such foreign professors as W. Spohn, Georges Mink and Jaroslav Kilius.

The second, *research methodology* block familiarises students with the basic approaches and problems of sociological, and to some extent historical, methodology. Explanation of research methods and techniques is focused on the application of quantitative and qualitative methodologies in areas such as biographical research, oral history, grounded theory, discourse analysis, case studies, stratification research and secondary data analysis from archives. The teaching of these subjects is conducted by Jiří Safr, Martin Vavra, and Magdalena Stovickova Jantulova among others.

The third block is characterised by selection and specialisation. Its core consists of three optional subject areas: 1 *Social structure and dynamics*, 2 *Historical sociology of politics*, 3 *Cultural history and sociology of leisure*. To these optional subjects the students can add others offered by the Faculty of Humanities.

Studies conclude with a final state exam, consisting of the defence of a thesis and three sub-exams: 1 *Theoretical conceptions of historical sociology*, 2 *Methods of historical-sociological research and data analysis*, 3 *Optional thematic block*.

Let me add that in academic year 2011/12 a teaching programme in English will commence at the department of Historical Sociology in Prague. At the same time arrangements will be made for a doctoral studies programme, which should begin one year later.

The education in historical sociology described above is envisaged to prepare students, both in terms of knowledge, and essential practical skills, for the future exercise of their professions, whether in the academic or general sphere (offices, agencies, educational institutions, consulting firms, editors, etc.). The study programme is designed so that students acquire a relatively broad set of professional foundations, which can be used in various types of employment with information of a socio-historical nature. Graduates should be skilled in seeking out information and accessing it, able to treat, evaluate, compare and analyse it using quantitative and qualitative approaches. They should also have an expansive intellectual outlook and be able to put the issues they deal with and the dilemmas they encounter into a

broader, especially socio-historical, context.

Finally, it should be pointed out that the concept of teaching historical sociology at the Faculty of Humanities of Charles University came into being independently, without external influence, underwriting or encouragement from abroad. Members of the Department of Historical Sociology in Prague view their programme as somewhat novel and experimental. In 2012 they will use their experience of teaching to prepare an innovative programme for the coming period. Thus they appeal to the international professional public to join in the debate on how the education of historical sociology should be conceived of. They particularly welcome direct foreign experience and input concerning the curricula according to which historical sociology is taught at other universities. Such input may be addressed to: [jiri.subrt@fhs.cuni.cz](mailto:jiri.subrt@fhs.cuni.cz). Any suggestion or contribution to the debate on the new conception of the study programme of historical sociology will be welcomed.

## CONFERENCE REPORT

International Scientific Conference: Civilisational Dynamics of Contemporary Societies

*Sociological Institute of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Russia, St Petersburg, 23–24 September 2011*

On the first day of the conference six plenary papers were offered:

*Johann P. Arnason* (La Trobe University, Melbourne, Australia; Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic) in his paper ‘Making sense of civilisational dynamics’ began with reflections on the basic aims and assumptions of civilisational analysis, moved on from there to the question of its relevance to the modern world, and concluded with a brief reconsideration of civilisational factors in the constitution and the dynamics of contemporary societies. Referring to Eisenstadt’s definition of the civilisational dimension of human societies, Arnason regarded civilisational formations as contingent combinations of interpretive and institutional patterns. This approach goes far beyond the mainstream sociological focus on cultural values and social norms, as well as more familiar ways of thinking about civilisations as holistic socio-cultural or social-historical units. Arnason also took note of additional insights into the civilisational dimension that can be found in the works of classical and post-classical authors. Durkheim and Mauss defined civilisations as ‘families of societies’ – that is, as large-scale and long-term groupings of societies with specific patterns of interaction, integration and differentiation. Braudel’s historical analyses suggested comparative perspectives on economic forms of life that are still one of the notably underdeveloped themes of civilisational analysis. The speaker mentioned some other themes complementary to and partly overlapping with civilisational analysis, including three subjects of comparative history – religions, empires, and ‘economic worlds’. In regard to the relevance of the civilisational paradigm to the theory and comparative analysis of modernity, Arnason noted some of the misunderstandings that often arose in the debate on multiple modernities. First of all, the very idea of multiple modernities is not reducible to arguments



around civilisational legacies and their long-term impact on modernising processes. There are other factors of the multiplication of modernity. The most obvious of them include geopolitical, geo-economic and geocultural constellations of the global or regional kind; social struggles and alliances within particular societies; contingent historical situations. In addition, Arnason referred to Eisenstadt's idea of modernity as a new and distinctive type of civilisation based on a massively upgraded vision of human autonomy. This new cultural orientation is complex enough to sustain divergent interpretations culminating in the 'antinomies of modernity'. The diversification of modern cultures and societies, thus, happens due to the complexity of the new civilisational pattern as well as due to the variety of its combinations with other sources.

In his presentation 'The Soviet Model of Modernity in Contemporary Historical Sociology' *Mikhail Maslovskiy* (Nizhny Novgorod State University, Russia) gave a comparative overview of different approaches to the analysis of the Soviet model. Thus, Wallerstein regarded the USSR as a military power that emerged on the semi-periphery of the world-system and followed the path of catching-up modernisation. But accentuation of the USSR's semi-peripheral position contradicts to the evidence of the role which this state played in the world politics. Michael Mann discussed Stalin's regime and German National Socialism as examples of 'continuous revolutions' that were driven by the idea of profound social reconstitution and went through similar stages. However, the conservative stage of Stalin's regime from the end of the 1930s cannot be explained by the dynamic model presented. Maslovskiy criticised Giddens's interpretation of the Soviet state as neglecting the USSR's imperial character and postulating the Soviet model as non-modern due to its non-capitalistic nature. The theory of multiple modernities was regarded as an important alternative to the interpretations mentioned above and as a promising frame of analysis of Soviet and post-Soviet experience. Particular attention was devoted to Johann Arnason's civilisational analysis as representing a fruitful theoretical perspective on the Soviet model as a distinct version of modernity. In Arnason's view, the Soviet model incorporated the legacy of imperial transformation from above and the revolutionary vision of a new society, which resulted in a rearticulated tradition that structured a specific version of modernity.

In the presentation titled 'Civilisational analysis in global context', *Björn Wittrock* (Uppsala University, SCAS, Sweden) reviewed the evolution of social sciences and the emergence and the history of civilisational analysis. The interest in civilisational analysis, its rise in the first half of the eighteenth century and its waning in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, and the very meaning of 'civilisation' in the singular or plural were tightly bound to the processes which affected the world. The rediscovery of civilisational analysis in 1970s happened in a world which was profoundly different from the one in which it came into being, in the world dramatically changed by the two World Wars and the decline of European dominance and power. Civilisational analysis came back to the academic scene with the idea of Axiality and the concept of the Axial Age coined by Karl Jaspers, with a particular focus on the periods of deep critical transformation and cultural crystallisation in human history and the notions of cultural and institutional programs (S. Eisenstadt) opposed to the previous view on civilisations as monolithic blocks. Then Wittrock discussed relationship between civilisational analysis and comparative-historical analysis. The rediscovery of civilisational analysis happened in the context of the rise of historical analysis in social sciences represented for instance by the speech act theory, the linguistic turn and by historical institutionalism. Since historical institutionalism and globalisation theory depict the relationship between the centre and the periphery as static and not having an articulated analysis of agency they have a limited explanatory capacity as they cannot explain what

S. Eisenstadt called the cultural programme of modernity and contradict the historical evidence of the dynamic character of the relationship between the centre and the periphery. The relevance of civilisational analysis of contemporary societies is highlighted by the theory of multiple modernities, which in some sense continues the tradition of comparative analysis started by Max Weber, but also faces the related problems, addresses the analysis of evaluative and interpretative aspects of culture and links historical analysis with agency. The analysis of institutional programmes and the changes of macro-societies should incorporate a reflection of deep changes in interpretative dimensions. Sociology should focus on the very moments of change and transformation since today we observe crises of political and economic systems, of arenas where explanatory discourses emerge and interpretative discursive practices take place. According to Wittrock, since relationship between the centre and the periphery is not a static one, it has a very important implication for the way we think about the academic and university policies.

*Kuanyshbek Muzdybaev* (Sociological Institute of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Saint-Petersburg, Russia) in his ‘The idea of wisdom in the dead, ancient and contemporary civilisations’ reviewed the principles of two theories of wisdom – the theory of balance and the collectivist theory – and the components of wisdom in models of three ancient civilisations. He showed that in the Sumerian civilisation more attention was given to the possession of contextual knowledge, to the ability to consider the problem from all sides. In Ancient Egyptian civilisation, more attention is paid to understanding injustice and human dignity. The model of Old Russian wisdom is the consolidation model in a greater degree, directed on solidarity strengthening between members of the society, on training of mutual loyalty and mutual aid.

*Maxim Khomaykov* (Ural State University, Russia) in his presented paper ‘Towards a critical theory of monolithic modernity’ focused on the critical analysis of modernisation in the modernist vision of modernity. The presentation began with the question of ‘What the ideal and the destination point or  $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omicron\varsigma$  of modernity are?’ and ‘How they are depicted in various theories?’ A peculiar ‘metonymic’ logic of the connection between different discourses and narratives of the ‘monolithic modernity’ was demonstrated and the involvement of the imperial civilisation discourse was analysed. Some principal breaches in this logic and internal contradictions of the monolithic modernity open up an interpretative space for the development of the theories of plural modernity and rethinking of modernity as a specific constellation of different discourses and practices. It was suggested that a systematic reflection and a critical theory of monolithic modernity are required.

*Vladimir Kozlovsky* (Sociological Institute of the Russian Academy of Sciences; Saint Petersburg State University, Russia) in his ‘Civilisational order as a process of socio-cultural self-regulation of contemporary societies’ focused on civilisational transformations of contemporary societies and post-Soviet Russia. He argued that civilisational order is a combination of different social forms (elements) on civilisational process of societal formation and regulation of cultural practices. The constitution of contemporary societies is based on different forms of integration, social and cultural control, and regulation of violence. Civilisational changes in Russian society of the early twenty-first century have two clearly marked tendencies. Firstly, civilisational changes in Russian society have become the leading form of transformation of the social and cultural order. Development of economic and political institutions in Russia has slowed down and stepped to the background, despite its much acclaimed public priority. Secondly, civilisational processes have become a way of embedding different social groups into the global environment. The search and design of

civilisational identity at societal, group and individual levels are becoming the dominant form of social and cultural self-determination, the strategy of life-course in modern societies. Socio-cultural identification is a process of choosing among multiple modernities and trying to appropriate them. The diversity of fluid modernities constituting the environment of Russian society is a new format of global realities.

During the second day of the conference, papers were presented that addressed the epistemological issues of civilisational analysis and the different aspects of civilisational dynamics of contemporary societies. Presentations covered a broad range of topics such as critique of explanatory capacity of civilisational theory in the analysis of contemporary societies; understanding of social change and history in the perspective of Giddens's theory; discourses of civilisational identity, analysis of civilisations from the point of view of the cyclical sociogenesis; reflection on revolution as an inevitable mechanism in the context of stagnation and crisis of institutions of civilisation's self-regulation; phenomenon of copyright as a practice of inventory support conceived as a vehicle of development of human civilisation; critique of the consumption society through the eyes of zombie-narratives in the contemporary cinema; new configurations of labour market in contemporary Russia; features of the western civilisation in the welfare state and insurance system; new tendencies of cultural politics represented by the active role of a consumer as the subject of cultural production etc. Selected conference papers will be published in a special issue of the *Journal of Sociology and Social Anthropology*.

### **Ruslan Braslavsky, Yulia Prozorova**

Ruslan Braslavsky  
 PhD, Senior Researcher  
 Sociological Institute of the Russian Academy of Sciences  
 190005, Russian Federation, St Petersburg, 7th Krasnoarmeyskaya st., 25/14, of. 504.  
 e-mail: [braslavru@yandex.ru](mailto:braslavru@yandex.ru)

Yulia Prozorova  
 PhD, Senior Researcher  
 Sociological Institute of the Russian Academy of Sciences  
 190005, Russian Federation, St Petersburg, 7th Krasnoarmeyskaya st., 25/14, of. 504.  
 e-mail: [yulia.prozorova@gmail.com](mailto:yulia.prozorova@gmail.com)

# STATUTES AND BY-LAWS OF ISA WORKING GROUP 02 HISTORICAL AND COMPARATIVE SOCIOLOGY

NOTE: At the request of the ISA Secretariat in Madrid, certain small amendments to the statutes discussed at the last World Congress, in Gothenburg in 2010, concerning the procedure for nominations of officers and members of the Board were made and circulated to members of WG 02. No objections having been raised, the amended version is deemed to have taken effect from 1 December 2011.

## **Statutes**

---

### **ARTICLE I. PREAMBLE**

1. The Working Group on Historical and Comparative Sociology was formed as a body of the ISA in 2010 in accordance with Article Four of the Statutes of the ISA, by the decision of the Executive Committee of the ISA. It is based on four years of work in the framework of Thematic Group 02, established in 2003.
2. WG 02 shall report its activities to the Research Council of the ISA
3. For the realisation of its activities, WG 02 shall obtain funds of its own and spend them in accordance with Article Four, Paragraph 7 of the Statutes of ISA

### **ARTICLE II. AIMS AND SCOPE**

1. The aim of the Working Group is to further and develop the approaches, investigations and methodologies in historical and comparative sociology in the direction of an international, transnational and global sociology. It will seek to develop inter-disciplinary research cooperation, particularly with history but also historical orientations in other social, political and cultural sciences, and in this context the study of micro–meso–macro historical changes in social institutions, individual and social habitus, mentalities, identities, collective memory and historical consciousness.
2. Historical and comparative sociology, arguably the core of the whole discipline in the era of classical sociology, has developed as a well-established and innovative sociological area particularly in the American Sociological Association, has been recently replicated in the European Sociological Association, but has not yet found its appropriate place in the International Sociological Association. The aim of the Working Group on comparative and historical sociology is to fill this institutional void in the ISA with its particular commitment to an international and global sociology.
3. The Working Group will focus particularly on the following topics of a historically and comparatively oriented international global sociology:
  - 3.1. In the context of sociological theory: the long-term development of human

society and its key processes; comparative-historical sociology, global sociology and social theory; multiple modernity or modernities; comparative-historical sociology, theories of social change, and multiplicity of social change regarding varying traditions and modernization processes in Western and non-Western societies; Eurocentrism, Orientalism and post-colonial studies.

3.2. In relation to historical social psychology: the varied patterns of habitus formation and their sociogenesis through power struggles throughout human history, and the multiple forms of civilizing, decivilising and dycivilizing processes, with particular attention to inter-human violence – including genocide, colonialism and post-colonialism, internationally and globally.

3.3 In relation to methodology: the use of process-produced data, longitudinal research and methods of historical research; comparative methodology between generalizing, trans-cultural positivist and individualizing, cultural-relativist orientations, inter-civilizational hermeneutics or the civilizational and historical contextuality of sociological concepts; qualitative and quantitative research methods in a transnational and inter-cultural orientation.

3.4. In an analytical comparative civilizational and historical-sociological orientation: research on the manifold socio-economic, political and cultural dimensions of multiple modernization processes; the impacts of the inter-civilizational historical foundations in these dimensions (Empires, transnational economies, world religions) on the formation of national identities and globalization; as well as their micro-, meso-, macro- and global linkages, interrelations and interactions.

### **ARTICLE III. ACTIVITIES**

1. For the achievement of the objectives stated in Article II of the present Statutes, WG 02 shall realise the following activities:

1.1. exchange of information among its members

1.2. international scientific communication

1.3. international research projects

1.4. organisational activities and implementation of a network in sociological childhood research

1.5 organisational activities and implementation of a network in figurational sociology (the international research tradition stemming from the work of Norbert Elias)

2. The exchange of information shall be realised by publication activities and a documentation system. A weblog shall be established in order to inform members and other interested persons/institutions about the ongoing activities of WG 02

3. The international scientific communication on important issues of historical and

comparative sociology shall be carried out by means of scientific conferences, symposia, colloquia, electronic networks, and other forms of interpersonal communication, and by participation in the activities of the ISA. Electronic networks and channels of communication should be used in such a way that members who do not have access to such facilities are not excluded.

4. Initiative planning and carrying out of regional and inter-regional projects shall aim at

- 4.1. the promotion of historical and comparative sociology, in particular the development of theoretical paradigms in global sociological research;
- 4.2. empirical research connected with key problems in historical and comparative sociology;
- 4.3. development, evaluation, and improvement of research methodologies in historical and comparative sociological research

5. The aims of the organisational activities shall be

- 5.1. the realisation of an effective interaction among the researchers united in WG 02 on the national, regional, and international levels;
- 5.2. the realisation of an effective connection between WG 02 and other Research Committees, Working Groups and Thematic Groups of the ISA;
- 5.3. the realisation of an effective co-ordination between WG 02 and the governing bodies of the ISA;
- 5.4. the realisation of an effective co-operation and co-ordination between institutions and organisations dealing with research in historical and comparative sociology.

#### **ARTICLE IV. MEMBERSHIP**

1. Members of WG 02 may be individuals or institutions. Members shall be

- 1.1. researchers dealing with historical and comparative sociology by teaching and/or by research work or related scientific activities;
- 1.2. institutions dealing with research in historical and comparative sociology and corresponding national associations;
- 1.3. other scientific international or regional-level institutions dealing with research in historical and comparative sociology.

2. Members shall either be regular members or affiliated members

- 2.1. Regular members shall be individuals or institutions in good standing within the ISA

- 2.2. Affiliated members shall be individuals or institutions interested in the activities of WG 02, who are not members of the ISA
3. All regular and affiliated members of WG 02 shall be entitled to vote as individual members in the discussions about organisational matters at the General Meetings according to the principle ‘one member, one vote’ that means that one institution also has one vote
4. All regular and affiliated members of WG 02 shall be entitled to:
- 4.1. participate in the scientific activities of the Research Committee
  - 4.2. access the WG 02 weblog free of charge
5. All members of WG 02 shall be obliged to
- 5.1. uphold the present Statutes of WG 02 and to adhere to the stipulations of the present Statutes
  - 5.2. conscientiously fulfil the tasks entrusted to them by the General Meeting or other bodies of WG 02
  - 5.3. pay their fee for the respective period (that is, 4 years). This fee shall be fixed by the Board of the Working Group at each General Meeting for both individual members and organisations. The respective amounts to be paid shall be specified in the By-Laws to the present Statutes
6. The Board of WG 02 shall discuss the state of membership every two years and shall take the corresponding decisions

## **ARTICLE V. BODIES**

1. For the effective fulfilment of its activities, WG 02 shall form the following bodies:
- 1.1. General Meeting
  - 1.2. Board
  - 1.3. Nominations Committee
2. General Meeting of WG 02:
- 2.1. The General Meeting shall comprise all members who have the right to vote (i.e. all regular and affiliated members of WG 02).
  - 2.2. The General Meeting shall be held
    - regularly during the World Congresses of the ISA
    - at the proposal of one third of the members of the General Meeting
  - 2.3. General Meetings shall be announced at least six months in advance
  - 2.4. The General Meeting shall
    - determine the directions of activities and shall accept the plan for the work

of WG 02

- elect the Board of the Working Group
- accept the report on the activities of the Board

2.5. The decisions of the General Meeting shall be taken by a simple majority (50% of the participating members plus one) by open vote

### 3. Board of WG 02:

3.1. The Board of WG 02 shall consist of nine members as follows:

- President
- Vice-president
- Organisational Secretary/Treasurer
- Eight Officers-at-Large
- Past President of the Working Group.

By appropriate selection of Officers-at-Large, the composition of the Board should reflect the regional variety of the Working Group. Temporary vacancies in the Board between consecutive World Congresses of the ISA may be filled by appointment by the Working Group's president. Each member of the Board shall be a regular member of WG 02

3.2. The Board of WG 02 shall

- elaborate the Plan of Activities of the Working Group
- organise the implementation of the Plan of Activities
- discuss problems referring to the development of research in historical and comparative sociology in various regions
- promote scientific and organisational contacts with other Research Committees, Working Groups and Thematic Groups of the ISA
- if necessary, create assistant bodies for the realisation of the activities of the Working Group
- establish contacts with the governing bodies of the ISA
- report its activities to the General Meeting
- report the activities of the Working Group to the governing bodies of the ISA
- identify the themes and topics for at least one mid-term conference and take responsibility for the organization of those sessions

3.3. The members of the Board shall be elected by the General Meeting of WG 02 for a period of four years. The President of the Working Group may not be re-elected. Other members of the Board may be re-elected only once, for the position of the President one more time

3.4. A quorum of 50% plus one of all board members shall be required for taking decisions at meetings or by mail ballot. Decisions shall be taken with a simple majority (50% plus one of the participants/respondents)

4. The obligations of Board Members shall be specified in the By-Laws to the Statutes



of WG 02

4. Nominations Committee:

1. The Nominations Committee shall consist of one member of WG 02, to be entitled the Nominations Officer, who shall not be eligible to seek election to any other position within the Working Group.

2. The Nominations Officer shall be elected at the General Meeting of WG 02, following the same procedures as for the election of other officers, with the exception that nominations for Nominations Officer shall be submitted to the Organising Secretary. This provision shall not be held to bar the Organising Secretary seeking election to any post other than that of Nominations Officer.

3. The Nominations Officer shall, from among members present at the General Meeting who are not seeking election to any post, appoint two tellers who shall assist in the counting of votes.

## **ARTICLE VI. NOMINATION PROCEDURE**

1. To ensure participation of all regular members, nomination shall be done by mail. To this end, the Organisational Secretary shall prepare a form to be sent to all regular members at least six weeks before the date of the election, together with a list of all regular and affiliated members of WG 02.

2. Each nomination shall be supported by two other members of WG 02, a proposer and a seconder. All regular and affiliated members of WG 02 shall be entitled to nominate or second candidates for the Board. Nominated candidates shall be regular members of WG 02. They shall confirm their preparedness to accept the respective position on the Board in case they are elected and shall return the nomination form to the Nominations Officer, together with a brief *curriculum vitae*

3. The Nominations Officer shall prepare a ballot listing all nominated candidates along with the respective positions on the Board. In case of several nominations for the same position, the nominated candidates shall be listed on the ballot in alphabetical order. The ballot shall be sent to all regular members of WG 02 by e-mail at least two weeks before the date of the election.

4. Regular members attending the General Meeting shall cast their vote in person, by secret ballot. Those unable to attend shall send their ballot to the Organisational Secretary. All ballots received by the Organisational Secretary at least two weeks before the date of the election shall be added to those cast at the General Meeting before the votes are counted.

## **ARTICLE VII. AMENDMENTS TO STATUTES AND BY LAWS**

1. Any proposal for amendments to the Statutes or By Laws may be made by any member of the Board, or by any five members in good standing of WG02.

2. Such a proposal must be received by the Board at least one year before the World

Congress.

3. The proposal will be circulated among all WG02 members, together with an explanation of its rationale, at least six months before the next World Congress. The Board will be entitled to propose amendments, to be circulated at least two months before the World Congress.

4. The proposed amendments will be put to the General Meeting, and adopted if approved by a two-thirds majority.

#### **ARTICLE VIII. GENERAL CONDITIONS**

1. These Statutes were adopted by the members of WG 02 in Decemer 2011.

## **BY-LAWS OF WORKING GROUP 02 "HISTORICAL AND COMPARATIVE SOCIOLOGY"**

### **OBLIGATIONS OF BOARD MEMBERS**

#### 1. The President of WG 02 shall

- 1.1. preside the General Meeting and the Meetings of the Board of WG 02
- 1.2. represent WG 02 as a delegate in the Research Council of the ISA and other organisations
- 1.3. conduct the activities of the Board of WG 02 in accordance with the decisions of the General Meeting
- 1.4. be responsible for the activities of the Board to the General Meeting of WG 02
- 1.5. be responsible for the whole activity of WG 02 to the governing bodies of the ISA

#### 2. The Organisational Secretary/Treasurer shall

- 2.1. organise the General Meetings and the meetings of the Board of WG 02 in co-operation with the President
- 2.2. represent WG 02 as an alternate in the Research Council of ISA
- 2.3. assist the President in organising the work of the Board and observe the fulfilment of its decisions
- 2.4. collect the membership fees and other incomes
- 2.5. keep financial documentation
- 2.6. prepare the financial report to the Board to be accepted by the General Meeting
- 2.7. realise the financial relations between WG 02 and the ISA

#### 3. The eight Officers-at-Large shall

- 3.1. organize the work of the Board according to the objectives and the decisions of the General Meeting
- 3.2. provide material for the WG 02 weblog
- 3.3. inform the scientific community about the activities of WG 02 and discuss the developments in historical and comparative sociology in their respective regions with the Board

#### 4. All Board Members

Each member of the Board must at all times be:

- (i) a member in good standing of the ISA in accordance with the ISA Statutes, and
- (ii) a member in good standing of WG02.

#### 5. Replacement of Board Members

5.1 Temporary vacancies in the Board between consecutive ISA World Congresses may be filled by appointment by the President, in accordance with ISA Statute 4.5.

5.2 The places of any Board member not in good standing with either the ISA or WG02 may be declared temporarily vacant by the President, at the President's discretion, and the vacancy filled according to paragraph 4.1.

5.3 Should the President fail to carry out their presidential responsibilities or allow their membership to lapse, the Secretary/Treasurer is required to inform the Board and to serve a six-month period of grace notice on the President. Should the irregularity not be resolved by the end of this period, the Secretary/Treasurer is required to inform the Board and to refer the matter to the ISA Secretariat.

### **MEMBERSHIP FEE**

In line with the decisions taken at the General Meeting held in Gothenburg Sweden on 14 July 2010, the membership fees are fixed as follows:

- US \$ 15 per year for members from 'category A countries'<sup>1</sup> as defined by the ISA
- US \$ 5 per year for members from all other countries

In line with ISA practice, membership fees are collected for a period of four years – that is. US\$60.00 for members from 'category A' countries, and US\$20.00 for all other members.

---

<sup>1</sup> For a list of 'category A' countries see currently valid ISA membership form.