INTERNATIONAL SOCIOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

Research Committee on Racism, Nationalism and Ethnic Relations

RC05 NEWSLETTER

Summer 2009

Editorial

We are pleased to include in this issue the presidential address from Dr. Peter Ratcliffe and some important news and initiatives regarding the RC05 involvement in the upcoming ISA World Congress. In this regard we are happy to announce a joint session with the Department of Sociology of the Gothenburg University, followed by our business meeting on the 12th July, 2010. More information will follow. At this point we would also like to thank Dr Anna – Karin Kollind for agreeing to host this meeting.

We ask you to take particular attention to the information provided by our vice-president, Dr Zlatko Skirbis, concerning the RC05 mailing list, which can be found in the Membership Statement section.

Many thanks to Dr. Avishai Ehrlich for submitting a comprehensive report of the Durban Review Conference at Geneva, April 2009, which is included in this Newsletter.

I recently attended the Latin American Society Association Congress in Rio de Janeiro, although this is not a specific international gathering for the study of racism and discrimination, it was widely felt that ethnicity, race, xenophobia and discrimination are still pending in the Latin American academic agenda. During an ad-hoc meeting with other delegates, it became apparent that even more effort should be made to welcome Latin American specialists to join the RC05 community. This will remain one of my priorities.

Contents

---

1. Presidential Address

First of all I'd like to welcome all those of you who are receiving this Newsletter for the first time as new members of RC05. As Zlatko will explain in his membership statement below, our numbers are relatively stable. Having said this, there are still parts of the world where I feel we could do even better. I'm hoping that the World Congress next year will provide an opportunity to help in this respect (whilst acknowledging the difficulties faced by many members, and potential members, in attending international conferences, given historic inequalities and the current global financial turmoil). I shall return to this issue in the next Newsletter.

Although the process leading to the election of the new Executive Board for RC05 will not commence until early next year, I would urge you all, even at this stage, to think about putting yourself forward as a candidate for election. It is clear to me that we need urgently to begin the process of improving the generational balance of the Board by electing a number of you who are in relatively early and mid-career positions. Please feel free to contact me by email at Peter.Ratcliffe@warwick.ac.uk if you'd like to discuss what is entailed in being a Board member.

I shall return to the subject of the Congress shortly but first wanted to explain the slight departure from normal custom in this edition of the Newsletter. I felt it important to give pride of place on the covering page to Avishai's report on the Geneva conference.

Members of RC05 automatically sign up (via its Constitution) to a commitment to work towards the exposure and eradication of oppressions and exclusionary mechanisms based on 'race', ethnicity, nation, and faith and their intersections with gender, class and other forms of difference and diversity. I felt, therefore, in my final Congress as President that I would use one session for a reflection on the nature and impact of our work. The opportunity for this came with the transfer of Caroline Pluss' session to another RC stream within the Congress programme.

At a conference in Amsterdam a little two decades ago I delivered a plenary paper on the politics of research in our field and the state of the profession more generally. My core concerns were about what I saw as the negative impact of increasing bureaucratic controls on our research agenda via state sponsored regulatory mechanisms and on the streams of research that I felt betrayed those whose interests we routinely claim to represent and defend. The overt reflexivity in my approach seemed to shock many: in fact, there seemed to a tacit reluctance to see a 'problem'. Indeed, the imposition in many countries, following the lead of the US, of research assessment regimes based on 'peer review' did not seem to be regarded as a threat to our work.

Two decades on I suspect there are few who do not see them as constituting a major impediment to those of us who actively pursue a 'public sociology'. In reprising these debates in a paper in the General Sessions at last September's ISA World Forum in Barcelona, the response was a clear demonstration of this point. Members of the ISA Council to whom I spoke felt that a much wider discussion of the issues was an urgent priority.

To prevent the Congress session simply being a collection of formal papers I have organised this as a Roundtable. With relatively brief contributions from as many colleagues as possible from as diverse range of countries as possible, we can initiate a discussion around both existing constraints and the ways in which agency on our part can overcome them. There is also a clear synergy here between these issues and those raised by Helma Lutz and Kathy Davis in the second of our Roundtables (see session 19 below). In debating the role of transnational intellectuals we will once again confront the issue of how we pursue an effective 'public sociology'.

The really exciting thing about the Gothenburg Congress from my perspective is the feeling that colleagues who are offering sessions in our programme seem to share a similar degree of commitment and passion. Our final programme listed in full below demonstrates that most of the major areas of contemporary research are reflected: migration, transnationalism and diasporas; human displacement and trafficking; the rise in Islamophobia in the West alongside increasing racism and nationalism across the globe; the material effects of a continuing, pervasive 'race' discourse; and the social/spatial integration of migrants.

In organising the programme I have been especially delighted by the number of RCs that have expressed the desire to work with us on joint sessions. These obviously provide a tremendous opportunity for us to share our ideas with colleagues having overlapping research interests. We do, of course, have a close working relationship with a number of these, perhaps most especially RC32 (Women in Society) and RC31 (Sociology of Migration). But next year we shall also have the chance of working with colleagues from RC36 (Alienation Theory and Research), RC38 (Biography and Society) and RC13 (Sociology of Leisure).

I see this Congress as an ideal opportunity to expand the work of our Research Committee by attracting more of our colleagues from around the world (who are currently non-members) to participate. To make this a reality I would urge you all to advertise our programme as widely as possible in your home institution and research and professional associations. It would also be a good idea to email those whom you think might be interested in showcasing their work by presenting papers, or at least participating, in our sessions.

How to register your interest in presenting a paper

The World Congress may seem a long way away, and I can understand the reluctance of members to commit themselves to presenting a paper a year in advance of the event. Despite this, I hope you will have a careful look at our programme (if you have not already done so) and submit your proposals to us. The earlier you do so, the better chance you have of being able to secure a presenter's slot in your preferred session.

The submission process and timetable is as follows:

DEADLINE FOR SUBMISSION OF ABSTRACTS - October 1, 2009

Abstracts should be a maximum of 350 words (preferably around 250 words).
Please be sure to provide the full name, organisational affiliation, phone, fax, and email address for all authors.

Submit your paper abstract by email directly to the session convenor(s) with a cc of your submission to the Congress Programme Co-ordinator (yours truly) at:
Peter.Ratcliffe@warwick.ac.uk

See the page RC05

http://www.isa-sociology.org/.

Centre for Rights, Equality and Diversity (CRED)

It is customary for me to devote a little space in our Newsletter to flag up developments at CRED (University of Warwick, UK).

The major development over the past year has been the addition to our staff complement of Dr. Stella Hart as full-time Research Fellow. Stella came to us via the Universities of East Anglia and Nottingham. On taking up her post she continued her work on aspects of cultural citizenship and young people. A paper by her is expected to be published in Citizenship Studies within the next 12 months. With CRED having secured a further major grant from the EU Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA – www.fra.europa.eu), the balance of her work has shifted somewhat. The new project involves taking control of a major EU Data Portal run by FRA. We are charged with maintaining a comprehensive database covering all areas within FRA's mandate for the European Parliament. This will also constitute an important source of comparative EU data for academic researchers, activists and policy analysts.

Our work on the RAXEN project (Racism And Xenophobia European Network) continues apace. Dr Teresa Staniewicz, Senior Research Fellow in CRED, whose major research interests are in the area of Polish migration and settlement, manages this project. The highlights of this year's research programme have been two major 'thematic studies', one on racism and sports in the UK, the other on the housing of Roma groups in the UK (the latter to include Gypsy and Traveller communities). These will form part of two EU-wide reports to be published by FRA in due course (these are likely to appear around the middle of next year – check the FRA web address given above).

My own work (beyond the latter two projects) has continued in a number of areas best summed up as: the politics of research, conceptualising 'ethnic group', theorising housing inequality, public procurement as a vehicle for promoting 'racial' equality, critiques of state education policies, and public policies on 'community cohesion and migrant integration'. A few of the most recent publications are as follows:

Peter Ratcliffe, '"Ethnic Group" and the Population Census in Great Britain: mission impossible?' Ethnicity Studies, 2008/1: 5-27.

Michael Orton and Peter Ratcliffe, 'From single to multidimensional policy approaches to equalities? The example of contract compliance' in D. Schiek and V. Chege (eds.) European Union Non-Discrimination Law: Comparative perspectives on multidimensional equality law. Abingdon: Routledge Cavendish, 163-184, 2008.

Peter Ratcliffe (2009) 'Re-evaluating the links between "race" and residence', Housing Studies, 24(4): 435-452.

In addition to our research programme, we host an Annual Lecture programme presented by an eminent researcher in our field. This year we were delighted to welcome Liz Fekete, Executive Director of the Institute of Race Relations (IRR) in London (an organisation which

many of you know runs the international journal Race and Class). Given my earlier comments airing concerns about the state of academe in our area, we were delighted to hear these views reiterated by Liz.

In talking about her excellent new book A Suitable Enemy: Racism, Migration and Islamophobia in Europe, which pulls together 16 years of activism and painstaking research and writing on xeno-racism and the marginalisation and demonisation/stigmatisation of Muslims and Islam across Europe, she bemoaned the lack of real, effective political engagement on the part of most university researchers, and academe in general. This struck a chord with many, if not most, of the audience. [For those of you who would like to know more about IRR and Liz's work go to: www.irr.org.uk.]

Concluding remarks:

By way of conclusion, I would just like to underline three points:

Please 'spread the word' about RC05 and about our programme for next year's World Congress. Crucially, this includes colleagues employed by independent research organisations, NGOs and public authorities as well as universities.
Please give some thought as to your own involvement in the Congress, and if you decide to present a paper, do remember to send an abstract to the convenor(s) of the session in which your paper appears to fit best by 1 October 2009 (and cc this to me).
Please also give some thought also as to whether you would like to put yourself forward for possible election to the RC05 Executive Board.

Peter Ratcliffe
June 2009

Email: Peter.Ratcliffe@warwick.ac.uk

---

2. RC05 Programme – ISA World Congress, Gothenburg, Sweden, July 2010

1. Roundtable. What is the point of our work? A critical reflection on the current state of the discipline.

Convenor: Peter Ratcliffe, University of Warwick, UK, Peter.Ratcliffe@warwick.ac.uk

Feedback from a paper I delivered at the ISA World Forum in Barcelona in September 2008 convinced me of the need to devote one RC05 session at the Congress to examining the role of the discipline in contemporary society.

There are widespread concerns about the structural constraints that impact on the work we do as a profession. More specifically, researchers addressing the concerns of this Research Committee normally express commitment to an emancipatory project that seeks to empower

those subject to oppressive forces and to strive towards broader societal change. Indeed, this is enshrined in the RC05 mission statement. But what does this mean in practice? To what extent is our sphere of influence constrained by external forces, not least institutional monitoring/assessment regimes that are increasingly central to modes/systems of state control? Does this ultimately mean that we flatter to deceive (ourselves as well as our 'subjects')?

As convenor, I propose to initiate the discussion by providing a personal view as someone based in the UK. The intention is then to hear as many views as possible from researchers working in other countries. Offers of papers are therefore welcomed with a view to achieving as wide a geographical coverage as possible. It is hoped that these papers will be considered for publication in an edited volume.

2. Transnational social imaginaries: Racial, ethnic and religious routes and barriers

Convenors: Caroline Knowles, Dep. of Sociology, Goldsmiths College, University of London, c.knowles@gold.ac.uk and Mette Andersson, Dep. of Sociology, University of Bergen, Norway, Mette.Andersson@rokkan.uib.no

This session will build on scholarship on modern social imaginaries and transnationality. We will be concerned with various social and political inscriptions, as well as projects, among migrants, travellers and second generation immigrants. In addition to ethnicity and nationality as central categories for transnational imaginaries, we are concerned with antiracism, music, travelling and religion as alternative spaces of identification, networking and politics.

We welcome papers focussing on various aspects of transnational imaginaries, and especially papers utilising visual sociology.

3. Return Migration in a Time of Crisis

Convenor: Mónica Ibanez-Angulo, Universidad de Burgos, Spain, miban@ubu.es

The current global crisis affects peoples from different social and economic backgrounds; yet, as in most crises, those individuals and social groups who experience inequality and social exclusion by virtue of gender, ethnic and class differences are the most vulnerable in the face of new adversities. In this sense, we can ask how and to what extent transnational migrants are more susceptible to these (vis-à-vis the local population).

In this session we would like to deal with issues related to the different social dimensions involved in return migration. We especially invite papers dealing with the following topics (though others on related issues will also be considered):

(i) Return policies in the contexts of origin and of destination: Are migrants familiar with these policies? Have they been properly informed? What is the role played by national and supranational institutions, such as the EU, in the 'success' of these policies?
(ii) The sociocultural aspects of return migration: what are the sociocultural attitudes towards return migration? Is return understood as a sign of failure or, rather, is it understood as a sign of success? How do social networks influence the decision to return?
(iii) The economic dimension: how do labour conditions in the host society affect the decision to return? How does return migration affect the well-being of family members (by breaking off remittances)? What are the employment perspectives in the country of origin?

(iv) Socio-demography of return migration: how and to what extent do sex, age and marital status have an effect in the decision to return?

(v) Specificities of place: does the integration of the country of origin in the EU affect the decision to return? How, and to what extent, does the current crisis transform the directionality of transnational migratory flows?

(vi) Historical perspectives: what has been the influence of broader social, political and economic transformations in return migration?

4. Public space and issues of social integration

Convenor: Karin Peters, Wageningen University, Netherlands, Karin.Peters@wur.nl

Giving meaning to multiculturalism and the negotiation of multiple cultural identities occurs in public spaces. 'Public space is a space of presence, recognition, participation and citizenship (. the means by which difference is negotiated, affirmed or contested' (Wood and Gilbert, 2005: 686). It is continuously produced and reproduced through the dynamic interconnections between and among places and social relations (Massey, 1992). Public spaces are for two reasons important for understanding issues of social integration. First, public spaces are sites of representation of a multicultural society. Second, public spaces test the relationships between the members of such society (Kilian, 1998, in: Wood and Gilbert, 2005).

In recent decades, thinking on public spaces can be divided into two differing views. The first can be characterised as the decline of public space (Sennett, 1974) stemming from privatisation and regulation. The second focuses on the possibilities of public spaces serving a diverse group of people and facilitating the display of identities (Dines and Cattell, 1996; Merrifeld, 1996). This apparent paradox is of interest since public spaces are supposed to play a role in processes of integration of ethnic minorities into western societies.

We invite papers relating issues of ethnicity and migration to place and space in terms of attachment, processes of exclusion, belonging, etc. The following topics and issues can be discussed:

relations between ethnic identity and physical setting
issues of exclusion/inclusion
issues of place identity and migration
issues of place attachment and ethnicity

5. Diaspora? (Im)migration? Transnationalism?

Session Convenors: Ann Denis, Dept of Sociology, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Canada – adenis@uottawa.ca, and Ulrike M. Vieten, Department of Culture, Organization and Management, Faculty of Social Sciences, Vrije Universiteit, Amsterdam, The Netherlands – UM.Vieten@fsw.vu.nl

In this session we are interrogating the concepts of diaspora, (im)migration and transnationalism as useful tools for the analysis of the movement of peoples since the end of the Second World War, but especially since around the turn of the millennium. Scholars such as Brah suggest that increasing facility (and complexity) of population movement means that the relatively static concepts of migration/immigration should be replaced by more fluid ones, such as diaspora (or diaspora space) and transnationalism. Concepts of diaspora and

transnationalism invite an intersectional analysis, but so too, it can be argued, do those of migration and immigration, since the very nature of these phenomena and how they are experienced (either individually or collectively) is informed by the multiple positionalities of the individuals or groups engaging in them. In addition, notions of (social) mobility and (cross border) migration have to be revisited since, in the 21st century, changing place unfolds in newly classed and legally prescribed social positions of individuals and communities. This session invites theoretical/conceptual and/or empirical analyses which address these issues, and which include intersectionality in the way the analysis is framed.

6. Diasporic identification, gender and family

Convenor: Georgina Tsolidis, University of Ballarat, Australia, g.tsolidis@ballarat.edu.au

This panel concerns identity issues and how these are framed by diaspora. Diasporic identification is understood here in the sense developed by Hall; a process that reflects an interdependency between at least two cultural formations and in so doing, invokes an historical past and, at the same time, evokes new representations of what it is possible to become.

Family, and particularly the role of women, are understood as pivotal to diasporic identification. The micro dynamics of the everyday offer an evocative 'bottom up' means of understanding the tensions implicit in new ways of becoming. Through this framework it is possible to shed light on the lived experiences of racism, dislocation and alienation on the one hand and, on the other, to consider how the complex power relations within the everyday, can mediate a sense of resistance and hope.

The panel will bring together papers that offer insights into the lived experience of diaspora. Framed in relation to the everyday these will explore family, youth issues and schooling as a means of understanding how identification can interpolate cosmopolitanism as a challenge to the 'monogamy of place' (Beck, 2006).

7. Researching ethnicity and ethnicising research.

Convenor: Michal Vašečka, Masaryk University, Brno, Czech Republic, mvasecka@fss.muni.cz

The panel aims to analyse specific features of current research on ethnicity. Research on ethnicity, identity, inter-ethnic relations and cultural determinants of ethnic interactions is from a methodological point of view specific, and differs between various cultural contexts. At the same time, ethnicity research is insufficient and problematic due to various structural factors. This panel aims to identify factors influencing the quality of research on ethnicity, for example – ethnic and primordial interpretations of nation; the lack of data on ethnicity; the failure to foster specific methods of ethnicity research; the over-representation of quantification of inter-ethnic relations, the lack of focus on phenomenological research in the field of ethnicity; paradigmatic chaos; the lack of research ethics on the part of ethnicity researchers and the failure to interconnect academic research and public policy analysis.

This panel attempts to document these problems by both theoretical inputs and examples of research on ethnicity over the past two decades. It explores the proposition that research on ethnicity should be understood as contextual, multi-paradigmatic, methodologically non-conventional, de-constructivist and 'sensitive'.

8. Islamophobia since 9/11

Convenor: Scott Poynting, Manchester Metropolitan University, United Kingdom, S.Poynting@mmu.ac.uk

Since 11th September 2001, Muslim minorities have experienced intensive 'othering' in 'Western' countries, above all in those nations most aggressively prosecuting their 'war on terror'. Certain key ideological elements recur in the formation of the 'Muslim Other' figure – images of violence, barbarism and animality, the contravention of social rules and the exhibition of 'offensive' behaviour. Muslim immigrants are portrayed in this ideology as unwilling or unable to integrate in 'Western' societies, and Muslim-majority societies are represented as inimical to democracy, civilisation, and women's rights. Whole communities of mainly immigrant Muslims have been criminalised in 'Western' countries as 'evil' and a 'fifth column' enemy within by media, politicians, the security services and the criminal justice system. Racial profiling and ethnic targeting by police, security services, immigration officials, airlines and other bodies has discriminated against Muslim communities. Negative media portrayals, together with discriminatory rhetoric, policy and practices at the level of the state have created an enabling environment that emboldens and legitimates public hostility toward Muslims. The level of Islamophobic hate crime peaks each time there is an outburst of such   rhetoric.

We invite papers analysing and critiquing such processes, and assessing the political forces in opposition to them.

9. The Need to Understand 'Race' Comparatively, Globally and Locally

Convenor: Millsom S Henry-Waring, University of Melbourne, Australia, m.henry-waring@unimelb.edu.au

Although 'race' remains a problematic term for many within the social sciences
and elsewhere, it retains a high level of public and political currency, globally and locally. Thus, despite its many flaws, it is difficult to move away from the term altogether. The reasons for this reflect a complex blend of historical, social and political factors which many scholars have attempted to describe and analyse. Further, most discussions about 'race' still focus primarily upon those of us deemed as Other, to the exclusion and invisibility of groups often insidiously defined as the 'norm' - usually meaning white, Anglo-centric peoples. In addition, there are many silences about 'race' from within Black and other marginalised communities. The aim of this session, therefore, is to draw together emerging and critical work from academics, policy analysts and activists interested in disrupting the theory and practice of 'race' by comparatively exploring how 'race' is known/experienced as a reality by and within a range of groups.

10. Forced displacement and trafficking in persons: the variables of gender, race and ethnicity

Convenors: Natividad Gutierrez Chong, Universidad Nacional Autonoma de Mexico, Mexico, nativid@servidor.unam.mx and Arun Kumar Acharya, Universidad Autonoma de Nuevo Leon, Monterrey, México, acharya_77@yahoo.com

This panel will focus on the nexus between displaced people and trafficking in persons, taking

into account the variables of gender, race and ethnicity. Such an exploration and debate of all possible variables involved in trafficking or forcing people to migrate will aim at finding ways of improving the coordination of efforts at the regional, national and global levels against sex trafficking, as well as strengthening gender sensitive approaches in all anti-trafficking efforts.

The primary objectives of this panel are:

To understand the extent, dimensions, causes and consequences of internal displacement and trafficking bearing in mind ideologies of racism and discrimination. To explore the ambiguities of the forced displacement-trafficking nexus. To identify the gaps and components of strategies/practices/interventions in the internal displacement and counter-trafficking fields.

11. Racial Discrimination in Europe – ten years on

John Wrench, Centre for Migration and Refugee Studies, NTNU Norway, John.WRENCH@fra.europa.eu

The year 2010 marks 10 years since the adoption by the European Council of the Racial Equality Directive (Directive 2000/43/EC), the most important piece of EU legislation combating racial/ethnic discrimination. Thus for the first time, all 27 Member States should have had for several years national laws forbidding direct and indirect discrimination, harassment and victimisation in several areas, including employment, and also should have designated specialised equality bodies tasked to promote and raise awareness of equality legislation, and assist victims of discrimination.

This session invites contributions which can provide an insight into the effects, if any, of the Racial Equality Directive on the awareness of the issue of racial discrimination, on national discourse or on social policies in European countries, specifically in the area of employment and the labour market. During the 1990s it was quite clear that there was a chasm between the countries of the EU in the level of public awareness of, and political responses to, issues of racism and discrimination in the sphere of employment. It may be that the gulf in awareness and practice between countries has now become narrower, and that the Directive and related activities at EU level have had a consciousness-raising effect, resulting in a 'convergence' of attitudes and practices between European countries.

Papers might address questions such as:

Is there evidence that more victims of employment discrimination are making official complaints?
Have employers and trade unions developed new policies and changed their practices in response to the Directive?
Has the Directive encouraged employers in recently acceded countries to adopt diversity management practices, and have trade unions embraced their new powers to support victims of discrimination?
What has been the character of government action, or inaction?
Have traditional national cultural, historical and institutional differences between EU countries in their responses to migration and ethnic diversity (assimilationist, guestworker, multiculturalist approaches and so on) maintained an impact on the character of national equality policies in the 2000s?

12. Racism, Nationalism and Globalization: Interethnic Relations in Latin America and the Caribbean

Co-Conveners: Alicia Castellanos (Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana-Iztapalapa, Mexico) alicastell@yahoo.com and Gisela Landázuri (Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana-Xochimilco, Mexico) giselalb@prodigy.net.mx, giselalb@correo.xoc.uam.mx

This session opens up the discussion on old and new forms of racism in the context of neo-liberal globalization towards the diverse groups who are racialized and discriminated against on grounds of their ethnic, racial and national origin. The axes of the analysis involve the policies of national states and the rising social and ethnic exclusion and shall be the basis for a prospective reflection on the necessary change in the conditions that support the continuity and resurgence of racism. The comparison of cases from the specificities of racism in front of a subject becoming increasingly visible in the national and international political scene is undoubtedly a key resource to help develop the discussion.

13. Virtual Ethnicity and the rise of New Ethnicities

Convenor: Vince Marotta (Deakin University, Australia) vince.marotta@deakin.edu.au

Over the past 20 years the ideas of ethnic identity and ethnic community have been critically assessed in terms of their underlying essentialist and universalistic practices. Globalization and advances in new technologies have led to different forms of ethnic ties emerging which transcend national boundaries. Are these emerging new ethnicities in cyberspace less coercive and more diverse? Do they empower or do they reinforce existing class and gender inequalities? What can they tell us about the politics and representation of ethnicity? Does the existence of virtual ethnicity intensify the process of the de-territorialization of cultures? This session invites both theoretically and empirically informed papers which address these questions, but also invite papers which shed light on the relationship between virtual ethnicity and issues such as transnationalism, diaspora, hybridity, nationalism, gender, sexuality, and race and racism.

[Session papers will be considered for publication in the Journal of Intercultural Studies (http://www.tandf.co.uk/journals/titles/07256868.asp)]

JOINT SESSIONS

14. Nationalism, Alienation and the Middle East. (Joint session RC36 and RC 05) – allocated as an RC05 session.

Convenors: Lauren Langman, Loyola University, Llang944@aol.com and Nira Yuval Davis, University of East London, n.yuval-davis@uel.ac.uk.

The conflict between Israel, Palestine and Arab States has festered, erupted in violence, receded and erupted again. There are a myriad of reasons and factors involved, competing nationalisms, nationalisms competing with fundamentalisms, and competing fundamentalisms. The integral nationalisms of the region were the products of European nationalism and imperialisms. The domination, alienation and powerlessness of Holocaust survivors confronting colonized peoples has resulted in various toxic nationalism. How can

we understand this history, the current realities and prospects for the future? This session will explore these questions.

15. New Theories of Ethnicity in Migration and Post-Migration Situations

Convenors: Marco Martiniello (FNRS and University of Liège, Belgium, m.martiniello@ulg.ac.be, President of RC 31)) and Peter Ratcliffe (University of Warwick, UK, Peter.Ratcliffe@warwick.ac.uk, President of RC05), Joint Session RC31-RC05: allocated as an RC31 session.

This session will examine the most recent attempts to advance theories of ethnicity in migration and post-migration situation throughout the world. Do the changes in migration patterns cause changes in ethnicity formation? Conversely, does the dynamics of ethnicity cause new forms of migration? Members of both research committees interested in theory development in the area of ethnicity and migration would ideally discuss these difficult questions.

16. Confronting the Politics of Racialized Sexualities: On Regulating Minority Gender Relations and Sexualities

Joint Session of RC 32 (Women in Society) and RC 05(Racism, Nationalism and Ethnic Relations): (RC32 session slot)

Convenors: Sirma Bilge, Université de Montréal, Canada, sirma.bilge@umontreal.ca and Paul Scheibelhofer, Central European University, Hungary, scheibelhofer_paul@phd.ceu.hu

Questions of gender and sexualities are essential to understand politics of race and nation at different levels of analysis, whether the local, the national, or the global.
Drawing on what David Goldberg called the 'liberal paradox', i.e. how the commitment of modernity to idealized principles of liberty and equality goes hand in hand with a multiplication of racialized identities and the sets of exclusions they prompt and rationalize, enable and sustain (Goldberg 1993), the proposed session will tackle the ways in which ethnocultural exclusion and racialization processes in western liberal democracies currently operate through the problematization of minority/migrant gender relations and sexualities. We are particularly interested in the current mobilizations of women's rights and gay rights to construe the 'civilized' space of western freedoms and their 'enemies'. Besides the critique of these exclusionary discourses and practices, we welcome contributions engaging with questions of resistance/emancipation and counter-hegemonic practices, and providing frameworks for developing knowledge that lessen domination.

Identified thematic areas for papers include but not limited to:

Articulations of sexuality and nationalism: recent developments and historical legacies
The 'war on terror' and 'progressive' politics of sexuality
Regulatory controls over migrant gender norms, sexualities and bodies
Discourses on sexual freedoms/gender equality and (cultural) racism
Minority/Migrant challenges to regulatory practices and hegemonic discourses
Representing and regulating minority/migrant masculinities and femininities
The class politics of racializing sexualities
Regulating controversial practices (hijab, arranged marriage, polygamy, 'honour' crimes, excision, etc.)

[Discourses on]'Human trafficking' and the control of mobility
[Discourses on] 'urban riots'; the 'war on drugs', the 'war on gangs'
Conjunctions of racism and technologies of sex

17. Femininities, Masculinities and Inter-Ethnic Intersections, Contestations and Competition in Post-Colonial Plantation Societies

Joint Session of RC 05 (Racism, Nationalism and Ethnic Relations) and RC 32 (Women in Society) (RC05 session slot)

Convenors: Rhoda Reddock, University of the West Indies, Trinidad and Tobago, rreddock@cgds.uwi.tt and Ann Denis, University of Ottawa, Cananda, adenis@uottawa.ca

While a great deal of recent emphasis has been placed on the situation of new migrants to metropolitan centres, there are continuing stories of the impacts of older migrations – forced and assisted, which occurred in earlier phases of capitalist colonial expansion. This panel will explore the situation in specifically post-colonial multi-ethnic plantation societies which trace their population diversity to the labour demands of an expanding trade in plantation products especially through British colonial and capitalist expansion. Countries such as Fiji, Guyana, Sri Lanka, South Africa, Malaysia, Singapore and the entire Caribbean share this history and legacy of British colonialism, forced labour systems, large-scale labour transportation and immigration, multi-ethnicity and the plantation. Contestations over ethnicity, identity and citizenship characterise many of these societies and some have been the site of ongoing or recent violent conflict. How are these societies located in the emerging scholarship on intersectionality and post-coloniality, and what new insights can gender analysis bring to our understanding of the history, current context and future of these societies? As feminists how can we learn from each other in addressing this problematic yet exciting legacy?

18. Migration, Leisure and Community Cohesion

Joint Session of RC 13 (Leisure) with RC 05: (Racism, Nationalism and Ethnic Relations) and RC 31 (Sociology of Migration) – allocated as an RC13 session.
Convenors: Ishwar Modi, iiiss2005modi@yahoo.co.in (RC13), Peter Ratcliffe, University of Warwick, UK Peter.Ratcliffe@warwick.ac.uk (RC05), and Marco Martiniello, FNRS and University of Liège, Belgium, m.martiniello@ulg.ac.be (RC31).
Large scale migrations taking place due to various social, geo-political and economic reasons are causing problems of lack of community and social cohesion and ethnic harmony. Migrants often face jealously, resentment, and competition from local people. Cultures and customs of migrants are often seen with suspicion arising from inherently insular motives. Can leisure become a bridge between the communities - local and migrant? Can expressions of leisure become platform for ethnic harmony, community cohesion and understanding?

19. Roundtable on 'the role of transnational public intellectuals'

Joint session between RC05 (Racism, Nationalism and Ethnic Relations) and RC38 (Biography and Society)

Convenors: Helma Lutz, University of Frankfurt, Germany, Lutz@soz.uni-frankfurt.de (RC05) and Kathy Davis (RC 38)

The role of transnational public intellectuals is currently a 'hot issue' in sociology. Michael Burawoy, who is known for his work on global ethnographies (and is now a member of the ISA Board) would be formally invited to join the debate. We also invite researchers from RC 05 (for example, looking at the impact of their own work on public discourse) and RC 38 (on the role they see for biographical research in various public and political debates) to join the roundtable.

3. Joint reception for RC05 Members and the Sociology Department at Gothenburg, 12th July 2010

A greeting from Göteborg, welcomes Peter Ratcliffe initiative for a Joint Reception for RC05 members and the Sociology Department at Gothenburg.
Further information will follow regarding the venue of the reception to follow on from the RC05 Business Meeting.

All RC05 members are invited

Anna-Karin Kollind, docent
prefekt/ Head of Department
Sociologiska institutionen/ Department of Sociology
Göteborgs universitet
Box 720
405 30 Göteborg
Leverans/ besöksadress: Sprängkullsgatan 25
tel 031- 786 48 10
fax 031 786 47 64
e-mail: Anna-Karin.Kollind@sociology.gu.se

4. Avishai Ehrlich: Durban II: On the politics Behind the Struggle against Racism

When I was ask to represent RC05 in the Durban Review conference in Geneva in April I thought, naively, that I would report back on the presentations and debates relating to different aspects of racism, xenophobia and intolerance. I knew what had happened in the 2001 Durban conference, but did not anticipate that the USA-Israel–Iran-Palestine conflicts would dominate and over-shadow the whole conference as well as its structure. Nira Yuval-Davis and other participants at Durban 2001 spoke of the exhilarating atmosphere which boosted their commitment to work against racism. So I expected something similar at Geneva. In the event, I was dismayed, angered and frustrated that so many important issues could not be properly aired because the Jewish lobby and its Iranian opponents were determined to use the conference as a platform for their own aims. I was not prepared for what I witnessed and later undertook some research to fill in the gaps in my knowledge and better contextualize the event.

What follows does not purport to cover the whole conference. It focuses on state interests in the fight against racism. It is not so much a personal account as a sharing of information and some of my gloomy conclusions.

Human rights have been a main issue within the UN since its foundation in 1945. As early as December 1946, the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) established the UN Commission for Human Rights (UNCHR). Two years later the UN General Assembly published the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The understanding of what human rights entail was further expanded in 1966 by the addition of two covenants - *The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights*, and *The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights;* together they comprise what is now known as *The International Bill of Human Rights*.

In more than 60 years of its existence the UNCHR went through several stages. In the first two decades it was utterly toothless, due primarily to the bi-polarity of the world order and the Cold War which paralyzed the UN. During this period the UNCHR focused mainly on the promotion of ideas of human rights, but was unable to even condemn violations. In the late 1960s the situation changed somewhat due to the entrance into the UN of many new member states - mainly African - and their demand for condemnation of the apartheid regime in South Africa. The competition between the USA and the USSR over influence in these new states meant that they could not openly object to a more human rights-centered agenda. This enabled the UNCHR to take some initiatives and investigate severe violations, but only if the states involved consented. The enforcement capabilities of the commissions were limited to negative publicity only.

Since the 1990s the architecture of the world order changed with the collapse of the Soviet bloc, the end of apartheid, and with democratization processes in many states. However, this period has also been marked by a new wave of ethno-national conflicts which resulted in widespread violations of human rights. The UNCHR lost most of its credibility due to its inability to rise above the interests of nation states.

Two new developments mark the first decade of the 21st century: the establishment of the International Criminal Court (ICC) in 2002, which could give human rights some teeth, and the replacement of the UNCHR with a new more democratic structure. The UN Human Rights Council (UNHRC) consists of 49 members representing regions, elected for a term by the General Assembly. The problems with this new structure, however, are [1] that the Council includes states which themselves violate human rights, and [2] that the USA (during the Bush administration) - the hegemonic power - opted out of the ICC and out of the new structure.

The struggle against racism and racial discrimination should be seen within the wider context of the UN in the changing world order: Durban was not the first conference to combat racism; before it there were several world conferences against racism and racial discrimination. The International Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination (ICRED) was the first instrument adopted by the UN General Assembly in 1965; by 2008 it had been ratified by 173 states. There were world conferences against racism in Geneva - in 1978 and in 1983. There was a declaration for the elimination of racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance in the World Conference on Human Rights in Vienna in 1993. The Vienna Conference established the position of the High Commissioner for Human Rights. It also brought together representatives from 171 countries and 800 NGOs; its program of action emphasized the protection of women's, children's and indigenous people's rights.

Durban I

The World Conference against Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance was held in Durban, South Africa, from 31 August to 8 September, 2001. The conference took place against the backdrop of the failure of the Israeli-Palestinian Oslo peace process in 2000. The failure resulted in the second *intifada*, which soon escalated into a vicious suicide bombing campaign on Israeli civilians and in a massive repression of the rebellion by the Israeli army, with much destruction and many hundreds of civilian dead and wounded.

The conference was preceded by four preparatory regional continental sessions, in France, Chile, Senegal and Iran. The last preparatory session, in Teheran, was packed with delegates from Islamic and Arab countries; Israel was prevented from attending. The Teheran session's final declaration accused Israel of perpetrating 'holocausts', 'ethnic cleansing', a 'new kind of apartheid' and declared that Zionism 'is based on race superiority'.

South Africa, which hosted the conference, conveyed a spirit of celebration over the demise of apartheid, which had ended seven years before. More than 18,000 participated in the conference, with over 1300 media personnel. The conference consisted of three parallel gatherings: an official diplomatic forum, a youth summit, and a forum for NGOs. The official forum had about 2500 delegates from 170 countries, including 16 heads of state, 58 foreign ministers and 44 other ministers. The youth summit had about 700 participants. The NGOs parallel forum was particularly huge and vibrant and included more than 7000 delegates representing about 1500 NGOs. It began a few days before the official opening and included hundreds of workshops and other events. The funding for the participation of so many NGOs came mainly from government grants, international super-NGOs and major foundations, like Ford, etc. NGO participation was also encouraged by the High Commissioner as a ginger group to prod the stultified official forum. The NGOs claimed to represent the authentic voice of the victims of racism, discrimination and xenophobia in contrast to the forum of government officials.

The atmosphere on the conference grounds was, by all reports, very anti-Israel. (Many go further and say it was anti-Semitic.), Israel was equated to apartheid South Africa. Palestinian, Arab and Muslim delegates admitted to using the conference to develop a campaign of de-legitimization of Israel as a sovereign state.

Thousands of South African participants and members of NGOs marched through the conference area chanting: "What we have done to apartheid in South Africa, must be done to Zionism in Palestine." Jewish representatives were subjected to verbal assaults and physical threats. In the NGOs forum the issues of Palestine and Zionism overshadowed all other issues, and Israel was singled out as the main perpetrator of crimes against humanity. No other country was specifically named in resolutions passed against breaches of human rights.

The proactive High Commissioner, Mary Robinson, encouraged the focus on the situation of the Palestinians, though she changed her position following the conference after much criticism. In the preparatory meeting in Geneva, a text that equated Zionism with racism was placed, but was removed subsequently and replaced by a text that only referred to violations of the rights of Palestinians. The US decided to send a low level delegation, and after four days of deadlock negotiations, the US and Israeli delegations withdrew from the conference. The conference ended in acrimony and accusations of anti-Semitism.

The final declaration of the Durban *NGOs' forum* was a strident indictment of "Israel's brand of apartheid", that resulted in the High Commissioner's refusal to accept it as formal. It called for:

> "...a policy of complete and total isolation of Israel as an apartheid state…the imposition of mandatory and comprehensive sanctions and embargos, the full cessation of all links (diplomatic, economic, social, aid, military cooperation and training) between all states and Israel."

In the debate after the event, US Senator Tom Lantos (who led the US walk-out from the conference) blamed the declaration on the radicalism of the NGOs forum. Gerald Steinberg, of Bar- Ilan University in Israel, blamed it on the "malign influence of unelected NGOs". Michael Warschawski, from the Alternative Information Center in Jerusalem, agrees that Durban was undoubtedly an anti-Israel platform, but argues that it was not anti-Semitic.

Ramzi Barood, editor of the *Palestine Chronicle* called the event "democracy in its best manifestations, where no country could defy international consensus with the use of veto power or could flex its economic muscles to bend the will of the international community". Nira Yuval-Davis maintained that the mood of the conference enacted as a whole the clash of civilizations thesis.

The *official forum's* final declaration, "The Durban Declaration and Program for Action" (DDPA) was more balanced, the then Israeli foreign minister Shimon Peres called it:" an accomplishment of the first order for Israel." It singled out Israel:

- *58. We recall that the holocaust must never be forgotten*
- *61. We recognize with deep concern the increase in anti-Semitism and Islamophobia in various parts of the world, as well as the emergence of racial and violent movements based on racism and discriminatory ideas against Jewish, Muslim and Arab communities;*
- *63. We are concerned about the plight of the Palestinian people under foreign occupation. We recognize the inalienable right of the Palestinian people to self-determination and to the establishment of an independent Palestinian state and we recognize the right to security for all states in the region, including Israel, and call upon all states to support the peace process and bring it to an early conclusion;*
- *64. We call for a just, comprehensive and lasting peace in the region in which all peoples shall co exist and enjoy equality, justice, and internationally recognized human rights and security;*
- *151. As for the situation in the Middle East, calls for the end of violence and the swift resumption of negotiations, respect for international human rights and humanitarian law, respect for the principle of self determination and the end of all suffering, thus allowing Israel and the Palestinians to resume the peace process, and to develop and prosper in security and freedom;*

Three days after the conference ended 9/11 took place and the world turned on its head. The idealist spirit and agenda which reverberated from Durban evaporated completely and was taken over by unilateralist neo-conservative realism. The Bush administration was soon to declare a world war on terrorism. Sharon, then Prime Minister of Israel, seized the opportunity and linked Israel's fight against the Palestinians to the US administration's new agenda. What followed were eight years of American (and European and Israeli) counter-insurgency wars and unimaginable abrogation of human rights on a colossal scale. These

new-wars did not recognize the limitations imposed by the international law of war. Counter-insurgency war is first and foremost against civilians and civilian infrastructure. The suffering of the Palestinians was to be replicated on a much wider scale in Iraq, Afghanistan and now in western Pakistan.

Durban II
In Durban the UN, the US, its European allies and Israel were taken by surprise and were insufficiently prepared. They were unhappy with its tenor and resolutions. For the US it was too oriented towards anti-slavery, 'third worldism' and anti-Americanism. Israel and the World Jewish Congress understood Durban in the context of the wider Israeli-Arab struggle for world public opinion, as part of a 'soft war' against Israel. Within the Durban conference the most problematic forum was the NGOs' forum. Israel saw in Durban the first example of a general strategy to de-legitimize, boycott, disinvest and sanction Israel. Since Durban they perceive civil society as a dangerous and problematic new front for Israel. This view coincides with attitudes towards civil society held by neo-conservatives in the US and in Europe. What they had hoped was to ignore Durban and let it fall into oblivion. However, Kofi Annan thought differently and in 2006 convened a 'Durban Review Conference' (DRC) to take place in 2009. Its mandated terms were: 1) to review progress and assess implementation of the DDPA; 2) assess effectiveness of existing follow up mechanisms; and 3) promote universal ratification and identify and share good practices. The DRC was thus set up as a <u>continuation</u> of Durban, not instead of it, and as such was from its inception anathema to Israel and the US.

<u>Marginalization of the NGOs forum</u>
The NGO sector is a most crucial agency in the struggle for human rights. Other agencies are states; they do not like interference in their policies. National Human Rights Institutes (NHRIs) are official organizations linked to states. In democratic states they can criticize specific practices by their state, but on the whole they are compliant. UN institutions in charge of human rights are too remote from ground level and themselves have the limitations that the UN has towards its member states. International NGOs are specialized in tracking and publicizing infringement of human rights and in rallying international publicity and action against them. They too may have interests. One hope their interests are those they lay claim to; these interests may coincide with foreign policies of some governments who will support them in certain campaigns or in activities in some countries. Local NGOs, however, are the most indispensable tools in the battle for human rights. They are the vanguard on the frontline confronting the infringements. They sound the alarm, record crimes, and give evidence and first aid to victims. They have the cultural knowledge and the networks. By definition they are not "objective". They are critical of their state, committed and proactive. From the state's point of view they are dangerous and may be targeted.

When it was clear that the DRC would take place, a major effort was mounted by the US Europe and Israel to render powerless the NGOs' forum. The very choice of Geneva, one of the most expensive locations in the world, made it prohibitive for NGOs from the third world. Under pressure from the US state department and the World Jewish Congress, the Ford Foundation and the Canadian and other governments cut the grants for NGOs' participation. To avert being flooded by putative NGOs, participation was restricted only to NGOs which had participated before. The validation and entrance procedures were ridiculously securitized. To top it all and most important, was the decision taken by the High Commissioner Navi Pillay from South Africa, not to have NGOs side events in the conference and not to involve NGOs in the process of negotiations about the resolutions. The number of NGOs that participated in Geneva was reduced to 315 as compared to about 1500 in Durban, with only

1132 delegates as compared to more then 7000 in Durban. Most were NGOs with rich sponsors from the west. It is difficult not to arrive at the conclusion, despite all the explanations of the High Commissioner, that NGOs were deliberately marginalized.

 The white flight: boycotting the conference
The conference was boycotted entirely by nine countries which did not send delegates: Canada, Israel, USA, Italy Australia, Germany, the Netherlands, New Zealand and Poland. Several other states: Denmark, Sweden, the UK, France and the Czech Republic as well as the EU considered boycotting, but in the end opted to send low-level delegations so as not to give legitimacy to the resolutions of the conference by ministerial presence. No heads of states, apart from Iran, participated in Geneva, whereas 16 heads of state, 58 foreign ministers and 44 other ministers had been at Durban. This is how Iran got the grandstand. During Ahmadinijad's speech in the opening session, 23 representatives of European countries walked out.

For Israel the key objection was that the Geneva Conference was supposed to reaffirm the official resolutions of Durban at which Israel had been singled out. Since Durban Israel's policy in many forums is to pull out and try to wreck any initiative where it is criticized or ostracized or if it deems an event unfavorable to its interests. It will do this by leveraging its influence in the US and through the US on many other pro-western countries. Tzipi Livni, then foreign minister of Israel said: "The document prepared for the conference indicates that it is turning once again into an anti-Israel tribunal, singling out and delegitimizing the state of Israel." "The conference" she said, "has nothing to do with fighting racism." The US (still under Bush) which participated in the early preparatory sessions demanded that the outcome document should be "shortened and should not reaffirm in toto the flawed 2001 Durban Declaration and Program of Action (DDPA); did not single out any country or conflict, nor embrace the troubling concept of 'defamation of religion'" or did "not go further than the DDPA on the issue of reparations for slavery." These demands by the US could not be accepted as they would have meant that the review conference would annul the previous conference resolutions which the DRC had no mandate to do. In February 2009 President Obama announced that "…the USA will not engage in further negotiations on this text, nor will it participate in a conference based on this text. A conference based on this text would be a missed opportunity to speak clearly about the persistent problem of racism".

 Upon reading these documents one can only wonder how breaches of human rights can be fought if they are not specified, if perpetrator states are not named and the discourse is left in the abstract. Seumas Milne from *The Guardian* wrote (23/4/09): "In International forums, it's almost unprecedented to have such an undiluted racial divide of whites versus the rest. And for that to happen in a global meeting called to combat racial hatred does not exactly auger well for future international understanding at a time when the worst economic crisis since the war is ramping up racism and xenophobia across the world." He then concludes: "The Geneva boycotters, fresh from standing behind Israel's carnage in Gaza, are in denial about their own racism - and their continuing role in the tragedy in the Middle East."

Ahmadinijad's speech was not helpful in this respect and played into the hands of those who wanted to wreck the conference. The difference between the written version which questioned the Holocaust, and the delivered version without it, was manipulative, and the media focused on it.

Ahmadinijad's obsessions harm the Palestinian cause by Iran's agenda embracing and championing the Palestinians and by the linkage between the Palestinians and Iran. Iran's

radical anti-Occidental stand tries to position Iran as the populist speaker for the world's oppressed, but its blustering posture also isolates and endangers Iran. Most Arab, and the PLO, delegations immediately disassociated themselves from the speech. Iran's negative stand towards the UN as undemocratic because of the veto power of the West in the Security Council coincides dialectically with Israel's negative attitude towards the UN because of the bloc of 57 Islamic states which vote against Israel. Both countries, each for its own interests, work to delegitimize the UN. After Ahmadinijad's speech, criticism of Iran dominated the States forum with each delegation criticizing it. One can say that Iran positioned itself to be singled out. Iran and Israel thus exchanged positions as embattled and victimized.

Navi Pillay was so afraid that the conference would disintegrate, that she decided to release the Outcome Document of the Conference as early as the second day. Usually this document, negotiated in advance, is announced at the end of the conference in order to give credence to the speeches of the states' delegations. The early release of the resolutions made the discussions in the last two days redundant.

Iran and Israel kidnapped the conference
In Geneva there was already a war between Iran and Israel; both made extensive preparations, long in advance, for the DRC. The Jewish World Congress (WJC) and the Anti Defamation League (ADL) coordinated a worldwide mobilization and media campaign, claiming that the Durban review in Geneva was going to be another 'hate fest' like Durban. The WJC was in coordination with the American 'UN Watch' which sent a strong delegation to Geneva. A special intelligence unit was created in Israel after Durban to monitor anti-Israel NGOs activities (NGO Monitor). The WJC conducted their operations in Geneva in a military style: security personnel, media unit, a Twitter network between the Jewish delegates, etc. A school next to the UN premises became the WJC's headquarters for the duration of the conference. As many Jewish NGOs as possible participated in the conference and packed Geneva. (I estimate more than a thousand.) .

On the same evening that Ahmadinijad spoke, Jewish European organizations conducted a mass rally to commemorate Holocaust Day in front of the UN in Geneva. In sessions in the conference the following day Israelis requested that all stand in a moment of silence to honor the Holocaust victims. Iranians retorted in other sessions by asking that all stand up in a moment of silence for the victims in Gaza. Jewish groups heckled Ahmadinijad's speech and were removed from the hall. Two Jewish and one Iranian NGOs' accreditations were removed after brawls and the distribution of seditious materials. Before the conference Iran tried to block accreditation of Jewish NGOs. Iran too sent a big delegation (I estimate a couple of hundred). Among their delegates the Iranians included ultra orthodox anti Zionist Jews.

 Jewish NGOs tried, session after session, regardless of the topic, to raise and denounce Iranian infringements of human rights and, in turn, Iranians denounced Zionist racism and its genocidal acts.

 Iranian activities overshadowed the Israel Review Conference, which was organized outside the DRC by the coalition of Palestinian NGOs together with European and North American Groups to Boycott, Divest and Sanction Israel (BDS).

Conclusion
The continuous struggle to implement an international regime of human rights and anti-racism in the UN reflects the basic contradiction inherent in its structure: on one hand, the major

violators of human rights are states while, on the other hand, sovereign states are the major entities that make up the UN. The answer to the problem of how to transcend the interests of states in implementing a global regime of human rights has not yet been found. With all respect due to civil society, it is not yet a match for states. Civil society organizations are dependent on states; they act on their behalf, and they are too divided. The story of the two conferences against racism – in Durban and Geneva - and the way they were usurped by states and national interests is a glaring case of this inherent contradiction. I doubt if after what happened in Durban 2 there will be a Durban 3.

Comments from Nira Yuval – Davis on Avishai´s report

Thanks for a comprehensive and illuminating report. However, you should correct the sentence in which you refer to the way I've talked about the conference. You must have confused my response to that of Nicos' and others. I told you that for me it was a very important and thought provoking and challenging event, but that I left it very depressed, and in some ways the experience of 9/11 ad its effects on the polarization of the world already started for me in Durban 2001

It would be worth mentioning that RC05 organized [by Kogila who was then the president and myself then the vice president] an interim conference during Durban in which we heard excellent [and depressing] analyses by South African sociologists on the complexities and difficulties of post-apartheid South Africa, and that we were astounded then by the anti-intellectualism of many of the organizers of the NGO forum [and thus marginalisation of any academic discourse and analysis] as well as the simplistic anti-imperialist discourse of so many of the participants which did not allow any space for any reflections of racism within the South, itself with the notable exception of the Dalit case in India.

---

5. Membership Statement

A special welcome to those who have joined RC05 in the period since the publication of our last Newsletter. I would also like to thank those members who have recently renewed their membership. As of early June 2009, there are 172 members of RC05 in good standing. There are still some members with outstanding membership fees. As our future activities depend on your membership and financial support I ask you to renew your ISA/RC05 membership by visiting the following website: http://www.isa-sociology.org/memb_i/index.htm.

All members of RC05 have access to the RC05 list-server which means that you can send messages to all other members without restrictions. If you have a message to circulate please send an email to the following address: rc05@lists.uibk.ac.at. Make sure you list this email address in the bcc field of your email message - this will minimize the risk of other members responding to the entire list. If you do not wish to be included in this list-server please let me know and I will disable your list membership - email me on z.skrbis@research.uq.edu.au. When disabling your membership you run the risk of making yourself isolated from important information on RC05 activities. Please make use of this excellent facility.

6. Membership Renewal

Thank you to all of you who have promptly renewed your membership. Our future activities depend on your membership/financial support. For information on membership please visit the ISA website at
Professor Zlatko Skrbis
The University of Queensland
School of Social Science
St Lucia, Qld 4072
Australia z.skrbis@uq.edu.au   +7 3365 3176

7. Newsletter

Any relevant material for publication and circulation in the forthcoming issue of the RC05 Newsletter is welcome. The material may include conference and workshop announcements, information on new publications, book reviews, career moves, reflections on contemporary issues that might be of interest to our members etc. Please forward any relevant material.

Dr Natividad Gutierrez Chong
Instituto de Investigaciones Sociales
National University of Mexico
UNAM nativid@servidor.unam.mx

****