NEWSLETTER 4 – SEPTEMBER 2013

The most urgent purpose of this issue of the newsletter is to impress on members that the deadline for the submission of abstracts for the presentation of papers in the next ISA World Congress of Sociology, in Yokohama, Japan, 13–19 July 2014 is almost upon us:

You must submit your abstract online by 24.00 GMT, 30 September 2013

How to do it? See below.

Contents

FORTHCOMING CONFERENCES

The civilising offensive (*Het burgerlijk beschavingsoffensief*): prospects for future understanding, or an obsolete concept?

Thursday 24th October 2013, Sheffield Hallam University

Co-conveners: Bernard Kruithof (University of Amsterdam – B.Kruithof@uva.nl) and Ryan Powell (Sheffield Hallam University – R.S.Powell@shu.ac.uk).

It is over thirty years since the theoretical concept of the civilising offensive (*het beschavingsoffensief*) emerged from Amsterdam and the work of Norbert Elias (De Rooy, 1979; Kruithof, 1980). Since then a small but important number of studies, primarily focused on the Netherlands, have applied the concept to various historical civilising projects aimed at bringing about cultural shifts and inculcating lasting habits in working-class populations deemed to be 'immoral' or 'uncivilised'. More recently, a number of UK academics have sought to apply the concept to contemporary concerns related to welfare and social policies aimed at specific 'problematic' populations perceived to be in need of 'civilising'. These disparate but overlapping UK accounts have neglected the Dutch origins of the concept. This symposium seeks to bring together a small number of academics from the Netherlands and the UK who have (or are) engaged with the theoretical concept of the civilising offensive.

From the Past to the Present and towards Possible Futures: The Collected Works of Norbert Elias

College Court, University of Leicester 20–22 June 2014

Call for Papers

'One cannot ignore the fact that every present society has grown out of earlier societies and points beyond itself to a diversity of possible futures.'

'Today we have basically lost the ability to think of a future. Most people do not want to go beyond their present – they do not like to see themselves as a link in the chain of generations'
– Norbert Elias, 1987

In 2014 the eighteenth and final volume of the *Collected Works of Norbert Elias* in English will be published by University College Dublin Press.

The mammoth undertaking, in association with the Norbert Elias Foundation, Amsterdam, and under the stewardship of Professor Stephen Mennell, has taken a decade to bring to fruition. It brings together the entire corpus of Elias's works, featuring many writings previously unpublished or not hitherto translated into English, faithfully representing his core ideas and his overall sociological position.

The conference marking the completion of the whole project will appropriately be held at the University of Leicester, where Elias lived and taught from 1954 to 1977. It both honours

Elias's association with the University of Leicester, and recognises the widespread interest in his work internationally and its resurgence within the University and more generally within British sociology.

Craig Calhoun, Director of the London School of Economics, has agreed to give the opening address.

The conference is organised around some of Elias's key works: *On the Process of Civilisation; What is Sociology?; The Established and the Outsiders; Quest for Excitement; and Essays I: On the Sociology of Knowledge and the Sciences.*

Despite its focus on the Collected Works of Elias, the spirit of this event is one of openness to, and dialogue with, competing sociological positions. It will pose questions including:

•   How might Elias's work be employed to address some of the challenges of sociology and social science more generally within in the twenty-first century?
•   In what different ways have Elias's ideas been employed, extended, revised, critically interrogated and applied, and in relation to which sociological fields?
•   To what extent does Elias's work provide a means of redressing and reintegrating sociologists who have intellectually migrated to different, increasingly diverse, specialisms and sub-disciplines?
•   Does Elias's critique of sociologists' 'retreat into the present' still stand today? What role might Eliasian sociology have in the more general 'relational turn' that has become a major topic of discussion in recent years?
•   Is it possible to reconcile Elias's 'figurational' sociological practice, with its emphasis on long-term processes, and caution regarding heteronomous analytical investments, with the institutional demands for short-term 'impact', sociological 'accountability', and the increasing emphasis on the practical value of sociology for specific 'user groups'?
•   Can Elias's approach to sociology be squared with recent calls for a more 'public' sociology, and indeed, more explicitly politically-involved and directed 'partisan' scholarship'?

In addition to a series of postgraduate workshops and keynote presentations on these and related central concerns, the conference will feature five parallel streams organised according to Elias's key works as follows:

1 On the Process of Civilisation
Civilising processes, *de*civilising processes, '*dys*civilising' processes and debates about processual 'directions'
Violence, war, terror in long-term developmental perspective
Sociogenetic and psychogenetic relationships
Critiques, revisions and extensions to Elias's magnum opus
(Contributors may also wish to refer to related works, such as *The Court Society* and *Essays II: On Civilising Processes, State Formation and National Identity*)

2 What is Sociology?
Power, figurations, interdependence and debates in theoretical sociology
Sociogenesis of sociology and the concept of 'society'
Game models and relational thinking
Structure/agency and the society of individuals

(Contributors may also wish to refer to related works, such as *The Society of Individuals* and *Essays III: On Sociology and the Humanities*)

Essays I: The Sociology of Knowledge and the Sciences
Knowledge and scientific establishments
The politics of figurational sociology
Problems of method and methodology
Elias's sociological practice
(Contributors may also wish to refer to related works, such as *Involvement and Detachment* and *The Symbol Theory*)

Quest for Excitement
Sport, social bonding and violence
Mimetic and leisure activities
Work, leisure and consumption
Gender, power and identities in the spare time spectrum

The Established and the Outsiders
Community studies and community relations
Blame and praise gossip in the formation of communities
Developments in established–outsider relations theory
Ethnicity, migration and locality

Abstracts of no more than 500 words for the conference should be submitted to
john.goodwin@le.ac.uk and jason.hughes@le.ac.uk *not later than 31 December, 2013*

Abstracts must:
• Specifically address one or more of the conference themes (and specify preferred stream)
• Include details of institutional affiliation
• Be written in English, since all presentations will be in English

Abstracts received after the closing date will *not* be considered. Registration for the conference will open 3 February 2014.

Conference organisers: *Jason Hughes* and *John Goodwin*, University of Leicester.

XVIII ISA World Congress of Sociology: Facing an Unequal World – Challenges for Global Sociology

Yokohama, Japan, 13–19 July 2014

The closing date for the online submission of paper abstracts for these sessions is **30 September 2013** *at 24.00 GMT.*

For full descriptions of each session, see:

www.isa-sociology.org/congress2014/wg/wg.php?n=WG02

For your convenience, we have reprinted the contents of the website in the Appendix on pp. 13–19 below.

The website also sets out the procedure for online submission of abstracts.:

If you have questions about any specific session, please feel free to contact the Session Organiser. *But please note that abstracts can only be submitted online via the ISA website.*

List of WG02 sessions

All sessions will be in English, unless otherwise stated.

Childhood and abuse in comparative-historical perspective

Glocalisation effects of the migration of ideas across the world

Habitus, pacification and the monopoly of violence in the age of globalisation

How to continue with the master concept of 'differentiation'? Historical and comparative analyses in non-western settings

Inequality in rich societies

Modernities in theories: perspectives from the colonised and the subaltern other(s)

Modernising moves in the 'non-western' world: historical and comparative analyses

New humanitarianism and international state-building

Roundtable session: process-oriented social research in historical and comparative Sociology

Why Bother About Inequality?

Joint Sessions

Becoming a racial subject, negotiating power: comparative historical contexts
Joint session of RC05 Racism, Nationalism and Ethnic Relations [host committee] and WG02 Historical and Comparative Sociology

Socio-ecological inequality: water futures
Joint session of RC07 Futures Research [host committee] and WG02 Historical and

Comparative Sociology

The emergence of sociology in an interdisciplinary context – nothing but success?
Joint session of RC08 History of Sociology [host committee] and WG02 Historical and
Comparative Sociology

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

Boatcă, Manuela, 2013 '"From the standpoint of Germanism': A postcolonial critique of
Weber's theory of race and ethnicity", *Postcolonial Sociology* (*Political Power and Social
Theory*, vol.24), pp. 55–80.

Onaka, Fumiya (ed.) 2013a 'Focus II : aspects of process theories and process-oriented
methodologies in historical and comparative sociology', *Historical Social Research*, 38 (2):
159–267.

Onaka, Fumiya 2013b 'Aspects of process theories and process-oriented methodologies in
historical and comparative sociology: an introduction', *Historical Social Research*, 38 (2):
161–71.

Onaka, Fumiya 2013c 'Relating socio-cultural network concepts to process-oriented
methodology', *Historical Social Research*, 38 (2): 236–51.

The Collected Works of Norbert Elias

Besides containing many texts never before published in English, or not published at all, the
Collected Works contain new editions, extensively amended, annotated and cross-referenced.
For further information, see the UCD Press website: www.ucdpress.ie. The volumes are as
follows:

1 *Early Writings* (2006)
2 *The Court Society* (2006)
3 *On the Process of Civilisation* (2012)
4 *The Established and the Outsiders* (with John L. Scotson) (2008)
5 *What is Sociology?* (2012)
6 *The Loneliness of the Dying and Humana Conditio* (2010)
7 *Quest for Excitement: Sport and Leisure in the Civilising Process* (with Eric Dunning)
   (2008)
8 *Involvement and Detachment* (2007)
9 *An Essay on Time* (2007)
10 *The Society of Individuals* (2010)
11 *Studies on the Germans* (2013)
12 *Mozart and Other Essays on Courtly Art* (2010)
13 *The Symbol Theory* (2011)
14 *Essays I: On the Sociology of Knowledge and the Sciences* (2009)
15 *Essays II: On Civilising Processes, State Formation and National Identity* (2008)
16 *Essays III: On Sociology and the Humanities* (2008)
17 *Interviews and Autobiographical Reflections* (Autumn, 2013)
18 *Supplements and Index to the Collected Works* (Spring 2014)

HOW THE ELEMENTS OF INDIVIDUALISM AND HOLISM CAN LIVE TOGETHER IN HISTORICAL SOCIOLOGY

Jiří Šubrt

Today's field of sociological theory is rather complicated, and more than slightly confusing. This is largely because from its very beginning theoretical thinking in sociology arose from different starting points. As a result, certain theoretical dilemmas recur, including in contemporary efforts at sociological theory. One of these dilemmas I analyse below. It's a dilemma associated with two contrasting theoretical positions that can be termed individualism (or atomists) and holism (collectivists). For individualism (rational choice theory, phenomenological sociology, etc.) the starting point of theoretical thinking is the human individual. For holism (structuralism, functionalism, systemic theory) it is social reality (or society) as a whole. How we can overcome the dualism of these two theoretical positions I aim to show using an approach loosely inspired by Émile Durkheim and his concept of 'homo duplex' (1914).

Homo duplex

Émile Durkheim notes that the human being is divided; moreover in an internally contradictory manner. At various points Durkheim characterises this division in different ways, but the characterisation is sustained. He says that in each of us there are two consciousnesses, two aspects of our mental life: personal and impersonal. Our physical body, on the one hand, is the source of our endless needs and desires, of our egoism. Our socialised being, on the other hand, is the construct of the society that lives and acts through us, and controls and diminishes the symptoms of our egoism through internalised moral principles.

A similar conclusion has been reached by many other thinkers, before and even after Durkheim. The tradition of dualistic thinking in philosophy comes from antiquity – through Descartes – up to the present day. This disunity of human nature was pointed out by Auguste Comte, who spoke about the opposition between egoism and altruism. According to Comte, egoism inspires human behaviour and gives it energy; altruism disciplines and directs it in socially desirable ways. According to Georg Simmel, man is an ambivalent human being with a notably ambivalent nature. In the essay 'Brücke und Tür' he characterises the situation of a human being, one part of which is focused externally and attracted by society and association with others, while the second part is a world in itself, longing for autonomy, independence and distance from others. George Herbert Mead gives the characteristics of the human 'I' – 'Self' as a contradictory unity of two components, the 'I' and the 'Me'. The 'I' is an individual, subjective component which is active and creative. The 'Me' is an objective, passive component, based primarily on internalised positions within the social group or society to which the individual belongs.

Durkheim raises the question of the cause of the dualism of human nature and concludes that this antinomy 'corresponds essentially with the dual existences that we simultaneously lead.' One part of our existence is purely individual and rooted in our corporeality. The second part of our existence is social and in it we represent just an extension of society. Society retains its own nature, and thus demands quite different from those that are included in our individual nature.

In his view of man Durkheim integrated two perspectives usually applied separately. One perspective, in which the individual is seen as a unique being equipped with its own 'ego', individual dispositions and will, is applied in some humanities and philosophy. The other perspective is where he is seen as socialised, which is utilised within sociological thinking. Durkheim himself and all his work is characterised by this thinking. But although Durkheim speaks of two components of human nature, in his sociological concept the first component is systematically ignored and almost excluded from his theoretical and methodological considerations. Since Durkheim, general sociology has developed a wide range of concepts to capture the social qualities of individuals, but is terminologically ill equipped for the theoretical grasp of their individual characteristics. When speaking on the sociology of individuals we usually use such expressions as status, role or habitus, and these are all terms that refer only to the secondary - social or socialised side of human being.

In trying at this point to follow up Durkheim in a certain way and be inspired by his concept of 'homo duplex', I want to emphasise and update what even Durkheim himself pushed aside in his theory – the consistent projection of a dualistic view of man onto the concept of the individual actor, and in all other key concepts of sociological theory. Durkheim frequently expresses himself in terms and ideas that have become slightly obsolete and anachronistic. I would not wish now to attempt to defend all his partial claims, but we should make efforts to utilise the most powerful elements which hold validity and topicality even today, meaning especially the inner ambiguity of 'homo duplex '. I would take and enhance this idea, but not strictly in the context and conceptual form in which the French sociologist uses it. I understand it rather as a kind of loose inspiration in exploring those issues which Durkheim did not deal with. I believe that in accepting this idea we can consistently derive further considerations on the nature of action, interaction, and structure, looked at through the perspective of 'duplex'.

In individualistic conceptions actions tend to be seen as one-way acts that come from the individual and in most cases are oriented outwards so as to impress something or someone in the outside world. However, the whole thing is more complicated. In the very act, from the very beginning, alongside the actor there is the other side, the world in which certain elements are striving to operate. The fact that one begins to act confirms the relevance of the rest of the world (regardless of whether it relates approvingly or disapprovingly). Every act intended to achieve something in this world is actually at the same time confirmation of its importance.

A man driven by his individual will monitors the actions of his personal (Durkheim would probably say, egoistic) interests and intentions. However, this activity is simultaneously social, and for this reason: it is oriented towards individuals and must therefore reckon with the surrounding social reality, its rules and expectations; such action – to one degree or another – reproduces some general role with its respective structural formulas, which, as structuration theory says, are both supportive but also limitations on actions. Both components in human action - individual and social - interrelate, condition and support each other.

In terms of work we could use two dimensions of action, distinguishing them by the terms 'voluntarism' and 'sociality'. Voluntarism suggests that action expresses the individual will or interest of the acting persons who are its very strong driving force. In the existing theoretical conception voluntarism is often associated with the issue of motivation and

choice; sociality is viewed as a problem for the anticipated action, which is mainly associated with the concept of its social role. While analytically it's possible to distinguish two components, it is extremely difficult because within action they may be multiply-linked. Owing to the fact that the actions of human individuals relate to other individuals, there starts to be interaction. These interactions may take different forms and intensities, ranging from ephemeral encounters to fixed steady relationships. Specific interests and goals conjoin interacting individuals in certain interactional configurations, in which- despite their variety of specific features and differences – we can find numerous generally applicable principles that allow us to consider its typical forms , such as cooperation, competition, opposition, conflict, etc.

Most sociologists, dealing with issues of interaction, develop concepts characterised by one feature which might loosely be described as typical: assuming that individuals exist as individuals with all their distinctive characteristics only until they start to act socially and interact with others. From the perspective of sociology, the moment they enter into social interaction it is as if they are internally changed. They lose their specific individual characteristics and transform into abstract, interchangeable representatives of social types, roles and institutions, free of subjective features. To generalise, the sociologically-perceived world of social interaction loses its vividness and individual characteristics. Sociology manifests a sort of methodological 'blindness' caused by approaching individual aspects as something accidental and unimportant, preferring only what has general social validity. In other words, sociology's perspective on interaction and structure tends to see human individuals as interchangeable 'parts' of the social 'machine set'.

The problem of structure from the duplex perspective

The flaw in current consideration of this topic in sociological thinking lies, in my opinion, mainly in seeing structures as something single-level in relation to activities. I believe that a more adequate picture of how social structures operate emerges if we imagine them as multi-level and multi-layer, where all the layers fit into each other and interact. In contrast to the established idea I now attempt to demonstrate how the perspective of 'duplex structures' may be applied

Sociological thinking about structures usually records social reality stripped of all individual features and reduced only to general and collective concepts, formulas and rules. In terms of efforts to achieve generalised scientific knowledge this is perfectly understandable, but nevertheless isn't usable in its pure form in all humanistic and social science-oriented disciplines. A typical example is in historical science, which isn't satisfied with only depicting the general historical trends, but incorporates the activities of specific historical figures, with their meaning and influence. If we look at the issue of structures through the perspective of the 'duplex' concept, it can contribute to solving this problem.
In that perspective social structures have two levels of structural rules. On the first level there are general rules defining basic social institutions and setting basic role positions and role activities. On the second level there are the specific rules in the context of specific human groups, where certain expectations are derived or enforced resulting from individual dispositions of their individual members; these are rules somehow negotiated within these groups, or imposed by power or force.

Consider the simple example of the nuclear family as representative of typical social institutions and primary social groups. When thinking about the family as an institution, we

give attention to the general rules that define the content of basic roles (mother, father, child), or – if we accept the functionalist approach – that determine the content of the basic functions (reproductive, protective, emotional, economic, educational) carried out by this structural unit. However, if we focus on a particular family as a small social group, we should consider another level of rules that has been formed or imposed by the specific characteristics, requirements and possibilities of individual family members (e.g. the rules over who is to pick the toddler up from kindergarten, who mows the lawn, or who walks the dog). In this example institutional rules exist as if dictated by society, while the operating rules of specific human group emerge from- to one extent or another – the individual characteristics of its members. In practice, the two types of rules interconnect in such a complementary way that it is hard to maintain any separation.

There are many similar examples we could mention that show the multilevel character of social structures. Take a sporting event happening in accordance with the relevant rules of the sporting discipline; the game itself is then further structured by the strategies and capabilities provided by the teams and their players. The functioning of various types of social groups, organisations and social systems can be considered in a similar way (eg. in the policy area, systems, which generally can be described as democratic, applying democratic rules of governance, may differ in the specific form of their expression, both due to different procedural rules but also and in particular how the representatives of the leading political parties put into effect their power).

No-one is denying here that social systems are capable of self-regulation. The economic system demonstrates this capability; it has a self-regulating mechanism that Adam Smith long ago dubbed 'the invisible hand of the market'. However, as the crisis in this system has recently clearly shown, what is really happening is not just the result of the activity of some unrestrained supra-individual forces and system mechanisms, but the result of many acting individuals, especially those who, as top managers of financial institutions, made fatally incorrect economic decisions, which, as it turned out, had a massive impact.

In today's theoretical considerations, having an impact on formation of social reality is typically granted to actors only on the micro social level (which is also widely studied through the approaches of social constructivism). The matter is generally ignored of whether and how actors can exert an influence on the macro-social level as well. Nicos Mouzelis (2006) draws attention to this and observes that a given problem cannot be successfully addressed if one does not take sufficiently into account how modern society is hierarchically organised and the role played within this hierarchy by so called 'macro-actors'. Let me simply note that the idea of 'duplex structures' opens a way to approach this theoretical problem.

One of the issues, which contemporary sociological theory has no answer for, and apparently does not even feel the need to seek the answer for, is the question of how individuals can influence the macro-level of societal structures and processes. Even if the question of acting individuals creators of social reality – thanks primarily to social constructivism – is attributed an important place in contemporary sociology, it's usual that attention is focused only on small anonymous actors and their activities in quotidian life, observed on the microsocial level. It appears that if sociology should deal with phenomena only on the macrosocial level, in principle it is not able to think other than in a functionalistic way.

The notion of individuals with society-wide influence is quite common and legitimate in the

study of history; sociology on the contrary – one might say 'on principle' – has ignored it. Simply put, for many years history has had a tendency to see social processes as the work of important historical persons, while in sociology these processes are at as the manifestation of supra-individual social units, structures and powers, or social systems and their functions. In other words, in historical studies the individualistic approach prevails, whereas in historical sociology the holistic approach dominates

Leaving aside the question of the methodology of historical sciences as one for historians themselves, and looking at the problem of interpretation, which sociology or historical sociology can offer, it is clear that a number of topics, particularly general trends in the development of culture, civilisation or modernism, can be monitored adequately from a holistic perspective, while overlooking the role played by important historical figures. There are, however, other research matters where the influence of these personalities cannot be ignored. In the case of post-communist societies we can take, for example, the analysis of the reign of communism, the coup in the year 1989 and the transformational development that followed it. Explaining this stage in the development of the society only as a movement of anonymous masses, or the dynamics of the general principles and tendencies, and disregarding those who were the leaders and 'architects' of social transformations, would be crazy. The individual element always plays a certain role in society; the character of social development and the character of social coexistence owe it their specific features, and to it social realities may attribute new, unexpected phenomena, which make social development so difficult to predict. Sociology, however, still lacks adequate theoretical and methodological instrumentation for understanding 'Macro Actors'.

It is the idea of 'duplex structures' that could contribute to the clarification of this issue. This explanation outlines that those individuals who, because of their social status (elite or monopoly position) have the opportunity to influence social macrostructures, are able to complement the level of general macro-structural rules with a further specific layer of rules which reflect their distinctive characters, the specifics of their activities, visions, ideas, wishes, discoveries, or even limitations, pathological tendencies, perverted ideas or deviations. These may be dispersed, or even inflicted, on a societal scale, due to the power and influence these individuals hold. In such a way one can attempt to clarify the roles of personality in history both in positive and negative cases, so you can describe the impact of outstanding historical personalities as well as tyrants and dictators.

In Conclusion

The theory of which I present an outline here should be constructed so as to reflect the idea that the individual phenomena of social life can always be viewed from both perspectives simultaneously, meaning from the individual and social perspectives. These two aspects are not only complementary, but also internally mutually conditional, and any interpretation conducted only from the position of one of them is always necessarily one-sided and incomplete. Therefore I propose an approach to the formulation of theoretical concepts that will reflect this ambiguity, showing that each surveyed problem can be approached from two perspectives at once.

The approach I was talking about is still rather a set of theoretical hypotheses. We do not anticipate from such an approach working out all the problems related to the matter of dualism of human individual and society; on the other hand, I believe that it's a perspective worthy of further development. Even if in future the problem of this dualism can be solved

more convincingly, it is inconceivable that it would mean abandoning either the individualistic or holistic position. Social reality is polycontextual, and individual specific events can be viewed from different perspectives: from an individualistic perspective, from a holistic perspective, and from a perspective that tries to interconnect and overcome individualism and holism. In specific cases examining social phenomena the analysis will undoubtedly always depend on which interpretation emerges as the most productive and convincing.

APPENDIX: FULL DETAILS OF WG02 SESSIONS IN YOKOHAMA

Programme Coordinator:
Manuela BOATCA, Free University of Berlin, Germany, mboatca@zedat.fu-berlin.de
Number of allocated sessions including Business Meeting: 14.

If you have questions about any specific session, please feel free to contact the Session Organiser for more information.

All sessions are in English, unless otherwise stated.

Proposed sessions in alphabetical order:

Author Meets Critics. Part I: Said Arjomand (ed.) Social Theory and Regional Studies in the Global Age (Not open for submission of abstracts)
Session Organiser
Manuela BOATCA, Free University of Berlin, Germany, mboatca@zedat.fu-berlin.de

The efforts to integrate social theory and regional studies in this volume represent a major departure from the foundational focus of classical sociology on modernity. They seek to decenter modernity heavy in social theory in two directions: by historicising social evolution and developmental patterns in different civilisations as well as varying regional paths of modernisation, and by introducing varieties of modernity lite in the overlapping forms of multiple, colonial, subaltern and peripheral modernities. Unjustly ignored by social scientists for too long, regional studies are at last being theorised and are thus poised to inject new life into stagnant social theory, and to reopen the way for the arrested advancement of comparative sociology in the global age.

Author Meets Critics. Part II: Said Arjomand, Elisa Reis (eds.) Worlds of Difference (Not open for submission of abstracts)
Session Organiser
Manuela BOATCA, Free University of Berlin, Germany, mboatca@zedat.fu-berlin.de

How can differences be understood in social theory through comparisons, and how should social theory relate to regional studies to do so? This question has been prevalent within the sociological field for over a century, but is becoming increasingly important in a globalised age in which cultural borders are constantly challenged and rapidly changing. The book edited by Arjomand and Reis illuminates the importance of exploring spatial, cultural and intellectual differences beyond generalisations, attempting to understand diversity in itself as it takes shape across the world. Scholars from diverse parts of the world explore key sociological themes such as citizen-ship, human rights, inequality and domination.

Childhood and Abuse in Comparative-Historical Perspective
Session Organiser
Robert VAN KRIEKEN, University of Sydney, Australia, robert.van.krieken@sydney.edu.au

Through phases of development, perceptions and expectation of childhood have changed considerably. Within these changes, the concept of abuse has been formulated and continues to be extended to incorporate previously normative forms of behaviour.

In this session, comparative-historical analysis will be applied to broader processes and particular instances in order to interconnect childhood and constructed fears and insecurities with the rise in prominence of the classification of abuse and abuser.

Glocalisation Effects of the Migration of Ideas Across the World
Session Organiser
Ewa MORAWSKA, University of Essex, United Kingdom, emorawsk@essex.ac.uk

Migration of ideas is an ideal field to explore the workings of glocalisation understood as the process of simultaneous homogeneisation and heterogeneisation of economic, cultural, and po-litical forms as they travel around the world and take root in particular time – and place-specific settings (Robertson 1994), yet for some reason this concept – and phenomenon – has attracted less attention among social scientists than Arjun Appadurai's (1996) 'multiscalar scapes' denoting the simultaneity of the multilevel, here, global and local dimensions of human actors' experience, including their ideas and orientations. Although the premise of the simultaneity of the global (remote) and the local is shared by the notion of multiscalar scapes and that of glocalisation, these two concepts are not identical with the former implying coexistence, often side by side, of different realms of experience, and the latter their fusion which generates distinct, new phenomena.

The purpose of this session is to elucidate the glocalisation effects of the migration of ideas from East to West, West to East, South to North, and North to South of the world. Papers focused on theoretical representations of this process are welcome as are empirical assessments of the transformative impact on the understanding and use in particular past and present settings of concepts and approaches absorbed from different cultural contexts.

Habitus, Pacification and the Monopoly of Violence in the Age of Globalisation
Session Organiser
Stephen VERTIGANS, Robert Gordon University, United Kingdom, s.vertigans@rgu.ac.uk

Levels of pacification and violence continue to confound sociological expectations. The post-Second-World-War dismissal of the bellicose tradition from sociological insight has meant the interrelationships between pacification and violence are largely neglected within sociology.

This session seeks to reposition bellicosity within sociology, drawing upon civilising and decivilising processes to illuminate phases of pacification and forms of violence. Processes will be localised, national and/or global.

How to Continue with the Master Concept of 'Differentiation'? Historical and Comparative Analyses in Non-Western Settings
Session Organisers
Kathya ARAUJO, Universidad Academia de Humanismo Cristiano, Chile, kathyaaraujo@yahoo.com.ar
Wolfgang KNOEBL, University of Göttingen, Germany, wknoebl@gwdg.de

It is obvious that the concept of differentiation has played an enormously important role in the history of sociology beginning from the times of Herbert Spencer and Émile Durkheim up to Niklas Luhmann's theory of social systems. It was and still is used as a master-concept in order to analyze almost all processes of social change insofar as it is often assumed that phenomena such as individualisation, bureaucratisation, secularisation are somehow related to – or are even the very essence of – functional differentiation. It is not so clear, however, whether this concept of 'functional differentiation' originally being developed in a western context can be used fruitfully with respect to other parts of the world. Even if – to use Luhmann's language – codes such as 'money' or 'truth' might be used everywhere, does that also mean that functional differentiation will be victorious all over the world?

The organisers would like to ask members of the panel to look empirically and/or historically into contexts where functional differentiation is not so much an established fact but more an open question. Problems such as the following could be dealt with:

Are there different meanings of – let's say – 'individualisation' and 'secularisation' in different cultures and countries and how – if at all – can that be accommodated to the idea of functional differentiation?

What is the relation between differentiation and complexification, which usually are seen as one and the same thing, but can be distinguished?

Are there currently processes of individualisation, bureaucratisation or secularisation that are difficult to subsume under the heading of 'differentiation'?

Were there historical phases with peculiar constellations of actors in which the existence of functional differentiation became more a problem than a solution?

Are processes of de-differentiation necessarily to be interpreted as indicators of crises, even of crises of modernity?

And more generally: Does the idea of functional differentiation depend on the western idea or reality of a homogenous nation-state and its institutional structure and – if the answer would be positive – how has this insight to be related to the debate on multiple modernities?

Inequality in Rich Societies
Session Organiser
Stephen MENNELL, University College Dublin, Ireland, stephen.mennell@ucd.ie

Studies of the global poor quite rightly concentrate upon the needs and experiences of people living in absolute poverty. This focus tends to result in the implications of people living in relative poverty within rich nations being overlooked at a global level.

In this session, attention is placed upon the contradictions between wealth and poverty in 'egalitarian' societies. Particular focus is placed upon long-term processes that enable the inequalities between socio-economic, religious, ethnic and racial groups to be normalised and for the compliance of the most adversely affected.

Modernities in Theories: Perspectives from the Colonised and the Subaltern Other(s)
Session Organisers
Manuela BOATCA, Free University of Berlin, Germany, mboatca@zedat.fu-berlin.de
Sujata PATEL, University of Hyderabad, India, patel.sujata09@gmail.com

The session intends to present a critical perspective to the contemporary analysis of modernity and its theories of multiplicity, hybridity, alterity and cosmopolitanism by bringing together critical approaches articulated by various subaltern groups in the Global North and South. In this panel, we wish to initiate a dialogue between the Latin American modernity/coloniality group's thesis of unfinished decolonisation and the expressions of the many subaltern others regarding the relevance (if at all) of conceptualising modernities and the ways to understand them from the perspective of subjects constructed as others(s).

We invite papers dealing with critiques formulated by a variety of 'othered' groups: women, racial and ethnic groups, indigenous people/scheduled tribes, dalits, nomadic communities.

Modernising Moves in the 'Non-Western' World: Historical and Comparative Analyses
Session Organisers
Jose Mauricio DOMINGUES, Federal University of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, jmdomingues@hotmail.com
 Yutaka KOYAMA, Japan Society for the Promotion of Science, Japan, cymytc55@gmail.com

In contrast to theoretical debates on globalisation or on 'world society' that often paint a too homogeneous picture of modernity and/or assume somewhat unilinear processes of global social change, this panel wants to bring in a more historical and thus empirical perspective.

The organisers would like to ask members of the panel to analyse closely social change in post-revolutionary and post-colonial periods in the world outside of Europe and North America. How did, for example, actors in Latin America at the beginning of the 19th century, in Japan after the Meiji-Revolution in the 1860s and 1870s or in Africa and Asia in the 1950s and 1960s think about the future shape of 'their' countries? How did they conceptualise modernity, what (if at all) were their 'reference societies' (R. Bendix)? How was foreign domination (empire, hegemony) related to those pictures of modernity? And which were the conflicts (with respect to the relationship between the state and religion, with respect to free trade versus protectionism, individual and collective rights etc.) emerging in these 'modernising moves'?

This also means that the organisers want to hear more about how models of modernity were accommodated to indigenous traditions, under which circumstances translations happened, and how in these processes a plurality of modernities took shape.

New Humanitarianism and International State-Building
Session Organiser
Abu BAH, Northern Illinois University, USA, abah@niu.edu

The path to modernisation has often been marked by conflicts and wars. Since the end of the Cold War, the efforts to move from authoritarian rule to democracy and/or make major economic reforms have produced mixed results. While many countries have made peaceful democratic transitions and major economic transformation, political and economic reforms in many other countries have resulted in conflicts and civil wars. Such countries include the former Yugoslavia, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Liberia, Cote d`Ivoire, Sudan, Democratic Republic of Congo, Libya, Iraq, Afghanistan, and Syria.

The security, political and economic challenges that face many of the countries undergoing violent conflicts have wider global implications. Moreover, global political, economic, and social factors shape the events in these countries. This global interconnection is best exemplified in the new system of global liberal governance, which merges security and development policies. Under global liberal governance, there is a renewed policy and academic discourse of human security, human rights, sovereignty, human development, humanitarian intervention.

All of these are embodied in a new sense of humanitarianism that redefines security, human rights, sovereignty, and economic and social development. Most importantly, efforts to end violent conflicts and address the economic, social and political causes of civil wars are no longer national task, but a challenge for the wider international community. This shift toward new humanitarianism and global liberal governance poses questions about state-building in countries that have experienced civil wars.

The security and development role of the major powers, UN, regional organisations (NATO, EU, AU, ECOWAS, etc.) and international NGOs has significantly increased in these countries. This raises questions about the implications of international state-building. What are the boundaries of new humanitarianism? How do domestic and external agents negotiate state-building? What are the comparative lessons in international state-building?

These kinds of questions can be addressed in a panel consisting of 4 to 5 papers. Ideally, the papers should inform both the theoretical and methodological issues and provide rich cases studies. Such papers will add a critical angle to the general interest on inequality at the global level. New humanitarianism and international state-building are not only born out of pathological inequalities, but they also breed new dimensions of inequality.

The Global South and Postcolonial Perspectives in International Sociology (Not open for submission of abstracts)

Integrative Session: RC08 History of Sociology, RC35 Conceptual and Terminological Analysis and WG02 Historical and Comparative Sociology.

WG02 Business Meeting

WG02 Roundtable session: Process-oriented Social Research in Historical and Comparative Sociology
Session Organiser
Fumiya ONAKA, Japan Women's University, Japan, fonaka@fc.jwu.ac.jp

The WG02/RC33 Joint Session 'Process-oriented Methodology and Theories in Historical and Comparative Sociology' held during the 2012 ISA Forum of Sociology at Buenos Aires attracted a large audience. It highlighted the challenges of naive 'historical' or 'comparative' sociology and the conflicts between subjective and objective standpoints. This session was originally proposed on the basis of the existence of close relationships between the nature of data and theories, and that the use of 'process-generated data' is more important for these process-oriented theories than 'research-elicited data', which the majority of sociologists rely upon. However, this session encouraged us to reconsider the relationship between `process-generated data` and 'social research'; some of which were based on 'historical' literature and others on 'social research' (e.g. 'time-related action research', and 'socio-communicational research'). Such differences are related to the aforementioned standpoints.

The main topics of discussion during this session will include the following points:

Is it really possible to collect 'process-produced data' through 'social research' or not?

If it is possible, what are the guidelines to be followed by this 'social research'?

What data can be collected through this 'social research'?

What does this 'social research' contribute to historical and/or comparative sociology?

What is 'process-produced data'?

What exactly is 'process-oriented'?

Such focused discussions will enable us to ascertain the proper methods and importance of social research in process-oriented historical/comparative sociology.

This session welcomes papers based on empirical social research focusing upon the concept of 'process' whilst attempting to answer the relevant questions.

Why Bother About Inequality?
Session Organiser
José Esteban CASTRO, Newcastle University, United Kingdom, esteban.castro@ncl.ac.uk

Session in English/Spanish

The concern with social inequality that underpins the organisation of ISA's XVIII World Congress is not an object of consensus among social scientists, including sociologists. In fact, for influential traditions of thought inequality is not something to be 'faced', as indicated in the congress' title, but rather to be accepted, perhaps even nurtured as an essential mechanism

for the structuring of social orders. Although the session is based on the assumption that a large section of the sociological community shares the position that Sociology should accept the challenge and make a contribution to ongoing (intellectual, political, and so on) struggles against old and structural inequalities, it recognises that for a range of different reasons this position is not universally accepted.

This session invites papers that propose to engage with this long-standing debate in the light of current global challenges including the inequalities related to the ongoing global 'crises' (ecological, economic-financial, political, etc.). We will give priority to proposals that place emphasis on conceptualisation, where empirical cases provide the ground for a theoretical discussion.

The proposals should address the topics from a process, historical or comparative perspective. The topics could include such issues as:

theoretical debates (e.g. inequality as an obstacle to democratisation and progressive social change vs. inequality as a function of democratic social orders; the interplay between natural and social structures in the production and reproduction of social inequality)

continuities and ruptures observed in patterns of structural inequality (i.e. empirical studies of the sociogenesis of social inequalities)

new conceptualisations of structural inequality

the production and reproduction of structural inequality as a structured social process

studies of social struggles and movements centered on facing structural inequality

etc.

Joint Sessions

Becoming a Racial Subject, Negotiating Power: Comparative Historical Contexts
Joint session of RC05 Racism, Nationalism and Ethnic Relations [host committee] and WG02 Historical and Comparative Sociology

Socio-Ecological Inequality: Water Futures
Joint session of RC07 Futures Research [host committee] and WG02 Historical and Comparative Sociology

The Emergence of Sociology in an Interdisciplinary Context – Nothing but Success?
Joint session of RC08 History of Sociology [host committee] and WG02 Historical and Comparative Sociology.