IN MEMORIAM

ABRAHAM VAN STOLK

Brum van Stolk, born in 1941 into an old Rotterdam merchant family, was a student of sociology at the University of Amsterdam in the late 1960s and early 1970s, when Norbert Elias taught there as a guest professor. Brum and Norbert became close friends, and spent many holidays together in Greece, Morocco, the Seychelles, and other warm and sunny places. When in 1983 the Norbert Elias Foundation was established, Norbert appointed Brum as one of his three executors. Brum died of AIDS on November 20, 1996. Another member of the board of trustees, Joop Goudstikker, gave the following address — in Dutch — at Brum’s funeral:

Brum loved festive occasions, and he knew how to make them truly enjoyable. On several such occasions I had the privilege of delivering a speech to him once when he obtained his PhD, just over five years ago, and then again at a dinner to celebrate the publication of his autobiographical novel St.

Over both occasions hung a shadow. On the day of Brum’s PhD celebration, his friend Rudolf Knijff was feeling ill. He did his best to hide it, but several of us feared the worst — and that turned out to be the case.

When St. appeared, there was no longer a fearful suspicion, Rudolf was dead. And we all knew that Brum too had AIDS.

He continued the struggle for a long time. I witnessed his determined fight in two capacities which were hard to distinguish: as a personal friend, and as a fellow member of the board of the Norbert Elias Foundation.

From the very beginning Brum devoted himself with verve to the Foundation. He felt a self-evident loyalty to Elias’s intellectual legacy. He was closely in- volved in all of the Foundation’s initiatives. His personal interventions leading to the establishment of the Norbert Elias Chair at the University of Utrecht were invaluable.

Collaborating with Brum was always a pleasure. He had a clear and accurate judgment, and knew how to present — and, if necessary, defend — it with style and charm. The words ‘board meeting’ may not immediately arouse pleasant associations; yet Brum managed always to bring an animated touch to our sessions. Official trips to such unexciting places as Hüniken and Marbach thus became events first to look forward to and then to look back upon with pleasure.

And not only to look back upon, but also to recapitulate at length about. For that was something that made Brum’s company especially agreeable: to go over common experiences and reconsider them once more in a thoroughly new perspective. How I would love to have a talk with Brum about the gathering that we are holding today in his memory!

That is, of course, out of the question. The cordon of family and friends has not been able to save him. All we can do is cherish his memory.

For me that memory is precious and encouraging. I am grateful for the friendship that Brum gave me and Maria. It was as teacher and student that we became acquainted, but we had long left that stage behind us. Just for my part was able to learn a great deal from him, for Brum had much to offer — not only in tradition but also in experience and judgement of human character, and in cordiality.

Some images stay with me — such as the summer afternoon when I was busy in the garden, and suddenly heard my name being called from above. There, at the balcony of the apartment above our own where Norbert lived, stood Brum and Rudolf. Two men in good shape, in good clothes, with good haircuts, and, above all, in good temper. They were, as I now realize, in the prime of life.

Apart from such moments to recollect Brum fortunately also left us his books.
The impressive SI (1995), with a moving account of the experiences of a homosexual Dutch soldier in Germany in the 1960s, Eigenwaarde als groepsbelang ('Self-Esteem as a Group Interest', 1991), a collection of highly perceptive essays on various minorities, and Vrouwen in tuin en stall ('Women in the Garden and Barn', 1983), written together with Cas Wosten and translated into German (1987). Each of these books bears witness to a unique combination of powers of observation, empathy, and sociological imagination. During the last years of his life Bram turned more and more to writing semi-autobiographical fiction, but he also found the energy to start working with Christians Bringgreve on a book about social inheritance. Christian will now have to finish that project by himself. 

So luckily there is a posthumous publication to which to look forward. Talking with Bram, however, asking him for advice, exchanging impressions and opinions and bringing back memories—all that is now a thing of the past. There is a book of poems by H.A. Gomperts called Of Loss and Death. I understand what he meant by this, but actually it is a pleasure. For death is a loss, the greatest loss.

Joop Goudsblom

* The book by Christiaan Bringgreve and Bram van Stolk, Van huis uit ('Out of the House' in literal translation 'By Birth'), was published by Meulenhoff, Amsterdam in February 1997.

NEW TRUSTEE OF THE ELIAS FOUNDATION

Following the death of Bram van Stolk, the remaining members of the Board—Joop Goudsblom and Hermann Korte—invited Stephen Mennell, editor of Figurations, to become one of the trustees of the Norbert Elias Foundation.

Stephen is Professor of Sociology and Head of Department at University College Dublin, Ireland. Born in Yorkshire in the north of England, he took his degree in economics—with some sociology—at Cambridge University, and then in 1966—7 was Frank Knox Fellow in the old Department of Social Relations at Harvard University. There he could easily have fallen under the thrill of Talcott Parsons, but what was really important for him was the confluence with that department of sociology, anthropology and psychology—a confluence which no doubt predisposed him to fall instead under the thrill of Norbert Elias. That happened after Stephen had returned to England as a lecturer at the University of Essex, and it happened quite by chance. He and Bruce Murryman were invited to translate Elias's War at Sociological into English, and as a result he met Elias for the first time in 1972. Since the mid-1970s Stephen has been an advocate of Elias's work in the English-speaking world.

With the encouragement of Norbert Elias, Joop Goudsblom, and other friends, the first half of the 1980s Stephen investigated the childhood of a neurotic and the development of cultural cultures in England and France for his book, All Manners of Food (1985, 2nd ed. 1996), and was awarded a doctorate for it by the University of Amsterdam. His other books include, Norbert Elias: Civilization and the Human Self-Image (1989, rev. ed. Norbert Elias: An Introduction, 1992), Sociological Theory: Ones and Others (1974, rev. ed. 1989), and (with Eric Jones and Johan Goedbloed) The Course of Human History: Economic Growth, Social Process and Civilization (1996). Recently he and Eric Dunning have translated into Eng- lish Elias’s The Germans (1946), and with Joop Goudsblom he has edited The Norbert Elias Reader (Blackwell, forthcoming 1997) and Norbert Elias on Civilization, Power and Knowledge (University of Chicago Press, forthcoming 1997). Stephen has been a Fellow of the Netherlands Institute for Advanced Study, Wassenaar, and spent the early 1990s in Australia as Professor of Sociology at Monash University, Melbourne. His current research includes work on structures and group identity in groups of Protestants and Catholics in Ireland and in the north and south of the former, and an eventual book on The American Civilizing Process.

ASSISTANT EDITOR OF FIGURATIONS

Anrie Richard has been appointed Assistant Editor of Figurations. Anrie is a graduate student in the Department of Sociology at University College Dublin, where she has just gained a Master's degree. Her thesis, supervised by Stephen Mennell, sought to explain why rates of breast-feeding are very low in Ireland, using Elias's theory of civilizing processes and Cas Wosten's writings on formalization processes. Anrie is now embarking on a PhD at UCD.

FIGURATIONS

PD Dr Thomas Kleinsepp is preparing a 60-minute radio broadcast on Norbert Elias, his life and work, entitled Der Menschenwissenschaftler: Norbert Elias zum 100. Geburtstag. It will include parts of a long interview with Elias, recorded in Amsterdam in the summer of 1988 and broadcast the same year, together with contributions by several of Elias's colleagues and friends in Germany and the Netherlands.

The programme will first be transmitted on Radio Bremen 2 on 19 June 1997, at 21:00 hours. The text and much further information (including scene extracts from Figurations) is available on internet on the web-pages of Radio Bremen 2: http://www.radio-bremen.de/figurations/fig2-home.htm. Hyperlinks will be provided there to other addresses relating to Elias and figurai- tional sociology.

Dr. Kleinsepp is a freelance social scientist and author of several features on cultural subjects for the German Broad-
A party was held on 28 February 1997 at the London offices of Sage Publications Ltd to mark ten years of Sage's association with the journal Theory, Culture & Society. And also the successful launch of the sister journal Body & Society. Both journals have been receptive to the work of process sociologists. In the last years of his life, Norbert Elias developed a close working relationship with Theory, Culture & Society. The editor, Mike Featherstone, visited him first in Bielefeld and then in Amsterdam on several occasions, and they developed a warm correspondence. A special double issue on Elias was published on the occasion of his 90th birthday in 1987. Over the years, the journal published several of Elias's articles and his book. The Symbol Theory was published in the TCS book series, as it was also the new edition of The Established and the Outsiders. In addition, the journal has published original articles by many process sociologists, such as Eric Dunning, Peter Giddens, Johan Guislain, Abram de Swaan, Cas Wouters and Stephen Mennell.

Theory, Culture & Society and Body & Society are both committed to publishing the most searching and relevant ideas in sociology, cultural studies and other cognate disciplines. Both journals support a critical, developmental and comparative approach to researching social problems. This is also something that Elias pioneered and practised in his own work. The journals recognise Elias as one of the towering influences in twentieth-century sociology. Although they are hardly house journals for process sociology, they have been consistently sensitive and sympathetic to the range of interests developed by Elias and his associates. This has also been evident at the two TCS conferences. The first was held in Seven Springs, Pennsylvania in 1992 (attended by 300 people) and the second in 1995 at the Berlin Hilton (attended by 500 people). Both included several papers on Eliasian themes. Further conferences are planned, with a third conference scheduled in Amsterdam or London.

In May 1996, the editorial offices of both journals switched to Nottingham Trent University. They are now located in the Theory, Culture & Society Centre: The Director of the centre is Mike Featherstone and the Deputy Director is Chris Rojek. The Centre is committed to a wide range of research in the areas of social and cultural theory, the body, the life course, city cultures, the state of modernity, citizenship, tourism, sport and leisure, and information technology. It also offers several opportunities for postgraduate study at Masters and doctoral levels. Any reader of Figurations interested in contacting either Mike or Chris can reach them at:

The TCS Centre
Nottingham Trent University
Clifton Lane
Nottingham NG1 8NQ
UNITED KINGDOM
Tel: +44-115-948 6336
Fax: +44-115-948 6331
E-mail: tcs@ntu.ac.uk
Website: http://www.cem.ee.nottingham.ac.uk/tcs

OPENING OF THE CONFERENCE
On Thursday evening, 20 March 1997, the conference delegates met at the Goethe-Institut in Vancouver where, to a capacity audience, Hermann Korte (University of Hamburg) delivered his figurational- inspired account of Norbert Elias’s life. The following morning, at the first of five sessions held in Vancouver College, UBC, participants were welcomed to the conference by Thomas Saturca, Chair of Comparative Literature (University of British Columbia), Errol Durbach, Associate Dean of Arts (University of British Columbia), and Stephen Mennell, the newly-appointed joint trustee of the Norbert Elias Foundation in Amsterdam.

In his opening remarks, Thomas Saturca addressed the broader contexts of
this conference on Norbert Elias and human interdependencies. Is the world coming together, he asked, or falling apart? At the end of the millenium the opposing paradigms of 'globalisation' and 'fragmentation' compete on the one hand the coalescence of developments regarding the global economy, communication, and increasing mobility is reshaping the world; on the other, as political boundaries change, facets of culture and ethnicity come to the fore in often bloody and destructive ways. Perhaps Norbert Elias was right when he said in 1985 that we 'presently live at the end of the Middle Ages.'

How can we change that? How can we, as Elias put it, 'arrange our lives in such a way that we do not constantly hurt ourselves and also gain as much pleasantness to experience and satisfaction as possible'? There is no answer to this question. There is only the desire for conclusions. In fact, the desire to find an answer might be part of the problem. What we can do is resist this desire to ground human relations and, in the process, we might find out more about the complex and continually changing ways in which we are connected.

A BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE PAPERS
Godfried van Berloem van den Bergh (Erasmus University, Rotterdam) discussed possible limitations and implications of nations as symbols and argued for the potential of seeing nations as processes of integration. Antonic Trebel (Padergogical University of Karlsruhe) explored changes in the relationship between men and women from the point of view of Elias's game model and understanding of 'power' as an attribute of human relations. Reinhard Blumet (Humboldt University, Berlin).argued that the increasing interdependencies of national currencies brought about some critical situations, which included the menace of a collapse of the monetary system. In his view, the crisis and the great fear of middle-class societies, the breakdown of the currency system, led to a series of international agreements on banking business standards, which confined national autonomy to a certain degree. Blumert suggested that this feature of economic figural constraints needs to be explored in conjunction with present civilising processes such as the ecological movement.

Stephen Guy-Howe (University of British Columbia) used Elias's comments on the monopolization of power to read Marie de France's 'Le Chastille' (c. 1180) as illustrative of the way in which human drives and relations became subject to the civilising process, stressing the male monopoly over women's bodies and over the produce of those bodies. Ann Buckley (Cambridge University) analysed the growing number of references to Elias in publications on medieval literature and cultural studies. Tom Kemper (University of British Columbia) showed that Weber's concern with Goethe's 'Faust' provides an allegorical expression of how 'the vocation of modern man is to be locked up or divided by an invisible wall from what happens outside.' Kemper's literary approach to a sociological theme suggests new directions for studying the 'figurations' of the trial or process of civilisation.

Jorge Arndt (State University of New York, Buffalo) examined the growing literature on 'netzeitgeist' posited in the World Wide Web in order to explore aspects of the 'centre of things' which is emerging in what is usually called 'cyberspace'. In spite of a widespread impression of chaos in cyberspace, Arndt suggested 'that things in cyberspace come together in ways specific to the modern world.' (University College Dublin), provoked by the question of why is there no 'Elisian' in the United States, took the four main sections of 'The Civilising Process' and related them to aspects of American history. Mentell argued that the relevant issues are very much part and parcel of American consciousness, but have yet to be connected in the productive ways known to us through the work of Elias.

Paul Nixon (University of Cambridge) drew attention to the fact that the concepts of Kitson and Relative Autonomy applied to imaginative-expressive products are little explored in writings addressing the sociology of Norbert Elias. Elias's observations in his little known 1970 African Art exhibition catalogue, Nixon suggested, could be utilised to this end. Ulrich Teutcher (University of British Columbia) reviewed Elias's synthesis of changing attitudes towards death and dying in light of autobiographies of cancer and their narrative structures. Helmut Kuzma argued that, following Elias, it is possible to avoid the arbitrariness of relativism and to give fiction its due weight in its function to improve our means of orientation in a complex (post-) modern society.

ON A MORE PERSONAL NOTE
I would like to use this opportunity to thank all those who so generously supported this conference. I am particularly grateful to the conference delegates who made this event possible. It was a real pleasure to meet you all and to share in your knowledge of Norbert Elias and his theory of the European court civilising process.

Thomas Samuels University of British Columbia

ELIAS IN KALAMAZOO

At the 32nd International Congress on Medieval Studies held at the University of Western Michigan, Kalamazoo, USA, from 8-11 May, a session on the relevance of the work of Norbert Elias to medieval studies was organised by Ann Buckley (University of Cambridge) and Barbara Walters (City University of New York).
This conference, the principal celebration of Elias's centenary in France organised by Bernard Latour and Alain Gourrioux, has just taken place as *Figuration* 7 goes to press. A report will appear in *Figuration* 8.

**FIGURATIONAL SOCIOLOGY AND RATIONAL CHOICE THEORY – A RECENT DEBATE**

An interesting debate took place last year in the pages of The Netherlands Journal of Social Sciences (Vol. 32, no. 1, November, 1996). The protagonists were two process sociologists (Abram de Swaan and Joop Goudsblom) and a longstanding devotee of rational choice models, Siegwart Lindenberg of the University of Groningen. Abram de Swaan's early work in coalition theory employed rational choice methods, and he continued to use them in a striking blend with Eliasian historical sociology in his magnum opus of 1988, *In Cure of the State*. Goudsblom remains more sceptical of their value.

In 'Rational Choice as Process: The uses of formal theory for historical sociology', de Swaan argued that the major drawback of rational choice theory is not its individualistic approach; on the contrary, it is well suited to explain aggregate outcomes. Its main fault is rather its essentially static, or at best cyclical, character which prevents it from coming to terms with social processes in which not only variables, but in the course of time also parameters and even 'constants' must be considered as changing entities. But this is incompatible with the requirements of formal conceptualisation and statistical testing procedures. Nevertheless, in decisive episodes, human beings tend to be 'alert' and 'scheming'; the key notions of rational choice theory are too productive to be ignored by historical sociologists who would do well to incorporate them as intellectual concepts in a pragmatic manner.

In his response to De Swaan, entitled 'Rational and Other Choices: Comments on the Rational Choice Model', Johan Goudsblom expressed some reservations about the use of the rational choice model. He argued that the model is either tautological (all action is interpreted as serving 'self-interest') or incomplete, leaving out such motives as habit, affect and conviction. He criticised the assumptions underlying the model for being unrealistic and misleading, since the prosecution has the image of 'man' as singular (without social ties) and timeless (without a relevant past).

Siegwart Lindenberg, in his article 'Low Evidential Situations in the Sociological and Historical Sciences: Rational Choice as a Heuristic Device', responded to De Swaan's suggestion that in order to weed the explanation of historical processes, one needs a theory of collective action and that, in turn, necessitates the use of rational choice theory. Lindenberg tried to show that in order to safeguard against ad hoc solutions in low evidence situations, one needs guidelines on which motives are and which are not likely in a given situation of constraints. Rational choice in general could be a very suitable instrument for such a heuristic device. However, without an explicit theory of preferences, the value of rational choice theory is very limited for low evidence situations. Because of the strong dominance of economists in the field of rational choice theory, this limitation of the theory has not received the attention it deserves. It is precisely in the area of structurally embedded preferences that the rational choice heuristic device for low evidence situations should be developed further in the future.

**FEATURED BOOK REVIEW**


The editor of *Figuration* has asked me to write something about Richard Evans's book. Since I am reviewing it for the annual *Criminal Justice History* and the review still has to appear, I think it fair to restrict myself to a brief note here.

This study is over a thousand pages long. Between introduction and conclusion it consists of six chronological parts, dealing with the periods 1600–1800, 1800–70, 1870–1918, 1918–33, 1933–45 and 1945–87. The abolition of the death penalty in the GDR in 1987 forms the end of the story. Together, the six parts comprise eighteen chapters, the first of which gives a general description of the practice of capital punishment in seventeenth and eighteenth-century Germany: its public character, its declining frequency, notions of honour and dishonour connected to the executions and the punishment itself. Chapter Two deals more in detail with execution ritual, while the third discusses penal reforms at the end of the eighteenth century. The representation of executions in broadsheets, ballads and folk songs forms the subject of chapter four. At the end of the first part we are on p. 189, clearly, the bulk of the work covers the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, the period with which Evans deals in most of his publications. The subjects of chapters five to eight are: changes in modes of punishment in the first four decades of the nineteenth century; punishment and
The Prelude to the 1848 Revolution: Punishment from the Revolution to Unification. The executioners of Imperial Germany, increasing embarrassment at and attempts to increase the secrecy around the death penalty, 1880-1914; the abolitionist debate at the eve of World War I; then three chapters on capital punishment and party politics, seasoned with stories of notorious criminal cases, in the early, middle and late Weimar years; legal changes in the period 1923-9; the executioners of the Third Reich; capital punishment during World War II; the brief spell of the death penalty in West Germany and its abolition; the vestiges of the death penalty in East Germany.

From the point of view of historical theory, the identification of a long-term process of privatization of executions remains the most important element in Evans’ study. This was already the guiding theme in the long article he published about the subject in 1984 (in German translation). In this book, the process of privatization sets a much more elaborate analysis. The crucial thing is that there were not only trials toward de-emphasizing the public character of executions during the last plane when they were conducted in public, but also some public elements remaining for some time after capital punishment had been removed to within prison walls. The most conspicuous of these elements was the issuing of entry cards—often many to interested notables who came in as witnesses. The case forms a perfect illustration of Elias’s notion of the unplanned character of social processes. The official right for admitting witnesses was avoiding secrecy around the death penalty, coupled with an insistence on conducting the trial in public. The result was that the privatization of executions became an even longer-drawn out process than it would have been otherwise.

The enormous energy of the author, who, besides his voluminous study, has published several other books and edited a number of volumes, is admirable. In this study and in his other works he demonstrates an impeccable historical craftsmanship. His conclusions, however, call for critical comment. In the introductory and concluding chapters Evans reviews the work of Foucault, Elias and Arendt, in order to determine whose theory is best suited to explain the evidence about capital punishment in Germany. Evans finally opts for Arendt. It could be argued that the long-term development in attitudes toward death described by Arendt forms part of the more encompassing developments which Elias analysed in his Civilizing Process. Obviously, this is not Evans’ view; he exhibits an incomplete understanding of Elias’ contribution to historical-sociological theory. As a consequence, Evans also misunderstands my own work (see, in particular, The Spectacle of Suffering, Cambridge 1984) on several occasions, even though I consider most of his empirical evidence as support for my theory. To correct this question in detail can easily take twenty pages. Let me just make three brief points.

1. Evans tends to ignore that my Elias–based theory is about physical punishment as its totality, not only about capital punishment. Because of this, much of what he says in the concluding chapter is beside the point. The reference to Arendt, for example, is relevant for the death penalty, but less so for whipping or branding. Thus, Evans could have put his observation that many people from the lower classes (especially socialists) in late nineteenth and early twentieth-century Germany were against capital punishment, in a broader context. What about their attitude to punitive hearings? For example, did they physically discipline their children and did they do so in a more severe manner than fathers and mothers from the bourgeois society?

2. Evans lightly dismisses Elias’s views on state formation and civilisation in nineteenth and twentieth-century Germany, as expounded in his Über die Deutschen (Eng.

lish translation: The Germans). The empirical base of the dismissal is just one, unreferenced to Evans, which, he claims, shows that the German bourgeoisie around 1900 had not adopted aristocratic, warlike values. Authors such as Ute Frevert, on the other hand, have found the world of bourgeois men in Germany at this time to be militaristic. Evans also fails to note that Stetten über die Deutschen is essentially an attempt to explain the human destructiveness of the Third Reich and that the question of similarities regarding capital punishment in Germany and the rest of Europe is not the book’s subject.

3. When Evans cannot find the theorists he attacks to be wrong on scholarly grounds, he attempts to discredit them for their political beliefs, real or alleged. Not only does Elias fall victim to this, but also Foucault, whose theorists are dismissed because he is an "opponent of the Enlightenment." Conversely, Evans considers Elias as a "defender of the Enlightenment." Elias, he says, wrote Über den Prozeß der Zivilisierung ‘in defence of the traditional liberal idea of progress’ (891). Because Evans, as he explicitly states in his preface, is incapable of or unwilling to attain a measure of detachment from his own personal feelings, he thinks that others are equally incapable of doing so. Worse, he proceeds to accuse Elias of eugenicism and even states that his theory ‘implically justifies racism and imperialism’ (892). To substantiate this wholly unfounded accusation he only refers to the report about a conference at which a few others, equally unfounded, have stated the same. Needless to say, Evans does not come up with any quotation from Elias which betrays a racist conviction.

Historians will consult this book for its rich details, but its conclusions are essentially unwound.

Peter Spierenburg
Ermans University Rotterdam
RECENT BOOKS & ARTICLES


Elias's Über die Zeit, one of his most important and brilliant though ill-organised books, has now been published in France. It received a rousing review by Pierre Lepape in Le Monde on Friday 31 January. Headed 'La cinquième dimension', the quarter-page review stated in summary that 'by defining the nature of time as a practical concept linked to the evolution (sécurité) of societies, Norbert Elias drives from the field all of humans' habits of thought and even perception'. Grand claws!

SIM


Die Ballade vom Arme Jakob is the play which Elias wrote in blank verse while in imprisonment on the Isle of Man in 1940. Previously it was published only in the collection of Elias's poems, Los der Menschen, which Suhrkamp published to mark his ninetieth birthday in 1987. Now Insel Verlag have issued it on its own, as a handsome little hardback book with a foreword by Hermann Korte and with striking illustrations by the prominent German artist and cartoonist Karl-Georg Hirsch.


Figurations 2 reported the highly successful conference organised by Alain Garrigou and Bernard Lacroix in April 1994, in which the relevance of Elias's work to contemporary political science was explored. The papers have now been published in this attractive and substantial paperback. According to the blurb, this is the first book in French devoted to Elias—although, as noted elsewhere, his own books have been met with acclaim as they have appeared in French translation. Certainly this book constitutes both a good introduction to Elias's work for French readers, and presents an excellent sample of recent research by younger scholars in France inspired by Elias's ideas. I wonder whether this book is also one of the several symptoms of the emergence of a distinct and trenchant 'Naissance School' in the social sciences in France.

The Contents are:
- Alain Garrigou and Bernard Lacroix, 'Introduction: Norbert Elias: le travail d'une oeuvre' 
- Bernard Lacroix, 'Portraits sociologiques de l'auteur' 
- Catherine Collot-Thébée, 'Le concert de rationalisation de Max Weber à Norbert Elias' 
- Jacqueline Blondel, 'Enchaînements et regularités dans les sciences de la culture': en suivant Friedrich Nietzsche, Max Weber et Norbert Elias' 
- Alain Garrigou, 'Le "grand jeu" de la société' 
- Eric Duemmeg, 'Civilisation, formation de l'État et premier développement du sport moderne' 
- André Burguinha, 'Processus de civilisation et processus national chez Norbert Elias' 
- Guillaume Court, 'Norbert Elias et la construction des groupes sociaux: de l'économie psychique à l'art de se regrouper' 
- Charles Henry, 'Eléments pour une théorie de l'individuation: quand le domestique Mozart se prenait pour une libre artiste'
- Stephen Meemael, 'l'envers de la médiévale: le processus de déchristianisation' 
- Eric Phelippeau, 'Sociocratie de la profession politique' 
- Delphine Dufourn, 'Le président de la République: configuratrice et position prééminente'
- Jacques Defrance, 'Le gout de violence' 
- Johanne Goebelmann, 'Penser avec Elias'


This is, in effect, the third Messrsaler-Haus relating to Elias and his ideas, following the two edited by Gleichmann, Goebelmann and Korte in 1980, also published by Suhrkamp. This one contains essays by many younger scholars who have been working on and with Elias.

The book is organised into three sections. The first centres on Elias's work and person, and includes essays giving much new information about Elias in the years long before his fame in Breslau, his relations with Walter Benjamin, and in the Leicester years. The second section concerns the reception (and, for many years, non-reception) of his work in many different disciplines: psychology, Germanistics, literary theory, medieval studies, and history among them. The third section is devoted to theoretical comparisons: Elias in relation to Simmel, Weber, Marx, Schmitt. But the book ends very much with the present and the future: Amont Trefbel compares Elias's and Ulrich Beck's treatments of sports of individualisation, and Dirk Kässer hauls Elias in as 'a European sociologist for the twenty-first century'.

This is a most valuable book, essential reading for those interested in Elias's ideas, and their applications.
I have reviewed this book at greater length for the *American Historical Review*, but the appetite of readers of *Figurations* may be whetted by a brief note about Powelson's notable study in comparative economic history.

For a good many years, the 'Industrial Revolution' tradition among economic historians, and the 'modernisation' and related Weberian 'Protestant Ethic' theories which once appealed to many sociologists, have been under severe challenge. Both of them encouraged students of economic development to look for exceptional 'propellants', often of a cultural kind, which made development happen in Europe, European societies beyond Europe, and a few exceptional non-European cases like Japan since the Meiji Restoration. One challenge has come from Wallerstein and 'world-systems theory', the thrust of which is that initial development in Europe and its consequential trade and colonialism retarded or reversed development elsewhere. Another challenge came from Eric Jones who, in *The European Miracle* (1981) and *Growth Reversing* (1986), contended that there was a general propensity in human society towards 'extensive growth' (economic growth which is constantly outstripped by population increase so that per capita income does not grow), but that this was typically prevented from tripping over into 'intensive growth' (rising per capita incomes) by the 'rent-seeking' activities of exploitative land-owners; in other cases, including that of Song China, 'accidents' such as natural disasters or invasions stymied out intensive growth. The case of Europe was thus to be explained almost negatively — why were there that kind of accident and rent-seeking avoided?

Powelson's book brings together and synthesizes many earlier strands of thinking, but adds some distinctive ones of his own. His central thesis is that the institutions necessary for economic development are crucially formed through that he calls the 'power-diffusion process', and this operated most effectively in Japan and in north-western Europe. He begins by pushing back the beginnings of economic growth and of appropriate institutions in Japan long before the mid-nineteenth century — Japanese economic growth was by no means so much a derivative of European as has generally been thought. In both cases, the power-diffusion process operated as follows: beginning in medieval times, lower-level interest groups allied themselves with upper-level groups, exacting power in return. For example, as nobility kings, or church, competed with one another, peasant groups might join forces with either side, demanding greater power or freedom if their side won. These arrangements, across social clusters, will be called 'vertical alliances'. The application of vertical alliances to enhance power is referred to as 'fervor'. (pp. 5-6)

There follow two chapters depicting the consequences for institutions and modes of behavior favorable to economic growth arising out of the long-term struggles, bargaining and negotiation between Emperors and Shoguns, Shogun and shogun, and the holders of various rights and obligations within the Japanese manor — all before attention is turned to the more familiar ground of the institutional development of north-western Europe. What the two had in common was that: 'In thousands upon thousands of conflicts, no group could impose its will; each learned to settle for some proximate sum short of its ideal. Thus were the rules of the market, corporate enterprise, parliamentary government, financial system, and commercial laws fashioned and endowed with sustaining power. More important, the various groups came to value long-term ends more than short-term ones, and they learned that negotiation and compromise, not confrontation and violence would best achieve them.' (p. 11)

The rest of the book consists largely of showing why this pattern did not evenuate elsewhere, in spite of often favorable beginnings. Broadly speaking, authoritarian rules unchecked by an internal balance of power were able to
impose both the short-term view and institutions ill-suited to economic growth. Highly illuminating chapters deal with Africa, India, China, Russia, Spain, and Portugal, Mexico, and Central America; South America, and the Middle East. Finally, some chapters fascinatingly compare Newgordon and the medieval Italian city-states with today's Four Tigers of the Far East; examining 'the German miracle' (for Povelson argues that German history combines both 'European' and 'non-European' features); and providing a prospective glance into the twenty-first century.

Povelson's way of thinking strikingly resembles aspects of Norbert Elias's. The account of European state-formations in *The Civilizing Process* offers several parallels to Povelson's ideas. The 'power-diffusion process' appears to be identical with what Elias called 'functional democratization'. Povelson's 'leverage' is remarkably similar to Elias's account of the 'royal mechanism'. The internal pacification of territory - the importance of people being able ordinarily to live in peace together - is important to both writers, even though the one is explaining changes in typical behavior, mentality or habits and the other economic growth; his eagerness rightly to demonstrate the disastrous consequences of over-powerful central rulers, Povelson perhaps allows himself slightly to understimate the importance of the growth of central power within a balance of power as an agent of pacification.

Elias's account of 'parliamentarization' (in *Quest for Excitement*, 1986) is very similar to Povelson's. Finally, Elias stresses how lengthening chains of interdependence exert pressures on people towards greater habitual foresight - the longer-term view also important in Povelson's theory. Nevertheless, in view of the relative unfamiliarity of Elias's writings both in North America and among economic historians, it is no surprise that Elias does not feature in the bibliography of Povelson's excellent book.

P. Lindner. 'The category of space in the civilization process according to Norbert Elias.' *Anthropos* 91 (4-6) 1996: 513-524.

Abstract: In his theory of the civilization process, Norbert Elias uses several crucial concepts, which refer both to social and spatial developments without exactly defining the terms used. In fact the civilization process - described from the social point of view - implies a 'spatial process of civilization' three different levels: differentiation at the 'level of the emotional-affective private sphere', expansion at the 'level of class-specific fields of action', and a change from disintegration to integration at the 'government-territorial level'. Within these developments, natural environment gains an important role as a limit-setting factor on the one hand and as a source of power on the other, whereas various mechanisms of continuing interaction between space and society are the overall basis. Empirically founded on an analysis of European societies between the eighth and the nineteenth century, Elias's own understanding of this process as a social tectony valid all over the world seems to neglect some specific frame conditions, which forbid the application to foreign cultures.


This paper examines Norbert Elias's theories on the 'sportisation' process in the light of two hunting sports, fox-hunting and angling. While his analysis of fox-hunting is found convincing, his approach proves particularly useful in analysing the development of modern angling. The paper argues that Elias's thesis is too broadly applied, and requires a more detailed analysis of the social milieu and culture of the players involved in changing and unchanging codes of play. In addition, it argues that the relevant differences between fox-hunting and angling can only be fully explained through the analysis of changing relations between humans and animals/nature.
ELIAS CENTENARY SUPPLEMENT

ELIAS FOUNDATION CENTENARY CONFERENCE, BIELEFELD, 20-22 JUNE 1997

This conference will be held in the Zentrum für Interdisziplinäre Forschung, Bielefeld, where Norbert Elias spent the highly productive years 1978–84. Ending on the centenary date itself, the conference will be sponsored by the Elias Foundation and by the Department of Sociology, University of Bielefeld.

PROVISIONAL PROGRAMME
Friday, 20 June:

1.30  Welcome Address by Hermann Korte, Stichting Norbert Elias

PROVISIONAL PROGRAM FOR GROUP 1: REFLEXION – REVISION – ZUKUNFT DER ZIVILISATIONSTHEORIE
2.00 – 4.15  Reflexion und Revision der Zivilisationstheorie I

Chair: Annette Treibel, Karlsruhe

Helmus Kuzmics (Graz): Einführung Jörg Hackeschnidt (Bonn): 'Die Kultur der Kreise': Norbert Elias und die Zionismus-Jugend 1918–25
Peter-Ulrich Merz-Benx (Hannover): Probleme der Akteure im Kontext der zivilisationstheoretischen Perspektive
Wilhelm Mühlemann und Ilan-Peter Dourer im Vorgleich

10.45 - 12.30  Beyond the 'Problem of Order': Elias and the Question of Habit

Heinrich Kuzmics (Graz): Nationaler Habitus und Handlungstheorie
Roland Axmann (Aberdeen): The Contribution of Norbert Elias to the Debate on State Formation in Historical Sociology

12.30  Lunch Break

2.15 – 3.30  Erweiterungen und Anwendungen der Zivilisationstheorie

Chair: Helmut Kuzmics

4.30 - 6.30  Kenneth Anders (Berlin): Fortgeschrittener Humanismus oder humanitärischer Fortschritt?

Norbert Elias and the Teleologieproblem

Paul Stokes (Dublin):

The 'New Hegelians': Affinities in the Work of Norbert Elias and Gregory Bateson

Saturday, June 21:

9.15 - 10.30  Reflexion und Revision der Zivilisationstheorie II

Chair: Reinhard Blommer, Berlin

Dennis Smith (Lerester): The Civilising Process and the Care of the Self (Elias and Foucault)
Ann Buckley (Cambridge): Elias on Manesang – a Reassessment

10.30 - 12.30  Coffee

10.45 - 12.30  Robert van Krieken (Sydney): Beyond the 'Problem of Order': Elias and the Question of Habit

Heinrich Kuzmics (Graz): Nationaler Habitus and Handlungstheorie
Roland Axmann (Aberdeen): The Contribution of Norbert Elias to the Debate on State Formation in Historical Sociology

12.30  Lunch Break

2.15 – 3.30  Erweiterungen und Anwendungen der Zivilisationstheorie

Chair: Helmut Kuzmics

3.30 - 4.00  Coffee

4.00 – 6.15  Edmund Lefèvre (New York): The Informal Culture of Public Spaces in
Today's New York: Some Eliasian reflections - and some Thoughts on Elias
Helmut Letten (Rostock): Norbert Elias Konstruktion der 'satisfaction inlagen Gesellschaft'. Die Wundfragen des 'verbürgerlichten Krieges' and das Ideal des Lebens in der Distanz

Summing up and General Discussion

Reception

PROVISIONAL PROGRAMME FOR GROUP II: DECEIVISING PROCESSES

Friday, 20 June 1997

Chair: Eric Dunning

14.00 – 15.45 General Considerations on Decivilising Processes
Peter Gleichmann (Hanover): Can Humans stop Killing each Other?
Pieter Spijerenburg (Rotterdam): The Problem of Violence: Historical Processes and Present Developments
Artur Bogner (Berlin): 'Tribal' Wars in Northern Ghana in the late twentieth century

15.45 – 16.15 Coffee

16.15 – 18.30 Beyond Western Europe I
Elgin Kürsatz-Ahlers (Hanover): The Process of Decivilisation in the late nineteenth-century and early twentieth century in the Ottoman Empire
Moncef Djaïli (Lusaranne): The Figurational Dynamics of Colonial Stratification in the Middle East and its Effects on Contemporary Arab Societies: A Comparative Historical and Sociological Study
Dennie Nel (Durban): The History of Conservation in South Africa in the Light of Elias's theories
José Esteban Castro (Oxford): The Control of Water and the Civilising Process: The Valley of Mexico, from the Fifteenth to the Nineteenth Century

Saturday, 21 June 1997

Chair: Godfried van Bentheim van den Bergh

9.15 – 10.45 Beyond Western Europe II
Tom Zwaan (Amsterdam): State Disintegration, Violence and Decivilising

Processes: Yugoslavia in the Perspective of the Theory of Civilising Processes
Arpad Szakolczai (Florence): Decivilising Processes and the Dissolution of Order, with Reference to the Case of Eastern Europe
Paul Nixon (Cambridge): Civilising Processes in Eastern Europe: Coping with Decivilisation

10.45 – 11.00 Coffee

11.00 – 12.30 Meanwhile, back in Western Europe (and America)
Cas Wouters (Utrecht): Etiquette Books and Emotion Management in the Twentieth Century: American Habitas in International Comparison
Alain Garrigou, 'The Manners of Political Activity: Emotions and Civility'

Lunch Break

Chair: Richard Kilminster

14.15 – 15.30 Globalisation and Decivilising Processes I
Lutz Häning (Hamburg): Globalisierung aus Sicht der Civilisationstheorie
Paul Kaptheijns (Amsterdam): The European Mutation, Dominant or Recessive?: European Civilization in Global Perspective

15.30 – 16.00 Coffee

16.00 – 18.15 Globalisation and Decivilising Processes II
Joe Maguire (Loughborough): Global Sports and Patriot Games: Disinstituting Contracts and Increasing Varieties
Erie Dumang (Leicester): Sport in the Process of Social Stratification
Godfried van Bentheim van den Bergh (The Hague): Resilience of States, Decline of Nations: Summing-up and General Discussion


NORBERT ELIAS (1894-1990) – CENTENARY SESSION

Provisional Program
STUDENT CONFERENCE IN BELFAST
27 November 1997

Kenneth Bishop is organising a centenary conference on 'Men
ners, Emotions and Sociological Theory' at Queen's University,
Belfast. In recent years Norbert Elias's writings have found
time to work upon the teaching syllabus of a number of Irish
Universities: University College, Dublin; Queen's University,
Belfast and University of Ulster. The aim of the conference is to
take the opportunity to build upon the already expanding under-
graduate interest in Elias. Papers will be presented to Irish stu-
dents by Godfried van Berchem van den Bergh, Johan Gould-
blom, Stephen Merrnell and Kenneth Bishop. Enquiries to
Kenneth Bishop, Department of Sociology and Social Policy,
Queen's University of Belfast, Belfast BT7 INN, Northern Ire-
land. E-mail: K.Bishop@qub.ac.uk.

ORGANIZED VIOLENCE: THE FORMATION AND BREAKDOWN OF
MONOPOLIES OF FORCE - CONDITIONS AND CONSEQUENCES
Norbert Elias Centenary Conference 18-20 December 1997
AMSTERDAM

One of the pioneering contributions of Norbert Elias was to
show that the civilizing process in early modern Europe was in-
creasingly connected with the process of state formation - the
formation of increasingly more stable organisations exercising a
monopoly of taxation and force over a relatively extensive terri-
tory. As Elias made quite clear, the civilizing process did not be-
gin in Europe in the early modern age. Nor did the process of
monopolisation of organised violence. In order to explore his
ideas and to further his approach, the Norbert Elias Centenary
Conference in Amsterdam will focus on organized violence.
At the conference we propose to distinguish three stages in
the development of monopolies of organized violence:

1. A stage in which organized violence became the
monopoly of adult males, who excluded women and children
from the use of weapons. Initiation rites and taboos served to
uphold the adult males' monopoly.

2. A stage in which organized violence became the
monopoly of specialists, the warriors, to the exclusion of
other adult males. This may be called the stage of mili-
tary-urban societies, of which medieval Europe is an ex-
ample.

3. A stage during which the relatively autonomous
warrior elites were forced to yield the monopoly of violence
to central state organisations. This is the process of state for-
monization described by Elias for early modern Europe.
The three stages are part of a process model. We do not sug-
gest that at any time a process of monopolization has been
'completed'. On the contrary, it makes more sense to assume
that throughout human history the monopolization processes
have been accompanied by counter-tendencies veering to-
ward undermining the established monopolies.

The three-stage model is intended to serve as an organizing
principle for the plenary sessions of the conference. It may also
serve as the organizing principle for some of the paper
sessions. We expect that the model also may provoke discus-
sion on the possibility that humankind is in the process of en-
tering a fourth stage. If this indeed is so, the question arises of
whether the model sketched above is of any help in under-
standing current developments.

We hope that, next to the plenary sessions, the thematic paper
sessions will provide a forum and meeting point for all social
scientists who are interested in the historical comparative ap-
proach that Norbert Elias has advocated. The organizers in-
tend that no-one should feel excluded, so although the plen-
ary programme will focus on organized violence the paper
sessions will deal with other topics as well.

PROGRAMME
Thursday 18 December 1997

14.00 Introduction
prof. dr. Johan Gouldblom, University of Amsterdam

14.35 Male monopolistic rituals
dr. Ronald Glassman, New York

15.30 Male Monopolies and Collective Fantasies
prof. dr. Bonso Thoosen van Velzen, University
Utrecht

16.05 The Formation of Warrior Societies in Africa
dr. Paul Richards, Wageningen Agricultural
University

16.50 Forum with invited speakers.
First discussant: prof. dr. Igata Verbong, University
What happened to the USSR?
prof. dr. Randall Collins, University of California, Riverside
11.30 The Violent State and Supranational Monopolies of Violence
prof. dr. Abram de Swaan, University of Amsterdam/College de France
14.00 Challenges to State Monopolies: Organized Crime
prof. dr. Frank Bloemenkirk, University Utrecht
14.35 Violence in Contemporary Chinese Fiction
prof. dr. Mark Elvin, The Australian National University, Canberra
15.30 Football Hooliganism as A World Problem
prof. dr. Eric Dunning, University of Leicester, UK
16.05 Stylized Violence: Martial Arts in Contemporary Society
dr. Johan Heilbron, CNRS, Lille
16.50 Chasing forum with first discussant dr. M. van Creveld (Hebrew University of Jerusalem) and invited speakers on the topic ‘the formation and breakdown of international monopolies of violence’

Further details from: Kitty Verrins, SISWO, Plantage Muidergracht 4, 1018 TV Amsterdam, The Netherlands. Fax: +31-20-622 9430. E-mail: verrins@siswo.nov.nl

CONTRIBUTIONS TO FIGURATIONS

The next issue of Figurations will be mailed in November 1997. News and returns should be sent to the Editor by 1 October 1997.
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Editorial Address: Department of Sociology, University College Dublin, 74, Pearse Street, Dublin 2, Ireland
Tel: +353-1-706 8004; Fax: +353-1-706 1125
E-mail: stephen.mennell@iol.ie
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