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PEOPLE
• Hermann Korte has been re-elected for a further term as Treasurer of the German PEN Club. International PEN is a worldwide association of writers, originally founded in London by John Galsworthy in 1921, and claims to be the oldest human rights organisation in the world. PEN originally stood for ‘Poets, Essayists and Novelists’, although it now includes writers of any form of literature, such as journalists and historians. The organisation fights for freedom of expression and in defence of writers persecuted and imprisoned for their views.

• Nina Baur has been appointed full Professor for Methods of Social Research in the Department of Sociology at the Technical University Berlin. She will head the Department’s research group on methods of social research and will be mostly teaching qualitative and quantitative methods (‘I know’, says Nina, ‘a little boring. Most of us hate it but need it.’) Her own substantive research will be in line with the department’s specialisation in social processes and innovation, spatial sociology, market sociology and the sociology of science.

• Florence Delmotte has been appointed a Research Associate of the Fonds de la Recherche Scientifique de Belgique. The hosting university is the Facultés
universitaires Saint-Louis, Bruxelles (FUSL), which is part of the Catholic University of Louvain. Florence is attached to both the Centre d’études sociologiques (CES) and to the Centre de recherches en science politique (CReSPo). Apart gaining this secure post, Florence has also been busy producing her second child, Marcel, who arrived on 6 August weighing 3.245 kg.

- Randall Collins – whom we have always regarded as a fellow traveller or honorary member of the figurational family – has been elected President of the American Sociological Association for 2010–11. He has chosen as the theme for the 2011 Annual Meeting (13–16 August 2011 in Chicago) ‘Social Conflict: Multiple Dimensions and Arenas’. The theme statement read: ‘Social conflict is constantly in the headlines, in the breaking news, but also under the surface of social life. Wherever there is change, struggle, or domination, there is conflict. Social conflict involves many dimensions, including not only economic and power struggles, movement dynamics, and violence, but also forms of inequality and domination latent with conflict, and practices which resolve conflict or which divert attention from it. Sociology is the only social science that takes conflict as a major topic, and the only field that throughout its existence has been crucially centred on class, race, and ethnicity. New fields focused on race, ethnicity, gender, and sexuality are also concerned with conflict, but the intellectual driving force in most of these fields is a sociological perspective. There is a reason why sociologists were heavily involved in the rebellious movements of the 1960s and 70s – sociologists are experts at understanding both power and group mobilization. This has continued to be sociology’s special strength.’

- José Esteban Castro writes from Newcastle to say that he has received a large the Leverhulme Trust and is now coordinating a research network on water resources, ‘to do more work, and ready to get even more intrusive with Elias’s and other relevant theoretical insights into the worlds of grand theory and other dangerous terrains’. The network’s website is www.waterlat.org.

**EDITORS’ NOTES**

The editors apologise for the late arrival of this thirty-second issue of *Figurations* – they have both been exceptionally busy this autumn.

Readers are reminded that they should notify us – and where possible send us copies – of publications (their own or other people’s) that are relevant to *Figurations*. We try to achieve as comprehensive as possible a cover of work bearing on the ideas of Norbert Elias, but we do not have the time, staff and resources to conduct systematic bibliographical searches for each issue. We depend on you!

And, by the way, if you are sending us books or articles in languages other than English, it helps us enormously if you can also send us a short English abstract or blurb.

The attention of readers is especially drawn to the details of three conferences being held in 2010 – in Dublin in April and in Florence in October, in addition to the long-announced ISA World Congress in Göteborg in July. See page 19.

---

**FROM THE NORBERT ELIAS FOUNDATION**

The Foundation’s new website: www.norbertelliasfoundation.nl

The website of the Norbert Elias Foundation has been in a state of desuetude for several years, but now it has been completely redesigned. The new homepage looks like this:

We are in the process of thoroughly updating it, and we shall welcome suggestions for its improvement.

Please send your ideas to Katie Liston (K.Liston@ulster.ac.uk).

One new feature is a section called ‘Figurational Research Network’, in which we intend to include biographical notes and photographs of the key people in the international network – all those whose names are familiar to readers of *Figurations*, Katie will be contacting them over the next few months.

- The new website has been designed and built by Clare Spencer, who used to...
work as an administrator in the School of Sociology at UCD, and is now working at the Royal Scottish Academy of Music and Drama (RSAMD) in Glasgow. Some readers will have met Clare at the conference on ‘Elias in the twenty-first century’ in Leicester in April 2006, where she presented a paper comparing the sociological assumptions underlying the architecture of Charles Rennie Mackintosh and Le Corbusier. It is probably not a coincidence that the RSAMD is one of the most famous buildings designed by Mackintosh. Clare can be contacted at: Clare.Spencer1@gmail.com.

Giselinde Kuipers appointed Norbert Elias Professor at Rotterdam

Giselinde Kuipers has been appointed the third holder of the Norbert Elias part-time chair, which is now located at the Erasmus University Rotterdam. Giselinde was born in 1971, received an MA with distinction in cultural anthropology from Utrecht University. During her studies, she took courses in anthropology as well as psychology, philosophy, history, and sociology, including courses in civilising processes and figural rational sociology with the first holder of the Norbert Elias Chair, Nico Wilterdink. She wrote a doctoral dissertation at the Amsterdam School for Social Science Research about social differences in sense of humour, under the supervision of Joop Goudsblom. In 2001, she received her PhD in sociology with distinction. This dissertation Goede humor, slechte smaak: Een sociologie van de mop, won the Ruigrok award of the Koninklijke Hollandsche Maatschappij der Wetenschappen (Royal Dutch Society for Sciences). Her book Good Humor, Bad Taste: A Sociology of the Joke (Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2006) is a translated and expanded version of this dissertation, which compares her Dutch findings with a later, smaller study in the US. This book was a finalist for the 2007 Norbert Elias Prize.

After receiving her PhD, Gislindie worked as a lecturer in the Department of Communication Science of the University of Amsterdam, spent a year at the University of Pennsylvania, became a postdoctoral fellow at the Department of Culture and the Arts at Erasmus University, and then went back to the University of Amsterdam Sociology Department. She has published in Dutch and English on humour, popular culture, taste and stratification, media, and cultural globalisation. In the past four years, she has conducted research on the import, translation and reception of American television programs – specifically comedy, which is considered the hardest genre to translate – to four European countries: France, Italy, the Netherlands, and Poland. This study was funded by the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO). Currently, she is working a book about this project, provisionally entitled Comedy and Hegemony. Gislindie was a member of the Editorial Board of the Amsterdams Sociologisch Tijdschrift, and currently is on the editorial board of its slightly more mainstream successor, Sociologie.

Gislindie will give her inaugural lecture in the Norbert Elias Chair at the EUR on Friday 11 June 2010.

Marcello Aspria appointed Secretary to the Norbert Elias Foundation

Marcello Aspria, born in Alkmaar of Italian parents in 1974, obtained his first MSc in Sociology from the University of Amsterdam in 1997, specialising in the sociology of culture, and his second in 2009 from the International School for Humanities and Social Sciences (also in Amsterdam) – on gender, sexuality and society. He is currently pursuing his PhD in health policy and management at the Erasmus University in Rotterdam. Besides sociology, Marcello has a keen interest in perfumes and motorcycles.

Elizabeth Bernstein wins Norbert Elias Prize 2009

In choosing Elizabeth Bernstein’s book Temporarily Yours: Intimacy, Authenticity, and the Commerce of Sex (University of Chicago Press, 2007) from among the 27 books nominated for the 2009 Norbert Elias Prize, the jury wrote:

From the very first few sections onwards, Elizabeth Bernstein’s analysis in Temporarily Yours challenges preconceived notions of prostitution and sexual commerce more generally. Bernstein develops the compelling thesis that there has been a major historical shift in the character of sexual commerce and associated debates concerning the meaning of sexuality. The shift broadly follows from related trends associated with the rise of post-industrialism. In particular, we can
witness a fundamental change in ‘what is sold’ in response to the disenchantment and routinisation of inter-personal exchanges (à la Ritzer) through which commercial sex increasingly centres on ‘bounded authenticity’. ‘Working Girls’ become ‘Girlfriends for Hire’ – promoting the sale not simply of intercourse, but genuine intimacy that is both emotionally authentic and ‘bounded’ by its episodic pecuniary character. Accordingly, the understanding of ‘punters’ shifts from the image of the sexually desperate seeking transient release, to high-tech professionals unable to find time for any other means of personal connection.

Bernstein is refreshingly original and non-judgemental. Where she parts company from the likes of Andrea Dworkin, Kathleen Barry, and Sheila Jeffreys is in rejecting the a priori assumption that sex work, and the objectification of sexuality more generally, constitutes the basis for all gendered exploitation. She does so in a way that by no means discounts the endemic violence, brutality, human trafficking, subjugation, and so on that she acknowledges are widespread within the industry. Instead, her approach is to focus not so much on ‘victimized women and their exploitation by “bad men”, but on the structural factors and social locations that incline women and men toward specific labour and consumptive practices and produce particular embodied subjectivities’. In this respect, in particular, her analysis goes beyond many others in the field. She is able to historicise not just the commercialisation of sex, but in tandem with this, to shift notions of ‘normal sexuality’, including those that are unreflectively adopted by scholars in the field. Towards the end of the book, for example, she recounts a conference entitled ‘Economic Justice for Sex Workers’ in which battle lines are quickly drawn between opposing camps – the ‘criminalisation’ versus the ‘pro-sex’ lobby – in the context of which a former sex worker gives a talk discussing ‘not only the potential economic benefits but also the erotic and emotional pleasures’ for those employed in the industry. An audience member agitatedly provides the well-rehearsed riposte: ‘How could you enjoy sleeping with hundreds of men … sex is supposed to be intimate and private, with one person you love?’

And yet Bernstein is able to show, it is precisely what ‘sex is supposed to be’ that is being re-drawn, reconfigured in relation to the broader cultural and economic transitions she explicates. Indeed, ‘intimacy’ itself, she is able to document, has come to take on new forms and modalities.

This is not to discount that new forms of sex work continue to have dangers and costs to those who engage in it. Indeed, following Hochschild, Bernstein documents the potential dissolution of ‘private’ and ‘public’ subjectivity and sensuality, leaving little space for emotional or psychological retreat.

Overall, Bernstein’s analysis is ethnographically rich and theoretically sophisticated. She shows a skilful command of both the literature and the (sometimes conceptually incompatible) mix of theory she draws upon. The piece is highly scholarly, engaging, and full of insight. Put simply, we learned a great deal from reading this book.

The 2009 Chester MSc class: Anthony Maher is standing for Hire.

The 2009 Chester MSc class: Anthony Maher is standing to the right of Daniel Bloyce, holding his certificate.
on Sir Thomas More’s *Utopia* and the subsequent tradition of utopian (and dystopian) writing.

With the publication of this volume, social scientists will have no excuse to confine their attention to Elias’s theory of civilising processes alone. These essays show the vast scope and significance of Elias’s theory of knowledge, and its relevance to the practice of the social sciences.

**contents**

1. *Sociology of knowledge: new perspectives*
2. *Dynamics of consciousness within that of societies*
   - *On nature*
3. *The sciences: towards a theory*
4. *Theory of science and history of science: comments on a recent discussion*
5. *Introduction to ‘Scientific Establishments and Hierarchies’*
   - Norbert Elias and Richard Whitley
6. *Scientific establishments*
   - *On the creed of a nominalist: observations on Popper’s The Logic of Scientific Discovery*
7. *Science or sciences? Contribution to a debate with reality-blind philosophers*
8. *Thomas More’s critique of the state: with some thoughts on a definition of the concept to utopia*
9. *What is the role of scientific and literary utopias for the future?*

Like previous volumes in the series, this has been very carefully edited and annotated to improve the readability of the texts: sadly, it appears that the first editions of most of Elias’s works in English escaped the attentions of competent copy-editors, a lacuna that has now been remedied.

Especially because of the higher standard to which these volumes have been produced, which makes Eliass’s texts much more accessible both to students and scholars, it is important that they find their way into university libraries throughout the world.

You can buy copies of the volumes at a discount of 20 per cent on the published price, if you order direct from the publisher, via the website: www.ucdpress.ie.

This is the third, in order of publication, of three volumes of Elias’s mature essays, and the ninth volume of the 18 that will constitute the Collected Works.

Previously published volumes in the series are:

5. *Involvement and Detachment* (2007)

The next in the series to appear, scheduled for early in 2010, is volume 6, containing *The Loneliness of the Dying* and (for the first time in English) *Humana Condita*. Shortly after that will be published volume 12, *Mozart and Other Essays on Courtly Art*; besides the long essay on Mozart, this volume will contain two other major essays that have not previously been published in English: ‘The fate of German Baroque poetry’ and ‘Watteau’s Pilgrimage to the Island of Love’.

**YET ANOTHER ANECDOTE ABOUT NORBERT ELIAS**

David Kettler recalls his ‘favourite Norbert Elias moment’. He writes: ‘It was 1978. I’d seen in the *New York Review of Books* that Richard Sennett would be hosting a day-long conference at NYU in honour of the first volume of *The Civilizing Process*, which had just been published, and I did something I hadn’t done before and have barely done since: I went to the conference (driving down from Ontario) without having any paper to present or careerist business to transact. Nevertheless, I was somehow recruited to serve as moderator for a session at which Elias was presenting on the sociology of time. I have to set the scene. He and I were on a low riser at one end of a sort of reception hall, and the floor was taken up with about twenty rows of free-standing gilt-edged chairs, maybe eight and eight on either side of an aisle. The room was moderately full.

He had finished his presentation and I opened the floor to questions. Things went in the usual way until a very attractive young black woman in one of the last rows at the very back asked whether it wasn’t true that the argument he’d presented followed quite closely a major theme initiated by Durkheim and pursued by his students. Elias bounced off the riser and rushed three-quarters of the way down the aisle. Gesticulating, he called out in voice made a little shrill by his excitement: “Young woman”, he said, “young woman, you must not listen to those old codgers!” “All I can remember after that is everyone falling about laughing,” Elias was 81 at the time.

**ON FACIAL EXPRESSIONS**

In *The Expression of the Emotions in Man and Animals* (1872) Charles Darwin presented a systematic study of facial expressions in humans and other mammals. The study provided important evidence for the universality of human facial expressions, supporting theory of a common derivation from mammalian ancestors. During the early twentieth century much anthropological research was directed at supporting the opposite view, that facial expressions were entirely cultural affair, learned
during the course of childhood socialisation. Now new research published in Current Biology and conducted at the University of Glasgow suggests that the anthropologists may have had a point and that ‘people from different cultures read facial expressions differently’...

In fact the research does not contradict Darwin as much as the headline makes it appear. The expression of emotions is very much genetically regulated and there are behavioural tropes that we share with other mammals. But at the same time, culture seems to be very important in regulating how these genetic predispositions are expressed by humans. The researchers suggest that some of the difference between Asian and European patterns of expression may be to do with the social acceptability of emotional display in different cultures.

This should be very interesting to Elia- sian researchers interested in the differential societal regulation of emotions and the impact of civilising processes on facial expressions. One aspect of the research that Elias would certainly have appreciated is the methodology. Researchers examined the ‘emoticons’ current in the virtual cultural worlds of Asian and European cyberspace. They found significant differences, particularly in the extent to which these graphics referred to the eyes or the entire face. Thus a Western ‘happy’ :-) corresponded to an Eastern (^_^), and the Western ‘sad’ :-( corresponded to the Eastern ;_; or T_T and the Western ‘surprise’ :-0 corresponded to the Eastern (o.o). ‘The Eastern emoticons are not only the right way up but focus on the eyes, whilst in the West the mouth is important’.

Here again, like the ‘marshmallow test’ [reported in Figurations 30], is another piece of natural science research dealing with the interface between biological (neuro-physiological, ontogenetic and phylogenetic) processes and social processes – an area where Elia- sian sociology should be, but as far as I am aware is not, making a contribution. Anyway, at least on the sociology side, the field is clear. Funding bodies – please don’t all rush at once!

Steve Quilley
Keele University

References
For the BBC report see http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/sci/tech/8199951.stm
For academic research in this area see http://www.kasrl.org/facial_expression.html


THE STATUE OF A GREEK BOXER

I would normally hesitate before inflicting my holiday snaps on readers of Figurations, but I make an exception for those I took of the statue of a Greek boxer that is almost the first major work one encounters on entering the Museo Nazionale Romana, Palazzo Massimo, in Rome. In Quest for Excitement, Elias writes:

‘Kicking the shins of an opponent was a normal part of the boxing tradition in antiquity. The hands and the upper parts of four fingers were bound with leather thongs fastened to the forearm. Fists could be clenched or fingers stretched and, with hard nails, rammed into the opponent’s body and face. As time went on, soft leather thongs gave way to harder thongs specially made from tanned ox-hide. These were then fitted with several strips of hard thick leather with sharp projecting edges. The statue of a seated boxer by Apollonius of Athens (first century BC), now in the Museo Nazionale in Rome, shows the arrangement fairly clearly.’

Besides the hands, the photographs also clearly show the boxer’s bruised face. If I had taken these holiday snaps a year earlier, I would have been tempted to include them in the new Collected Works edition of Quest for Excitement.

Stephen Mennell

New light on Frankfurt, 1930–33

This is a marvellous book, containing much fascinating new information on the brief but scintillating years that Karl Mannheim, with Norbert Elias as a principal Assistant, spent in the chair of Sociology at the University of Frankfurt. By our friends ‘the Mannheim gang’ (no doubt they call us ‘the Elias gang’), it is based on three academic lifetimes’ copious archival research, supplemented by personal conversations over the decades with survivors – now deceased – of those Frankfurt years. Some of what Kettler, Loader and Meja have to relate may be familiar to those who have read Hermann Korte’s Über Norbert Elias and Reinhard Blomert’s Intellectuelle im Aufbruch, but most of the detail was not previously known to me.

The authors’ key thesis is that, from the later years in Heidelberg, Karl Mannheim was moving steadily away from his more philosophically and politically orientated early work towards a closer and closer engagement with the work of Max Weber, and defining himself more exclusively as a professional sociologist. The book begins with three chapters tracing Mannheim’s intellectual development, as lucid an exposition as one would expect from this source. A recurrent theme is Mannheim’s relationship to the Weber brothers, Max and Alfred. Alfred ‘had served as Mannheim’s mentor and patron during his years as a candidate and Privatdozent at Heidelberg [but] it was Max’s work that became ever more important to Mannheim …’ (p. 3). In his autobiographical essay in Reflections on a Life, Elias recalls the angry dispute that suddenly erupted at the 1928 meeting of the German Sociological Association between Alfred Weber and Karl Mannheim in the discussion of Mannheim’s paper on the importance of competition in the intellectual field; but the breach between them was evidently not total because, one learns here, the two subsequently ran a joint seminar to ‘talk through’ the issues in debate (p. 85). According to Elias, Alfred had interpreted Mannheim’s thesis as an attack on Max, but that would seem to run contrary to Kettler et al.’s central message.

Whatever the exact state of his relations with Alfred Weber, Mannheim shortly accepted the call to the chair of sociology at Frankfurt, where he established an ‘intensive research group’ to pursue Weber’s intellectual legacy through students’ doctoral projects of a ‘theoretical–empirical’ character (as Elias would later term it). Mannheim encouraged students to do research on topics related to some conflict they experienced in their own lives – something that Elias continued to encourage. The diverse array of projects seem to have been held together partly through the seminar focusing on research methods – which at first sounds almost as boring as modern sociology. Mannheim even had some interest in ‘American’ research methods, although he recognised the unacceptable intellectual narrowing to which an exclusive emphasis on them would (and did) lead. Elias apparently played a leading part in this enterprise; again at first glance it seems surprising to find the young Elias leading discussions on ‘methods’. Later he said that while he did not have a ‘methodology’, he did perhaps have a ‘method’, and in a note to himself summed it up as ‘Makrostrukturen durch die Untersuchung von Mikrostrukturen sichtbar zu machen’.

Also of great significance was the group founded by Mannheim and Adolf Löwe concerned with the development of liberalism (the Liberalefliegengruppe to which Elias referred). Over the two years of its existence, participants in the seminar also included the political scientist Ludwig Bergsträsser, the historian Ulrich Noack, the philosopher and theologian Paul Tillich, Hannah Arendt and her husband Günther Anders, Hans Gerth, Jacob Katz, Hans Weil and Kurt H. Wolff.

We tend to think that Mannheim made an easy transition to academic life in Britain, unlike Elias and many others among the Frankfurt group who struggled to re-establish themselves, but Kettler et al. stress that he made many efforts to reconstitute a similar research group in exile, but all failed.

The authors speak generously of ‘the most influential work arising out of [Mannheim’s] research group, the remarkable achievements of Norbert Elias’ (p. 34). Elias is the subject of the first of a series of chapters dealing with the work of members of the Frankfurt group. It is slightly oddly headed ‘Norbert Elias and the sociology of external forms’ – the reason being that the focus is on Elias’s Habilitationsschrift, ‘Der höfische Mensch’, with its remarkable opening chapter on ‘The structure of dwellings as an indicator of social structure’ – apparently unchanged in Die höfische Gesellschaft when that was eventually published almost four decades later. (It is sad that the Habilitationsschrift, having long been mislaid until it came to light in the mid 1960s, has disappeared again since the publication of the revised and expanded version.). The authors write that:

‘what Elias brings to the wider research project is, first, a curiosity and capac-
ity for detail that stands in productive tension to Mannheim’s more sweeping and occasionally more essayistic constructions, something that brings Elias consistently closer in the actual body of his work to the shared programmatic commitment to empirical grounding. Second, Elias has a more vivid awareness than Mannheim of the violence that social and political constitutions suppress, channel and manage … Unlike Mannheim, Elias did not think that there was always somewhere a mutually advantageous, if also sometimes asymmetrical and provisional, settlement to be negotiated’ (p. 79).

All in all, Kettler and his colleagues tend to imply that Elias was primus inter pares among the students and ‘postdocs’ (as they would now be called) who assembled around Mannheim in Frankfurt. That accords with Elias’s own self-estimate. Some years ago, there was a gentle dispute between Kettler et al. and Richard Kilminster, who contended that Elias ‘influenced’ Mannheim as well as the other way round. ‘Although we have never reached complete agreement with him’, the authors write, they ‘are grateful for Kilminster’s open-mindedness and helpful communications over the years’ (p. 75n).

Yet much of the value of this book rests in what it has to say not so much about Elias, but about others in the research group. Chapter 6 deals with Hans Gerth (to whom Mannheim awarded part of the Assistant’s salary he had been paying Elias!) and Hans Weil, focusing on their work on the genealogy of early German liberalism and the rise of the ideal of Bildung. (Elias once told me – I can’t find it in his writings – that the early origins of Über den Prozess der Zivilisation lay in work on French liberalism in connection with this seminar.) Chapter 7 is concerned with Kathie Truhol, who wrote her dissertation on her own profession of social work and its relation to the state bureaucracy. Next comes a chapter on Natalie Halperin and Margarete Freundenthal. Halperin wrote on eighteenth-century German women authors of novels of ‘sensibility’. Freundenthal, who was a special friend of Elias’s, studied women’s role in the household, using for instance the household accounts of the Goethe family between 1760 and 1830. The authors note her ‘puzzling neglect’ of questions of the erotic, as well as her indifference to legal aspects of women’s status (which had been tackled by Marianne Weber). Elias mentioned Freundenthal especially in the context of an expedition they made to Switzerland in early 1933, to explore the possibility of obtaining academic posts there. The trip was apparently on Mannheim’s initiative, and its occasion was to present papers at the meeting of the International Institute of Sociology; it is a pleasant thought that figurational sociologists have been busy presenting papers at the two most recent conferences of the IIS, in Budapest in 2008 and Yerevan in 2009. Freundenthal eventually settled in Israel.

Chapter 9 deals with Jacob Katz’s dissertation on the origins of Jewish assimilation in the same period and social group – the Bildungsbürgertum – as Gerth’s study. Katz was fortunate – given the topic and his own Jewishness – to be one of the small number of students who were able to have their theses accepted at Frankfurt after Mannheim’s dismissal and the dispersal of the research group. Not so Nina Rubinstein, the subject of chapter 10, whose thesis concerned aristocratic émigrés at the time of the French Revolution. The daughter of Menshevik refugees herself, she initially planned to write a comparative study of the French aristocrats and of the White Russian refugees from the Russian Revolution. Elias appears to have taken a particular interest in her work, and may have influenced her towards a more manageable project, especially as a study of the French émigrés followed neatly from his own interest in die höfische Gesellschaft. Her thesis had been submitted to Mannheim shortly before his dismissal on 13 April 1933. Somehow, she persuaded a brownshirt to retrieve it for her from his office. It again went missing in Paris, once again to be retrieved after the war. Rubinstein moved to New York and the New School, but eventually abandoned her studies in favour of a career as an interpreter at the United Nations. Her story has a touching end many years later, when in 1989 the University of Frankfurt at last approved her thesis for the award of her doctorate – at the age of 81 – when her examiners included Jürgen Habermas and David Kettler.

Apart from the students who worked within the ‘intensive research group’, there were also several notable students who negotiated their thesis topics directly with Mannheim. These are discussed in chapter 11, and included Hans Speier, Gisèle Freund and Kurt H. Wolff. Freund, famous as a photographer and for her pioneering work – submitted to the Sorbonne – on the sociology of photography, was a lifelong friend of Elias’s. Kurt Wolff, who after a period of difficulty, made a good career at Ohio State and Brandeis, was in effect the final guardian of Mannheim’s flame.

This is an absorbing book for anyone interested in fleshing out Elias’s often rather vague allusions to this formative period in his intellectual career.

Stephen Mennell

Abstract: Kenneth Waltz’s structural realism abstracts the international political domain from other spheres of social interaction to explain recurrent patterns of competition and conflict across the millennia. There are similarities between the structural-realist ‘grand narrative’ and the process-socio-logical approach developed by Norbert Elias. But the latter supported ‘high-level synthesis’ in the social sciences in order to understand how relations between material, ideational and emotional forces have contributed to the growth of human interconnectedness. He argued that one of the purposes of the social sciences is to increase knowledge of how humans can gain greater control of processes that bind them together in global networks of interdependence. Elias was opposed to partisan inquiry such as Kant’s notion of a universal history with a cosmopolitan intent. But their shared emphasis on how humans have developed the ability to cause more destructive forms of harm over greater distances reveals how future grand narratives can combine the analysis of growing interconnectedness with the cosmopolitan argument for advances in transnational solidarity.


Abstract: This thesis is an effort to apply Elias’s thinking on social development to the Chinese social situation. At first glance his account of the civilising process would appear incompatible with this context, in that, after state formation with the Qin and Han dynasties beginning in 221 BC, Chinese civilisation remained both stable and highly traditional for well over two millennia. It is argued, however, that closer scrutiny reveals a process that was merely interrupted for a considerable period. The traditional system relied upon a symbiotic relationship between local society and the centre whereby the centre remained relatively small and aloof, not interfering with local social relations, as long as local society provided the required taxes and labour. In this situation the state had the monopolies of both violence and taxation that Elias would look for, but left local society to its own devices primarily because it was already pacified. This self-reinforcing system was enshrined and codified in the Confucian canon over the course of centuries from the Han dynasty. Central control of the distribution of resources was eventually required to re-start the Chinese civilising process, for this was the mechanism through which the local social structure would finally be altered. This only happened within the past century as the Chinese people struggled to grapple with their own ‘backwardness’ in the face of incessant Western and Japanese incursions. At this point the old system was toppled and replaced by progressively more aggressive central governments who saw as their most important task the destruction of the traditional social order in the interest of modernisation. As the Chinese state consciously and forcibly took control of the distribution of resources at all levels of society, traditional social relations were stretched and warped, and the Chinese civilising process re-commenced its long-stalled march toward modernisation. This has been evidenced both by the dramatic growth in mobility and the rapidly extending chains of interdependence in the form of connections primarily during the Post-Opening period after 1978.


This thesis is based on two periods of participant observation – one conducted as a ‘military cadet’ at the Australian Defence Force Academy, the other as a ‘police recruit’ at the Australian Federal Police College. The thesis attempts to provide an answer to the question of what, in pacified ‘civilised’ societies, shapes and motivates individuals to join state institutions of violence. It answers this by exploring the habitus of the individuals and groups involved in these figurations, as well as the development of the broader figurations within which modern military and police institutions originate, particularly processes of state formation. The thesis builds upon Norbert Elias’s influential work on the historical trans-
formation of violence, as well as his connection of the development of individuals' sense of self and the structures of everyday interaction to large scale, long term social development.

In order to explore how state institutions of violence develop and are maintained and populated in 'civilised' societies where social violence has been increasingly 'confined to the barracks', particular attention is paid to processes of civilising, disciplining, nationalising, gendering and professionalising violence.

The thesis concludes with an outline of a possible future shaped by cosmopolitan politics, in the context of contemporary violence.


Abstract: This article examines the social significance of Real Tennis among the Western European nobility during its heyday of the sixteenth century. Underpinned theoretically by Norbert Elias’s seminal work The Civilising Process, this article seeks to identify the societal preconditions for the emergence of Real Tennis, and provide explanations for its diffusion across Western Europe and subsequent boom in popularity among the nobility. A critique is offered of the current body of literature written on Real Tennis, with an aim of addressing a general lack of focus on the game’s ‘social’ elements and how their development is linked with structural changes to the game over the centuries. The article then goes on to examine the ways in which Real Tennis became a symbol of prestige and a tool for social mobility among the increasingly status-competitive royal court nobility. Played during royal festivals, the game provided opportunities for nobles to engage in conspicuous consumption through architectural, clothing and gambling displays; having an entourage in accompaniment to the noble players; and, through the style of play and behavioural control, exhibiting self-restraint and foresight. Overall, an attempt is made to apply Elias’s theoretical framework to aid our understanding of the development of Real Tennis, a game that has never been characterised by overt ‘violence’ of the kind examined previously by other sociologists employing an Eliasian framework.


Abstract: This thesis is a theory proposing and theory-testing study that examines the conditions of state survival in the Middle East. In contrast to the predominant Political Culture and Political Economy approaches, which focus on domestic factors to account for state survival in the Middle East, this thesis suggests that, more than the individual characteristics of states themselves, state survival in that region is a function of the anarchic state system.

This thesis examines states as a ‘process’ situating them in time and place. It shows that Middle Eastern states are at once in the early phases of state formation as well as late comers to the international state system. This ontological status contributes to the vulnerability of these states to systematic forces, which in turn shapes their internal development. A major dilemma facing the late-forming state is between regime survival and political incorporation.

The first part of this thesis examines the literatures on the state, the Middle East state, and state survival. The second part proposes a Historical Structuralism model and then examines the ontology of the state in the Middle East, specifying the conditions and variables of state survival. The third part presents an empirical examination of the cases of Saudi Arabia and Iraq.


Summary: Nuclear weapons have intended beneficial consequences. They compelled the major powers to avoid war among themselves, even as they conducted an arms race and competition in the Third World.

Over time, the restraint imposed by nuclear weapons leads to security cooperation ‘within rivalry’. Nuclear weapons do not enable their possessors to gain positive political results, for example, through blackmail or territorial aggrandisement. In this sense, nuclear weapons help produce stability and order.

The positive effects of nuclear weapons can and should be achieved at drastically lower numbers than the United States and Russia currently possess. The non-proliferation regime should be improved in order to prevent destabilising rapid proliferation, and non-discriminatory measures should be part of this improvement.


The idea of praxis was explored in the 1960s, contemporaneously with the publication of an English translation of History and Class Consciousness, the early writings of Hungarian Marxist Georgy Lukacs. Reminding us that Marx entitled the first volume of Capital ‘The Process of Production’, his dynamic, processual and revolutionary brand of Marxism inspired many would-be radicals by its contrast with the official Marxism of the Eastern Bloc (and Western European communist parties). Like Elias, his notion of social figurations going through long-term processes of change as the motor of history represented a dynamic breakthrough from the rigidities of previously held versions of necessary stages of historical development.

When Lukacs wrote in the 1920s, he was countering the determinism represented by the Second International Marxism of Kautsky and Plekhanov, the leading theoreticians of Western social democracy and Russian menshevism. By the 1960s and 1970s this ‘objectivist’
brand of Marxism was associated with Althusser and the structuralists. The political sense of liberation represented by the Paris uprising in May 1968 gelled with Lukács’s revolutionary ‘subjectivism’, which affirmed that the working class could make history in the dynamic process of making social change. Like his contemporary Antonio Gramsci, Lukács was centrally involved in a revolutionary uprising in 1919, in Turin and Budapest respectively. Both sought what Lukács called ‘the algebra of revolution’; both wrestled with the ways in which the state and its rulers hegemonised, and the tactics of the resistance; and both wrote in a style that was both suggestive whilst being open to a range of interpretations. Ninety years on, this article explores the extent to which these two ‘Western Marxists’ agree, and still provide relevant insight, and how linked ideologies from contemporaries such as Mannheim and Elias, and later Wacquant, have further developed ‘praxical’ sociology.


Abstract: Borrowing from Norbert Elias, we introduce the habitus of restraint to the study of security communities. This habitus constitutes a key dimension of the glue that holds security communities together. The perceived compatibility of practices emanating from the habitus that members hold fosters the collective identity upon which a security community is built. The violation of a member’s habitus by the practices of another member, however, disrupts the reproduction of collective identity and triggers a crisis of the security community. Our analysis of Germany’s reaction to Washington’s case for war against Iraq provides empirical evidence for the salience of the habitus for the internal dynamics of security communities.

**Tito Bachmayer and Nico Witterdink,** ‘Salsa is class: a study of the relationships between status characteristics of Latin American immigrants and their preferences for different styles of salsa music’, *Sociologie* 5: 3 (2009), pp. 343–75.

Abstract: This articles reports the results of a study of differential taste preferences for one popular music genre: salsa. It is based on in-depth interviews with 40 Latin American immigrants in Switzerland and the Netherlands. During the interviews eight recorded pieces of salsa music that represent different styles within the genre were played and respondents’ spontaneous appreciations were noted. The empirical findings show a clear and fairly strong connection between taste preferences and status/class indicators, particularly education and to a lesser extent occupational status and social origins. High-status respondents tended to prefer those pieces and styles that were classified as artistically worthwhile by professional experts in salsa music, whereas low-status respondents showed much more appreciation for pieces and styles that experts had classified as popular, commercial, and artistically inferior. In connection with this, respondents also differed in their stated preferences for other musical genres, styles, and pieces as well as in the reasons they gave for their preferences: while high-status respondents tended to stress traits like complexity, originality and textual substance as reasons for their appreciation, low-status respondents said more often that they liked the music because it invited to dancing, had emotional value for them, or was performed by a singer with a beautiful voice. All in all, these results largely confirm Bourdieu’s distinction theory for this specific ‘popular’ genre, and call in question studies that conclude to a shift from status distinction, cultural exclusivity and ‘snobbery’ toward cultural ‘omnivorosity’. High-status respondents in this study tended to combine their preferences for certain salsa styles and pieces with an appreciation of ‘legitimate’ musical (sub)genres, and could be said to be ‘cultural omnivores’ in this sense; but this ‘omnivorosity’ went hand in hand with status-related distinctions and even exclusivity. This conclusion suggests that whereas the significance of hierarchical distinctions between cultural genres has become weaker in Western societies during the last few decades, the significance of more specific hierarchical distinctions within genres – in particular genres classified as popular – has increased.


*Norbert Elias and Globalization*, edited by Akira Ohira, is a collection of essays that address two related strands of thought in Elias’s work. The first is the relationship between Elias’s civilising process, modernity and globalisation theory. The second is directly concerned with power relationships within the framework of established and outsider groups.

Snowdon’s contribution places Elias within the cosmopolitan intellectual cultural context in which he grew up, making clear that concern about the social forces which are often grouped under the label ‘globalisation’ is by no means as novel as we are sometimes led to believe.

The essays by Ohira, Manning and Waddington concerning aspects of sport in the tradition of Elias and Dunin in *Quest for Excitement* (1986) show how the historical development of sport and the contexts in which they are performed provide empirical studies of civilising social forces in action. Not only that, they also demonstrate that far from being oppositional concepts, the nation and globalisation are intimately connected, simultaneously challenging and reinforcing each other. The dialectical relationship between the national, sub-national and supra-national is also elucidated in Bacon’s essay on the development of the European Union.

The essays by Ohira on Japanese literature, Oliphant on disability and Manning on stigmatisation present the depth of Elias’s thinking on the articulation of power in society that is put into the context of sociological practice if read in conjunction Wada’s essay comparing Elias’s civilising process with Max Weber on modernity.
There is a distinctly Japanese flavour to the volume with four of the essays presenting case studies from Japan. The juxtaposition of these with the contributions that address subjects within cultural contexts more familiar to Elias serves to emphasise the applicability of Eliasian concepts beyond Europe. It is hoped that this book is a useful contribution to those seeking to combat the reifying dead hand of cultural essentialism.

This believed to be the first book about Elias and things Eliasian to be published in English in Japan


Abstract: Resistance to Europe is inseparable from ‘sovereignism’ or Euroscepticism. The indifference of some citizens to European integration is also significant, although its definition and measurement are difficult. However, is emotional identification essential to the legitimacy of the European Union? As Norbert Elias’s description of state and nation shows so well, there is often a lag between the emergence of a political entity and the development of a community membership feeling. This subjective integration is not primarily based on self-esteem or the opposition to others. In the modern era democratisation is in fact also producing national or post-national identities.


Summary: Initially a local affair without much international involvement, the Habré affair was seized upon by international NGOs at the end of the 1990s, and subsequently became caught up within a global issue, that of universal jurisdiction. Despite the mobilisation of the international NGO community, no effort to bring the former president of Chad to trial has so far succeeded. Drawing on Elias’s game models, it is demonstrated how the increase in the number of actors and their interdependences lead to a lack of mastery of the game and bring the actors into an unexpected figuration. Hence the multitude of U-turns in the Habré affair: Senegal, which in 2001 was refusing to bring Habré to trial, is now adopting laws to that end; the 1993 Belgian law on universal jurisdiction on which the international NGOs were going to rely on was repealed.


Artistic and scientific activities pertain to the world of ‘vocation’, which demonstrates a close relationship with recognition issues. Referring to recent trends in French, German and American sociology and political philosophy, this article addresses both the status of recognition in present-day sociology and the necessity of prizes in vocational activities. Grounded on two empirical surveys about literary and scientific prizes, it displays the various axiological problems raised by such a mode of recognition, as the ‘felicity conditions’ of this mode of recognition have to ensure a feeling of justice and avoid envious reactions. On a more theoretical ground, the article aims to demonstrate the necessity for sociology to shift, first, from material to ‘symbolic’ or, rather, ‘intangible’ outcomes; second, from a concern with power and domination to a concern with interdependency; and third, from recognition conceived as egalitarian respect to recognition conceived as un-egalitarian esteem.


This paper reconsiders the relationships between feminist perspectives and the figurational/process-sociological perspective of Norbert Elias for understanding gender, sport and sport-related activities. The main aim of the article is to respond to Colwell’s claim that there are differences between feminist and figurational approaches to understanding and explaining gender that potentially negate the possibility of being a feminist and figurational sociologist at the same time. The paper makes a contribution to the wider discussions about the adequacy of Elias’s work in understanding gender and sport, and the potential of blending feminist and figurational perspectives on sport and gender. It introduces the principles underlying feminist and figurational approaches to sociology. The key features of the ongoing debate about the differences between feminist and figurational approaches are briefly outlined. I reply to Colwell’s criticisms of my work and revisit issues surrounding the role of values and evaluation in sociology. Involved-detachment is introduced as a feminist interpretation of Elias’s theory of ever changing balances of involvement–detachment. The final part of the paper presents some reflections about working with involved-detachment in specific research on women’s involvement in sport-related fitness activities.


Two papers in the European Physical Education Review by Sarah Colwell (‘Feminisms and Figurational Sociology: Contributions to Understandings of Sports, Physical Education and Sex/Gender.’ European Physical Education Review, 5: 3 (1999): 219–40 [see Figurations 13]) and Louise Mansfield [see abstract immediately above] have argued respectively against, and in favour of, a potential synthesis between feminism and figurational sociology as a vehicle for making more adequate sense of physical education and sport. This paper offers both selective summaries and reflections upon some of the theoretical implications arising from this exchange, specifically as it relates to sport in schools. The first sections
offer some remarks about sociological theory and the ways in which the theoretical endeavour is bound up with what C. Wright Mills has termed ‘the sociological imagination’, one aspect of which has included the relatively recent emergence of a more reflexive, democraticising and synthesising generation of sociologists. The paper concludes that we do not have either to agree or disagree with Calwell or Mansfield. Nor is there a need for a present-centred approach to, or resolution of, the theoretical issues arising from the exchange. Rather, there is scope for stimulating further this kind of dialogue between researchers of physical education, sport and gender and being well versed in these concerns.


Aldo Leopold in ‘The Land Ethic’ in *A Sand County Almanac and Sketches Here and There* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1949), p. 225 made the case for an environmental ethic as both a moral imperative and an unfolding historical process. In *The Civilising Process*, Norbert Elias shows how, in all societies, the moulding of personality and the internalisation of affective constraints on behaviour are linked to long-term processes of social development. In terms of a common root in Darwinian/Humean naturalism, an understanding of the land ethic as an ‘ecological civilising process’ can shed light on the sociogenetic mechanisms which are transforming, albeit slowly, the ‘foundations of conduct’ toward the environment. In this transformation, expanded notions of kinship and proximity provide the basis for the deontological identification of community with the biosphere.


This chapter describes Norbert Elias’s impact on organisational sociology. The aim of this handbook is to re-assert the importance of classical sociology to the future of the study of organisations. The volume includes chapters on Marx, Weber, Durkheim, Simmel, Parsons and some twenty other European and American scholars. The chapter on Elias concentrates on the importance of his theory of the civilising process. When brought into the context of contemporary work organisations, Van Iterson argues, Elias’s approach is rich in implications for the behavioral and emotional aspects of trends towards empowerment, teleworking, 24-hour working day, despecialisation, and multitasking.


Abstract: Taking Norbert Elias’s work on the concept of civilisation as their cue, the authors explore the long history of the ‘civilising process’ in Ireland, showing how a dichotomy between the civilised and the barbarians is central to English colonialism there. Examining comparative examples such as the colonisation of North America and Australia, justifications of the violence of the colonisers are surveyed to show their reliance on the idea of civilising a racially inferior people. That inferiority can be demonstrated, in different contexts, by a nomadic lifestyle, a lack of industrialness or a different religion. ‘Civilisation’, it is argued, is the process of rendering colonial subjects fit for purpose, first by transforming resistance into subjection and, finally, recruiting ‘natives’ as actively co-opted citizens. This process is examined in depth in the Irish context, with particular focus on the early conquest, the seventeenth-century Plantations and the eighteenth-century Famine. The symbolic ritual humiliation that continues to be imposed on nationalists in Northern Ireland – for example, compulsory poppy-wearing – shows that the Irish are still required to prove their ‘civilisation’.


Interpreting sources that stretch over a period of more than a century causes major methodological problems. For every type of source, different pragmatic contexts exist on the level of the generation of these data (administrative, audience-directed etc.) that determine also the possible uses for descriptive and explanatory purposes. This paper argues that although these problems should not be neglected it is, nevertheless, possible to overcome them in a reflexive, theoretically informed way. The example discussed here is how to verify the assumption of a stable habitus: Most Habsburg commanders and officers seemed to have lacked the readiness to take (calculated) risks and initiative – the qualities of good leadership. Can we explain lacking success in war by a specific Austrian military habitus? This paper tries to solve this puzzle by analysing selected autobiographies, official files, literary sources and semi-official regimental histories that contain descriptions and declarations of the relevant emotions that steered the behaviour of Austrian officers and commanders throughout this period of more than a century.

**Anthony Maher**, ‘The inclusion of pupils with special educational needs: a study of the formulation and implementation of the National Curriculum Physical Education’. Unpublished MSc thesis in the Sociology of Sport and Exercise, Department of Sport and Exercise Sciences at the University of Chester, 2009. [Winner of the 2009 University of Chester Norbert Elias Prize]

The thesis examines the planned and unplanned outcomes that are associated with the inclusion of pupils with Special Educational Needs (SEN) in the National Curriculum Physical Education (NCPE) 2000. This involved the use of the key concepts and assumptions that underpin the figuralational perspec-
tive to examine, firstly, the emergence of disability as a social issue in the wider society and, subsequently, secondary school education. In this regard, the thesis highlights how wider social processes such as the campaigns undertaken by the disabled people’s movement, and international policy developments such as the Salamanca Statement (UNESCO, 1994) contributed, to varying degrees, to the increasing power chances of disabled people generally in the wider society. Subsequently, one outcome of these processes was that the British Government were constrained to provide all pupils with the opportunity to be educated in mainstream schools.

The figurational approach and, in particular, Elias’s game models ([What is Sociology?, chapter 3] were then used to analyse the NCPE 1992, 1995 and 2000 documents, and their associated consultation materials. This approach was used because it was argued that Elias’s theoretical framework may allow the researcher to identify all the major players – that is, the whole relational network – involved in the formulation of the NCPE, and the extent to which the objectives of each player, and their subsequent power struggles with each other, impacted upon the NCPE’s overall objectives and content. In this regard, the thesis suggests that the British Government were able to constrain, to varying degrees, the power and actions of the PE Working Groups by setting the format for the Groups’ recommendations, the groups they should consult, and the time scale within which they were expected to complete their consultation and recommendations. This resulted in the outcomes generated from these formulation processes being largely understood in relation to the government’s elite sports performance objectives, with ‘inclusion issues’ being at the periphery of their objectives for PE.

Elias’s game models (Elias, 1978) were also used to examine the extent to which the objectives of the players involved in the implementation of the NCPE 2000 generated outcomes – that were identified by examining existing empirical data – which none of the players involved in the formulation process planned for, or could have foreseen. In this regard, the thesis has suggested that, although the government were by far the most powerful player during the formulation process, their actions – that is, their desire to develop a flexible, inclusive PE curriculum – gave PE teachers the power to determine the extent to which the government’s elite sports performance and inclusion objectives would be achieved. From this process, research suggests that a planned outcome of the NCPE 2000 is that many PE teachers are using their power chances to further their own and, more specifically, the government’s, elite sports performance objectives. However, an unplanned outcome of this process is that some pupils with SEN are spending less time in PE, and are participating in a narrower range of activities than their age-peers in mainstream and special schools.


As if to mark their relative success in the latest round of the British Research Assessment Exercise (RAE), the Chester Centre for Research into Sport and Society hosts yet another monograph for review in Figurations. In Sport Policy and Development: an Introduction, Bloyce and Smith set out to ‘focus on some of the major issues that characterise sport policy and development activity via a case study approach (p. 2). This – allied to the short-term and almost reactionary priorities of government to sport, health and community development – requires them to be necessarily selective in their sociological examinations of: the sport policy process; the emergence and development of sport policy (primarily from the UK perspective); youth sports development including physical education, school sport and community club links; community sports development and the dual aims of promoting social inclusion and health; elite sports development; and, a timely commentary on the politics and policy of mega-events as reflected in London 2012. In keeping with previous publications and the sociological tradition at the CCRSS, this latest publication derives its theoretical inspiration from process sociology which, as Houlihan, Bloyce and Smith note, has begun to exact a greater profile in, and influence on, analyses of policy processes in sport and beyond. Until now, however, we have not seen this degree of concentrated application of figurational concepts to the realities of the sport policy-making process.

The Introduction and chapter 1 make the most explicit reference to the key figurational concepts or principles which underpin the analyses that follow. These include the concept of figuration and Elias’s game models, unplanned and unanticipated outcomes and, importantly, involvement–detachment. It is the latter which becomes the crux on which Bloyce and Smith argue that greater degrees of detachment are a prerequisite for maximising ‘the development of knowledge that is more reality-oriented and that is less mythical and fantasy based’ (p. 5). To their credit, they also invoke in a highly original manner the interdependence between theoretical assumptions and empirical observations even if, in so doing, they come to distance themselves from the ideologies, mythologies, policies and claims of government and others about the seeming infinite potential of sport. The merits to be gained in this regard include the avoidance of simplistic and idealised notions about the work of sport policy-makers and sport developments officers (SDOs), the demonstrable policy relevance of an understanding of sport policy and development that is grounded in empirically verifiable and tested observations, and the academic value of theory as an evolving map from which to examine the complexities of the social world.

The text will be of central relevance to students and researchers of sport policy and development, not least because the authors seek to understand the often-contradictory processes that drive these areas. It may be of more relevance and benefit to those whose minds are open to rigorous academic practice if a recent comment to me by a sports development practitioner is anything to go by. In his words, ‘I was disappointed because the book was more about policy than development’. When
I probed further, he offered the following reason: ‘They (Bloyce and Smith) just seem to want to point out the negatives. I’m far more interested in actually doing something.’ Of course, his words reflect some of the very pressing problems in sports policy and development that lie at the heart of Bloyce and Smith’s analyses. But, fear not, Bloyce and Smith: your academic honour was defended by this lowly maiden and I lay any blame firmly at the feet of one Ken Green who, in your own words, was ‘the person to be blamed for [us] writing this book’.

Katie Liston
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Stephen Mennell, ‘Liminality and the Wild West: The Frontier Myth, Manifest Destiny, and the building of the American empire’, in International Political Anthropology 2: 1 (2009), pp. 37–51. (IPA is a new online journal which also prints a very limited number of hard copies; see www.ipa3.org).

FROM THE AUTHOR

Brief notes under this heading do not preclude longer reviews later.


This is not a French translation of Studien über die Deutschen, but a collection of essays about that book. To be reviewed later.


We have yet to see the book itself, but Dietmar Schloss’s introduction (pp. xi–xxiii) shows a strong influence of Elias’s work. We hope to review this book in due course.

Debra Hopkins, Jochen Kleres, Helena Flam and Helmut Kuzmics (eds), Theorizing Emotions: Sociological Explorations and Applications (Frankfurt am Main: Campus, 2009) 343 pp. ISBN: 978 359338972-1

Theorizing Emotions reflects the recent turn to emotions in academia – not just in sociology but also in psychology, evolutionary biology, and neuroscience. Drawing on the classic studies of Max Weber, Erving Goffman, Norbert Elias, and Theodor Adorno, several leading European scholars present their findings on the role of emotions in various facets of society, from the laboratory to the office to the media. Among the topics discussed are the tensions between feelings and feeling rules, the conscious and unconscious emotions of scientists, emotions and social disorder, the effect of the emotional turn as an element of advancing modernity, romantic love in U.S. and Israeli codes of conduct, and the role of mass media in generating massive public emotions.


Christien Brinkgreve, De ogen van de ander: de sociale bronnen van zelfkennis [The eyes of the other: the social sources of self knowledge] (Amsterdam: Uitgeverij Augustinus, 2009).
In our culture of self-determination it is important to know yourself, but what is the ‘self’ and how can you know and understand it? In her new book, Christien Brinkgreve argues that there is no self without others. In 14 short chapters she tries to integrate insights from history, psychology, philosophy, sociology and literature to develop a sociological vision on the self.


A general textbook on political science for French students, with a distinct figurational flavour injected by Bernard Lacroix.

■ BIBLIOGRAPHICAL RETROSPECT


Long overlooked, at least partly because of its unexpected place of publication, this essay gives a digest in English of some of Hackeschmidt’s research concerning Elias reported at greater length in his book Von Kurt Blumenfeld zu Norbert Elias: Die Erfindung einer jüdischen Nation (Hamburg: Europäische Verlagsanstalt, 1997) – see Figurations 8.

Richard Kilminster writes: ‘Here is further corroboration of the importance of Elias’s Jewish experiences in the shaping of his outlook and priorities. It also gives insight into what might have been the content of Hönigswald’s seminars. They obviously went beyond merely formal issues to do with the apriori.

I don’t always agree with Hackeschmidt’s judgements and there are odd errors, but I found this contains very interesting insights into Elias’s development, hitherto unknown to me. It looks to me that he went through a rather rigid, precise and awkward phase, according to Bandmann’s diaries, which may have been something to do with his sexual identity struggles (p. 68). When bringing the girls’ and boys’ sections of the organisation together was on the agenda, Elias advocated keeping them strictly apart. Interesting, too, is the influence of Cassirer’s study of the Italian Renaissance and the way in which the young Zionists used it as a model for developing a worldly ideal of education and personal cultivation for the Jewish people as a nation. This leads into Elias’s choice of research topic on the Italian Renaissance with Alfred Weber.


Discovering Mart Bax’s essay from over 30 years ago sets a new record under the heading of Bibliographical Retrospect, but it was hitherto unknown to me, and strikes me as highly significant. For many years I have thought that one of the most significant weaknesses in the conceptual armoury of figurational sociology is the vagueness of the notion of ‘lengthening chains of interdependence’, which requires much more detailed working out and elaboration. Bax’s article is relevant to that task. – SJM

■ RECENT CONFERENCES

Workshop: Habitus: Soziologisch – literarisch – literatursoziologisch

Graz, 21–23 May 2009

Organised by Beatrix Müller-Kampel and Helmut Kuzmics, this workshop aimed at the clarification of the concept of ‘habitus’ in sociology and its fruitfulness for the sociological interpretation of fictional literature. The presentations centered on the positions and concepts of Norbert Elias (Kuzmics, Mennell, Reicher) and Pierre Bourdieu (Jurt, Sonderegger, Suderland). There was more accordance than dissent between the participants resulting in the conclusion that Bourdieu’s position has its merits in terms of its notion of ‘style’ (Panovsky) and ‘body techniques’ (Mauss), and Elias’s in acknowledging the relevance of psychic processes and their regulation, with a broad range of commonalities between both authors.
A number of interesting case studies referred to the empirical value of the notion of habitus for the sociological analysis by means of novels or drama. The sociological areas covered were 'habitus' under the condition of totalitarianism (Pollack, Suderland, Haring), the problem of 'state' or 'national' habitus (Mennell, Zechner), in institutions like the army (Kuzmics, Wolf), medicine, the 'literary field' (Lang, Bachleitner). Methodological problems were also discussed (Mozetic, Suderland, Sonderegger). The contributions will be published in forthcoming issues of the newly founded journal *LiThes: Zeitschrift für Literatur- und Theatersoziologie*, edited by Beatrix Müller-Kampel and Helmut Kuzmics, University of Graz.

The full list of papers presented is:

**Habitus – Theory and Method I**

Joseph Jurt (Freiburg): Pierre Bourdieu's Theory of Habitus

Gerald Mozetic (Graz): How much and which kind of hermeneutics do we need for the analysis of habitus? To be demonstrated in one literary and one political example

Sabine Haring (Graz): The Construction of the ‘New Man’ in Soviet Communism. Traces of Habitus in Fictional Literature

Stephen Mennell (Dublin): The Problem of American Habitus

**Habitus, Politics and Fiction**

Norbert Bachleitner (Vienna): The Habitus of German Authors around 1830 (Heine, Börne, Pückler-Muskau)

Birgit Lang (Melbourne/Vienna): Homo eroticus and homo academicus: Men of Letters, Sexual Scientists and their Habitus (1870-1930)

**Is there a ’Kakanian’ Habitus? Answers Given by Fictional Literature**

Helmut Kuzmics (Graz): Emotions and Habitus of Officers Mirrored in Fictional Prose: the Example of the Habsburg Army from 1848 to 1918

Norbert Christian Wolf (Salzburg): Bourdieu’s Concept of ‘Habitus’ and the Construction of Figures in Musil’s ‘Man without Qualities’

**Habitus in Novels and Drama**

Evelyn Zechner (Graz): About the Watchful German ‘Michel’, the ‘Dicke Berta’ and the brave ‘Kasper’. National Habitus in Puppet Shows Enacted during the First World War

Dieter Reicher (Graz): Fiction as Source for the Research on Deviant Behaviour: Ludwig Thoma’s ‘Lausbubengeschichten’ as a Model for the Investigation of Moods

**Habitus: Theory and Method II**

Ruth Sonderegger (Amsterdam/Vienna): ‘Habitus’ and the Question of Emancipation. On Rancière’s Critique of Bourdieu’s Concept of Habitus

Maja Suderland (Fulda): How does the Notion of Habitus Enter Fictional Literature? Theoretical Foundation, Methodological Considerations and Empirical Examples

**Habitus: Forms of Representation**

Martin Pollack (Bocksdorf/Vienna): ‘Die Figur des Vaters’ (read by the author from his novel)

Josef Haslinger (Vienna/Leipzig): ‘der sandler’ (’the hobo’; read by the author from his short story)

**Habitus: Forms of Representation**

Karl-Franzens-Universität Graz

1er Foro Internacional sobre Civilidades y Des-Órdenes Sociales.

*Instituto de Investigaciones Psicológicas, Universidad Veracruzana, Xalapa, Mexico 27–29 May 2009*

I was unable to attend this workshop, organised by Horacio González López of the Universidad Veracruzana, Xalapa, because of the worldwide panic about H1N1 influenza – the authorities were issuing instructions that only the most essential journeys to Mexico were to be made, and that invalidated most travel insurance policies. So I am disappointed not to be able to write a first-hand report – but I hope that I (and others) will be able to attend the second workshop that Horacio is planning for 2010.

Besides the absent me, other visiting speakers included: Jorge Arditi, State University of New York, Buffalo NY, USA; América Espinosa Hernández, Universidad Veracruzana, Poza Rica, and Roberto Manero Brito, Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana – Xochimilco, México. Home team contributors from Xalapa were: Ricardo García Valdés, Jesús Turiso Sebastián, Gonzalo Gamundi Polo, María Isabel Guiot, Adriana Rodríguez Barraza, Luis Rodríguez Gabarrón, Lenin Torres Antonio. - SJM
Overall the figurational sessions seemed to go really well, although on occasion were a touch chaotic. This did not, however seem to have a significant impact upon proceedings, with the papers being well received. A range of different issues were explored including shifts in the Ottoman application of time (Irem Ozgoren Kinli), interrelationships between terrorism and civilisation (Michael Dunning), regulatory processes in children’s television (Norman Gabriel), moral panics and climate change (Amanda Rohloff), post 1960s Western terror groups (Stephen Vertigans), state-making in the Georgian region of Mingrelia (Andrea Weiss) and long term changes in sexuality and phases of formalisation and informatisation (Cas Wouters). The room only held around 20 people and was full for both sessions, with first-time attenders and non-members of the group raising numerous questions. In light of the dire attendance reported at other sessions this was pleasing.

Alas, things then deteriorated because immediately after the session (5.15 p.m.) we went for a ‘drink’ and on to the conference dinner. Behaviour then regressed – decivilised? – somewhat, under the influence of the fine Armenian brandy. Proceedings ended in the Congress Hotel bar at 5.30 a.m. Anticipating next year’s ISA World Congress in Göteborg next year, the one positive aspect of the prices in Sweden is that the cost of alcohol may provide a greater restraint upon excess.

Stephen Vertigans
Robert Gordon University, Aberdeen

The Congress of the French Political Science Association attracted about a thousand participants, including 250 foreign researchers, from various disciplines. There were 53 workshops, and five plenaries on the general theme of ‘Unity and diversity in French-speaking political science’.

More specifically, workshop number 44, led by Paula Cossart (University of Lille) and Emmanuel Taïeb (IEP Grenoble), was about the notion of ‘depacification’, its historical and sociological forms. Its aim was to examine phenomena which test the pacification of the political game. Not only physical or verbal violence, but also that wide range of gestures, words, defamation, loss of self-control, blows ‘below the belt’, or inappropriate references (regarding sexual preference, social origin, religion, skin colour). The workshop also questioned connotate notions, such as ‘decivilisation’, ‘brutalisation’, ‘informalisation’ or ‘radicalisation’ of the political field.

Its three sessions included notably an introductory speech by Stephen Men nell, on the functional de-democratisation of the USA; historical analysis of the climate of violence of the French nineteenth century political game, with an agitator like Auguste Blanqui; and some studies of precise moments of depacification during the French Revolution, during the strike of the workers of the LIP watch factory (1973), or in the Republic of Côte d’Ivoire during the decade before the coup of 1999.

With the help of all the stakeholders, the workshop completed this first exploration of the notion of depacification, which was both discussed and welcomed by the participants and the audience as a new and useful term to designate a lot of situations that just do not come under the heading of political violence. But working out all the implications of the term ‘depacification’ remains an exciting and open project.

Emmanuel Taïeb
IEP Grenoble

The XII International Symposium on Civilising Processes was held at the Faculty of Education at Federal University of Pernambuco, in Recife, Brazil. As usual, it was a very pleasant opportunity for old and new friends to meet. The Symposium was attended by postgraduate students and researchers from many parts of Brazil. Many international guests were also present – Ali de Regt (Amsterdam School of Social Science Research, Netherlands); Carina V. Kaplan (Uba/UNLP, Argentina); Cas Wouters (Utrecht University, Netherlands); Dominic Malcolm (University of Leicester, England); Eric Dunning (University of Leicester, England); François Depelteau (Laurentian University, Canada); Jason Hughes (Brunel University, England); Lucas Krotsch (Uba, Argentina); Nico Wilterdink (University of Amsterdam, Netherlands); Vera Weiler (Unal, Colombia); Victoria Orce (Uba, Argentina). It is important to notice that, compared with the former Symposiums, we had a growing number of Latin American guests, as well as an increasing number coming from Europe and Canada. This shows that the Symposium is becoming an important forum of exchange of the figurational circle.

Nico Wilterdink presented the opening lecture (‘Civilizing processes in an evolutionary perspective’) and Eric Dunning the closing conference (‘Elias and modern society: habitus, figurations, power and process’). There were ten round tables on social theory, education, sports and environment. Also, there were two different spaces for postgraduate students to present their work in progress: communication sessions and workshops. A large variety of subjects was presented in this sessions, which is always great news!

Three books were launched at this opportunity: O controle das emoções, by Ademir Gebara and Cas Wouters (eds); Escritos a partir de Nor bert Elias, by Edilson Fernandes de Souza, José Luís Simões e Ricardo de

Section Thématique 44: Sociologie et histoire des mécanismes de dépacification du jeu politique
The next International Symposium Civilizing Process will be held in Bogotá, Colombia in November 2010. Everyone is already invited!

Luci Ribeiro
Universidade Estadual de Campinas, Unicamp

Tatiana Savoia Landini
Universidade Federal de São Paulo, Unifesp

The issues to be addressed will include:

• Is there really a lust for killing? – Challenging the Realist School’s assumption of an eternally unchanging and aggressive ‘human nature’; To what extent has the passage from peace to war and the return of the warrior back into society become more complex as a result of the civilizing process?

• Has there been a civilising process in world politics, how should it be understood? to what extent is the nineteenth century ‘standard of civilization’ a continuing influence on world politics?

• Rethinking the ‘clash of civilizations’: what can the comparative study of civilizing processes (‘western’ and ‘non-western’) contribute to understanding global integration/disintegration?

• Trust and nuclear weapons

• Cultural lag and social habitus – do habitus and we-feelings lag behind global integration, and will higher steering mechanisms and post-national loyalties be needed to manage the coming phase of global interconnectedness?

• Are the currently dominant models of ‘Western democracy’, in which the pursuit of self-interest at the national, commercial and personal levels are institutionalised an intellectually justifiable in-depth, compatible with the survival of large-scale human society and of the planet?

The conference will consist of plenary sessions with speakers and panels of discussants. To maintain the conference’s intellectual focus, there will be no parallel sessions. If a large number of people wish to present papers, however, one round table session will be organised.

To register, please contact the special conference email address: globalisationandcivilisation@gmail.com.

The conference will be preceded on the evening of Thursday 8 April (time to be confirmed) by an inaugural lecture by Robert van Krieken who, along with Chris Whelan, has succeeded Stephen Mennell as Professor of Sociology at University College Dublin.

Robert van Krieken
Sociology, University College Dublin

Andrew Linklater
International Politics, Aberystwyth University

Stephen Mennell
Sociology, University College Dublin

FORTHCOMING CONFERENCES

Globalisation and Civilisation in International Relations: Towards New Models of Human Interdependence

UCD School of Sociology
9–10 April 2010

It is less possible than ever before to separate what goes on inside a state, and especially the distribution of power within a state, from what takes place between states, in particular their power relationships. Wherever one looks, one comes across the interdependence of intra-state and inter-state processes. – Norbert Elias

Recent years have seen a convergence between the concerns of the disciplines of International Relations and Sociology: transitions from peace to war (and back); the dynamics of post-conflict social and political life, changing standards of acceptable behaviour between states; and rising levels of global interconnectedness.

In particular, an affinity has become evident between the ‘English School’ in International Relations and the theory of civilising and decivilising processes stemming from the thinking of Norbert Elias in Sociology. The affinity is especially manifest in the recent writings of Andrew Linklater, leading up to his three-volume study of The Problem of Harm in World Politics (Cambridge University Press, forthcoming) and in Stephen Mennell’s The American Civilizing Process (Polity, 2007).

This conference will bring together specialists in International Relations and sociologists, together with some representatives of cognate disciplines – such as history, political science and criminology – to explore central issues concerning the possible emergence of a single global society.

The conference will be preceded on the evening of 8 April 2010 by an inaugural lecture by Robert van Krieken who, along with Chris Whelan, has succeeded Stephen Mennell as Professor of Sociology at University College Dublin.

Robert van Krieken
Sociology, University College Dublin

Andrew Linklater
International Politics, Aberystwyth University

Stephen Mennell
Sociology, University College Dublin

Provisional list of participants (acceptances to 10 November 2009)

Brett Bowden, Politics, Australian Defence Force Academy, Canberra (tbc)

Godfried van Benthem van den Bergh, International Relations, Erasmus University Rotterdam

Florence Delmotte, Politics & Sociology, Facultés Universitaires Saint-Louis, Brussels

Michael Dunning, Sociology, Brunel University

Alastair Finlan, International Politics, Aberystwyth University

Jonathan Fletcher, Sociology, Amsterdam

Johan Goudsbloom, Sociology, University of Amsterdam

Hermann Korte, Sociology, University of Hamburg

Richard Kilminster, Sociology, University of Leeds

Helmut Kuechler, Sociology, University of Graz

Steven Loyal, Sociology, University College Dublin

René Moelker, Sociology, Netherlands Defence Academy, Breda

Abram de Swaan, Sociology, University of Amsterdam
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Giselinde Kuipers’ Inaugural Lecture
Erasmus University Rotterdam, 11 June 2010

Giselinde Kuipers will – as noted earlier – give her inaugural lecture in the Norbert Elias Chair at the EUR on Friday 11 June 2010. The subject, and further details of time and place, will be announced on the Norbert Elias Foundation’s website nearer the time – www.norberteliasfoundation.nl.

XVII ISA World Congress of Sociology
Göteborg, Sweden, 11-17 July 2010

The overall theme of the next ISA World Congress will be ‘Sociology on the Move’. The ‘figurational’ sessions will be organised in our new status as a Working Group within ISA Research Committee 20 (Comparative Sociology), who have generously granted us five sessions – more than at any other World Congress. Even so, it will be a tight squeeze, because we have received around 40 offers of papers.

Contact the organisers, Robert van Krieken (Robert.VanKrieken@ucd.ie) or Stephen Vertigans (s.vertigans@rgu.ac.uk), for further details of the sessions.

Robert also makes the following pitch for joining the ISA:

‘We urge readers to join the ISA and RC 20 (Comparative Sociology). The economics is that it costs around €170 (US$255) for 4 years, but this effects a reduction of €100 in the registration fee for the World Congress. Membership of RC20 is another US$25, around €16. So the net expenditure is €86, for which, apart from that additional line in one’s CV and the satisfaction of knowing that one is contributing to the vitality of the Figurational Sociology network (if we sign up even as many as 13 new members, RC20 will qualify for extra sessions), one gains a range of other benefits including:

The right to participate in RC20’s governance (i.e. voting, standing for office)
Subscription to ISA journals Current Sociology and International Sociology, The Directory of Members.
Reception of isagram, an electronic newsletter containing announcements of forthcoming conferences, calls for papers and manuscripts, prizes, competitions, etc.
Access to e-bulletin, ISA on-line publication.
Access to SAGE Full-Text Collection which includes 31 journals with more than 12,500 articles.
45% discount on SAGE Publications books.
Special subscription rates to journals offered by various publishers.’

You can join very simply through the website: http://www.isa-sociology.org/memb_i/index.htm

Beyond dichotomous thinking: the society of individuals – The legacy and continuing relevance of Norbert Elias’s sociology

University of Florence, 7-8 October, 2009

The proposed conference will mark the twentieth anniversary of Norbert Elias’s death in 1990, and it will also be the first conference on Elias to be held in Italy.

The central focus of the conference will not be on the most widely known aspect of Elias’s work, the theory of civilising and decivilising processes, but rather on his characteristic rejection of polar dichotomies.

If you wish to participate, please contact Professor Angela Perulli for further details: angela.perulli@unifi.it
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