European Sociologist has emerged as a major channel of communication for sociologists throughout Europe. As an e-newsletter, it is both environmentally friendly and "instant". Today, it is inconceivable to return to the position we were only a couple of years ago of sending out the newsletter by snail mail in hard copy.

The newsletter publicizes the latest ESA news, as well as keeping sociologists up-to-date with new trends in Europe. The feature focusing on intellectual giants entitled "In the Limelight" has proven to be of interest beyond the borders of Europe. This issue contains the second part of the interview with the late Prof. S.N. Eisenstadt.

EUROPEAN SOCIOLOGIST reports on past successes and future landmarks. There are descriptions of the ESA graduate summer school on the Finnish island of Seili, the speech given when Prof. Juan Linz received the prestigious Amalfi prize, and an opinion piece on the disciplinary identity of sociology. As in previous issues, we zoom in on a particular National Association – this time Croatia - and a specific Research Network - RN 17 on Industrial relations. In addition, we provide exciting details of the forthcoming conference in Geneva in September 2011.

The newsletter welcomes feedback from readers. If you have any suggestions or criticisms, please do not hesitate to contact me at: msshalva@mssc.huji.ac.il
Let us hope that 2011 will be a great year and fruitful one for European sociologists!

Shalva Weil

ESA Conference in Geneva.
"Social Relations in Turbulent Times"

The European Sociological Association is organizing its next conference in Geneva on 7th-10th September, 2011.
Details inside this newsletter

In an era of social turbulence and economic uncertainty in Europe, sociologists have even more to contribute, not only to other academics, but also to the general public. The ESA Geneva conference is organized around a socially relevant theme and will bring the best lecturers from around the world to lecture at plenary and semi-plenary presentations.

Calls to submit abstracts opened this week. Please enter the conference site, register for your chosen RNs and submit your abstract!
http://www.esa10thconference.com/

On our way to Geneva

EUROPEAN SOCIOLOGIST is available online at:
http://www.europeansociology.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=blogcategory&id=17&Itemid=95%0D
President’s Message

Crisis, cuts, bankruptcy, increasing inequalities, unemployment, precariousness, uncertainty. Words circulating in our everyday life reminding us constantly that we are living in the worst economic crisis ever since the financial crash of 1929. Words that remind me of other words, those of Pierre Bourdieu, when he insisted that all economic problems are also societal requiring sociological analysis and the voice and action of sociologists.

These voices were heard in the last ISA World Congress in Goteborg. Some of the most renowned scholars discussed fundamental and diverse topics like, war and new forms of violence, sustainability of the planet, and growing inequalities. Discussions also showed that different theories in sociology have tried to answer – or have not yet sufficiently answered - some of those questions.

Not unexpectedly the European participation in the World Congress was very high. The excellent thing about the ISA is exactly the tremendous capacity it entails to gather colleagues from all around the world to reflect upon our diverse societies and our capabilities to intervene. But European Sociological Association members were extremely prominent there and could easily be seen in the congress halls and corridors. Moreover, the ESA, through the initiative of Roberto Cipriani, also had an organized presence in a thematic session entitled Research in Europe: The State of the Art, Resources and Fragilities, which was addressed by Claire Wallace and by myself.

ESA was also officially represented in the ISA meeting organized by Michael Burawoy with national and regional associations. We had the opportunity to hear our colleagues and to present a short overview of the ESA’s activities. In this world Congress, the best attended ever, Michael Burawoy was elected President. We take advantage of this occasion to congratulate him and wish him a successful presidency. I would like to invite all colleagues to consult the newsletter Global Dialogue, created by Michael, where it is possible to read about sociological issues on a global perspective and interesting debates like the one between Raewyn Connell and Ulrich Beck (Global Dialogue 2). [See: http://www.isa-sociology.org/universities-in-crisis].

Still on the external relations field we went on representing ESA in several international fora. Our participation in Initiative for Science in Europe, has been guaranteed. It is an important bottom-up organization of scientists that helped create the European Research Council, and “whose aim is to promote mechanisms to support basic science at a European level, involve scientists in the design and implementation of European science policies, and to advocate strong independent scientific advice in European policy making”. Some structural changes are on the way and the ESA will continue to be involved and participate. Last September, in Brighton, I was invited to chair the session BRIC: What is the Deal? of the Conference organized by WES-Work, Employment and Society Conference. It proved to be a very interesting session with relevant information and lively debates about specific issues on Brazil, Russia, India and China.

ESA’s activities were intense during 2010. The ESA Summer School Academic Writing Workshop for PhD students in July 2010 in Turku was excellent with 24 PhD students chosen from more than 200 proposals attending. We have to thank Elina Oinas, Pekka Sulkunnen and the local team from the University of Turku (especially, Tiina Laakso) for the organization of the workshop that took place on a beautiful island (Seili) with a very quiet and peaceful atmosphere. It allowed intensive and productive academic work [see, page 9]. The school, with such a relevant topic for young researchers, corresponded completely to the expectations of the students and gave origin to close interaction among them from which a very promising proposal came out: the creation of an ESA PhD students’ network in order to encourage continuous and easy contacts among student ESA members [see, page 10].

Another relevant initiative, organized by Roberto Cipriani, Pekka Sulkunnen and myself, was the fruitful meeting with National Associations held on the 28 October 2010. For the first time we were able to have 31 countries represented from different parts of Europe, each of them presenting sociology in their country and lively debating crucial issues like the effects of Bologna process, cuts on social science research financing, the design of EC research programs, and other issues. We invited Jean-Michel Baer (European Commission, FP7) and Rifka Weehuizen (ESF, European Science Foundation,) to intervene about future action from their institutions. Both presentations suggested several questions and answers from a bottom-up perspective. Fears about the design of the European Framework programs being less adapted to social science were clearly expressed. At the end of the meeting, we decided to sign a joint manifesto. The idea is to have a commitment for future memory and new actions from both sides (ESA and NAS). One of the other actions decided in the meeting was to organize a session in our next conference in Genève about the Bologna process and its effects on sociological teaching, research and professional profile.

Finally, the call for a new editor of the European Societies journal resulted in the very promising selection of Göran Therborn, a well- known and respected scholar [see, page 13]. Welcoming him, I take this opportunity to thank once more the great work John Scott did for the Journal in these last four years.

Yours
Analía Torres
President-ESA
Preparations for the 10th European Sociological Association conference in Geneva are well underway. The baton was passed, without navigational difficulties, from Lisbon in September 2009 where 2,500 sociologists congregated in the biggest conference in the history of the ESA. The burgers and good people of Geneva are hoping for an invasion on a similar scale and their reputation for tolerance and international hospitality will, no doubt, be a significant attraction for a generation of sociologists who are encouraged by both the times and their universities to develop global networks. You will be welcomed in Geneva by the Local Organising Committee (LOC) chaired by Professor Sandro Cattacin, Head of Department of Sociology at the University of Geneva (Uni-Mail). The university has been home to Jean Piaget, Ferdinand De Saussure and more recently, to the controversial Jean Ziegler. Uni-Mail – the building that houses the Social Science disciplines and will play architectural host to the conference - is centrally located in the city centre, a short walk from the Lake and many of the city’s attractions, as well as much of the accommodation that will be available for delegates. There is a great deal to see and the LOC are keen to showcase their great city. Watch out for the organised trips. They will be compelling but so too will the attractions of the scientific programme which is taking shape and will involve more that 50 Research Networks and Streams, three plenaries and 12 semi-plenary presentations.

As a European Sociological community we will be meeting in difficult times and the theme of the conference – Social relations in turbulent times – is designed to reflect the unease and social vulnerability that has followed the credit crunch. In this context as sociologists, we are obliged to ask many questions: Will people find opportunities to explore and develop creative solutions? One might expect emotions to run high and fears to be stoked by pervasive references to the ‘external’ threats posed by inter alia immigration and radical Islam and the ‘internal’ dangers associated with high unemployment and the decline of public services. On the one hand, the present conjuncture points towards a future of commotion and unrest, of anomie and alienation but on the other it may announce novel forms of social, cultural and emotional life that grow out of new solidarities? How we face up to the challenges posed by the turbulence and unpredictability of our times is the key dilemma facing contemporary social analyses.

The LOC and the European Sociological Association invites scholars from around the globe to come together, in Geneva in September 2011 to debate the most pressing sociological questions of the day, enjoy the company of fellow scholars, meet old friends, make new ones and make the most of a beautiful city and a compelling scientific convention.
Bienvenu à Genève from the Sociology department of the University of Geneva! We are one of the oldest departments of this discipline in the world. Many famous scholars taught sociology in Geneva, such as de Sismondi, Louis Warin, or Jean Piaget. We are in charge to organize, together with the Swiss Sociological Society (SSS) the 10th ESA Conference in Geneva, that will be held from the 7th to 10th September 2011.

“Social Relations in Turbulent Times” is the title of the Geneva conference. At present, the Local Committee is working on the opening of the abstract submission process. All the calls have to be on the site and the next milestone is the 10th of January 2011. That key date is important for us, but also for you! You can then submit the abstract and we hope that the system will both be sufficiently stable to accept hundreds of abstracts and also sufficiently clear for you.

As you see, the Local Committee in Geneva is working and learning every day how to organize such a large event. Many things are already decided, for instance, that the opening ceremony that will take place in Victoria Hall, a place in which I last saw Cassandra Wilson perform! In fact, it’s a large concert hall in which there is normally classical music or jazz concerts. The city of Geneva is offering this hall to us in order to welcome sociologists in our city for some days.

We are organising three trips in the city for you around the conference:

• Geneva and the reformist history. Calvin was really a bad guy – but he is also the founder 450 years ago of our University. So we respect him. The highlight of the tour will be his grave: there are no signs of an important personality. He was really a Calvinist!

• Geneva’s international organizations (with a visit to the UN Building and the Red Cross Museum). Geneva is one of the world’s few truly global cities and also plays host to a great number of international organizations, providing the world-class infrastructure and communication facilities that help to promote intellectual and political exchange. In its role as a small metropolis, you can often find politicians discussing matters heatedly in the evenings in the bistros and the restaurants. From the “Place des Nations”, you can discover the international world hosted by Geneva: international organizations, non-governmental organizations related to Geneva in areas such as Human Rights, Environment, Development, Peace, Health, Trade, UN, ILO, Labor, Refugees, Telecommunications, AIDS, Indigenous Peoples, NGOs, and so on.

• Geneva and contemporary art. Geneva is known for the galleries in the “Jonction” neighbourhood, where you can also find the Mamco – the Museum of contemporary Art. Near to the main conference place, there is a large square called “Plainpalais”. At the bottom of the houses around that square, there are provocative installations of Sylvie Fleury, one of the most famous contemporary Geneva artists.

For the main evening together, more than one option is open – but for the moment, it’s top secret. But you can also discover Geneva on foot or by public transport that will be free of charge for you during the conference.

Note also that during the conference, the “Festival de la Bâtie” will take place in Geneva. That means 90 representations of theatre, contemporary dance and music in two weeks!

Geneva is a vibrant city offering a wide range of galleries, exhibitions and more: from the Museum of the Reformation to the Patek Philippe Museum, from the Ariana to the Martin Bodmer Foundation (with superb original manuscripts), more than forty public and private spaces tell the tale of Geneva’s passion for the fine arts, watch-making, ethnography, archaeology, the natural sciences and technology.

The ESA Conference will be held in ‘Uni Mail’, which is the home of the faculty of Social and Economic Sciences of the University of Geneva. Situated in the center of Geneva, Uni-Mail is easily reachable by public transport. The main meeting rooms are equipped with audio-visual and computing facilities. In this building, the registration and the Congress Party will take place in the entry hall, a kind of piazza where students normally meet.

What can I say more? I’m happy to work on this conference. But it’s not a work alone, as you can imagine. The most intensive help comes from Patricia Naegeli of the LOC, from the local staff, who are searching for the best accommodation rates in Geneva and who will handle abstracts and other queries, and from the Swiss Society of Sociology, which is mobilizing energy (and money....). See you soon in Geneva!
This exclusive interview, which took place in Shmuel Noah Eisenstadt's Jerusalem home before he passed away in September 2010, “European Sociologist” Editor Shalva Weil talked to Israel’s most renowned sociologist about his life, his theories, and the role of sociology today. The first part of this two-part interview, which appeared in "European Sociologist" 29 (Summer 2010), which Prof. Eisenstadt read and enjoyed, focused on issues of modernity, Europe and Israel. This part concentrates on empires, civilizations, such as India, democratization and globalisation.*

SW: In the last interview that was published in “European Sociologist”, we discussed fundamentalism in Europe and the concept of “hybridity”. We also talked about your earlier work on the absorption of immigrants in the context of the more recent theory on “multiple modernities”.

SNE: Yes, we talked about the reconstitution of new modernities, which reconstruct many traditional components of their respective societies. One of the most fascinating societies, which I’m studying now, from this point of view, is India.

SW: As you know, I’ve studied a tiny microcosm of India for many years now so I would be delighted to hear more. When you write about Axial Age civilizations, India is included, but you didn’t include Japan in your scheme. In fact, in 1996 you wrote a whole book explaining why Japan is not an Axial Age Civilization and why its development is more similar to Western Europe than China. Why is that?

SNE: Axial Age civilizations was used by Karl Jaspers to describe all those civilizations that developed during the first millennium before Christianity, in China, in Hinduism and Buddhism and later, in Islam. Using a Weberian style analysis, I showed how Japan has been a non-Axial society with an absence of clear concepts of state and law with only very weak tendencies to heterodoxy, and few utopian intellectuals. It took me seven years to write that book. But when we come to India, it is definitely an Axial Age civilization.

SW: How is it that the ancient caste system actually produced the largest democracy in the world?

SNE: The classical pre-modern Indian caste system is seemingly the extreme counter-example of public spheres and civil society that crystallized in Europe, above all in its emphasis on the group and hierarchical premises, as against the individualistic, potentially egalitarian ones that crystallized in Western Europe in the eighteenth century. However, in a 2009 article I published in Bergen entitled “Multiple Modernities and Multiple Forms of Civil Society”, I discuss the problem of the applicability of the term “civil society” to non-Western communities.

I demonstrate how the traditional Indian caste system produced a society that had many of the characteristics of a civil society.

SW: I still remain confused…

SNE: You see the major aspects of civil societies-autonomy of the group, autonomy of access to the state, or to the authorities, and publicity, open public discussion- developed in Europe on the basis of the conception of individual rights. In India these characteristics developed on the basis of conceptions of collective duties. So, we have similar structural effects but different cultural premises, which means that the dynamics are different. Indian democracy is a different democracy from France, but it is a very vibrant democratic system, maybe one of the most vibrant democratic contemporary systems. There are changes of government, criticism of dominant power structure and important attempts to maintain the rule of law. That’s why I’m so fascinated with India. Before this, I was intrigued by Japan.

SW: I think you’ve really laid your case with Japan, but India... I understand you are still grappling with it. Do I intuitively understand correctly?
SNE: I agree with you. Indeed, I am still more puzzled by India.

SW: I’m not sure that we’ve come to the end of the line with India, the understanding of the social dynamics...

SNE: Probably not yet, probably not enough. But it’s very important.

SW: For example, in India the individual is often negated. This is true both of the caste system and even of transnational loan associations based on the joint family which operate today in a globalized world. So, if human agency is denied, how can progress and indeed, democracy, be achieved?

SNE: We have to remember, that the caste system was one of the most mobile systems in the world i.e. such mobility was indeed effected by human agents. We also have to remember that moksha, a sort of equivalent of salvation is carried by individuals. When we talk about caste, we think that there are four castes in the varna system, but practice there are thousands of little caste-groups or jatis. Now let’s say that you a member of a third-rate legal caste in some province, and you want to become a member of a second-rate one. Today, paradoxically, it’s difficult to do it directly in such a way because everything is computerized and every piece of information is available. But a few hundred years ago, I could migrate to a new place, make a pact with a new ruler, who would recognize me. So, it was one of the most mobile of systems. The usual view of the old caste system was that it has been a fossilized system, but in practice it was one of the most dynamic, mobile systems in the world, and much more dynamic and mobile than Japan or Imperial China.

But, as indicated above, today it is difficult to effect mobility in this way – and the distinct dynamics of the Indian democracy – is the strong emphasis on affirmative groups action.

SW: You write more about other Axial Age civilizations, and about Different types of universalism: in Christianity, in Islam, in Confucianism and in other civilizations and empires. However, all of these civilizations are also particularistic and exclusive.

SNE: They’re exclusive... They’re universalistic and exclusive Islam is not particularistic. Even Judaism is not definitely so.

SW: How does the concept of the „Chosen People” in Judaism fit into this framework?

SNE: Each of these groups or civilizations looks on itself as the "Chosen People", but in universalistic terms. So, there’s always this tension between emphasizing the universalistic element, but also the special place of the group in this universalistic view. What is important is that the concept of „Chosen People” is a very open, but also a very exclusivist concept. Everyone can become a Muslim, if he or she accepts Islam. If he or she doesn’t accept Islam, then he can’t. So universalism can be also very illiberal. Universalism and liberalism are not the same. That’s one of our illusions: that universalism and liberalism are identical, but they are not. On the contrary, the great Italian classical scholar Arnaldo Momigliano wrote a famous article about how polytheism is good for empires because it’s not so exclusive; it allows greater variability.

SW: For many years, in all your writings on Max Weber, you avoided - flirted with, but avoided – “Ancient Judaism”. Only in 2004 did you analyse the text in „Explorations in Jewish Historical Experience: the Civilizational Dimension“. I was very glad that you brought my attention to it because I knew an earlier version of the book on Jewish civilization, which does not contain an analysis of Ancient Judaism, and I was happy to read this now. Here, in your analysis of Ancient Judaism, you point to the limitations of Weber and clearly mention his more successful treatises in relation to other civilizations. So, while it took you many years to delve into Ancient Judaism; why do you think it was worthwhile?

SNE: It got to me, that’s it. It finally got to me. I saw it as a very important component to understand Israeli society and contemporary Jewish society.

SW: But it doesn’t ring true theoretically like other things that Weber wrote, all that we know, with which we are familiar, like the Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism. Ancient Judaism is not „the best of Weber”?
SNE: It’s still very important. Except that Weber is wrong on one basic problem, and that is the conception of the Jews as a “pariah people”, which indicated Weber’s oscillation between a recognition of the distinct type of creativity of the Jewish people and the feeling that this creativity was stifled mostly by the experience both of exile and by a choice, Max Weber indeed was ambivalent to these trends of Jewish history. This understanding I also inherited from Martin Buber, the great philosopher who taught me at the Hebrew University. I recently worked out some of the problematics of Jewish Civilization in my 2009 article “Tensions as Resources in Jewish Historical Civilizational Experience”, which appeared last year in European Journal of Sociology.

SW: You are known as the “father of Israeli sociology”. Israeli society has come under heavy criticism lately. Could you tell us what your view of Israel is today? Is this a society that will survive or continue to replicate itself with tensions?

SNE: I think that Israel is facing very difficult times. The hostile relations between Israel and her neighbours are seemingly of a new nature, as not only between nation-states and movements, but they still bear many of the seeds of the historical ambivalence to the Jewish people and civilization. Another problem of Israeli society is, of course, that of the potential contestations between different social groups. However, Israel is in a difficult position, not so much because of the tensions between different groups, but because it has, in a sense, weakened very much because its basic institutional formats have become weakened. But at the same time there is a lot of continual creativity in the cultural arenas, in literature, in the arts, in technology and in economic entrepreneurship and then there is a continual tension or discrepancy between such creativity and the erosion of many central institutional frameworks.

SW: What do you mean by “the end of its institutional formations”? Societal institutions like the labour union, the Histadrut?

SNE: Not only the Histadrut. Just take up the paper in the morning. There is greater distrust in the government—in many institutions thereof.

SW: - which leads us back to solidarity and trust.

SNE: Exactly. One cannot have continuous social relations without solidarity and trust. There has always been a tension between the particularistic elements of trust and solidarity, and the possibility of extension. Any extension, any attempt at extending solidarity and trust, starting with the family and moving to broader settings is full of tension. In Israel, solidarity and trust in the institutional formations are declining, and this is worrying.

SW: In the last interview, we reviewed the world and sociology in the past decades. This time, I want to look forwards; I know that sociologists aren’t prophets, but I want to know if you foresee whether one particular empire, one particular civilization, like China, say, is likely to overtake other Axial Age civilizations rooted in the Protestant Ethic.

SNE: No, I think there will be more common frameworks, and greater global competition - some constructive competitions, some very destructive - between these frameworks.

SW: When you say constructive, you’re talking about global co-operation, on the one hand, and when you say destructive, can we talk about a clash of civilizations?

SNE: Not only civilizations. We could talk about clashes of different groups, of different states, movements, indeed of different modernities.

SW: Where is Iran in this scheme?

SNE: It’s a fascinating case of a modern, fundamentalist society. Jacobean fundamentalist.

SW: But not a member of the great Axial civilizations?

SNE: Oh, yes. It’s a member of the Islamic world, one interpretation of it.

SW: As a final question, you foresee both constructive and destructive future, as was in the past, but do you remain, at your age, optimistic?

SNE: This is probably connected with my own biological clock. In the morning I am mostly pessimist. In the afternoon and evening, I’m an optimist!

S. N. Eisenstadt – Obituary

By Gad Yair-Chair,
Department of Sociology & Anthropology, Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Israel

Professor Shmuel Noah Eisenstadt (1923-2010) passed away on September 2nd 2010. He was the Rose Isaacs Professor Emeritus of Sociology at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, where he served as a faculty member since 1946. He was chair of the department of sociology for 20 years (1949-1969), Dean of the Social Science Faculty (1966-9), and served in many roles at the Hebrew University until his retirement in 1983. He is considered the founder of Israeli sociology and the most prolific sociologist in Israel, having authored dozens of books and hundreds of papers. His reputation and works are well known throughout the academic world, and his academic prestige was echoed in appreciation in non-academic forums too. He was active in advising governmental offices and think tanks, and served as a facilitator for many important intellectual coalitions.

Prof. Eisenstadt was jokingly called by his younger colleagues here as “the living incarnation of Max Weber.” Like the great German master of historical sociology, Eisenstadt tackled the problems of modernity and historical diversity. He crystallized our understanding of the origins of modernity and the Axial Age, and developed a productive line of scholarship around his idea of “multiple modernities.” He was interested in traditions and their constant re-interpretations; in collective identities and the transformations of states; in globalization and primordiality.

Prof. Eisenstadt served as a visiting professor at numerous universities, including Harvard, Stanford, MIT, Chicago, Michigan, Washington, Oslo, Zurich, Vienna, and Hong Kong. He was a Fellow at the Center of Advanced Studies in Behavioral Sciences and the Netherlands Institute of Advanced Studies. As of 1967, Prof. Eisenstadt was a Senior Research Fellow at the Van Leer Institute in Jerusalem.

Prof. Eisenstadt had many colleagues worldwide, and he was invited to join the most prestigious academies and associations. He was a member of the Israeli Academy of Sciences and Humanities, Foreign Honorary Fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, Foreign Member of the American Philosophical Society, Foreign Associate of the National Academy of Sciences, Honorary Foreign Research Fellow at the Institute of Sociology of the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, and Honorary Fellow of the London School of Economics.

Prof. Eisenstadt is a recipient of honorary doctoral degrees from the University of Helsinki, the Central European University, Budapest; the University of Warsaw and Duke University; he was a doctor of law, honoris causa, from Harvard University. He was also recipient of many awards, among them the International Balzan Prize in Sociology, the McIver award of the American Sociological Association, the Amalfi Prize for Sociology and Social Sciences, the Israel Prize and the Rotshchild Prize in Social Sciences, Max Planck Research Award, Ambassador of Cultural Dialogue Award, Polish Asia Pacific Council, Warsaw; EMET Foundation Prize in Sociology – and most recently of The Holberg International Memorial Prize.

Prof. Eisenstadt's many students remember him with awe. He commanded many languages and was an astoundingly fast reader and a penetrating listener. His memory straddled across literature in history, anthropology, law, political science, anthropology and even economics. His sense of humor and self-cynicism were unique and he never failed to enjoy a good meal peppered with intellectual discussions. He supported many young scholars on their careers, opening up his immense home library to those who could not find what they needed elsewhere. He advised and encouraged Israeli doctoral students to travel abroad, and supported their applications to top universities worldwide.

Prof. Eisenstadt was active and in full capacity to his last day. Two weeks ago, upon my last visit to his house, he was sitting to his table, writing, as always. He told me: "If you get used to work, you can never quit." Just two weeks before his death he was happy to see two new books published. He is to be remembered as an Intellectual giant with a human friendly smile.
„I do not like to write - I like to have written”. This Gloria Steinem’s quote is an impeccable summary of what Academic Journal Writing Summer School in Finland 19-23 July, 2010 was about. The School was co-organized by the Sociology Departments of University of Turku and University of Helsinki, and the ESA and was aimed to work as an aid for PhD students struggling with an article ‘to have written’. It was a learning experience made unique by a truly diverse mix of 24 PhD students with an eclectic range of backgrounds drawn from Australia, Brazil, Canada, Israel and European countries such as Finland, France, Estonia, Germany, Italy, Lithuania, Poland, Russia, Spain, Switzerland and the UK. For one week they were gathered in a beautiful setting in the archipelago of Finland, the Archipelago Research Institute of University of Turku in Seili, Nauvo which provided a peaceful historic environment for writing and discussions, with sea, nature, and the midnight sun.

Writing workshops and theory lectures were delivered by Anália Torres (Lisbon University Institute, President of the ESA), Claire Wallace (University of Aberdeen), Elina Oinas (University of Turku), Pekka Sulkunen (University of Helsinki) and Shalva Weil (Hebrew University of Jerusalem, editor of European Sociologist). They all are actively involved in academic research and are world-class professors committed to teaching with academic rigour and contemporary relevance. From Shalva Weil’s presentation the participants learned about linguistic as well as ethical and copyright issues that arise in publishing research. Claire Wallace gave the students ‘insider’s advice’ on dealing with journal editors and academic reviewers whereas Pekka Sulkunen explained how to challenge these ‘journal insiders’ with his ‘imPekkable formula’ for article writing. He claimed that it always worked (for him)! But it’s amazing that every participant is now willing to try Pekka’s magic spell. Thus, Elina Oinas, you soon will see ‘locally-themed’ students’ papers go international! Thank you for giving them hope that research conducted in Portugal, Finland or ... Seili can grab editors’ attention. Kiitos!

This was just a brief sketch of the ESA Summer School, an essential learning experience and intellectual discovery once upon a time in Finland. Yet, the School is not off! The ESA PhD Student Association has been established as an outcome of writing workshops, formal and informal discussions and feedback sessions in Finnish sauna. This association is still a baby of the ESA, but it is hoped that the new-born organization will grow and will encourage academic exchanges and networking between doctoral candidates and recent graduates. Onnea!
The ESA PhD Student Association emerged out of the writing workshops, formal and informal discussions and feedback sessions in a Finnish sauna! This association is still a baby of the ESA, but it is hoped that the new-born organization will grow and will encourage academic exchanges and networking between doctoral candidates and recent graduates.

The ESA PhD student association is an organization created to encourage academic exchanges between doctoral candidates or recent graduates. Our aim is to provide a network for the exchange of ideas and experiences, facilitate communication, and stimulate cooperation in a critical stage of the academic career. We understand that working on the doctoral dissertation can be a solitary challenge. Based on our experience, an international group of PhD students have created this association in order to offer support and encouraging networking among participants. Our aim is to generate a platform that builds bridges among disciplines, academia and the business world by sharing and disseminating information about various research-related topics. We currently have a Facebook group where members can upload information concerning their interests, conferences, job opportunities, and exchange diverse academic information. The group expects to create in the near future a webpage where diverse academic information, relevant for PhD candidates, can be systematically offered. We invite all ESA PhD candidates or recent graduates to join our Facebook group.

In order to join the group, people can send me an e-mail (maranzana@live.com), or directly look for us at Facebook. The name of the group is ESA PhD Network.

**ESA PhD Workshop**

**Social Relations in Turbulent Times**

**Geneva, 5-6 September 2011**

**Call for Papers**

The European Sociological Association invites PhD students from all countries to submit their proposals for participation in a PhD Workshop. We welcome contributions from all areas of sociology that are related to the theme of the 10th ESA Conference „Social Relations in Turbulent Times“ (www.esa10thconference.com), including macro- and micro-sociological approaches as well as theoretical and empirical papers. The Workshop will be held prior to the 10th Conference of the European Sociological Association hosted by the University of Geneva. It aims to explore the challenges of the various „turbulences“ of contemporary societies from different sociological perspectives. Key note lectures given by members of the ESA Executive and plenary discussions will be combined with in-depth workshops that provide opportunities for presenting PhD research.

We are pleased to offer funding for 24 scholars covering workshop fees as well as travel and accommodation during the workshop on a flat rate basis. Please note: eligible for funding are ESA members in good standing, who are PhD students at the time of application. Candidates will be selected by scientific excellence following a peer-review process; we are also aiming at a fair distribution across the various countries and areas of sociological research and theories. We invite proposal outlines of no more than 1,000 words to be submitted via the online submission system; proposals directly sent to the workshop organisers will not be considered! The online submission system opens on 10 January 2011 and closes on 25 February (final deadline!). You will receive an automatic confirmation and will be informed on the results by 31 March. Please visit the ESA 10th Conference website for further information (www.esa10thconference.com) or contact PhD Workshop organisers: Ellen Kuhlmann (e.kuhlmann@bath.ac.uk) and Elina Oinas (eoinas@abo.fi).

**Workshop Programme**

**Monday, 5 September 2011**

9.00h Registration and Introduction
Ellen Kuhlmann and Elina Oinas (ESA PhD Committee) and Sandro Cattacin (University of Geneva, Chair of Local Organising Committee)

9.30h Lecture Sociology and social relations in turbulent times
Analia Torres, ESA President, ISCTE-IUL, Lisbon University Institute, Portugal

10.30-11.00h Coffee/tea break

11.00h Lecture Constructing agency in modern sociological theory
Pekka Sulkunen, University of Helsinki, Finland

12.00h Lecture Culture and identity
Thomas Eberle, University of St. Gallen, Switzerland

13.00-14.30 Lunch break

14.30-18.00 Parallel Workshops

**Tuesday, 6 September 2011**

9.00h Lecture Public policy in turbulent societies
Ellen Kuhlmann, University of Bath, UK

10.00 Lecture Citizens on the move
Ursula Apitzsch, Goethe University Frankfurt, Germany

11.00-11.30 Coffee/tea break

11.30 Lecture Writing and publishing as a PhD student
Elina Oinas, University of Turku, Finland

12.30-14.00 Lunch break; meeting journal editors and publishers

14.00-16.00 Parallel Workshops

16.00 Closing of the Workshop
Amalfi Prize for Sociology and Social Science

Last June, the prestigious European Amalfi Prize for Sociology and Social Science was awarded to Juan J. Linz, Sterling Professor Emeritus of Political Science and Social Sciences at Yale University. The Prize was established in 1987 at the initiative of the Italian Sociology Association. Previous recipients include Norbert Elias, Zygmunt Bauman, Charles Tilly, Shmuel Noah Eisenstadt, Richard Sennett and Niklas Luhmann. Presented here are excerpts from the eulogy given by the Spanish sociologist Salvador Giner on behalf of the scientific committee.

Laudatio

Professor Carlo Mongadini, Chairman of the Scientific Committee, Distinguished Members of the Scientific Committee of the European Prize for Social Science and Sociology, Ladies and Gentlemen,

It is a privilege to have been asked by the President and the Committee of the Amalfi Prize to speak before you about the work and contributions to knowledge made by the social scientist Professor Juan José Linz Storch de Gracia…

Juan Linz had a German father and was born in Bonn in 1926. He attended secondary school during the last two years of Civil War, in the city of Salamanca, and afterwards in Madrid until 1943, at the Ramiro de Maeztu High School. He studied Law and Political and Economic Science at Madrid University, where he received his degree with special honours. A disciple of Professor Javier Conde, a distinguished political philosopher, he obtained a scholarship to study at Columbia University. He studied sociology there, under Professor Seymour Martin Lipset, and obtained his PhD degree in 1959, with his dissertation on The Social Basis of Political Parties in West Germany. All of you must have read Lipset's Political Man, a classic in political science. You may have been surprised, as I once was, by the repeated references to an unpublished PhD dissertation by a certain Juan Linz.

Linz soon turned his attention to what he would call “authoritarian regimes”, then a much neglected field in political science and sociology, where, understandably, either democracy or totalitarianism –fascist, communist, or otherwise– held everyone’s attention. Yet Juan Linz realized that a great number of dictatorships did not fit these two extreme cases. Looking at his own country, Spain, Linz soon began to analyze the Franco dictatorship with the same undogmatic, thorough and systematic scholarship with which he had earlier looked at the Weimar Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany. His 1964 paper An Authoritarian Regime: Spain formulated the later widely used notion of ‘authoritarian regime’, especially in his paper of 1975 Totalitarian and Authoritarian Regimes, a now a locus classicus in the political science literature. It is a major effort to develop a taxonomy of non-democratic regimes in the world, with wide empirical implications for research.

In my opinion, that contribution would have been sufficient for an award like the one we are bestowing upon Professor Linz today. Much more was to come. Juan Linz soon became a world authority on the study of political transitions from democracy to dictatorship in studies such as can be found in the 1978 volume The Breakdown of Democratic Regimes, whose focus on the incompetence of political elites rather than on notions such as that of ‘class struggle’ or on the allegedly anonymous forces of history would soon irritate the more Marxist or observers of the process. A series of important studies then followed, such as The Failure of Presidential Democracy, in 1994, Problems of Democratic Transition and Consolidation in 1996. Working with other political scientists, such as Stein Rokkan, he also studied the processes on nation building and on the role of states as the origin, not just the result, of nations themselves…

Juan Linz also contributed some works in the history of ideas which remain important to our day, for example, his comprehensive study of Roberto Michels’ political sociology in the International Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences or his masterful study of the decline and enormous difficulties encountered by natural science and scholarship in XVIIIth century Spain, subjects often overlooked by sociologists, guided as they often are by the notion of progress.

Professor Juan Linz obtained a Chair in Political Science at Yale but often visited Europe and Spanish America. His presence in Spain was constantly felt, in his strenuous effort to participate in the life and letters of the country and, also in its democratic politics, though certainly not as a member of any political party. He is the doyen of Spanish sociologists. Among his many international awards and doctorates honoris causa, he received one of the highest prizes given by his country, the Prince of Asturias Prize, in 1987. His Chair at Yale became a place of pilgrimage for many Iberians and Iberian Americans who learned not only from his courses but very especially from his infinite patience and generosity while supervising dissertations, or assessing work in progress.

Again I was lucky that I witnessed the „Linz phenomenon” at first hand. On a sabbatical year in 1981 from my University in London and, by sheer chance, my family and I were generously lent a house in a village near New Haven. Professor Linz then gave me all the facilities at Yale, including a study, as if I had been appointed a visiting professor. I am not one of his direct disciples, and my own views and work orientations do not always coincide: yet I am as much a Linzian as anyone who is not his disciple can be. I wish to thank him and his wife Rocío for an unforgettable year and for the many, many hours spent in their charming company.

I cannot hide the fact, ladies and gentlemen, that I am overjoyed by the Amalfi Committee decision to honour Juan Linz with the highest honour European social science can award to anyone. As a political sociologist and political scientist, Juan Linz is one of the most outstanding in Europe and in the United States today.
The disciplinary identity of sociology has been debated since its institutionalisation in the late 19th century. Theoretical and internal questions that sociologists have asked themselves are now reinforced by new challenges from science policy, and from European science policy in particular. Trans- and inter-disciplinary research is the call today in all European science policy programmes and justifications for organisational and institutional reforms. University structures are encouraged to work in an inter-disciplinary manner through mergers of departments and faculties, at the expense of autonomous disciplines. The Bologna Process is now in a phase where structural solutions are sought. The claim for trans-disciplinary research has always had a dynamic, even radical connotation.

When Gibbons et al. (in The New Production of Knowledge, The Dynamics of Science and Research in Contemporary Societies. London: Sage, 1997) introduced the contrast between old-fashioned, academic Mode 1 science and inter-disciplinary, applied and problem-oriented Mode 2 science, the former was made to appear sterile and antiquated in its reliance on internal academic canons and traditions. Knowledge production in Mode 1 takes place at a distance from the context of application, and 'pure' science is at the far end of the RD-continuum from research to "development". Mode 1 knowledge production respects rigorous disciplinary boundaries. Its canon of accountability and quality control dictates that only intra-disciplinary expert authority is qualified to judge the validity of knowledge, the merits of the scientists and the value of their work. Mode 1 science is typical of work at universities, and, as Nowotny, Scott, and Gibbons claim in another book (Re-Thinking Science, Knowledge and the Public in an Age of Uncertainty. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2001), it is in fact not accountable at all in practical terms, such as outcomes in welfare or impact in policy effectiveness. In social science, its illusionary objectivity is associated with the idea of building consensus and designing the same good life for all (patriarchal, salaried middle class, familialistic etc.), and hiding away the normative presuppositions of what this is.

In contrast to Mode 1 "pure" science, Mode 2 knowledge production takes place in the context of application; it is trans-disciplinary and is directly accountable on grounds of its practical usefulness both to academic colleagues and to the society that maintains and provides resources for it. It is a liberal ideal, reflecting on its normative foundations. For Mode 2 science, the authority of the state does not suffice to define what the good society is, what kind of life is good or bad or how to solve the problems.

Today, the distinction and its value premises are less clear. Trans- or inter-disciplinary claims are voiced not only by liberal anti-positivists but also by ultra-conservatives. In Italy, a prominent science policy-maker Roberto de Mattei, a creationist who believes that Adam and Eve were real persons and that the human race is hardly more than 5000 years old, has steered the human and social science branch of the National Research Council towards issues of national identity.

Social sciences are not even mentioned in its work programme. Instead, an interdisciplinary approach is celebrated to support a national identity based on a conservative interpretation of the Christian doctrine.

In more social-democratic contexts like Finland, the same claim has other types of consequences. In the name of pluralism, the state no longer decides what kind of life is good. Nevertheless, officials have to be given grounds for decisions about how to direct the state's money to different purposes. Frame laws and programs define goals, and research is needed not to make plans but to evaluate results. Similarly, European Union framework programmes formulate goals on issues such as the development of technology, employment, prevention of exclusion, regional development, promotion of health, prevention of drug problems and harmonization of education. EU social policy is evidence-based, research is also policy-specific, and policy is not derived from research. The practical and policy-driven emphasis in EU science philosophy is reflected in the Bologna Process. Theoretically, it offers two opposing possibilities for sociological teaching. One is to introduce students to sociology at the BA level and offer them interdisciplinary MA programmes after that. The other is to join BA degrees among social sciences and continue with MA programmes structured around either sociology or topical interdisciplinary subjects. Either way, the practical concerns about employability take the upper hand over disciplinary considerations.

Disciplinary identity is not a matter of boundaries, it is a perspective on politics in the light of sociology's intellectual function. Sociology has played a major role in the making of modern Europe, the welfare state and the integration of societies facing serious social and political conflicts. This has been possible only because since Adam Smith's time it has operated with the modern idea of society as an entity which depends neither on violence nor on an external political apparatus. The same challenges that drive science policy in anti-disciplinary directions are also challenges in the current construction of European society. Global governance, immigration, universality based on cultural diversity, lifestyles and health, environmental constraints, open regionalism, social disintegration in mega-cities and regional inequalities within Europe, ageing, gender balance in different areas of public life, democracy and citizen participation, and many other policy targets are also challenges to social order. They involve issues of inclusion and exclusion, autonomy and intimacy, justification and human worth. What Europe needs is sociology – a science of society – that looks at policy with all its disciplinary tools in the light of its intellectual history, not – or at least not only – research that looks at society from a perspective already defined by policy.
There is a new Editor as well as a new editorial board for European Societies!

The new Editor will be the comparatively oriented macro sociologist sociologist Göran Therborn, recently emeritus from Cambridge University, though still doing some teaching there, while returning to live in Sweden. Therborn’s latest book is The World. A Beginner’s Guide (Polity 2011), but he has also worked extensively on European societies, in a series of books from European Modernity and Beyond (Sage 1995) to Les Sociétés d’ Europe du XXe au XXIe siècle (Armand Colin 2009), and (with Stefan Immerfall et al.) Handbook of European Societies (Springer 2010).

Therborn writes: « So far, in the field of European studies, sociology has not gained the centrality it deserves. We would like to draw the attention of all sociologists to the multidisciplinary field of European studies, and to stimulate more contributions to it. The journal should aspire to the central role in European studies which is inscribed on its name.

The important complex of issues around the place, the meaning, and the part of Europe in the world needs to be addressed in the post-globalization era of the 21st century. What does Europe and European societies stand for in the current world? Finally, we think the journal could make a still more active contribution to the commons - not necessarily integration - of European sociology. »

The Deputy Editor will be Sven Hort, of Linneus University, Sweden. He is an expert, above all, on comparative social policy. The book review editor is Dr Ola Agevall, also of Linneus University, with wide-ranging, largely theoretical interests.

The editorial team will try to make three types of interventions. First, editorial following, reporting, and commenting upon the multidisciplinary field of European studies, and upon scholarly perceptions of European societies in the world. Secondly, actively soliciting contributions from colleagues outside the Western half-continent, from Russia, Ukraine, the Baltics, East-Central Europe, Belarus, the Balkans, Turkey, and the Caucasus. This soliciting will include thematic sections and special issues.

Thirdly, the book review section will have a deliberate policy and focus on major works of European studies, of interpretations of Europe in the world, and on important sociological works in other languages than English.

New blood is also coming onto the editorial board thereby replacing most of the members of the former board. In addition to the Executive Committee members who participate in the editorial board : Ursula Apitzsch (University of Frankfurt, Germany), Tomas Boje (Denmark), Elena Danilova (Institute of Sociology, Moscow, Russia), and Marie-Thérèse Letablier (CNRS, Paris, France), the board includes seven new external members who were elected by the Executive committee in May 2010. These new members are: Cristobal Albero-Torres (Universidad Autonoma de Madrid, Spain), Tony Fahey (University College, Dublin, Ireland), Ute Gerhard (University of Frankfurt, Germany), Max Haller (University of Graz, Austria), Marju Lauristin (Tartu University, Estonia), Anna Lisa Tota (University Roma III, Italy), and Karen Wall (Lisbon university, Portugal).

Marie-Thérèse Letablier, Chair of the ESA Publication Committee, writes: “Thanks to John Scott (University of Plymouth, UK), the retiring Editor, and his team in Routledge, the journal has notably improved over the last years, reaching now a better position in the ranking of journals. The ESA executive committee is very grateful to John for the work done, as also to the former editorial board.”
Sociology in Croatia started its development as part of legal sciences. In 1874, the law historian Baltazar Bogišić (1834-1908) conducted a comprehensive survey for the purpose of publishing an Almanac of Legal Customs of Southern Slavs. For the first time in Croatia, Bogišić used methods such as participant observation, questionnaires, statistical methods, comparative method, and the analysis of archival documents. In 1888, he became the first president of the newly founded International Institute of Sociology, a precursor to the International Sociological Association (ISA).

Following an initiative in the Croatian Parliament to establish a department of sociology in 1900, a chair of criminal sociology was finally institutionalized in 1906 at the Law School of Zagreb University. This chair, held by Professor Edvard Miler, was the first chair of sociology established in what was then Austro-Hungarian Monarchy. The activities that predated the establishment of the Croatian Sociological Association (CSA) included an initiative to establish a museum of sociology, as well as an exhibition dedicated to the fight against alcoholism and tuberculosis, organized in collaboration with the Ministry of Public Hygiene. However, the CSA was formally established in Zagreb after the end of World War I in 1918, with Adolf Mihalić as its first president.

In 1923, the Secretary of Sociological Association Juraj Andrassy reported on its activities in the Revue internationale de sociologie. From here we learn that the Association had 160 members, and that it organized various public lectures. In the 1930s, the Sociological Association was extinguished due to political pressures and ideological differences among its members. It was only re-established only in 1959, under the name of Sociological Association of Croatia.

Prior to 1963, sociology in Croatia was taught in the form of individual courses at various faculties of the social sciences and the humanities. In 1963, Rudi Supek dissociated the Chair of Sociology from the Department of Philosophy at the Faculty of Philosophy in Zagreb and established the first autonomous Department of Sociology. In 1977, a sociology department at the Faculty of Philosophy in Zadar was set up. In 1996, a department of sociology was established as part of the Croatian Studies program at the University of Zagreb. Finally, in 2005, the department of sociology was established at the University of Split. Together, they represent the current network of sociology departments in the Croatian system of higher education.

The Institute for Social Research (the precursor of which was established in 1964), the Institute for Migrations and Ethnic Studies (the precursor of which was established in 1984), and the Institute for Social Sciences “Ivo Pilar” (established in 1991, and bearing its present name since 1997), also play a significant role in social research in Croatia. Numerous researchers from these institutions teach part-time in the institutions of higher education.

Sociological research is published in the official journal of the CSA, Sociological Revue; Sociology and Space (formerly Sociology of Village); Migration and Ethnic Themes (formerly Migration Themes); Social Research; Social Ecology; Croatian Journal of Social Policy; Polemos - Journal of Interdisciplinary Research on War and Peace; and the students’ journal for social sciences and the humanities Discrepancy and Amalgam.

The Croatian Sociological Association currently numbers over 250 members and is widely seen as one of the most engaged professional organizations in Croatia. There are three special sections within the association: Sociology of Religion, Sociology and Space, and Society, Economy and Labor. The establishment of a Section on Sociology of Education is planned for 2011.

CSA plays an active role in society by launching and supporting various public initiatives. It organizes public lectures and presentations, as well as national sociological congresses. In recent years, the biennially organized national congresses alternate with international conferences. An effort has been made to decentralize these events. The national congresses in the years 2007 and 2009 were organized in Split and Zagreb, while the international conferences in 2008 and 2010 were organized in Zadar and Rijeka.

In 2005, CSA co-organized (with the Institute for Social Research, Zagreb) the 28th world conference of International Society for the Sociology of Religion entitled Religion and Society: Challenging Boundaries. The 2007 national congress was devoted to the topic Methodological Challenges: Social Issues in Croatia, while in 2009 the theme was Social Changes and Social Structure: Croatia 20 Years After. The international CSA conferences dealt with the topics Sociology and Interdisciplinarity: Central and South East European Perspectives (2008) and Qualitative Transitions: Issues of Methodology in Central and South-East European Sociologies (2010).
European Sociological Association meeting with National Associations (NAs)

Roberto Cipriani, President of the Council of NAs

According to the statutes, NAs play a big role to play in the ESA as they propose names for the election of the ESA Executive Committee and President. They also have a crucial role in promoting sociology in Europe. ESA can bridge the gap between European sociology and European institutions and European funding.

In an attempt to further the understanding between the ESA and the NAs, a meeting was held in Paris on October 28th, 2010, to which all NAs were invited. In the end, the following NAs sent representatives to the meeting: Germany, Norway, Turkey, Romania, France, Portugal, the Westernarck Society of the Finnish Sociological Society, Switzerland, Hungary, Austria, Spain, Britain, Israel, Italy, Poland, Latvia, the Vojvodian Sociological Association, Denmark, Macedonia, Albania and the Russian Society of Sociologists.

ESA President Anália Torres, ESA Past President Claire Wallace and members of the ESA Executive Committee Elina Oinas, Pekka Sulkunen, Ursula Apitzsch, Thomas Eberle and Consuelo Corradi were present. Roberto Cipriani acted as the President of the Council of National Associations.

The special guests who were invited to the meeting included Jean-Michel Baer, Director for Science, Economy and Society, of the European Commission Framework Programme 7, who presented a paper on “The role of social sciences in addressing European grand challenges. FP7 Achievements and Perspectives”. Concerning the FP8, he explained that there are financial constraints but they were expecting an improvement and an increased budget. Rifka Weehuizen, the representative of the Humanities and Social Sciences Unit, made a presentation on behalf of the European Science Foundation. Pekka Sulkunen, the chair of the ESA Committee for external relations, reported on the activities of the committee, which has proposed the creation of a social science forum where scientists could bring to policy-makers ideas that they think are crucial. Then delegates from all the NAs made presentations and suggestions.

Developing a Research Network Council

Three years ago, the ESA established the “Research Network Council”, a meeting of all the research network coordinators with the Chair and the members of the Research Networks Committee (a subcommittee of the Executive Committee) as well as the President. The first meeting took place at the 8th ESA conference in Glasgow, and the second at the 9th conference in Lisbon. The goal was to exchange ideas, discuss problems and ponder ways to improve the organization and the relationship between the Research Networks and the Executive Committee. The assembly was called the Research Network Council similar to the Council of the National Associations. However, it was not formally added as a governing body or as an organ in the statutes.

The time has come to improve the structural position of the Research Networks (henceforth RNs) within the ESA. The idea that is presently discussed within the Executive Committee is to formally establish the RN Council in the statutes and to have a Chairperson elected by the RN coordinators, in analogy to the Council of National Associations (henceforth NAs).

The Chairperson should be a member of the Executive Committee and ideally be the Chair of the RN committee. As such s/he would have voting rights, like the Chair of the NAs (at present the latter participates at executive board meetings but is not allowed to vote). The Chairpersons of both councils would become formal members of the Executive Committee. This measure implies that the RNs elect their own representative within the Executive Committee, and this would secure that the Chairperson of the RN Committee has personal experience with RNs, preferably as a coordinator, and enjoys the trust and the support of the electing coordinators.

Many details have to be discussed and finalized. The Executive Committee has generally accepted this proposal and will decide about the details and the change of statutes in its next meeting in May. In the meantime, I will consult with all the RN coordinators and I welcome constructive comment by each and every one of our members (thomas.eberle@unisg.ch).

The project will only be implemented if it is generally agreed that this marks a significant progress of the ESA’s structure and of the structural position of the RNs within ESA. The final say will be given at the General Assembly in Geneva in 2011.
In the fourth article in this series, European Sociologist takes an inside look at Research Network No. 17 on Industrial relations, labour market institutions and employment.

The initiative of creating a forum for sociologist of labour and socio-economists was taken by Franz Traxler in 1999 in cooperation with the International Sociological Association – Research Committee (RC) 44 (labour movements). The interaction between the ISA RC and the European Sociological Association (ESA) Research Network (RN) has continued over the years. RN 17 organised sessions in the ESA Ljubljana, Toruń and Lisbon Conferences. It also organised two mid-term conferences that took place respectively in Jena (2006) and in Parma (2010).

The number of RN participants has been constantly growing and this trend confirms the raison d’être of the RN to provide occasions for exchanges among academic and professionals in order to keep cultivating the sociological debate about changing labour and employment relations.

The sessions in Lisbon were jointly organised by ESA RN 17 AND ISA RC10 and ISA RC10 (Participation, Organizational Democracy and Self-Management). This cooperation proved to be fruitful in terms of the number and quality of participants. The number of papers presented and the rich discussion encouraged the RN to organise a mid-term conference in order to keep debating some key research perspectives. The last event in April 2010 in Parma focused on “Perspectives for labour relations in Europe”. Papers were given on a variety of topics, including sector studies and the role played by the strategic choices of the European Unions, and the extent collective bargaining is playing a role in the governance of macro economic variables, and the continuing ability of trade unions and employers associations to coordinate their bargaining activities and contribute to economic development. A forthcoming publication by M. Baglioni and B. Brandl, Changing labour relations between path dependency and global trends, (Peter Lang) will deal with some of these issues.

The organisation of the RN17 was discussed in the business meeting at the Lisbon conference. The elected board consists of three members (Mirella Baglioni, Lucio Baccaro and Isabel da Costa). Franz Traxler was confirmed as coordinator and of Alessia Vatta as vice-coordinator.

The unexpected death of Franz Traxler in January 2010 (reported in European Sociologist Issue 20, Page 15) caused some organisational changes in RN17. Mirella Baglioni (University of Parma) became the coordinator and appointed Bernd Brandl (University of Vienna) as vice-coordinator.

The RN 17 will meet in Geneva and will open the debate on the board composition and on the focus of the next initiatives. We intend to define more precisely the roles of the board members in view of further developing information and communication about research opportunities, meetings and conferences.

Submitting material for the Newsletter

European Sociologist is the newsletter of the European Sociological Association, which aims at disseminating information to the widest possible audience. Material appearing in other newsletters or the publications of national associations, university departments may be duplicated in the Newsletter.

European Sociologist is not a journal and hence does not publish academic articles, but all other types of material of relevance to sociologists working on or in Europe will be considered: articles, opinion pieces, features, comments, letters to the Editor, reports and more.

We work directly from electronic media, so please send material in a Word file via e-mail.

The newsletter charges for commercial advertisements only. The current fees are:

• 200 EUR for a quarter page

If you have material, an advertisement or an article or feature you would like to submit, please send it to the Editor, Dr. Shalva Weil at msshalva@mscc.huji.ac.il
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