Norbert Elias Memorial Artists’ Award

As is well known, Norbert Elias spent two years (1962–64) as Professor and head of the new Department of Sociology at the University of Ghana, where he acquired both a passionate liking for and an excellent collection of West African art. In response to an initiative by Dr Artur Bogner, who was one of Elias’s assistants in Bielefeld in the early 1980s and himself became a Ghanaian specialist, the board of the Elias Foundation has agreed to establish an annual award in his memory for a Ghanaian artist. Hermann Korte had a meeting with Dr. Petra Raymond, Director of the Goethe Institute in Ghana, which will administer the scheme on the foundation’s behalf, organising publicity and exhibitions by the artists. The artists will work in the ArtHAUS in Accra, founded by the Ghanaian artist Kofi Setordji. The jury to award the stipend will be composed of Kofi Setordji and representatives of both the Goethe Institute and the National Museum. The first award will be made in the early months of 2004. After three years the scheme will be evaluated. A prospectus is being prepared and will be available from the foundation.

See www.norberteliasfoundation.nl.

Marbach Stipend

The German Literature Archive and the Norbert Elias Foundation, Amsterdam, will once again award a Marbach Graduate Stipend to undertake research for six months (starting not earlier than autumn 2004) on the papers of Norbert Elias, which have been deposited in the German Literature Archive. A definitive announcement will be made in Figurations 21, but in the meantime those who may be interested should contact either Dr. Christoph König (Deutsches Literaturarchiv, D–71666 Marbach-am-Neckar, Tel. +49-7144-848-432) or Professor Hermann Korte (Kleimannstr. 8, D–48149 Münster, Germany).

Advance Announcement: Fourth Norbert Elias Prize 2005

We should like to alert readers in good time to the fact that the Fourth Norbert Elias Prize will be awarded in 2005. The Prize consists in a sum of €1000 and it will be awarded to a significant first work by a European author published between 1 January 2003 and 31 December 2004. Discussions are in train about continuing collabora-
tion with the Premio Europeo Amalfi organisation, but the Elias Prize will be awarded whatever their outcome.

The Prize is awarded ‘in commemoration of the sociologist Norbert Elias (1897–1990), whose writings, at once theoretical and empirical, boldly crossed disciplinary boundaries in the social sciences to develop a long-term perspective on the patterns of interdependence which human beings weave together’. The Norbert Elias Prize is intended to draw attention to a promising young European scholar who has published a first book in sociology or a related discipline, although it is by no means necessary that Eliasian ideas be deployed in their work. The first Norbert Elias Prize was awarded in 1999 to David Lepoutre for his book *Coeur de Banlieue*, the second in 2001 to Wilbert van Vree for *Meetings, Manners and Civilisation*, and the third in 2003 to Nikola Tietze for *Islamische Identität: Formen muslimischer Religiosität junger Männer in Deutschland und Frankreich*.

In order to nominate a book for the award, please send a letter of recommendation to

Saskia Visser
Secretary, Norbert Elias Foundation
J.J. Viottastraat 13
1071 JM Amsterdam
The Netherlands

In the case of books written in a language other than English, French or German, nominators are asked to provide an outline in English of the content of the book.

An ISA Thematic Group on Civilising and Decivilising Processes?

At the last three World Congresses of Sociology – Bielefeld in 1994, Montreal in 1998 and Brisbane in 2002 – there has been an ‘Ad Hoc Group’ in Figurational Sociology. The success of each of them – as reported in earlier issues of *Figurations* has testified to the international interest in and the variety of research being pursued under the rubric of ‘figurational sociology’. Reading back through the reports, one can see clear evidence of the way debates, research and the sheer variety of topics arising within figurational sociology have moved forward. These meetings have provided an occasion for colleagues from around the world, who otherwise keep in touch mainly by e-mail, to meet each other in person and to enjoy more leisureed discussions of their work, both in the sessions themselves and (typically) over drinks afterwards. Many new faces, too, have appeared among those of the usual suspects on these occasions.

An ‘Ad Hoc Group’ is the lowest form of life in the ISA’s elaborate evolutionary hierarchy, which extends all the way up to the three or four dozen full-blown ‘Research Committees’. The problem with Ad Hoc Groups is that – successful as ours have been – approval for their inclusion has to be sought from the World Congress Programme Committee each time, and in every other way they have to be arranged from scratch. Ad Hoc Groups are also allocated only two sessions, often in unsociable hours (or rather, during what would otherwise be social hours in the pub) – although at Bielefeld we did somehow wangle five sessions.

With the 2006 World Congress in Durban, South Africa, in mind, Robert van Krieken of the University of Sydney has been exploring the possibility of our being promoted to the next, modestly higher, level in the ISA ladder – what is called a ‘Thematic Group’, and which at least is recognised as having a continuing existence.

Robert has submitted the requisite number of names of paid-up members of the ISA, but we have run into a problem. Faced with the title ‘Figurational Sociology’, the ISA secretariat has responded, ‘Yes, but what do you actually study?’ The ISA is largely organised around research into specific factual topics, ranging from ‘Armed Forces and Society’ through ‘Stratification’ to ‘Sociology of Sport’. And indeed, the Congresses are largely organised on the assumption that members mainly attend meeting just of ‘their own’ Research Committee, along with plenary and other special sessions. Much as we may deplore this intellectual Taylorism – the whole thrust of ‘figurational sociology’ being to show how many diverse aspects of society are intertwined with each other – it is an unavoidable fact.

To circumvent the problem Robert suggests changing the title of the proposed Thematic Group to ‘Civilising and Decivilising Processes’. This may not be ideal – not everything we have discussed at previous congresses falls easily under that heading – but it is the best we can think of. If you can think of a better title, please e-mail Robert at robertvk@mail.usyd.edu.au.

Please also contact Robert if you would like to add your name to the list of supporters for the Thematic Group, and let him know whether you are provisionally thinking of attending the Durban congress.

- A SUPPRESSED POEM BY NORBERT ELIAS

Only a handful of poems in English were included in the volume *Los der Menschen* published by Suhrkamp in 1987 to mark Norbert Elias’s ninetieth birthday. One of them has been widely admired and quoted – the three-line *haiku* (p. 59) which follows three longer poems in German under the general heading ‘Von der Tangerreise’ (From the Journey to Tangiers). But now Richard Kilminster has turned up a longer version that appeared in the journal *Luciad*, issue number 22, June 1962, published by the Students’ Union of the University of Leicester. Here it appears under the title ‘Marginal Notes to an introductory lecture in sociology’. The photocopy has a couple of minor corrections in Norbert’s handwriting, which are incorporated below.

how strange these people are
how strange I am
how strange we are

when I was young
I thought women and men mysterious
what games what smiles
what whispers and what silences
there seemed something hidden away
one could never understand
now that I am old
the patterns of men have ceased to be
strangers
one learns to read
the signs of the eyes
the languages of lips
the signals of fingers and feet
there are no mysteries
only a lot I don’t know
nothing unknowable
only the novelty of the living
and their infinite variety of surprises
the journey – not the arrival
not the survival – the struggle

why do you want to save mankind from
destruction
if you are not going to make men’s
lives richer?

Although the later stanzas contain some
striking thoughts, on the whole one is
struck by Elias’s discernment and self-
knowledge in including only the first in
his collected poems.

SJM

THE FIGURATIONAL IMAGINATION AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Andrew Linklater’s article on ‘Norbert Elias and International Relations’ (Figurations 19) examining the potential of applying a figurational perspective to the study of international relations was a welcome contribution from a leading scholar in the discipline. Professor Linklater notes the interest in bridging divides between historical sociology and IR, and this has been one aspect of a ‘social turn’ in the discipline over around two decades that has also seen successive development of (i) Marxist and critical theories (ii) postmodern and post-structuralist theories; (iii) feminist and normative theories; (iv) social constructivism and finally, (v) the historical sociology of international relations. There has been minimal discussion of Elias’s writings within these debates (compared with the attention given to figures such as Weber or Giddens), with some exceptions: Professor Linklater cites the important work of Godfried van Benthem van den Bergh, to which we could add the attempt by Mayer et al. (1993) to explore the civilising effects of international regimes, and Jung’s (2001) synthesis of Marx, Weber and Elias to provide a framework for a global political sociology. Given the many paths of the social turn, analysis of the sociogenesis of international relations may yet develop into a productive research agenda for scholars in both disciplines.

Professor Linklater’s own outline for research on civilising processes within state-systems and the civilising effects of ‘cosmopolitan harm conventions’ is insightful and thought provoking. He suggests links between Elias’s work and the ideas of Martin Wight, who alongside other ‘English School’ realists, developed the conception of an ‘international society’ of states, with specific rules, customs and institutions that socialise states, fostering order and stability. This echoes the sentiments of an earlier argument by Roland Robertson (1992) who sought to supplement Elias’s understanding of civilising processes in global society with (international society theorist) Gerrit Gong’s (1984) concept of the ‘standard of civilisation’, contributing to social integration at the inter-state level. We could thus develop a potential synthesis of figurational sociology and the international society/English school to produce an historical sociology of state-systems, supplementing understanding of routes to internal pacification of societies (state monopolisation of conflict management functions, higher levels of integration and interdependence), with analysis of the civilising effects of norms and conventions arising in the context of international society. This could be linked to the large literature on institution building, regime formation and global governance in IR, that suggests non-violent routes to the pacification of global society through the ongoing rationalisation of state affairs. That is, there is great potential in considering the treaties, protocols, charters, covenants and conventions of international concerts, conferences, regimes and organisations as state-level equivalents to the manners books of Elias’s original civilising processes research, that may have tamed states, if not completely pacified international relations.

Another way to introduce analysis of the processes of pacification into IR is suggested by the work of the American IR scholar John Herz, who by all accounts possessed a ‘figurational imagination’ (Herz 1942, 1950, 1957, 1967, 1978). There are multiple points of convergence: Herz, like Elias, advocated a processual approach to his field of study and had a relational understanding of power and the interdependence of states and societies. Just as Elias was interested in the force that state competition and monopoly formation exerted on social development within social units and on habits, so Herz was concerned with the effects of total war on state, society and personality. Elias and Herz also converge on an understanding of the state’s security monopoly: the state-society nexus as a survival or protection unit, monopolising conflict management functions which produced, for Elias, the paradox of seemingly intractably violent inter-state relations, and for Herz, the rather similar ‘security dilemma’. Both recognised, in the transfer of competition and protection to larger and larger groups, the implications of humanity as a whole as increasingly the only survival/protection unit in any meaningful sense. And as Elias conceived of civilising processes in the social sphere yielding centralised state apparatuses, accepted standards of behaviour and the development of habitual self-restraint, which could be thrown into reverse as decivilising processes, so Herz offers civilising processes in the political sphere, producing democracy, legitimacy, procedures for international cooperation and international law which could also be subject to erosion in a potentially global decivilising process.

This presents a further agenda for a figurational sociology of international relations, focusing on monopoly formation and competition around the notion of ‘security’. States may no longer be able to monopolise the use of violence, but they seek to monopolise security. The erosion of legitimacy of this monopoly and threats from non-state actor violence (in such phenomena as weapons proliferation, transnational criminal activity and terrorism), ‘rogue states’ and the responses from states themselves (as seen in the present
PHOTOGRAPHS OF ELIAS’S AFRICAN ART

In the early 1980s Gerard Holzmann’s took many photographs objects from Norbert Elias’s collection of African art, and he has now made some of them available on the Internet, at http://spinroot.com/elias/index.html. Many of these statues were part of an exhibition at the Leicester Museum and Art Gallery from April 24 - June 14 1970.

Elias was interested in having more of his collection documented, with the ultimate aim of one day collecting these images, with an explanatory essay, in a small book. Gerard, being interested in photography, offered to help, and started photographing parts of the collection in 1983, continuing at intervals until 1987. But the book was not completed at Elias’s death in 1990.

Gerard has selected a small number of images from among the hundreds he took, and we have selected a few from the website. He writes that ‘many of the images are hauntingly beautiful, and no doubt all have a story attached to them that alas can no longer be told’.

The photos were taken in Amsterdam with studio flash, using several cameras. Many of the photos were made with a Cambo view camera on 4x5” negatives, others with a medium format Hasselblad 500 C/M on 6x6cm film, and a few others with a 35 mm Canon A1 camera.

All photographs are © 1983-1987 Gerard J. Holzmann.
<p>“War on Terrorism”) to reinforce this monopoly may unintentionally foster pacification (as with the territorially-based contests that led to internal pacification) or conversely engender a decivilising process that transforms the meanings and possibilities of ‘protection’. The more states seek to reinforce their monopoly over security, they will find challenges to that monopoly from parties who see themselves as no longer able to ‘accept’ a state’s protection or who are willing to challenge its efficacy through the manipulation of fear. As well as cosmopolitan sentiments that renounce unnecessary suffering, cruelty and harm, we may find many elements in modern global society, amongst both state and non-state actors, who find themselves unable to forswear violence in this political context. Thus to supplement the historical study of the civilising effects of international society, we could analyse the (de)civilising effects of monopolisation processes. The first agenda, led by analysis of institution building and conventions of non-violence and the second led by a focus on violent challenge to monopolies, can both work towards answering the question central to any figural sociolog of international relations: can there be (long-term, durable) pacification of global society without violence? One final point should be noted. As a sociologist who has studied International Relations theory, I am aware that producing work of interest to both sociologists and IR scholars may be limited by the differences of approach, vocabulary and method between the two disciplines. Despite many moves towards inter- or trans-disciplinarity in the social sciences in the last decade, parties in both camps might have to become familiar with a mode of engagement that can seem rather alien. Sociologists may have their own obscure jargon, but this is matched by a similar vocabulary in IR. For instance, neoliberal institutionalist theory invites attention not least as it incorporates Keohane & Nye’s seminal text <i>Power and Interdependence</i> (1989). Though ostensibly sharing an interest in two key concepts, their treatment of power and interdependence is incredibly different from a figural treatment. This does not mean we should forgo the development of a figural sociology of international relations, merely that we should not disregard the impact of such differences.</p>
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### Latest Volumes in the Gesammelte Schriften


By an oversight, we failed to mention in Figurations 18 that volume 6 of the collected works of Elias in German had been published by Suhrkamp in 2002. Under the editorship of Heike Hammer, it contains both the long essay on the loneliness of the dying and the short book <i>Humana Conditio</i>, reflections on the history of humankind originally written to mark the fortieth anniversary of the end of the Second World War. While <i>Humana Conditio</i> has not as yet been published in English, on the other hand this volume also contains an afterword to <i>Loneliness</i> entitled ‘Ageing and Dying: Some Sociological Problems’ that had hitherto not been published in German.

**Sport und Spannung**, volume 7 of the collected works, is the first full translation into German of <i>Quest for Excitement</i>. These writings all originate in English. Although some of the essays on sport and leisure were translated by Willi Hopf and published as <i>Sport im Zivilisationsprozeß</i> by his firm Lit Verlag as early as 1982 – that is, before <i>Quest for Excitement</i> was published by Blackwells in 1986 – the present volume represents <i>Quest</i> as it was finally conceived by its co-authors, including four essays by Dunning (one co-authored with Patrick Murphy and John Williams). Elias did not share in the writing of these – on achievement striving, social bonding and violence in modern sport, and on sport as a male preserve – but he approved their inclusion as complements to and continuations of his own and Eric’s work. The parts that did not appear earlier in German have been translated by Detlef Bremecke and Reinhardt Peter Nippert, and the volume as a whole has been edited for the Editorial Board by Reinhard Blomert.

### Fata Libelli – Four Volumes of Secondary Literature on Elias


With the last issue of <i>Figurations</i>, subscribers received a fairly lavish
leaflet from Sage advertising the above four-volume collection of secondary literature, articles which either discuss the work of Elias directly or take it forward in further research. Some readers, affiliated with university departments, may subsequently have received in their post a further leaflet from Sage – advertising another four-volume set, this time on critical theory – in which our contribution to the series is said to be about Norman Elias! Somehow that seems symptomatic of the misfortunes that befell our collection.

In editing the volumes, we tried to represent key points in the reception of Elias’s work, reprinting for instance the very early reviews of Über den Prozess der Zivilisation by Raymond Aron and Franz Borkenau, and also a representative selection of research and comment (including some negative comment) from the last three decades. Yet although four volumes may seem a great deal of space, we must have miscalculated how much could be crammed in, and at a very late stage we had to make significant emergency cuts at the request of the publishers. The result is that the collection is not quite as representative as we planned it, and a few key people ended up unrepresented. To them we apologise.

There was worse, however. Under the contract, the publishers were responsible for clearing the rights for the articles that we wished to reprint. We understood that to mean that authors would be contacted, and that there would no doubt result a period of feedback, in which some authors refused permission and others perhaps suggested alternative essays. In the event, the publishers simply wrote to the publishers of the relevant books and journals and, to our great embarrassment, we found that almost none of the authors had been contacted, even when they were the copyright holders. It has to be said that this was clearly a misunderstanding on our part, for which again we apologise. In a fairly tight-knit, if extensive, circle of friends such as are the Eliasians, this has been a source of considerable discomfort to us. Nevertheless, we hope that for those who have access to these volumes, they will provide a useful introduction to the extensive debates that have centred on Elias. The contents are organised into seven major sections: Situating Elias; General–Theoretical Orientations; The Theory of Knowledge and the Sciences; Long-Term Processes (including civilising, decivilising and dyscivilising processes, state-formation processes, and informalisation processes); Established–Outsider Figurations and Communities (class, ethnicity, race, gender); Contributions to ‘Special’ Sociologies (the body and emotions, religion, leisure, sport and the arts, professions and organisations, crime and punishment, medicine and psychoanalysis, drugs alcohol, and tobacco use); and Critiques and Counter-Critiques. In spite of the omissions, this is certainly the most comprehensive collection of widely-scattered contributions to the reception of Elias’s work over more than half a century.

‘Those who have access to these volumes’? Few people will be able to afford to have them on their private shelves. Retailing at over STG £400, they are aimed at the library market, especially in the Far East, and one suspects that the print-run was short. Even the editors received only one set each, contributors did not receive any copy at all, and review copies are not available. We hope, even so, that we may be able to arrange for the set to be assessed in a future issue of Figurations, preferably by someone from outside the circle of the usual suspects.

SJM

RECENT BOOKS AND ARTICLES


Tattooed is a comprehensive and well-written book that speaks to many audiences. Not only does Michael Atkinson place tattooing within a specific cultural context, but also shows how body modification relates to broader trends of group inclusion and group exclusion. The voices of individual enthusiasts, which are included in the book, help us better to understand the practice of tattooing as a form of personal expression. The interviewees also speak to us about the wider social relationships that are involved in the tattoo experience. The author’s subjective approach to ‘the sociogenesis of a body art’ successfully combines his background in sociology with his personal interest in permanent body decoration.
This book arises from the Colloque International Norbert Elias, held at the Université de Haute Bretagne – Rennes II on 13–14 October 2000. In Figurations 14 we referred to ‘Norbert Elias’s Flying Circus’, meaning that several of the familiar figurational figures from beyond France – Eric Dunning, Stephen Mennell, Bram de Swaan, Cas Wouters – took part in the conference, and they are all represented here. But so are other voices.

The book is divided into two sections, focusing on two of the major areas of debate about Elias’s work. The first is entitled ‘Contemporary forms of extreme violence: an invalidation of the theory?’. Besides essays by Dunning and De Swaan that have appeared earlier in English, it contains three other chapters. Harald Wydra (Regensburg) writes about the wars in Yugoslavia, advancing une lecture événementielle of a decivilising process. Patrick Bruneau considers Elias and the question of genocide, examining his hypotheses, both explicit and implicit, about the possibility of a kind of ‘split personality’ among participants. And Fabienne Soldini discusses literature and the civilising process, with reference to horror stories.

The second half of the book deals with the question of whether informalisation represents a reversal or a new phase of civilising processes. It is, almost inevitably, introduced by Cas Wouters. Christian Le Bart writes intriguingly about ‘chivalric nostalgia’ among professional politicians, and Erik Neveu about the privatisation and informalisation of political life. Taking quite a different tack, Jacques Le Bohec and Philippe Teillet ask whether music softens manners – a fascinating and original topic. Finally, Stéphane Héas – in collaboration with Dominique Bodin, Malika El Ali and Patrice Régnier discuss contemporary forms of self-constraint in relation to relaxation, martial arts and marathon-running.

In short, this book brings new insights and perspectives to two well-established but thriving debates.


Women’s under-representation in leadership positions in scientific and business life has been explained in organisational theory from several perspectives, all of which agree that women nowadays are highly qualified for leadership posts. Women are a relatively new phenomenon in this particular sphere of work life. But long-term figurational approaches provide an explanation for the persistence of women’s under representation. Being an outsider in leadership positions implies ambiguity and an ambivalent fluctuation between stigmatisation and counter-stigmatisation. The present study uses Norbert Elias’s established and outsiders model to understand the complex polyphony in the movement of ascending and descending groups in leading positions, which are traditionally constructed as a ‘man’s world’. Referring to eighteenth-century books on etiquette through to present-day career guides, the author traces behavioural codes in gender and business life.


Lutz Rosemann was the first recipient of the Marbach Stipend awarded by the Norbert Elias Foundation for a period of work on Elias’s papers in the Deutsche National Literaturarchiv in Marbach and der Neckar. He writes that Elias’s publications have not so far allowed one to understand him genetically till now, because the editions do not take the extended material of the Deutsche Literaturarchiv into consideration. A comparison between the material of the archive and the published texts shows that the latter were edited under specific conditions during Elias’s lifetime, which provoked a lot of contaminations and inconsistent emendations on the part of the editors. The article describes and analyses these difficulties by using as an example the book Über die Zeit in relation to the English edition Time: An Essay and suggests a way of coming to a reliable text.

[Note: The publishing history of Time is especially complicated. It was first writ-
ten in four separate instalments (in English) and published during 1974–5 in Dutch in issues of the journal De Gids. Additional sections numbered 30–46 were then written in English in the early 1980s, together with a long new introduction written in German. These later additions were included when the ‘essay’ first appeared in book form, in German (Über die Zeit, 1984), but not in the Dutch book (1985). With the additions, the German edition was twice as long as the original four parts published in De Gids. The English edition, Time: An Essay, finally appeared in 1992, the parts originating in German being translated into English by Edmund Jephcott, and being printed along with the English Urtext. – SIM]


Lacroix poses the question of the reception of Elias in French academic circles, led in particular by a group of historians at the École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales (Bourgïe Chartier, Revel) and political scientists (notably Garrigou and Lacroix himself) rather than by sociologists. He focuses on the situation of political science in France, which as recently as the 1970s was struggling to define itself as a discipline autonomous in particular from faculties of law and in the context of all that followed from 1968. He detects a certain affinity between the situation of French political science and both the political circumstances of Elias’s formative years and his intellectual struggles to throw off the yoke of philosophy. He then discusses at some length how both La Société de cour and La Processus de civilisation proved paradigmatic for the study of the French state.


This second article by Lacroix follows on neatly from the previous one. Elias’s ‘political sociology’ is most widely identified with his theory of state formation – especially the French state – from the Middle Ages to the age of absolutism, although of course there is also a good deal in The Germans too. Some other crucial arguments about the ‘parliamentarisation’ of political conflicts are to be found in the Introduction to Quest for Excitement, which, being a volume centring on sport, may not be the most obvious place to look. Using these hints, Lacroix and his colleagues at Nanterre have developed an ambitious Eliasian interpretation of the rise of the parliamentary state.

By the Author


By stating ‘the state made war, and war made the state’, Charles Tilly underlined the interconnectedness of war and societal developments. Likewise, the armed forces are a social phenomenon that cannot be studied without at the same time analysing developments in their parent society, the sociological mechanisms that influence all kinds of changes and the people who play their part inside and outside the armed forces. A historical sociological approach is appropriate when the relationship between armed forces and society is considered.

This approach goes without saying when the topics dealt with in the chapters of the book Krijgsmacht en Samenleving are related to state formation, the genesis of the military profession and sociological conceptions of military technology. But the book also contains chapters on civil–military relations, political–military relations, ethics, the blurring of moral standards, and courage. In short, the eight chapters which deal with these matters comprise a broad array that draws from such disciplines as political science, sociology, history, psychology and philosophy. In places the book is clearly inspired by the work of Norbert Elias, at other places military sociology seems more or less to have developed into a sub-discipline of its own with discussions that are specific to the field.

State formation and armed forces are intertwined. Moelker and Soeters illustrate the interconnections by discussing classical thinkers as Elias and Tilly but they also deal with new developments. New wars, as Mary Kaldor asserts, seem to contradict some of the principles of state formation because they are characteristic of failed states and are mostly situated in intra-state conflicts. They involve humanitarian suffering, refugee problems and intervention by third party militaries. Ignatieff notes the virtual character of these new conflicts. Intra-state war challenges the military profession and leads to changes in its tasks.

In a second chapter by Moelker, changes in the image of the military profession are related to these new tasks. Once the ‘warrior’ image of the military prevailed, but since the 1960s the military profession has gradually evolved and policing tasks have been added to the job description. Janowitz characterised the military professional of the 1960s as a ‘manager of violence’. Nowadays this description is only partly correct for another set of tasks is again added to the profession. In Peacemaking operations (third party intervention in ‘new’ intra-state conflicts often under auspices of the UN), the roles and images of the military are changing again. Peacemaking operations call for the soldier-diplomat and the soldier-scholar who knows his languages, knows how to deal with local warring factions and local civilians and who controls his own conduct. The prevailing attitude towards violence is one of inhibition. The soldier acts according the rules of engagement and will make only minimal resort to the use of force. The self-restraint of the military has grown.

New wars change military operations in political statements. More than ever the acts of every single soldier are subjected to political control. Peacemaking operations are to a certain extent political operations, decided on by parliaments, questioned by politicians and media, and dependent on public opinion. Van der Meulen discusses media and public opinion in a chapter dedicated to civil–military relations, whereas Born and Metselaar investi-
gate changes in democratic control of the armed forces. In western societies parliamentary control is the dominant system, but it is not without problems. For if the military guards the democratic system, who is guarding the guardians? And did not the rivalry between General McArthur and president Truman in the Korea war prove that civilian control is by no means simple and easy? Born and Metselaar discuss several political–military decision-making models that improve our understanding of political–military relations.

Closely connected to changes in the military profession are changes in technology. Moelker debunks the causal determinism that is often imbedded in theories of technological change and illustrates his point using three historical examples: the rejection of horse and chariot in antique Judaism (an example taken from Max Weber’s sociology of religion), the introduction of muskets by Prince Maurice (first described by Jacques van Doorn) and the system of planned intervention leading to changes in Lieutenant-General De Gribouval’s artillery (an example from William McNeill).

As peacemaking operations have become the most important task for the military of European societies, the conduct that is becoming for the soldiers could well be described as a result of civilising processes. Ethics are imperative to peacemaking operations. Interposing between two rival factions can only be done properly if the conditions for *ius in bello* and *ius ad bello* are fulfilled. Ethics are important in warlike situations as well, but they are all the more important since peacemaking operations have the objective of serving humanitarian goals. Verweij describes the developments leading to ethical codes of conduct that provides the soldiers with moral guidelines.

In a related chapter Vogelaar explains why, despite increased political awareness, despite ethical codes of conduct, and despite clear rules of engagement, in every peacemaking operation there is a risk of moral standards getting blurred. European peacekeepers who normally behave in a civilised way forget their standards when isolated, when deprived (in extreme conditions without food, shelter, sleep), when given the wrong example by their superior, and as a result they behave in morally abject ways (and sometimes become involved with criminal behaviour). Group psychology, for instance conformity theories such as those derived from the work of Milgram, prove useful in explaining the blurring of moral standards but also show the way how to structurally prevent the deterioration of norms.

As ethics, the changed tasks of the military, and public acceptance put more emphasis on civilising the soldiers, the warrior spirit is tamed and as a result the military are confronted with yet another problem. Civilising the warrior spirit in the soldiers sometimes hampers the requirement that soldiers have to change quickly from a diplomatic or policing attitude to a more traditional military role. Sometimes old-fashioned military courage is required to get the job done or to provide safety for civilian refugees. Inhibition and self-restraint can in some situations be dysfunctional. Soeters, Verweij, Olsthoorn and Linssen investigate the key concept of courage and conclude on the one hand that some forms of courage may be trainable. On the other hand, honour functions as a reward for courageous deeds. Though at first sight archaic, for the military honour and courage still are core values that prove functional to their profession.

Normally a book review should end with a few critical remarks, but this is too hard a job for someone who himself is the editor and co-author of the book about which he is writing – which I was invited to do because of its main shortcoming … it is in Dutch! But there are some points for improvement. The sociology of urban combat is nowhere discussed in the book, even though urban combat is going to prove one of the most difficult interfaces between the military and society. The interface with the media is only discussed in brief. The effect of globalisation on conflicts and military functioning is not discussed at all. In short, readers of all sorts, scientists, politicians, civilians and military would probably welcome an elaborated English version.

RENÉ MOELKER
Royal Netherlands Military Academy, Breda
E-mail: r.moelker@mindef.nl


This thesis represents an attempt to understand the roots of violence and aggression at a general level, and to create a framework for exploring and investigating the occurrence of violence in modern societies (for example, post-Second World War England) by using and adapting a number of concepts and ideas within Norbert Elias’s sociological paradigm. My thesis should be read as a counter, and as a reaction, to what I perceive to be over-specialisation within the social sciences concerning the subject of predominantly expressive or affective forms of violence. More specifically, I evaluate, and in some instances test, three particular elements within Elias’s paradigm that, I believe, are essential for establishing a framework for the study of violence and aggression: his concept of civilising processes; his models of emotional trajectories and affective behaviour; and lastly, his methodological procedure(s).

With regard to all three areas, I compare and contrast Elias’s ideas with other prominent theorists – most notably Giddens, Foucault and Freud – who I believe offer alternative or contrasting ideas to those of Elias. However, although much of the thesis is concerned with theoretical issues, my own empirical research concerning, firstly, the incidence and level of violence in England from the late medieval era to the early twentieth century and, secondly, people’s sensibilities in pre-modern England, offers the possibility for testing Elias’s theory of civilising processes and for an exploration of the nature and extent of violence and aggression in England’s past. Ultimately though, my objectives are to illuminate our understanding of why people are led to aggress and, in the last instance, to suggest further lines of inquiry – by exploring a number of Elias’s concepts further than he did – concerning the study of violence in contemporary England.
Abstract: This discussion uses the debate on globalisation as an opportunity to explore the possibilities of a dialogue between sociology and international relations (IR) on the relationship between state and society. This problematic has been constitutive of these disciplines as well as the relations between social groups and is thus central to ongoing analysis of social change. It is argued that IR and sociology are largely incompatible approaches to the sociogenesis of states representative of and acting in relation to social groups. IR theorists have progressively developed (both unintend- edly and intendedly) a more ‘sociological’ conception of their subject matter, but the potential for a reconstruction of the theoretical agenda of IR is nevertheless problematic as this conception could call their entire oeuvre into question. The rationale for a ‘discipline’ of IR has been articulated in terms of the ‘problem of order’, interpreted by IR theorists as a search for the constitution of international society. It is argued that this problem of order refers in fact to the problematic of ‘pacification’, which denotes the ongoing sociogenesis of states and social groups. By cast- ing this problem in primarily political terms, IR has concealed, but presumed, this unassailably social quality of ‘international relations’, and analysis of this problem that does not take account of group-formation is unsustainable. To this end, a ‘social theory’ of glo- balisation is also called into question. To this end, a ‘social theory’ of globalisation is also called into question.

■ PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

We hope to review the following in the next issue of *Figurations*:


■ RECENT CONFERENCES

**Seminar on Interpersonal Violence**

**First Meeting: Theoretical and Methodological Issues Ferrara, 18 September 2003 Organised by Sophie Body-Gendrot and Pieter Spiierenburg**

This meeting was the first in a series of four and, consequently, had a prepara- tory and exploratory character. Fifteen scholars, criminologists, sociologists and historians acted as presenters and discussants, debating general issues relating to interpersonal violence. After the opening remarks by Sophie Body-Gendrot, the first session was concerned with the definition or range of meanings to be attributed to the word ‘violence’ itself. Whereas Willem de Haan, emphasising that violence is an essentially contested concept, argued for a rather broad definition, Pieter Spiierenburg favoured a more restricted one, in which violence refers to intentional encroachments upon the body’s physical integrity. The discussants, Chris Quispel and Philippe Robert, qualified both approaches, the latter emphasising that ‘violence’ is not a technical term but belongs to the reperto- ire of common speech.

In the second session, two diverging theoretical papers were presented. Eric Dunning discussed Elias’s theory of civilising processes as it pertains to violence, supplementing this with empirical find- ings about collective violence in twen- tieth-century England. As discussant, Xavier Rousseau elaborated on the uses of Elias’s work. Helmut Thome argued that the theory of civilising processes should be supplemented by that of Durkheim about decreasing collective solidi- darity, and he illustrated this with data from Imperial Germany. The discussant, Manuel Eisner, focused on the interpre- tation of some of Thome’s data.

The third session started with an elabo- rate paper by Suzanne Karstedt. Using various statistics about homicide in stable democracies, stable bureaucracies and ‘transitional countries’ over the last forty years, she attempted to develop a model showing the relations- hips between violence, form of government and egalitarian values. As discussant, Hans Binnenveld questioned her thesis of a decline of the welfare state. Joachim Kersten’s paper dealt specifi- cally with police and violence in con- temporary Germany, using material from a participant investigation. As discussant, Clive Emsley put these observations in an historical perspective.

The final session shifted the focus to events in Eastern Europe, with Gorazd Mesko presenting an overview of research, published during the last twelve years, into violence in Slovenia. Discussant Dag Lindström drew some parallels with Sweden/Finland, while Sophie Body-Gendrot questioned the relevance of some of the research dis- cussed. It was decided to try to have a selection of the papers published in an issue of a journal.

**Praemium Erasmiunm 2003 – Laureate Alan Davidson**

The Erasmus Prize for 2003 was pre- sented to the food writer Alan Davidson by HRH Prince Bernhard of the Nether- lands, in the presence of HM Queen Beatrix and other members of the royal family of The Netherlands, at a cer- emony in the Royal Palace in Amster- dam on 5 November. Many figuration- ists were guests at the presentation and

then featured prominently in various seminars that were organised in connection with the event.

The Erasmus Prize was established by Prince Bernhard in 1958, ‘to enhance the position of the humanities, the social sciences and the arts and to promote appreciation of these fields within society, within the context of the cultural traditions of Europe in general and the ideas of Erasmus in particular’. This year it was decided to recognise the area of food and its appreciation, and then to recognise the outstanding contribution made to it by Alan Davidson. A former British ambassador, Mr Davidson is author of – among many other books – the classics Mediterranean Seafood and North Atlantic Seafood, and the massive Oxford Companion to Food. He is also founder of the journal Petits Propos Culinaires (each issue of which is, as he put it, ‘rather odd’), and of the Oxford Food Symposiums. He has encouraged countless younger scholars, including Stephen Mennell when he was working in Oxford on All Manners of Food. The conference dinner at the Hilton Hotel that evening was a spectacular event when a multicultural meal was entirely prepared and served by the pupils at a local primary school.

The same day, in the first of the associated seminars, on ‘Changing Tastes’, Stephen Mennell spoke about ‘The civilising and decivilising of appetite in the expanding anthroposphere’, Katarzyna Cwierta on ‘Culinary encounters between East Asia and Europe’, and Anneke van Otterloo on ‘Fast food and slow food’. The seminar was chaired by Peter Scholliers (Brussels) and introduced by Joop Goudsblom. A follow-up round table discussion took place the next day, on the theme of ‘Food in the expanding anthroposphere’, under the chairmanship of Abram de Swaan, when Goudsblom spoke about ‘Food and eating habits in the emerging and expanding anthroposphere’ and Steve Quilley (University College Dublin) on the dramatic title of ‘Food systems, prosthetic ecology and the arrow of history: what people might be eating and how it is likely to be produced if global society avoids catastrophic social-ecological collapse’. On the third day that led on to a major workshop on ‘Guts, brains, food and the social life of early humans’, the participants including some of the world’s leading paleoanthropologists: Leslie Aiello (University College London), Lewis Binford (Southern Methodist University), Robin Dunbar (University of Liverpool), Dale Guthrie (University of Alaska), Hillard Kaplan (University of New Mexico), William Leonard (Northwestern), Margherita Mussi (Università di Roma ‘La Sapienza’) and Michael Richards (University of Bradford). It is hoped that in the not too distant future the Elias Foundation may be able to organise a small conference to explore the evident complementarities between recent developments in paleoanthropology and the figurational perspective – notably ideas advanced by Elias in The Symbol Theory and Goudsblom in Fire and Civilisation.

Farewell to SISWO

We are sad to announce that this will be the last issue of Figurations published for us by SISWO, the Netherlands Universities Institute for Co-ordination of Research in the Social Sciences; a massive reduction in its university grant means that SISWO will have to withdraw from publishing to concentrate on its core activities. We want to thank, in particular, Kitty Roukens (Deputy Director of SISWO) who has supervised publication ever since Figurations began in 1994, as well as all the SISWO staff who have had a hand in its production over the last decade: Peter de Kroon, Judith van Rooyen, Cobie Rensen, Lidwien van Dartel, Tineke de Koning, Annette van de Sluis, Gudy Rooyakkers, and Ente Breed. Discussions are taking place about alternative arrangements for the production of Figurations, and an announcement about this – including new contact details – will be made in Figurations 21. In the meantime, enquiries about such matters as the mailing list should be directed to the editorial office at UCD rather than to SISWO.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO FIGURATIONS

The next issue of Figurations will be mailed in May 2004. News and notes should be sent to the Editors by 1 April 2004.
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