EDITOR’S MESSAGE

In November 2016 Oxford Dictionaries released their English language Word of the Year. Rather fittingly they chose the word “post-truth”, an adjective defined by the Oxford English Dictionary (2016) as “relating to or denoting circumstances in which objective facts are less influential in shaping public opinion than appeals to emotion and personal belief”. With the growing strength of right-wing populist parties across the globe, the shocking results of the UK’s In-Out “Brexit” referendum and the success of Donald Trump (whether aided by hackers or not) in the USA’s Presidential elections, we have seen that knowledge, expertise and objective facts are often set aside as irrelevant or they are evaluated on the same footing as spurious claims and mistruths. Indeed, in an Opinion Piece in the Independent (November 8th, 2016) shortly before the US elections, Matthew Norman noted that the “truth has become so devalued that what was once the gold standard of political debate is a worthless currency.”

Nowhere is this more evident than in the run-up to the Brexit referendum when the then UK Secretary of State for Justice and Lord Chancellor, Michael Gove, argued that “people in this country have had enough of experts” (Financial Times, June 3rd, 2016) when challenged by an interviewer over the fact that a majority of authoritative sources from global intergovernmental and nongovernmental organisations to academics to trade unions had claimed that the outcome of the UK leaving the EU would be highly detrimental to the prosperity of the country. When coupled with fantastical claims such as the assertion that the UK would save some 350 million pounds per week by leaving the EU which could then be used to bolster the National Health Service (NHS) (The Guardian, September 10th, 2016) - a claim that was quickly walked back following the results of the referendum! - one might acknowledge that “post-truth” is certainly the order of the day.

CONTINUED ON PAGE 3.
Dear Colleague!

“Athens” appears to be electrifying to sociologists: keynote speakers happily accepted the invitation, and participants eagerly registered. We think the coincidence of conference theme – (Un)Making Europe: Capitalism, Solidarities, Subjectivities – overreliance on capitalism, austerity measures and evaporating European solidarities in Greece, and the specific site of the conference is stimulating social scientists to think more sharply and rigorously about the big questions of sociology and society today. We are counting on you. Make this 13th ESA conference sociologically relevant!

The ESA Executive Committee has tried its very best to put sociology first. We have moved the “conference party” to Friday night, which will enable us to organise an additional special evening plenary on the main theme (Della Porta/Varoufakis), thus complementing the Opening (Harvey/Iliou) and Closing plenaries (Brown/Rosa). In addition, there are many semi-plenaries that directly cover the core questions. We regard it as important that delegates have the chance to share in core discussions, particularly because the meeting also welcomes a huge diversity of presentation themes from all branches of the discipline.

Statistically speaking, ESA’s 13th conference is attracting more participants than all previous meetings (3500+). For the first time, some semi-plenaries (not all) have been opened for submission of abstracts. The number of both, non-native English-speaking as well as female, (semi)plenary speakers increased (from roughly about 30% to 60%). By the new all-in-one registration process the number of ESA members increased by 1/3 and currently stands at about 2800 members. Another innovation will be ‘Roundtable sessions’ and ‘Research Network Keynote sessions’. Both formats have been introduced specifically to provide a variety of options. We are very curious and look forward to learning from your experiences with both of these new session types.

Of course, organising the biennial conference has always been one of ESA’s core tasks. Scholars seek opportunities to engage in productive exchange and, governed by numbers, most of us also need to give ‘international presentations’. Although just one year ago, for austerity reasons, our conference planning had to face a challenging move from one university in Athens to a consortium of two other ones, this part of our ESA activities seems to work well. What else have we done since 2015?

The major change on the backstage of the ESA has been the appointment of a second employee in our Paris headquarters, Dagmar Danko. Many ESA members already experienced her commitment to ESA and her enthusiasm for sociology. It is a worthwhile aim to strengthen the ESA headquarters, in order to enable a proactive ESA for sociologists in Europe. However, how can this goal be financed?

We readjusted our conference organisation. We removed several tasks from the list of the conference budget, thus ‘saving’ a six-figure amount that in the past had been charged by Professional Conference Organisers, and transferred a set of specific new tasks to our Paris headquarters, especially those that are related to ConfTool, the conference abstract submission and registration software.

To support the move, we (1) reorganised the division of labour in the headquarters, (2) moved to another location in Paris (the previous building has been closed), (3) introduced online banking (sicl), (4) moved to a new bookkeeper in order to reduce costs, and launched (5) an interim website (because of a hacking attack), and a new (6) website, (7) logo, and (8) database. The latter has been most important because it enables us to replace time-consuming secretarial work by means of automatic software mechanisms, e.g. printing invoices by members, instead of creating new MS Word documents one by one, on request. The challenge has been, for both of our employees (pictured overleaf), Dagmar Danko and Andreia Batista Dias, as well as three interns, Christine Frank, Veronika Riedl and Thomas Caubet, and also for me, the ESA President, that all these changes were met at the same time. While still operating the ‘old’ manual system, we had to learn about and introduce new practices, and working with both at once during a quite demanding period of conference preparations.

All the organisational changes were not made for their own sake. Rather, in a climate of the commercialisation of science, the fragmentation of sociology, new paywalls, a language divide, austerity measures at universities, and the new rule of metrics in research assessment, it is essential that social scientists come together and unite their forces. For this reason, we joined the European Alliance for Social Sciences and Humanities (EASSH), Brussels, and actively are supporting several similar initiatives and activities in Europe. And for the same reason, we also meet here in Athens at this our 13th ESA conference.

Looking forward to discussing with you!

My most cordial thanks to Apostolos G. Papadopoulos for a wonderful long collaboration, Peter Holley for his superb work in editing this European Sociologist since 2012 and to all members of the current Executive Committee and ESA Paris team who supported all these abovementioned ESA changes.

Frank Welz
August 2017
In this truth-challenged world in which we now find ourselves - one in which fake news is shared and voraciously consumed through social media -, what can the we, as sociologists, bring to the table? How can sociological knowledge help European societies and the world to understand this the latest crisis of democracy? These are pressing questions that I am sure will be much discussed at the 13th Conference of the European Sociological Association in Athens between August 29th and September 1st, 2017. Indeed, our theme for the conference “(Un)Making Europe: Capitalism, Solidarities, Subjectivities” couldn’t be more fitting as we come together to discuss our work in the light of recent events, a fresh wave of terrorist attacks (for example in Charlotte, Virginia; Barcelona, Spain; and Turku, Finland) and with the looming threat of more political gains by the far-right.

Turning to the current issue, my last as editor of European Sociologist, we again have interesting content for you all divided across three sections - For Sociology, From ESA and For Sociologists. The issue begins with Frank Welz’s regular President’s Message, which focused on the upcoming Athens conference and the work done by the Executive Committee and our employees in Paris. Following this, we have a timely Viewpoint by Dr Gareth Rice on questions relating to Brexit and British identity. This piece discusses the challenges faced by Northern Ireland as the UK seeks to extract itself from the EU. After this, the For Sociology section concludes with a piece highlighting the threat to the Central European University posed by Viktor Orbán’s government in Hungary. It includes an assessment of the situation by Anton Pelinka and a letter sent to the Office of the Hungarian Prime Minister, to the CEU Rector and to the President of the Culture and Education Commission of the European Parliament by the European Alliance for Social Sciences and Humanities (EASSH).

Our From ESA section includes a welcome to the 13th Conference of the European Sociological Association by members of the Local Organising Committee, an announcement regarding the upcoming ESA conference for representatives of national sociological associations, a voting guide for the upcoming ESA Presidential and Executive Committee elections, a note from the Editors of the European Journal of Cultural and Political Sociology (EJCPS), a note from the Editors of ESA’s book series – Studies in European Sociology, a proposal for a new ESA journal - Emotions & Society - by Dr Mary Holmes and Dr Stina Bergman Blix, a new discussion section on Publication Strategies that includes two pieces on the possibilities presented by Open Access publishing in a European context written by Ana Romão and Patrick O’Mahony, a piece on the pragmatic selection of Open Access publishing in China by Xiao Mei, and a piece on Journal Publishing in French Sociology written by Frédéric Lebaron; three short interviews with ESA’s office staff; a Perspective article, written by ESA Executive Committee member Kathrin Komp, discussing the challenges faced by sociology in Finland as its Higher Education sector undergoes transformations due to government policy changes; and two conference reports: one from the Polish Sociological Congress and the other from Research Network 04’s mid-term conference.

Finally, as this is my last Editor’s Message, I would like to thank the many ESA members who have contributed to European Sociologist during my term as editor, our advertisers, those of you who have sent me your feedback (this was greatly appreciated) and, of course, the 2011-2013, 2013-2015 and 2015-2017 Executive Committees with whom I have had the privilege to work. In particular, I would like to thank Elena Danilova, Robert Fine, Petti Alasutari, Sue Scott and Laura Horn; ESA Presidents Pekka Sulkuinen, Carmen Leccardi and Frank Welz; and our Executive Administrator, Gisèle Tchinda-Falcucci. Your assistance has been key to the development of European Sociologist while I have been at the helm.

While my time as editor of European Sociologist is coming to an end, you can expect great things for the future of this, your ESA Members’ Journal. I am sure that our new Editor, Dagmar Danko who has joined our office in Paris as ESA’s Executive Coordinator, will continue to develop will continue to develop European Sociologist. We can expect great things to come in the coming months and years!

Peter Holley
August 2017
Identity has long been a contested concept. Whether on a personal, regional or national level, it has been debated and fought over by people across Europe and beyond. Since the United Kingdom (UK) voted to leave the EU in June 2016 (leave won by 52% to 48%) British identity has become contested in more intraregional ways. Brexit, and its ensuing fallout, has added new dimensions to the debate about Britishness and what it means to identify oneself as British. Those who view Brexit as a political awakening remain at loggerheads with those who lament the idea of the UK leaving the EU after the triggering of Article 50 of the Lisbon Treaty took place in March 2017. After Brexit happens the UK will become the first country to leave the EU since it was set up (initially as the European Coal and Steel Community) in the aftermath of WWII.

At the UK level, the differing views of the ‘Brexiters’ and the ‘Remainers’ were borne out by the electoral geography of the referendum vote. While Scotland voted to remain in the EU – by 62% to 38% – England rejected it: Every region outside of London voted to leave. The highest vote for leave was in the West Midlands with 59.11% opting for Brexit. In Wales, only 3 authorities – the Vale of Glamorgan in the south, Monmouthshire in the south-east and Ceredigion in west Wales – out of 22 voted to remain. In Northern Ireland, the focus of this article, the majority voted to remain in the EU by a majority of 56% to 44%, but will be made to leave as a result of being part of the UK. What is particularly interesting and in many ways unique about the outcome of the Northern Ireland vote is what it says about British identity.

I am going to focus on Northern Ireland to make a number of contributions to the debate about British identity and then raise some questions about that devolved region’s place in the forthcoming post-Brexit future. I will first take a developmental view to delineate why British identity has and continues to be contested in particular ways in Northern Ireland. Although similar broad distinctions (Protestant not Catholic, British not Irish and North not South) remain in place, Brexit is putting British identity through a new set of steps which will inevitably lead to further political and institutional divisions. This is by no means a natural process with some fixed end point which can be reached and settled upon. To shed light on this, I turn to the work of Zygmunt Bauman to grapple with the uncertainty and insecurity which Brexit has brought to British identity in Northern Ireland and beyond the UK. This leads me to conclude that the post-Brexit future is less about differences between unionist or nationalist points of view than another stage in the ongoing transformation that is “liquid modernity” (Bauman 2004).

Whose island is it anyway?

If there is a place in the UK where British identity remains highly contested it is in Northern Ireland. A look back into the past helps make sense of this. Unpartitioned Ireland formally joined the UK in 1801 under the Act of Union. The hope of the British Government of the day was that Ireland would become an integrated region of Britain in the way that Wales and Scotland had done so.

This wasn’t to be. The Irish weren’t British nor did they want to be. On Easter Monday 1916, 2,000 Irish volunteers rose against their British occupiers and proclaimed an Irish Republic. Although the Easter Rising, as it
became known, was defeated the execution of its 16 leaders by the British roused immense sympathy for a Catholic nationalist Ireland.

Two explicit rejections of British identity then followed: The failure of the Home Rule Bill and the decline of the Irish Parliamentary Party, in 1918, and nationalist opposition to conscription. British Protestants, mainly in the north east of the island saw this opposition as a betrayal of and a direct challenge to their British identity. The 1918 general election further strengthened the case for a Catholic nationalist Ireland: Sinn Féin (SF), the political party committed to achieving an Irish Republic (a separate Irish State) won 73 of the 100 seats. However, rather than sit in Westminster they instead set up the Dáil Éireann, whose manifesto refused to recognise the British parliament at Westminster.

The more the Irish continued to seek their own sovereignty, the more violently the British forces reacted. This was exemplified by the heavy handed tactics of the Black and Tans, a ruthless auxiliary police force of ex-soldiers traumatised by their experience of the war on the Western Front.

It had become obvious that the British government’s attempts to sustain British identity across the whole of Ireland were unsustainable. In 1920 Westminster passed the Government of Ireland Act which legislated for two governments – one in Belfast with jurisdiction over the six north-eastern counties and the other in Dublin with authority over the remainder. In May 1921, Northern Ireland received a separate Parliament at Stormont which was used to ensure that that part of the island remained British – within the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. The creation of Northern Ireland set the scene for two opposing identities: A British identity associated with the Protestant religion and unionism (membership of the UK) and; an Irish identity with links to Catholicism and an anti-British republicanism.

Both Parliaments in Dublin and Belfast were given very limited devolved powers with which to legislate on policy and to govern local issues. This was acceptable to the Ulster Unionist Party (UUP), who governed Northern Ireland from 1921 to 1972. The UUP enjoyed support from those who felt that they shared a common British identity and similar historical roots. However, this ‘supremacy’ wasn’t to last. On March 28th 1972, after increasing levels of violence between Catholics and Protestants, the British government, led by the then British Prime Minister Edward Heath imposed Direct Rule in Northern Ireland. This brought an end to the assembly and transferred the Stormont Executive’s limited devolved powers across the Irish Sea to Westminster.

The current phase of devolution, which was constituted under the Northern Ireland Act 1998, granted Stormont more legislative control over certain matters (known as ‘transferred matters’) than in the past. The Good Friday Agreement, also signed in 1998 has brought much needed stability to the ethno-national conflict which raged for thirty years. However, whilst the Northern Ireland Act 1998 and the Good Friday Agreement have created the space for a coalition government, composed of nationalists and unionists, both have fallen short on narrowing the divisions in voting behaviour which were highlighted by the Brexit referendum.

Brexit and British identity in Northern Ireland

Brexit, in all its forms – hard, soft or red, white and blue - has added more layers of complexity to Northern Ireland’s already turbulent past cum current British identity crisis. National differences across the UK notwithstanding (see above), those with the most negative feelings about immigration and loss of sovereignty were least supportive of the EU. When broken down, the Brexit result for Northern Ireland revealed that: British/Protestants/unionists were more likely to vote leave and Irish/Catholics/nationalists more likely to vote to remain.

From his examination of voting behaviour of Brexit in Northern Ireland, Garry (2016-2017: 2-3) showed that Catholics overwhelmingly voted to remain by a proportion of 85% to 15% while Protestants voted to leave by a proportion of 60% to 40%. With specific reference to identity, 63% of British identifiers voted to leave compared to only 13% of people who described themselves as ‘Irish’. Interestingly almost two thirds of those who identified themselves as ‘Northern Irish’ (neither definitively unionist nor nationalist) voted to stay. And the same strong patterns emerge when attitudes to the constitutional future of Northern Ireland are compared to referendum voting: 85% of those in favour of Irish unity voted to stay while only two fifths of people in favour of Direct Rule did so.

The EU referendum vote has thus added another field of division to Northern Ireland society. The leave vote was also supported by The Democratic Unionist Party (DUP), who, since 2001, has grown to become Northern Ireland’s biggest political party. Compared with its closest rival in the Ulster Unionist Party, it is more staunchly British, Conservative and Eurosceptic. However, when compared with ensuring that Northern Ireland remains a constituent part of the UK (via devolution or under Direct Rule, though more the former), Euroscepticism is a minor part of the DUP’s identity (see Taggart and Szczesniak 2002).

The Border and Beyond

Quite apart from the type of Brexit which the UK will eventually leave the EU with (this is being debated at the time of writing) is the issue of the border between Northern Ireland and the Irish Republic. When this border was established it ossified British identity by confining the Protestant majority to the six counties which make up Northern Ireland. After Brexit, it will become the UK’s only border with
the EU. In a recent update email, DUP leader Arlene Foster (2017) indicated that she did not favour a hard border:

“During the referendum campaign and since, some of those who advocated ‘remain’ have argued that the UK’s departure from the EU will result in a hard border on the island of Ireland. I know of no one who wishes that to be the case.”

Currently, the border is part of the Common Travel Area (CTA) which also includes the Isle of Man, and the Channel Islands. Because it is an internal border, British and Irish citizens can cross it with minimal identity documents. Who will decide on the type of border (hard or soft?) which will be operated after Brexit? Will the governments in Belfast, Dublin, London or Brussels need to come to an extraordinary agreement?

The sticking point will be how any decisions are interpreted by the political parties and how they ‘sell them’ to the electorate. SF, Northern Ireland’s second biggest political party, and the DUP’s nemesis, view the CTA as a softening of the formerly British militarized border and as a further step towards a united Ireland - a proposed sovereign state absorbing all of the thirty-two traditional counties of the island. The border (perceived and actual) and what it means to British identity could end up becoming a more pressing issue than other factors such as religion or support for certain political parties.

British identity also faces bigger challenges beyond Northern Ireland. As Ware (2007: 3) points out: “Globalisation undermines the very idea of national borders surrounding separate spaces that demand special allegiance.” With Britain’s place in the world currently being renegotiated by Theresa May’s Government, it remains to be seen what will become of British identity and its regional variations across the different parts of the UK.

Conclusions

This article has delineated the main challenges which British identity faces in Northern Ireland. Until devolution and the signing of the Good Friday Agreement in 1998, the challenges were largely a result of the British state’s refusal to fairly accommodate Irish identity. Whilst the issues discussed were specific, it can be argued that British identity is facing challenges from other parts of the UK - the policies of the Scottish National Party and Plaid Cymru are cases in point. When reading Bauman’s work (2004) term “liquid modernity” because it describes the condition of constant mobility and change which he sees in relationships, identities, and global economics within contemporary society. It is on this bigger canvas which plans for the future of British identity will need to be painted.

Because of its fundamentalist Protestant ethos, which was personified by the late Rev. Ian Paisley, there is a belief that many DUP voters are more British than those living in mainland GB. It is true that in Northern Ireland, British does not mean English. As Darran Anderson (2017) recently wrote, “there is a silent grudging acceptance that the place [Northern Ireland] is different and that we are regarded as distinctly “other” by the rest of Ireland and the UK.”

To remain relevant in a post-Brexit future, the debate on British identity needs to move beyond unionist and nationalist points of view. I suggest going back to Bauman’s (2004) term “liquid modernity” because it describes the condition of constant mobility and change which he sees in relationships, identities, and global economics within contemporary society. It is on this bigger canvas which plans for the future of British identity will need to be painted.
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The Hungarian parliament controlled by Viktor Orbán’s party FIDESZ has passed a new law, just some days after the proposal was published – using a fast track procedure preventing a more intensive debate. The new law would end the very existence of the Central European University (CEU), an academic institution founded in 1991 and accredited in Hungary as well as in New York State. The law claims to change the rules for all Hungarian universities – but among all existing universities, only the CEU which is affected.

During the 26 years of its existence, the CEU has fulfilled all the requirements the Hungarian state has formulated for universities. To change these requirements for only one of the universities and expecting the implementation of the new rules within one year is nothing but using legislature to destroy one and only one specific university.

This is not a matter of Hungarian law. It is a matter of one of the most important principles the European Union stands for: academic freedom.

Hungary is on a slippery slope. Under Viktor Orbán, the country’s political system has become more and more authoritarian, more and more nationalistic, and more and more anti-European. In that respect, Orbán follows the path Russia under Vladimir Putin and Turkey under Racep Erdogan have started – and Donald Trump’s election seems to confirm this: Populism, understood as democracy by referenda initiated from above; as democracy, without checks and balances; as government by a strongman.

The CEU has been (and still is) an institution independent from the Hungarian government because it does not need public money. It is its independence and the academic freedom it has enjoyed until now, which runs against the instinct of an authoritarian leader: What he cannot control he must destroy.

The CEU was designed by liberal dissidents in Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and Poland during the process of transformation. George Soros, Orbán’s scapegoat, did not plan this university – Soros helped to make possible what anti-communist intellectuals had in mind. In the years of its academic activity, the university has opened its doors to academics especially from former communist countries. It has won academic reputation in humanities and social sciences, expressed in the prominent international ranking of its MA- and PhD-programs. But this does not matter for Orbán; or, better, it matters – because such a university in its independence is the antithesis to any authoritarian government.

On March 31st, the European Alliance for Social Sciences and Humanities (EASSH), endorsed by ESA, sent the following letter to the Office of the Hungarian Prime Minister, to the CEU Rector and to the President of the Culture and Education Commission of the European Parliament:

“The European Alliance for Social Sciences and Humanities is deeply concerned by the recent amendments to Act CCN of 2011 on National Higher Education, which was submitted to the Hungarian Parliament on March 28th, 2017.

The European Alliance for Social Sciences and Humanities understands that the amendment threatens the existence of an internationally renowned and respected academic institution, the Central European University. This university has served for many years as a focal point of research in Central and Eastern Europe and connecting with the rest of the world.

The European Alliance for Social Sciences and Humanities strongly believes that international exchange of and between scholars is the essence of high-quality and innovative research. We urge the Hungarian Government and Parliament to undertake a review of the Act with a view to securing the principles of freedom for academic education and research and safeguarding the continued operation of the Central European University.”

Note: The European Alliance for Social Sciences and Humanities (EASSH) brings together more than 25 European disciplinary associations and scholarly networks. The main purpose of EASSH is to promote research on social sciences and humanities as a resource for Europe and the world and to give a voice to SSH disciplines in the design of science policy at national and international levels (www.eassh.eu).
Welcome to Athens

The location of the 13th Conference of the European Sociological Association

The Hellenic Sociological Society (HSS) is delighted to organize the 13th ESA Conference in Athens in August 2017. The conference venue is Panteion University of Social and Political Science (136 Syggrou Avenue, 17671 Athens) and Harokopio University (70 El. Venizelou Street, 17671 Athens), which jointly offer their facilities for this mega-event of the social sciences. Both Universities are in walking distance from one another and cooperate closely in many academic and research actions. It is important to mention that the city centre of Athens with its historical buildings, museums and exhibitions is a few paces away from the conference venue. The venue is easily accessible by Metro and bus, while it is a close distance from the seafront and the Stavros Niarchos Foundation Cultural Centre (SNFCC) where President Barak Obama gave his speech on November 16th, 2016. The opening of the conference will take place in Christos Lambrakis Hall of the Megaron – The Athens Concert Hall.

Panteion University, founded in 1927, has steadily grown over the years as a monothematic public university dedicated to the social and political sciences. It is a university firmly oriented towards the social character of public higher education linking science and research to practical social activity with a view to maximizing its social contribution. Indicatively, it hosts the first Sociology Department in the country established in 1982. Moreover, the first Postgraduate Programme in Regional Studies (in 1975), the first course in Criminology and the first Institute for Gender Studies were established, among other achievements, at this university.

Panteion is a medium sized university with eight academic departments namely sociology, psychology, international studies, public administration, communication, media and culture, social policy, social anthropology, economic and regional development, political science and history, and is structured around four faculties. Each department organizes a postgraduate programme containing various specializations. Research is developed in 38 research institutes, research centres and laboratories.

Harokopio University is a public university dedicated to promoting research and learning in a small, well focused set of intellectual areas, also giving particular emphasis to specialized and applied research. The University originates from an educational institution that was first
established in 1929 and gained the status of a university in 1990. It takes its name from the national benefactor Panagis Harokopos. It hosts four academic departments namely home economics and ecology, geography, informatics and telematics, nutrition and dietetics, structured in three faculties. A number of postgraduate programmes are organized in sub-disciplines connected to the main academic subjects of the university.

Both universities are situated close to the UNESCO World Heritage Centre of the Acropolis, while many important cultural sites of interest such as the Acropolis Museum, Thissio, Panathenaic Stadium (where the first modern Olympic Games were organized in 1896), Keramikos and the Benaki Museum are nearby.

Truly Athens is well known as the city of ideas. Numerous exciting ideas were born in this city. Its exceptional past is coupled with a vibrant contemporary cultural life. Athens is one of the few places in the world where you can discover a city more that 2,500 years old integrated into a contemporary metropolis. Today’s capital integrates the ancient and medieval history into the contemporary era. Monuments can be found all around the city center, side by side with contemporary constructions such as buildings, roads and train stations. The visitors are free to discover the cultural and ideological landmarks of the past, while they may also experience the multicultural and hybrid present. Overall, the city is full of contradictions but it also contains synergies and symbolisms. For those who wish to unlock the modern city life they should be prepared to spend loads of time and energy.

The Athens International Airport (AIA) is located 33 km southeast of Athens and is easily accessible via the Athens City Ring Road. Public transportation to Athens and the Port of Piraeus is provided by express airport shuttles on a 24-hour basis, while a direct Metro line connects the airport to the city center (Syntagma Square) in less than 40 minutes. Metro, Buses, Tram, Trains, Trolley Buses and expansive highways allow for easy and quick transportation at a very low cost. Most hotels are within walking distance from a metro station within the city centre. The ticket fare is low, compared to many other European cities and it may be used on all forms of public transport within specified period of time. Taxis are also relatively inexpensive, compared to prices in most European capitals. In addition, regular coach services link Athens with the southeastern European states and the Balkans, while daily ferry services link the port of Patras (two hours drive away from Athens) with Italy.

The whole of the sociological community of Greece together with the relevant academic departments enthusiastically support the event and are most willing to support and actively involved in the smooth running of the Congress. We wholeheartedly welcome you to Athens in August 2017!

We cordially invite sociologists and social scientists from around the globe to join us in Athens – to attend the conference, to participate actively in the discussions, and to contribute their own work!

Welcome!
Conference for Representatives of ESA National Associations
Athens – August 29th, 2017

Keynote Speakers

Professor John Holmwood
University of Nottingham, UK

Professor Marta Soler
University of Barcelona, Spain

Chair
Professor Sue Scott
ESA – Chair of the Council of National Associations
University of York, UK

Panel Sessions:

• Research Assessment in European Universities and its effect on Sociology
• The Impact of Research – Definitions and Implications

Group Discussions:

These will provide an opportunity for National Association representatives to explore the situation in their own country in relation to research assessment and impact compare this with others. It is hoped that suggestions for ESA strategy, with regard to the implications of research assessment on sociology, will emerge.

It was agreed following discussion at the ESA Executive and consultations with the national associations that the next National Association Conference will immediately precede the main ESA conference in Athens (August 29th – September 1st, 2017).

The National Associations conference it will last for the whole day on August 29th* and will be followed that evening by the opening ceremony for the ESA conference. It is hoped that holding the National Association Conference in Athens will enable more representative from National Associations to attend the ESA conference and especially that it will ease the pressure on small associations which have difficulty in finding the resources to send a representative to two separate conferences.

It is also important that we discuss something in our conference that affects us all and ‘Research Assessment and Research Impact’ certainly does – it is a very topical issue where the ground is shifting and there are strong views.

As well as the two excellent keynote speakers we will have two panel sessions and if you have would like to suggest someone, or to put you self forward to be a member, either on the topic of Research Assessment or Research Impact, then do please contact me. In addition there will be time for group discussions about the situation in relation to research across all European countries.

In preparation for the conference I am asking each National Association to send me a short report - no more than 1,500 words about Research assessment and discussions on Research Impact in their country. Templates for this report will be sent to National Association representatives during May and I will collate and summarize the reports in preparation for the conference. This summary will also be published as an article in a future issue of European Sociologist.

Some National Associations have already suggested that we should hold a National Association/ESA conference on migration in Europe. Discussions about this are now ongoing and it seems likely that it will be held in Germany in 2018.

*If you are planning to stay on for the ESA conference in Athens please make you booking through the conference website, but do remember that you will need to book the hotel for the night of the 28th as well.
The Nomination committee of the European Sociological Association (ESA) has conducted wide consultations and asked for proposals for candidates from ESA members, from ESA Research Networks, and from the National Sociological Associations in Europe.

Based on these consultations a slate of 28 candidates (14 male, 14 female) for the Executive Committee and two candidates for the Presidency has been made, taking into account gender equality, country representation and fields of research (ESA Statutes, Article 11).

According our Statutes “regular members in good standing elect 14 members of the Executive Committee and the President. The elections take place during the Conference. In order to allow members not attending the conference to vote, they shall be given the possibility to vote electronically” (Article 11).

All individual members of ESA in good standing (who have paid their membership fees by the time of the 13th ESA Conference in Athens, August 29th – September 1st, 2017) are eligible to vote for president of ESA and for members of the ESA Executive Committee for the next two-year period.

Members may vote before the Conference or during the Conference by using the online voting system for 1 (one) candidate for the President and a maximum of 10 (ten) candidates for the Executive Committee. Members may also express their candidate preference by writing in the name (or names) of other ESA members in good standing.

When the election starts, each voter will be emailed a message with a unique voting key. People who become ESA members after the beginning of the elections or during the conference in Athens will also be emailed a message with a unique voting key.

The voting starts on Sunday, August 27th and ends on Friday, September 1st, 2017, at 10:00AM (Athens time) during the 13th ESA Conference to be held in Athens, Greece.

Information on and assistance with voting while at the Athens conference can be sought from the registration desks at Panteion University from Wednesday August 30th at 9:00AM until 10:00AM on Friday September 1st, 2017.

Helena Serra
Chair of the ESA Nomination Committee
Candidates for the Presidency

**Sue Scott**  
Centre for Women’s Studies, University of York, United Kingdom

Professor Sue Scott has been a member of ESA since 1993 and Chair of the National Associations and Vice President from 2015 to 2017. She is Fellow of the UK Academy of Social Sciences and a member of its Council. She was President of the British Sociological Association from 2007 to 2009 and its Director of External Affairs from 2013 to 2016. She has held Professorships at four UK Universities, and from 2009 to 2012 was Pro Vice Chancellor for research at Glasgow Caledonian University (GCU). She is an Honorary Professor at the University of York and a Visiting Professor at the University of Helsinki. Sue has extensive international experience of the funding and evaluation of Research in Sociology.

**Frank Welz**  
University of Innsbruck, Austria

Professor Frank Welz has worked for ESA Committees in many functions and serves as ESA President in his first term. He conceives of sociology as a public good. In order to foster a more active ESA, he is currently restructuring ESA’s conference and headquarters operations. After studying sociology, history, philosophy, and psychology, he taught and conducted research at the Universities of Basel, Bielefeld, Bolzano, Cambridge, Freiburg, N. Delhi, Onati, and Innsbruck where he currently is supervising 11 PhD students. He has been publishing in the areas of social theory, sociology of law, and the history of sociology (*The Battlefield of European Identity*, co-ed. Gallina Tasheva, Routledge; *The European Sociology We Want*, CSR 2016). His enthusiasm for ESA was sparked by his peer experience coordinating ESA’s Research Network 29, Social Theory. Since then, he has co-organized ESA, ISA, OGS and DGS congresses, and currently actively is supporting ESA goals as a board member of the new ‘European Alliance for the Social Sciences and Humanities’ (EASSH).

Candidates for the Executive Committee

**Airi-Alina Allaste**  
Tallinn University, Estonia

Airi-Alina Allaste is Professor of Sociology at Tallinn University and president of the Estonian Sociological Association. As a member of the current ESA Executive Committee, she is the director of Pre-conference PhD Workshop in Athens from August 27th to 28th.

Her research, publications and teaching focus on youth studies. She has been a national coordinator and work package leader for various international projects and been recently visiting professor at Lisbon University, Portugal; Griffith University, Australia and Åbo Akademi, Finland. She has been responsible organiser of several conferences including 10th Annual Conference of Estonian Social Sciences (Tallinn, Estonia, March 2017).
Nilay Çabuk Kaya
University of Ankara, Turkey

Nilay Çabuk Kaya is Professor of Sociology at the University of Ankara. She is currently serving as the vice-president of the Turkish Sociological Association (TSA). She is currently a member of the ESA's Executive Committee (2015-2017). She is also in the board of ESA Research Network 33 (Women's and Gender Studies) and a regional representative for the Middle East and West Asia at the International Sociological Association's (ISA) Research Committee 32, Women in Society.

She holds a BA an MA from Ege University in İzmir, Turkey and a PhD (1994) from Durham University in the United Kingdom. Her research focuses on gender inequalities, gendered processes of work, women’s employment in factories, women’s empowerment, domestic violence and femicide. She has worked as a consultant on various projects funded by national (TUBİTAK,) and international (World-Bank, UNDP, EU, IFC, EBDR) bodies, and published in national and international journals.

Milica Antić Gaber
University of Ljubljana, Slovenia

Milica Antić Gaber is Full Professor at the Department of Sociology, Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana, where she teaches several courses, among others Introduction to Sociology and the Sociology of Gender. She also coordinates doctoral programme Gender Studies. She was Head of Slovene Sociological Association for two mandates (2010 – 2016) and chairs a section on Gender and Society. She is also one of the board members of ESA RN 33 Women's and Gender studies. She has been involved in different expert groups on women in politics in Slovenia and in an international context. Her research interests are oriented to gender (in)equality in different fields of life (politics, migration, violence against women, imprisoned women) in which she either coordinated or participated in several national and international research projects.

Pedro Caetano
CICS.NOVA, Lisbon, Portugal

Pedro Caetano is a sociologist and researcher at the Interdisciplinary Centre of Social Sciences of the New University of Lisbon (CICS.NOVA) and a secondary school teacher. He graduated in Geography from the University of Coimbra and in Sociology from the Universidade Nova de Lisboa (UNL). He has a doctorate in the Sociology of Culture, Knowledge and Education from UNL (2014). His doctoral thesis was titled “Individuation and Recognition: Processes of Political Socialization in the Uncertainty of School Itineraries”.

He has participated in several national scientific projects related to gender, inequality and humiliation in schools, the school choices of young people, and the Educational Territories of Priority Intervention. In 2011, he initiated a programme of exchange for Portuguese and Brazilian researchers focused on controversies, public causes and political participation in a comparative perspective. He has participated in several international congresses with communications and published in several national and international journals on themes related to school and education from youth perspectives, and on how they manage the proximity, responsibility and diversity in schools. His current research interests are centred on qualitative research, questions of justice and discrimination in schools, and modes of governance in schools. In 2017, he organized a thematic seminar entitled “The School and the metamorphoses of educational justice”.

Mikael Carleheden
University of Copenhagen, Denmark

Mikael Carleheden is currently associate professor in sociology and coordinator of the Centre for Anthropological, Political and Sociological Theory, University of Copenhagen, editor of Distinktion: Journal of Social Theory (Routledge), consulting editor of Acta Sociologica (Sage) and a board member of ESA Research Network 29, Social Theory. Mikael has further been president of the Swedish Sociological Association, Head of studies (Örebro), Head of department (Örebro), Head of the PhD programme (Copenhagen), visiting scholar (philosophy, Goethe-University Frankfurt and sociology, University of Chicago), post-doc (political science, Columbia NYC) and employed at different sociology departments (Lund, Aalborg, Örebro, Copenhagen). He is conducting research in social and political theory, the theory of science, and methodology.
Agoston Faber  
ELTE Budapest, Hungary/EHESS Paris, France  
Agoston Faber (1981) is a Hungarian sociologist. He earned his MA degrees in sociology and the French language and literature at ELTE University, Budapest. He is a doctoral candidate in sociology at ELTE and EHESS (Paris), and is about to defend his PhD thesis on Pierre Bourdieu’s ‘political turn’ at the end of the year. Since 2009, he has been the editor of Replika – a Hungarian social science quarterly. His work centres on social theory with a special focus on contemporary French sociology. Faber is also one of the main Hungarian translators of Pierre Bourdieu and Luc Boltanski’s works. His last paper titled “From false premises to false conclusions: Pierre Bourdieu’s ‘sociological determinism’” was published this year in The American Sociologist.

Elena Danilova  
Institute of Sociology, Russian Academy of Sciences, Russia  
Elena Danilova is a Head of the Centre for Theoretical Studies and History of Sociology at the Institute of Sociology, Russian Academy of Sciences in Moscow. Her recent interests and publications intersect the sociology of transformations. These include the changes taking place in post-socialist societies and critical sociology. Her latest publications include: “Actual and perceptual social inequality under transformative change in Russia and China”, Europe-Asia Studies (2017) and “Neoliberal Hegemony and Narratives of ‘Losers’ and ‘Winners’ in Post-Socialist Transformations”, Journal of Narrative Theory (2014). She also teaches sociology at the National Research University Higher School of Economics. She is a member of the editorial boards of several professional journals and a member of the Russian Society of Sociologists. She served as a member of ESA’s Executive Committee from 2009 to 2013, and as ESA’s Vice President from 2011 to 2013. She was again elected to the ESA Executive Committee from 2015 to 2017. At ESA, she has contributed to and initiated Research Network 36, the Sociology of transformations: East and West, and she is currently its coordinator.

M. Teresa Consoli  
University of Catania, Italy  
M. Teresa Consoli (1967) has a PhD in Sociology and MSc in Social Policy and Planning at the London School of Economics. She is Associate Professor in the Sociology of Law at the Department of Social and Political Sciences, University of Catania. She teaches the Sociology of Law and Social Policy and her research interests are focused on the normative and comparative aspects of welfare systems. Among her latest publications, she has contributed as an expert to a European comparative study on homelessness titled Asylum Seekers, Refugees and Homelessness (European Observatory on Homelessness, 2016) and edited a book titled Migrations towards Southern Europe: The case of Sicily and the Separated Children (Angeli, 2015). At present, she is head of a Master’s degree programme in the Planning of Social Policies at the University of Catania and she is the Director of the University Research Centre, Laposs.

Marco Caselli  
Universita Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, Italy  
Marco Caselli was born on May 19th, 1973. He holds a Degree in Political Sciences from Genoa University and a PhD in Sociology and the Methodology of Social Research from the Catholic University of the Sacred Hearth in Milan. Marco is professor of Sociology at the Faculty of Political and Social Sciences at the Catholic University of the Sacred Hearth, Milan. He is Vice-Coordinator of ESA Research Network 15, Global, Transnational and Cosmopolitan Sociology, and a member of the Scientific Board in the Methodology Section of the Italian Sociological Association (AIS). His publications include, amongst others, Trying to Measure Globalization, Experiences, Critical Issues and Perspectives (Springer, 2012) and Globalization, Supranational Dynamics and Local Experiences (edited with Guia Gilardoni, Palgrave Macmillan, in press).
Laura Horn
Roskilde University, Denmark
Laura Horn is Associate Professor at the Department of Social Sciences and Business at Roskilde University. Her work focuses on processes of capitalist restructuring in Europe from a critical political economy perspective. She has been a member of Research Network 6, Critical Political Economy, since 2005. Between 2015 and 2017, she has served as the Chair of the Research Network Council, and, as such, represented ESA Research Networks on Executive Committee.

Haldun Gülalp
Global Studies and Class Strategies (GSCS) Research Group, Istanbul, Turkey
Haldun Gülalp retired from teaching in 2015 as Professor of Political Science at Yıldız Technical University and currently chairs the Global Studies and Class Strategies (GSCS) Research Group in Istanbul, Turkey. He holds doctoral degrees in Economics from Ankara University and in Sociology from Binghamton University. Previously, he taught sociology at Hamilton College in New York and at Boğaziçi University in Istanbul. He also held visiting professorships at George Washington University, Northwestern University and UCLA, and was awarded research fellowships at the Woodrow Wilson International Centre for Scholars and St. Antony's College at Oxford University. His primary areas of research include social theory, the sociology of religion and religious movements, citizenship and secularism. He has been an active member of ESA since 1999 and of Research Network 29, Social Theory, since 2008. He served on the board of this Research Network from 2011 to 2015. He is also in good standing as member of Turkish Sociological Association. Among his many publications is a co-edited book that appeared as N°18 of the ESA book series “Studies in European Societies”: Haldun Gülalp and Günter Seufert (Eds.) Religion, Identity and Politics: Germany and Turkey in Interaction (Routledge, 2013).

Peter Golding
Northumbria University, United Kingdom
Peter Golding is emeritus Professor at Northumbria University and Visiting Professor at Newcastle University, both in the UK. He was previously Pro Vice-Chancellor for Research at Northumbria, and before that at Loughborough, where he had been Head of Social Sciences and Professor of Sociology. He has been a member of ESA since 1995, and founded Research Network 18, Sociology of Communications and Media Research. Peter is an editor of the European Journal of Communication and an elected member of the Academy of Social Sciences. He was chair of the research assessment panel for his field in the UK in both 2014 and 2008. Peter is a strong supporter of the European Sociological Association, and keen to see specialised fields, like media and communication, retain their connection to primary disciplines, like sociology, and for the cross-national and comparative dimensions of the discipline to continue to receive the vital support of ESA.

Lígia Ferro
University Institute of Lisbon, Portugal
Lígia Ferro received the Eng. António de Almeida/University of Porto Award for the best student graduating in Sociology in 2004. She received her Ph.D. from the University Institute of Lisbon, ISCTE-IUL in 2011. Currently she is an invited Assistant Professor at the Sociology Department, Faculty of Arts, University of Porto. Lígia Ferro is the coordinator of ESA Research Network 37, Urban Sociology, and a founder member of the European Network of Observatories in the Fields of Arts and Cultural Education - UNESCO. Since 2016 she is a member of the directive committee of the Portuguese Sociological Association.
Monica Massari  
University of Naples Federico II, Italy

Dr Monica Massari (1971) is Associate Professor at the Department of Political Sciences of the University of Naples “Federico II” (Italy) where she teaches Sociology. During the past few years she has been focused on issues related to migration, stereotypes, prejudices and new forms of racism at a European level, and dynamics of identity and recognition within multicultural societies, after several years spent in the analysis of organized crime and illegal markets in the context of globalization. Among her recent publications there is the book, *Il corpo degli altri. Migrazioni, memorie, identità* (Orthotes, 2017, forthcoming), and some contributions in edited books and journals such as: “Reconsidering Transnational Organized Crime in the Shadow of Globalization: The Case of Human Smuggling across the Mediterranean” (Hart Publishing, forthcoming), “La maledizione di essere niente” (Milano, 2016), “At the Edge of Europe: the Phenomenon of Irregular Migration from Libya to Italy” (Palgrave Pivot, 2015), “Uno come te. Europei enuovi europei nei percorsi di integrazione” (with P. Donadio and G. Gabrielli, Franco Angeli-ISMU 2014), “Musulmane e moderne. Spunti di riflessione su donne, islam e costruzioni sociali della modernità in Europa” (in *Rassegna Italiana di Sociologia*, No 3, 2014).

Kathrin Komp  
University of Helsinki, Finland

Kathrin Komp is Assistant Professor in Sociology at the University of Helsinki. She specializes in country-comparative studies of population ageing, the life-course, welfare states, and the social effects of the 2008 economic crisis. She had more than 20 publications to date, among them, several scientific articles and a text book for students. She was a fellow of the “Future Leaders in Ageing Research” programme between 2011 and 2013, and received a Marie Curie grant in 2015. She is currently chair of ESA Research Network 1, Ageing in Europe.

Tomáš Kostelecký  
Institute of Technology, Academy of Sciences, Czech Republic

Tomáš Kostelecký is the Director of the Institute of Sociology of the Czech Academy of Sciences and a senior researcher in its Department of Local and Regional Studies. He is professionally interested in the analysis of spatial aspects of human behaviour, local, regional, and comparative politics, socio-spatial inequalities and the social and political consequences of metropolisation and suburbanisation. He is the author of a number of books and regularly publishes work in domestic and international journals. He served as the chair of the Local Organizing Committee of 12th ESA Conference in Prague and has been a member of the ESA Executive Committee between 2015 and 2017.

Frédéric Lebaron  
Ecole normale supérieure Paris-Saclay, France

Frédéric Lebaron has been Professor of Sociology at the Ecole normale supérieure Paris-Saclay (ENS Cachan) since 2016, where he directs the Department of Social Sciences. Frédéric is presiding the Association Savoir Agir and in 2015 he was elected President of the French Sociological Association. His research interests are social inequality and stratification, the sociology of the professions and quantitative methods of sociological research. In 2015, he jointly published with Brigitte Le Roux (Eds.), *La méthodologie de Pierre Bourdieu en action* (Paris: Dunod).

Detlev Lück  
Federal Institute for Population Research, Germany

Detlev Lück is a senior researcher at the Federal Institute for Population Research (BiB) in Wiesbaden, Germany. He studied sociology at the University of Bamberg and achieved his doctoral degree at the University of Mainz in 2009. He has worked in Bamberg, Mainz and Wiesbaden as a teacher and researcher in the field of family sociology. Detlev’s research interests include fertility, family forms, gender, and cultural conceptions of family. He uses quantitative as well as mixed methods. Detlev is a member of ESA and of Research Network 13, the Sociology of Families and Intimate Lives, since 2009 and a member of the Research Network board since 2011. Since 2013, he has served as Vice Coordinator of the same research network.

Kathrin Komp  
University of Helsinki, Finland

Kathrin Komp is Assistant Professor in Sociology at the University of Helsinki. She specializes in country-comparative studies of population ageing, the life-course, welfare states, and the social effects of the 2008 economic crisis. She had more than 20 publications to date, among them, several scientific articles and a text book for students. She was a fellow of the “Future Leaders in Ageing Research” programme between 2011 and 2013, and received a Marie Curie grant in 2015. She is currently chair of ESA Research Network 1, Ageing in Europe.
Eleni Nina-Pazarzi
University of Naples Federico II, Italy

Eleni Nina-Pazarzi is Professor Emerita of Sociology at the University of Piraeus. She is a member of Athens Bar Association and was President of TADKY between 1996 and 2002. She has been coordinator and principal researcher in several European and National research programmes. Indicatively, project manager of the EU programme “E-medi@te Justice”, institutional and academic coordinator of EPEAEK “Gender Equality and Employment”, and coordinator of ARTEMIS–EQUAL. He has a great deal of teaching experience in graduate and post-graduate programmes in, for example, Sociology, Industrial Sociology, Social Psychology, Industrial Relations, and has been the chair of the programme committee in for the Bachelor’s and Master’s degrees since 2012. He was awarded UvA Lecturer of the year 2011.

Lena Näre
University of Helsinki, Finland

Lena Näre is Associate Professor of Sociology (tenure track) at the University of Helsinki. She holds a DPhil in Migration Studies from the University of Sussex and a PhD in Sociology from the University of Helsinki. Her research focuses on migration, gender, work (especially care work) and ageing. Her work has been published in, for example, Sociology, Ethnic and Racial Studies, Men and Masculinities, and the Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies. Recent publications include Transnational Migration and Home in Older Age (Routledge, 2016) co-edited with Katie Walsh. She is the Editor-in-Chief with Synnøve Bendixsen of the Nordic Journal of Migration Research.

Adam Mrozowicki
University of Wroclaw, Poland

Adam Mrozowicki, completed his PhD in social sciences at the Catholic University of Leuven in 2009 and his habilitation in sociology at the University of Wroclaw, in 2016. Since 2009, he has been employed at the Institute of Sociology, University of Wroclaw. His academic interests concern the sociology of work, comparative industrial relations, biographical research methods and critical social realism. He is heading the Sociology of Work Section of the Polish Sociological Association from 2013 to 2019 and he is Vice-President of Research Committee 44, Labour Movements, at the International Sociological Association (ISA). He is the author of Coping with Social Change: Life strategies of workers in Poland’s New Capitalism (LUP 2011) and over 80 articles, book chapters, reviews and reports.

Gerben Moerman
University of Amsterdam, Netherlands

Gerben Moerman is senior lecturer in Methodology in Sociology at the University of Amsterdam. His expertise lies in the field of qualitative research and mixed methods. Specifically, he researches qualitative interviewing (PhD in 2010) and different forms of qualitative analysis. He has been active as vice-chair (2013-2015) and chair (2015-2017) of Research Network 20, Qualitative Methods. Gerben has a passion for teaching. He has taught many courses on sociological research methods at various levels. He has been the chair of the programme committee in for the Bachelor’s and Master’s degrees since 2012. He was awarded UvA Lecturer of the year 2011.
Marta Soler-Gallart
University of Barcelona, Spain

Marta Soler-Gallart (Harvard PhD) is Professor of Sociology and Director of the CREA Research Centre at the University of Barcelona. She is member of the ESA Executive Committee and Chair of Research Network 29, Social Theory. She is also Vice-President of the Catalan Sociological Association and Governing Board member of the European Alliance for Social Sciences and Humanities. She is also involved in ISA, as the Editor of the journal *International Sociology*. She is the principal researcher of the H2020 project SOLIDUS and Knowledge Management Coordinator of the FP7 project IMPACT-EV. She has published her research in journals such as *Current Sociology, Qualitative Inquiry* and *Nature*.

Roland Pfefferkorn
University of Strasbourg, France

Roland Pfefferkorn is Professor of Sociology at the University of Strasbourg where he has taught for approximately 25 years. His research focuses on social inequalities (inequalities between classes, between men and women, between the generations and also on ethnic-racial inequalities) and social relations, particularly gender relations. His further interests are indicated by his publications in the sociology of work, economic sociology, regional sociology (religion and languages) as well as the epistemology and the history of sociology. At ESA 2017, together with Konstantin Minoski, he is jointly organising Research Stream 17 on “100 Years Charles Wright Mills: Sociological Imagination Today”.

Apostolos G. Papadopoulos
Harokopio University, Greece

Apostolos G. Papadopoulos is Professor of Rural Sociology and Geography at the Department of Geography, Harokopio University in Athens. He has served as Director of Postgraduate Studies in his Department from 2009 to 2011 and as an elected Vice-Rector of Economic Affairs and Development from 2011 to 2015. He has great deal of experience in the coordination and management of research projects in two distinct research domains: rural development and migration. He is particularly interested in applied social research and recently he was appointed as member of the CIHEAM Advisory Board (2017-2020), focusing especially on research, education and rural development in the Mediterranean countries. Currently, he is Chair of the Hellenic Sociological Society (HSS) and Chair of the Local Organising Committee for the 13th ESA Conference in Athens.

Patrick O’Mahony
National University of Ireland, Cork

Dr Patrick O’Mahony is Senior Lecturer at the National University of Ireland, Cork (UCC) and recently published *The Contemporary Theory of the Public Sphere*. He is a theoretical and methodological pluralist with particular concern for innovative application. His sociological interests include general theory, methodology, discourse, critical theory and critical sociology, new social movements, science and technology, economic sociology, law and democracy and interdisciplinary. He serves on the Editorial Board of the European Journal of Social Theory and reviews for many journals. He has been principal investigator and evaluator of projects on many EU social research programmes. He has been Director of the Centre for European Social Research at UCC. His goal for ESA is to improve academic conditions for geographical and social peripheries.
Teresa Carvalho
University of Aveiro, Portugal

Teresa Carvalho is Professor at the University of Aveiro in Portugal. She is a senior researcher at the Department of Sociology, University of Vienna. Between 2009 and 2011 she was Marie Curie Fellow at the Central European University, Budapest; from 2013 to 2014 she was Erwin Schrödinger-Fellow at Lancaster University and at Georgetown University, Washington, DC; and in 2017 she is a research fellow at the University of Haifa. Her main research topics include social theory (especially critical theory and feminist theory), intersectionality, research on antisemitism, nationalism, racism and sexism. Teresa Carvalho is currently Chair of ESA Research Network 19, Sociology of Professional Groups. Her main research interests are related to New Public Management and managerialism's impact on professional groups. The main focus of her current research is the relationship between managerialism and academic professionalism with an emphasis on gender issues. She has published research on these issues both in books, book chapters and scientific journals. Since 2013 she has been the chair of the ESA Research Network 19, Sociology of Professional Groups, and a member of the executive board of the ISA Research Committee 52, Sociology of Professional Groups. Her main intent is to contribute to the continuous and sustained growth of all ESA networks by assuming the voice and forwarding the interests of ESA's Research Networks in the Executive Committee.

Gallina Tasheva
University of Münster, Germany

Gallina Tasheva a German-Bulgarian Sociologist. She obtained her doctoral degree in Sofia and after carrying out her post-doctoral research at the University of Bielefeld, she has been working at the Universities of Bielefeld, Kassel, and Jena before moving to the University of Münster. In ESA, she coordinated Research Network 29, Social Theory, between 2013 and 2015. Her work centres around social theory, theoretical sociology and qualitative empirical research, especially phenomenology, existential hermeneutics and critical studies, with an emphasis on value conflicts and identity, intersubjectivity, alterity, and hospitality. Recently her efforts have been engaged in the development of European Studies (The Battlefield of European Identity, Routledge, 2018, co-edited with Frank Welz).

Karin Stögner
University of Vienna, Austria

Dr Karin Stögner studied sociology and history in Vienna and Paris and is currently lecturer at the Department of Sociology, University of Vienna. Between 2009 and 2011 she was Marie Curie Fellow at the Central European University, Budapest; from 2013 to 2014 she was Erwin Schrödinger-Fellow at Lancaster University and at Georgetown University, Washington, DC; and in 2017 she is a research fellow at the University of Haifa. Her main research topics include social theory (especially critical theory and feminist theory), intersectionality, research on antisemitism, nationalism, racism and sexism. Karin is currently Chair of ESA Research Network 31, Ethnic Relations, Racism, and Antisemitism.

Candidates for the Chair of the Council of Research Networks

Teresa Carvalho
University of Aveiro, Portugal

Teresa Carvalho is Professor at the University of Aveiro in Portugal. She is a senior researcher at CIPES (Center for Research in Higher Education Policies). She is also a member of the CIPES board and of the executive board of the Department of Social, Political and Territorial Sciences at the University of Aveiro. She is the Director of the PhD programme in Public Policies and vice-director of the Master’s degree programme in Public Administration and Management at the University of Aveiro. She is the Director of the research network WHEM (Women in Higher Education Management). Her main research interests are related to New Public Management and managerialism’s impact on professional groups. The main focus of her current research is the relationship between managerialism and academic professionalism with an emphasis on gender issues. She has published research on these issues both in books, book chapters and scientific journals. Since 2013 she has been the chair of the ESA Research Network 19, Sociology of Professions, and a member of the executive board of the ISA Research Committee 52, Sociology of Professional Groups. Her main intent is to contribute to the continuous and sustained growth of all ESA networks by assuming the voice and forwarding the interests of ESA's Research Networks in the Executive Committee.
Candidates for the Chair of the Council of National Associations

Sokratis M. Koniordos
University of Crete, Greece

Sokratis Koniordos (BA, Deree & Panteion, MA Kent, PhD LSE) is Full Professor at the University of Crete. Has also taught at the following universities: Middlesex, Quest-Nanterre-Paris 8, Cyprus, Milan-Bicocca, Open, Thessaloniki, and HOU. His main research interests include: economic sociology, the sociology of work, migration, modernity, civil society. Koniordos has published 18 volumes; for instance, *The Handbook of European Sociology*, (Routledge, 2014) with A.A. Kyrtsis; *Conflict, Citizenship and Civil Society* (Routledge, 2010) with P. Baert, G. Procacci and C. Ruzza; Towards a *Sociology of Artisans: Continuity and Discontinuities in Comparative Perspectives* (Ashgate, 2001).

Linda McKie
University of Durham, UK

Linda McKie is Professor of Sociology and Social Policy, Dean/Head of School for the School of Social and Political Sciences at the University of Edinburgh. She joined Edinburgh in August of this year after completing five years at the University of Durham where she was also Head of School. Linda has over 25 years of experience in academic research, teaching and administration. She is a sociologist with a strong track record in publishing, securing external grant income, project management, and career development and mentoring. Activities to support the development of the next generation (journal writing and mentoring work) and the future of the discipline (professoriate and learned society networking) are central to her sociological vision. Active in the development and promotion of social sciences across all sectors of the economy and with a range of communities and organisations, she also has strong collaborations in Finland and across a range of universities. Over the course of her career she has been elected to serve as a trustee on the board of the British Sociological Association (BSA) on three occasions and she is currently the BSA’s Director of Public Engagement.

VOTE! VOTE! VOTE!
Programmes for ESA’s Presidency 2017-2019

I n order to provide our members with sufficient information when electing ESA’s President for the coming term (2017-2019), we have decided to include a short statement detailing each of our candidate’s electoral programmes. Therefore, in the following each candidate briefly introduces some of their key concerns and priorities.

Alongside these brief statements, all candidates will present themselves and their plans for the ESA Presidency at our Athens conference. Those attending the conference have the opportunity to meet both candidates. This will take place during the opening ceremony and first plenary session Tuesday August 29th between 18:00 and 20:00. This will take place in the Christos Lambrakis Hall of MEGARON – The Athens Concert Hall. The MEGARON is one of the contemporary landmarks in the city of Athens.

Professor Sue Scott
centre for Women’s Studies,
University of York,
United Kingdom

I am a sociologist of gender and sexuality and with an international reputation for both empirical and theoretical work. I was nominated to stand for President in 2015, but withdrew. At the time I felt that as an experienced researcher and as someone committed to raising the profile of sociology and encouraging sociologists to communicate with wider audiences I could serve ESA well, however, I also felt that I did not have sufficient knowledge of the internal workings of ESA or of sociology across Europe at that time. For the past two years I have been a member of the Executive as Chair of the National Associations and have served as Vice President. On the basis of this, coupled with my previous experience including as President of the British Sociological Association and a member of the Executive of the UK Academy of Social Sciences, I am now ready and willing to lead ESA.

What I have learnt over these two years is that the Executive needs to communicate better, and to engage more, with its members - the new website and improved office systems should facilitate this - and also to consolidate. If elected I would want to draw on the range of skills and knowledge available both within the Executive and across the RNs and NAs to ensure that we can take advantage of every opportunity to improve the standing of sociology across Europe. Being President is a leadership position, but it is also an opportunity to support and encourage others and to reinforce and develop democratic structures and processes.

While European Sociology continues to thrive intellectually it has a lower profile than it deserves, both within the academy and outside and I would want to work to raise it both through my own efforts and by supporting the National Associations and the Research Networks in encouraging wider public engagement and the dissemination of our research to non-academic audiences. I have experience of doing this in a range of ways not least through being a President of the British Sociological association and as an Editor of Discover Society. It is also important to foster the diversity of our discipline and the diversity of sociologists and our membership, by ensuring that both kinds of diversity are represented within ESA. The future intellectual development of sociology is of course crucial to meet the challenges faced in Europe and beyond. This must be done through supporting the next generation of researchers.

We are changing the way that ESA conferences will be organized in future and have appointed an Executive Co-coordinator who will take responsibility for much of the practical conference organization, while the RNs continue to provide most of the intellectual content. Our Coordinator will also support the development ESA Publications and the website. Our Administrator has resigned, due to other commitments, and we now have the opportunity to rethink our staffing needs and how best to organize and manage and support the office for the further benefit of members. This may sound mundane, but it will be an important task for the next President and Executive and I have a good deal of experience of ensuring that organizations work well and would relish the opportunity to help ESA in this regard.

I also have experience of leading research at institutional level, as well as in the context of my own projects, and of research evaluation and assessment for Research Councils and other national and international bodies. This would be important in the context of lobbying for recognition of, and funding for, sociology across Europe. It may seem ironic that someone from the UK is standing for President in the middle of ‘Brexit’, but the UK is still part of the European academy, and hopefully UK members will continue to work at the heart of sociological research in Europe regardless of EU membership status.

I no longer work full-time for a University, a decision I made in order to develop my own research and consultancy and to work pro bono to support sociology and social science more generally. I therefore have the time and energy and commitment to give to leading, supporting and developing ESA.
Professor Frank Welz  
University of Innsbruck, Austria

For Sociology as a Public Good

My enthusiasm for ESA was sparked by my experiences as Research Network (RN) coordinator. ESA is a joint initiative of peers. Its floor is open to all. It exists by volunteers investing their time into a common European-wide project of public sociology that contributes to building a better world.

The voice of sociology. How can we support and foster their efforts? Europe is in a severe crisis. Extreme intrasocietal inequalities are aggravated by intersocietal imbalances. There is a great and urgent need for sociological knowledge informing collective efforts to meet proliferating challenges. The anti-social forces beyond our discipline that successfully have been penetrating thought and action in society – mainstream microeconomics, austerity, neoliberalism on the proactive side, as well as nationalism, xenophobia, right-wing-extremism on the reactive side – keep bolstering the political ontology of a Hobbesian war. How can we form and strengthen the voice of sociology as a public good that serves human life in society? I will outline three directions, from the first step to the basic aim:

(1) Organisational stability

Strengthening ESA. Social science and academia, are not just words, they are a set of practices, too. They require material anchorage. For making the intellectual and social ESA plans possible, an organisational first step has to be done.

For lasting strategies (e.g. SSH advocacy), ESA’s manifold volunteer work has to be ‘memorised’ and continuously transmitted to new volunteers! For enabling a more powerful infrastructure, we are currently reorganising the relations between ESA and the Professional and Local Conference Organisation. We cut a six-figure amount from the conference budget and relocated specific tasks to Paris. This step reduces conference costs and at the same time facilitates more stable ESA (wo)manpower. The mission is not yet completed:

Further professionalization. In order to further increase its internal efficiency, ESA should introduce a bookkeeping software. The annual accounts must be prepared professionally, not operated manually, as in the past. I have carefully prepared all steps, drawing on expert knowledge from accounting professors. I am offering to complete this job, making ESA a more stable and proactive force against the commercialisation of science.

(2) Improve social inclusion (in collaboration with RNs and National Associations)

Services. One side-effect of ESA’s current restructuration is the concentration of practical knowledge in Paris (instead of restarting all work from scratch for each conference). We also recently launched profound technical improvements (through a new database and website) that will offer new time-efficient services to ESA RNs and National Associations (direct editing of information on the ESA website, group email etc.).

A ‘European Sociological Debate’ - beyond linguistic and regional boundaries. Concerning publishing in a market where most journal titles are owned privately, my proposal is to launch a third ESA journal that has a strategic role for European Sociology, European Sociological Debate, to facilitate a broader exchange of sociological thought beyond existing boundaries. The idea is to bring together world-leading sociological authors with a range of critics from all regions. Editorship should be flexible from issue to issue so that the journal serves all RNs and NAs as a non-commercial open access journal.

‘European Sociologist’, the relaunch of our members’ journal is already planned too. It should develop into ESA’s European-wide discussion medium for important themes such as Sociology after Metrics, Teaching after Bologna, Open Access, Advocating for SSH, Dissertation Spotlights, etc.

(3) Build an intellectual voice: For sociology as a public good

EU research policy. In EU Horizon 2020 research funding, the main success rate for the social sciences and humanities (SSH) is 1.2%. There are hundreds of lobbyists in Brussels, but no voices for the SSH. Since 2016, I have become increasingly active in several networks in Brussels, and ESA also joined the ‘European Alliance for the Social Sciences and Humanities’ (EASSH). I will continue these efforts of building a proactive voice for SSH in the EU.

Sociology as public sociology. Finally, I plan to build up a media strategy via our headquarters so that ESA facilitates linking civil society actors and journalists to sociological experts.

Sociology first. Sociology helps to understand the world and improve life. I am advocating for treating sociology as a public good and practicing it as public sociology that, with the best of its knowledge, intervenes critically into the public sphere.

Remember: EVERY VOTE COUNTS!
The 13th ESA conference in Athens is very close. As the experience from previous ESA conferences has shown, the conference registration fees are a recurrent issue of discussion. In particular, in the context of Greece and the consequences of austerity on universities, the accessibility of the conference is an issue that we have discussed at great length in the ESA Executive Committee (ExeC) and the Local Organising Committee (LOC). With this statement, we would like to provide information on the conference fees as well as the overall decision on organising the conference in the locations where it is taking place. Our objective is transparency, and an open invitation for discussion.

The 2013-2015 ESA ExeC selected Athens as the conference location for the 2017 conference. The conference theme is certainly the most critical of all ESA conferences to date, explicitly addressing capitalism, the crisis and its consequences for Greece and Europe. To us, it also seemed a matter of solidarity to hold the conference there. When we had our first pre-conference meeting in Athens in May 2016, it became clear that there would be severe challenges: The management of the University of Athens was very sceptical of the burden of organising such a big event as the host institution. It turned out that given years of austerity that have starved Greek public services, including public universities, the university’s infrastructure is in a state that does not allow it to organise a very large international conference with more than 3,000 participants. This almost resulted in the cancellation of the entire conference.

We did our very best to identify alternative locations. The choice was between a private US college or a consortium of two small public universities, Panteion University of Social and Political Sciences and Harokopio University of Athens that are in a walking distance to each other, in conjunction with using a few conference rooms at a nearby hotel. The ExeC decided to go with the second option. In the Greek context, the primacy of and respect for public higher education institutions are more important than ever. It has been obvious from the beginning, that the challenges of making this choice work are formidable including the need for additional conference rooms at the Intercontinental Hotel result in increased expenses for the conference budget (e.g. IT and audio equipment). The only hotel large enough to be suited for the conference and in walking distance of the other universities puts conditions on renting out seminar rooms to ESA, namely that a specific number of rooms and nights must be booked in the hotel. ESA had to secure the room rental, IT and room equipment, amount in advance and cover the shortfall. As conference organisers, we were torn between the Scylla of entering financial risks and the Charybdis of cancelling the conference. Cancelling the conference was no option. Finally, the average expenditure per participant unavoidably increased by a quarter (Since we also changed the management of the conference in general, therefore are saving money in another regard and have invested a huge amount of volunteer work, we can afford it).

Against this background, the discussion of conference fees takes on a new light. Self-evident as it may sound, the main purpose of the conference fees is to cover the costs of conference organisation. These include room rental, IT and room equipment, services, catering, travel and accommodation for invited speakers and so on. To give you an indication, catering for participants (except extra lunch boxes) comes to about 100,000 euro. The budget for the previous conference is made public, and at every conference, ESA provides a detailed financial report of its general activities. As organisers, we are acutely aware that the fees are higher than some participants can afford, in particular, local colleagues. It should be noted here that this time the average conference fee is the lowest one in ten years if not longer (same as in 2009), about 40 euro lower than from 2011 to 2015. The number of participants from “Band 2” countries (World Bank classification) substantially increased from 11% to 19%. The share of ESA members (who pay lower fees) of all participants also substantially increased from half (2015) to three quarters (2017). Compared with other international conferences of social science associations, ESA fees are at the lower end. For a non-profit volunteer organisation as ESA is, conference fees are a kind zero-sum game. You cannot announce a price considering a concrete group of participants. If fees are lowered at one end, you have to increase them for another group. Some people propose to increase fees for “established” colleagues and consequently further reduce fees for students and scholars in precarious working conditions. There are also counter-arguments. If you increase fees too much for one group, the number of participants will shrink.

Nevertheless, we have not done nothing. Apart from the band 1 and band 2 country category, we introduced a brand new category for unemployed sociologists, following the ASA model. One question arose, are retired sociologists unemployed? A relatively small (insufficient affordable) number of participants is currently making use of it. In addition to that, a student group

A statement by the ESA Executive Committee (ExeC) and the Local Organising Committee (LOC) in respect to the organisation of the 13th ESA conference in Athens, August 29th to September 1st, 2017.
ticket has been introduced that will be an option mainly for local students who can form a group. We have, in cooperation with the LOC, also attempted to offer a wide range of accommodation options. It is not only the conference fees that build the costs but accommodation for four nights and travel too. In the past (2013), to our surprise, only very few participants took up the offer of a very cheap but good accommodation through our booking website. However, the main initiative for enabling local students (and other students who contacted us) to participate has been to substantially increase the number of volunteers who support the conference. In very close collaboration with the LOC, this conference will have the highest number of volunteers ever for enabling a good number of students to be around, help but also participate in sessions.

Concerning the future, we are working on being able to organise ESA conferences with fewer costs by making use of the new ESA conference management, including the work of our new ESA Coordinator in Paris as much as possible. In the past, all investments were repeated every two years (e.g. paying for the implementation or even development of an electronic submission and conference system). In the past, we paid about 170,000 euro on average for external delegated work that we now operate from Paris while, of course, we now also have higher costs in Paris too. From 2015 onwards, more and more of these steps are being standardized so that each conference builds on the same organisational processes and system. The current 13th conference is the first one operated on this basis. We have also been in close contact with the ISA on these issues. We experience that we receive more and more proposals for organising an ESA conference which are prepared and co-submitted by Professional Conference Organisers (PCO). Since several conferences, we have noticed that when PCOs and/or commercial Congress Centres (instead of public universities) are in the game, costs explode. You get invoices for “IT” and “IT services” plus “power sockets” and “technicians”, “general services” and “secretariat”, “support desks” etc. and can’t evaluate this. For our next conference in 2019, we were therefore already trying to actively contact host institutions about their interest in co-organising an ESA conference offering them our support and active conference management since we have changed the structure of the latter in 2015-2017.

We hope this statement helps to clarify how and why the conference fees are what they are. We invite you to also have a look at a discussion about similar organisational issues in respect to the 2015 conference that was published in the Czech Sociological Review in 2016. Such discussions should continue. ESA cannot by itself resolve the inequalities and contradictions of academic engagement in a market economy, and we have to bear in mind the organisational problems and political economy of organising a large international conference in times of austerity. But together we can certainly create a social space for critical sociological discussion of the future of Europe, the economy, and society.

The ESA Executive Committee and the Local Organising Committee
August 2017
A Note from the Editors of the European Journal of Cultural and Political Sociology

The European Journal of Cultural and Political Sociology is the ESA’s second official journal. It embraces the gamut of interests of ESA members, building on the idea that sociologists today tend to take into account both how people see the world (broadly speaking, culture), and how they affect and are affected by it (broadly speaking, politics and power). There is no subject-matter it excludes, and we are pleased to emphasise that every one of the ESA’s Research Networks should feel that this journal is a welcoming home for their work.

The articles we have published since the first volume in 2014 cover issues that are sociologically and more broadly topical, within and outside Europe, and debate theoretical questions that aim at constructive ways of better analysing the empirical world. We have published creative and theoretically informed work exploring, for instance, processes by which local people in Russia have become involved in collective action in connection with their homes, by Karine Clément; contrasting attempts at ‘participative democracy’ and the challenges they face, by Mathieu Berger and Marion Carrel; the effects on research cultures of ‘expertisation’ in European bureaucratic practices by Sebastian Büttner and Lucia Leopold; or the way policies develop as they spread, for instance in connection with national ethics committees as explored by Jukka Syväterä and Pertti Alasuutari. Articles have touched on class and education, neighbourhood and politics, memory, race and the effects of colonisation in different national settings.

Laurent Thévenot, in the first volume in 2014, provided a welcome reflection on his work in ‘the sociology of engagements’; Drori, Höllerer and Walgenbach devoted much effort to the task of ‘unpacking glocalisation’. Later that year, Robert Fine introduced a special issue on Hannah Arendt’s On Revolution with a finely-tuned analysis of how construing theoretical texts can make us more sensitive to what is happening in the political world. Early in 2016, Paul du Gay and Thomas Lopdrup-Hjorth contributed an original and trenchant critique of the ‘fear of the formal’ they detect among sociologists of organisations. In 2016, we published a special issue, guest-edited by Ali Qadir, tackling local-global entanglements in world society theory, addressing challenges and potential of the framework both empirically and theoretically.

This blend of empirical and theoretical creativity can be seen in the current issue too, which covers issues from the impact of discursive expectations on a young woman seeking refugee status, linguistic interventions by peace-building protesters in Cambodia, or ‘feeling rules’ evolving between environmental protesters and local councils in the Netherlands, to the question how we can profit from Bourdieu’s field theory to understand political structure in a way that takes people’s meanings seriously. Our next issue will include articles on unintended effects of political efforts to eradicate bullying in schools that create ‘cultures of resistance’ among teachers, comments on the political cultures of Ireland and Italy, and work on the pitfalls of translation.

Our book reviews cover a wide and fascinating range of topics, from analyses of major sociological thinkers to issues concerning migration, human rights and borders; art and culture; imagination and politics, not least imagining Europe; youth and ageing; memory, social order, cultural transmission and agency. Members of ESA Research Networks are more than welcome to suggest new volumes for review!

Our current editorial stresses our commitment to our authors, perhaps especially those whose first language is not English. Colleagues who have published with us regularly thank us for our support. This overview is intended to stimulate members of the ESA’s Research Networks to publish with us, and to see us as a journal they can feel is their own.

Ricca Edmondson (left), Eeva Luhtakallio (right) and Siobhan Kattago (not pictured).
News from ESA’s Book Series

A Note from the Editors of the ESA Book Series – Studies in European Sociology

The European Sociological Association has a dedicated book series published by Routledge. The series title is “Studies in European Sociology” (at the link: www.routledge.com/Studies-in-European-Sociology/book-series/SE0204 you can find the list of all the books published and related information about authors and content). The current Series editors are Maria Carmela Agodi (Federico II University of Naples, Chair of ESA RN33 Women’s and Gender Studies) and Ellen Annandale (University of York and a former ESA Vice-President).

The book series was formerly known as “Studies in European Societies”. It provided a forum for sociological responses to massive change and developments that different European societal systems were undergoing after the breakdown of the Soviet Union. The book series sociological focus was on those differently changing societies moving toward an imagined common European economic, social and political area. A European society – that was the idea – was in progress through changes in European societies.

However, since the ‘Great Recession’ of 2008, the idea that Europe can be made or unmade entered the political and sociological imagination. The convergence of European societies within a European society, and even the very idea of Europe, is questioned.

The inherent contradictions of capitalism seem to be stronger than the promises of solidarity; Europe has seen a deepening of neo-liberal politics, the subversion of the so-called European social model centered on the welfare state and increasing inequality rates. The economic crisis formed a context for both the constitution and the undermining of solidarities, now fragmented in and between societies across Europe. Refugees’ human rights are questioned by the closure of borders and the lack of a coordinated European strategy. Authoritarianism, nationalism, racism, xenophobia, violence, and ideological fundamentalisms have proliferated throughout the world, including the USA and Europe. As a result, the promise of Europe and its geographical, political, and social borders look unmade and this ‘unmaking’ – of which “Brexit” is just a symptom – poses a profound challenge for sociology and the social sciences more generally.

The new name for the ESA book series – Studies in European Sociology – is intended as a call addressed to European sociologists to face this challenge and as an opportunity offered to all of them, with their different theoretical backgrounds and diverse research methods, and empirical foci, to act as a global and reflexive scientific community. We call for books (both monographs and edited volumes) which give voice to European sociology as plural and diverse, while sharing the same and unique character of a critical, theoretically and empirically oriented, thoughtful and imaginative, intellectual scientific program, deepening the understanding of our present and helping to look forward to our global future. We welcome proposals from all ESA Research Networks.

General proposal guidelines for authors can be found at: www.routledge.com/resources/authors/how-to-publish-with-us. For any details you may contact the ESA book series editors.

Editorial contacts for ESA:

Maria Carmela Agodi: agodi@unina.it; mcagodi@gmail.com
Ellen Annandale: ellen.annandale@york.ac.uk

Editorial contact for Routledge:

Gerhard Boomgaarden: Gerhard.Boomgaarden@tandf.co.uk; gerhard@routledge.co.uk

Recent publications from the ESA book series:

Every ESA conference, indeed every sociology conference, offers promising theoretical perspectives and rich empirical data increasing our understanding of the role of emotions in social life. Despite the proliferation of sociological work on emotions in recent years, there is no dedicated sociology journal in this field. Thus, Research Network 11 (RN11), the Sociology of Emotions, are proposing a new journal, to be edited by members of the network. Here we set out why we think such a journal is important and two possibilities for launching it: one via an established publisher and the other as an open access journal under the umbrella of the ESA. We welcome the opinions of ESA members on the proposed journal and on the options suggested.

This journal is of importance not just to those working within the sociology of emotions but to the discipline as a whole. The diverse field of the sociology of emotions deals with questions fundamental to the broader discipline and to neighbouring fields. It sheds light on major social processes such as globalization, individualization, and rationalization. It also provides new thinking to further debates around social inequalities, all forms of politics, personal life, agency, institutions, social change, reflexivity and more. In addition, research on the sociology of emotions transcends disciplinary boundaries, enriching knowledge for sociologists and their intellectual neighbours.

There is an urgent need for sociologists to better understand emotions and to expand the publication possibilities for sharing those understandings. Current conflicts, and political and social uncertainties, call for analyses that account for the emotional consequences. The emotional tenor of ordinary life is also important and sociologists seek to make sense of love, joy, confidence and boredom, as well as everyday fears and frustrations. The journal will provide a home for sociological approaches to understanding emotional experience in all its forms.

In furthering sociological knowledge, the sociology of emotions can draw on forty years or more of specific work in the field, as well as tracing ideas back to classical sociology. Early sociologists including Emile Durkheim, Max Weber, Georg Simmel, and Harriet Martineau were vocal about the importance of emotions in analyzing society. They were joined in attending to emotions by other theorists such as Adam Smith and William James and were succeeded by sociologists of emotion such as Norbert Elias, Theodore Kemper and Arlie Hochschild. From this has come a distinct sociological approach, along with a broader emotional turn in the social sciences, and arguably in social life itself. This journal will provide a forum for scholarly work examining emotionalization of the social world. It will also be a showcase for the rich and invigorating variety of sociological work addressing emotions.

The proposed editors have for some time been in discussion with ESA’s Taylor & Francis Group (Informa business) publisher about publishing the journal with them, although for this to be done on acceptable terms would require the support of ESA. The alternative is for the ESA to provide a platform for the journal to be published in open access form. We here outline the pros and cons of each option:

**ESTABLISHED PUBLISHER PROS:**

- Get the name and prestige of an old publisher.
- Get support with technical and administrative matters, including financial support for editors.

**ESTABLISHED PUBLISHER CONS:**

- ESA’s established publisher won’t put the journal in the mainstream package sold to libraries for several years.
- Researchers from south and eastern parts of Europe are not able to afford subscriptions (especially due to the above point)
- The open access shift changes the situation in the publishing market fast and if we strike a deal with the publisher now, we will have a contract tying us to them for some years.
- The deal currently offered would involve authors paying to submit manuscripts (published papers would then be open access), although a more standard deal akin to other ESA journals (no fees to submit articles) could probably be negotiated if this becomes one of ESA’s official journals. Researchers with grants can usually cover a fee, but it will be difficult for researchers that do not have grants. However, most
established journals do take fees for open access publications (although they also have standard publications with no fees).

OPEN ACCESS PROS (NON-PROFIT UNIVERSITY PRESS):

- ESA is influential enough to offer a counter force to the private market of publishers.
- There are already Social Sciences Citation Index (SSCI) journals that are open access.
- Most grant funders demand open access (OA) already, and the time frame for when one needs to offer OA is getting shorter.
- It may be possible to get some funding from setting access so that institutions pay a fee and private people do not (we believe that Sociological Research Online did this).
- Libraria, the network of libraries, is a coalition of 300 libraries around the world that can offer financial support for journals that leave the private market – however, this does not apply to new journals.

OPEN ACCESS CONS (NON-PROFIT UNIVERSITY PRESS):

- Lose the support of an established publisher, and become dependant on grants, or voluntary non-profit work to run the journal. This might affect the quality of the output (e.g. less thorough proof-reading).
- May be perceived as less prestigious, at least initially.

On a more general note, an open access or standard publisher alternative within ESA and with continuous support from the organization could be a secure long term possibility, but ESA would then need to decide on their more general publishing strategy. Does ESA want to be an actor and supporter in the publishing of European sociological journals in the future?

Dr Mary Holmes, proposed editor of Emotions & Society (left)
University of Edinburgh, UK

Dr Stina Bergman Blix, coordinator of RN11 (right)
Stockholm University, Sweden
Open Access Publishing and the Challenges for Scientific Associations

From the first experiences in the early 1990s, Open Access (OA) has experienced an extraordinary increase, both in the number of journals published and in the total article output. This development is shifting the background of scientific publishing and opening up new ways of sharing scientific knowledge. Following the OpenAire definition, OA “is the immediate, online, free availability of research outputs without restrictions on use commonly imposed by publisher copyright agreements. Open Access includes the outputs that scholars normally give away for free for publication; it includes peer-reviewed journal articles, conference papers and datasets of various kinds”. My arguments on the benefits and challenges of OA will be mostly based on reflections developed within the framework of the Portuguese Association of Sociology (APS). I will especially argue for OA, as an opportunity to promote language diversity and cross-cultural exchanges among sociologists, as a way to accomplish more rewarding forms of research networking and encourage international scientific collaboration.

Whether at a national or international level, scientific associations assume a crucial role in the mediation between scientific communities and society. International scientific associations are best positioned to inspire the process of knowledge production and dissemination, and stimulate contrapositions to economically and culturally dominant phenomena. First of all, scientific associations are the place for the creation of networks of teachers and researchers who bring together specific skills capable of forming strong critical masses. Because scientific work implies, precisely, the exercise of systematic confrontation of different views, international scientific associations may stand as an “antidote” against species of dogmatism and fundamentalism. Again, and especially in the field of social sciences, international associations are more prepared to act in all matters connected with the hegemony of cultures and languages. Finally, international scientific social science associations are in a position to help global governance, by enabling serious and empirically grounded analyses reach public debate and contribute to the understanding of and reflection upon different dimensions of globalisation (Martinelli 2003, 2006).

In short, international scientific associations are best placed to provide the institutional conditions for establishing transnational links and to innovate ways of doing it. These include major congresses, the creation of thematic research committees/networks, a whole range of discussion forums, internet platforms, not to mention (given its great importance in the process) the publication of high-impact international journals. In 2006, the Journal Citation Report (ISI) checked 93 journals in sociology, of which 22% depended on international, regional or national associations. More significant is the fact that six of the top 10 journals (the top 10 specifically sociological journals) belonged to American or British associations (Platt, 2010, 111).

It is well-known that the diversity of scientific languages has decreased with the dominance of the English; well-known is also the fact that this discourages many scientific communities from participating on international circuits. Among other aspects, the thematic and linguistic dominance determined by high-impact international journals is accompanied by the invisibility of research produced in local contexts. This invisibility is much greater if the research is conducted in languages of minor impact and when it concerns countries less represented in the bibliographic databases.

By these obvious remarks, I do not wish to put into question the advantage of using English in international academic practices. It is understandable that the English language imposes itself when, for example, sociological work refers to global comparisons. But what can be said when the work is concerned with comparisons at the regional level? Will it be possible to escape this logic of linguistic monoliths when it comes to thinking about and comparing societies having geographic, cultural and linguistic continuities, as is the case for example in Southern Europe?

Given the fact that as cultural domination (associated with and reinforced by economic and political domination) becomes evident, new forms of seeing language are needed. As indispensable tools for global dialogue, languages can also be an element of gathering and resisting hegemonic tendencies, a condition that is also essential for effective, inclusive and open dialogue on the diversity of interpretative repertoires.
Several approaches to the articulation/compatibility of linguistic diversity can be noted. Summary examples: English is typically used in thematic networks at, for example, ISA or ESA. In regional networks, other working languages are possible, for example, the Network of Sociological Associations of Southern Europe (ReSu) and the Regional Research Network on Southern European Societies (RN27/ESA) organize their working sessions in the perspective of linguistic diversity, having English and Latin as their working languages.

As we see it from the experience of APS there are opportunities to improve the visibility of sociological work and its plurality, and OA journals may provide an excellent instrument to expand sociological dialogue within Europe and worldwide. The Portuguese journals who adopted an open access policy have achieved an extraordinary increase in readers, especially from Latin America, a region where OA models have been extremely positive and where a sample of good practices on regional collaboration have been identified in the search to find alternatives to the dominant for profit press (Alperin, Babini, and Fischman, 2014).

Given the concept and technical features of an OA journal, within ESA’s structure, a full OA journal could allow for more rewarding engagement and the participation of National Associations and RNs, calling them to lead discussions on special subjects of multilateral public interest, and giving voice to the diversity of European sociology by adopting multi-language policy.

Open Access, Democratization and the Periphery

Practices of academic and general intellectual knowledge production and dissemination have always operated in complex relations to associations, markets, networks, technologies, media, public organisations, and associated institutionalised material resources and cultures. It is common knowledge that the advent of digitisation as a production and diffusion medium has had a profound impact on these practices in ways that are still unfolding. A pivotal aspect of this impact is the manner in which it has re-energized moral-normative debates concerning the conditions of access to knowledge, raising a variety of issues, but emphasising critique of what is perceived as the existing state of publisher domination.

I would like to introduce a few considerations regarding a specific aspect of the politics of knowledge in the above sense, the differential conditions of production, dissemination, and access that separates the core and periphery. In the first instance, I am thinking of this issue with respect to Europe, but the implications are clearly wider. My concentration is on Europe because it is the place where most of my direct experience of the issue has been gained, but also because I want to direct a few remarks to the possible role in this matter of the European Sociological Association (ESA).

For present purposes, when the terms ‘core’ and ‘periphery’ are used below, they are used rather loosely and, indeed, my illustrative case, Ireland, is really better addressed though the category of semi-periphery rather than periphery. I count Ireland as on the semi-periphery in the relevant respect for the following reasons: Firstly, access to academic books is relatively restricted, as, on the whole, library budgets are rather small and cannot ensure comprehensive coverage; secondly, with regard to article access, there has been a type of inverse movement between the disadvantage of rising prices of journals, on one side, and the greater availability of institutionally pooled digital database access on the other; thirdly, the national sociology association is small, has little or no publishing influence beyond its own journal, and does not play a significant role in opening up international networks; and, finally, for various reasons.
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sociology is weakly institutionalised and its outputs have very limited resonance with wider publics, with the consequence that the potential influence of sociological enlightenment on civil society is radically abridged, notably so compared to the influence of the disciplines of history and economics in the public sphere. This situation has perhaps historically improved over the last three decades, at least on the academic production and access side, primarily through somewhat greater and easier access to journals, but it hangs by the thread of the affordability of the basic databases.

While much more is implicated in improving the quality of sociology than access to resources for producing and generating knowledge in the narrow sense, the cumulative effect of restrictions on the availability of such resources, in addition to the reduced network centrality of national academics who do not belong to more developed and influential national networks, has nonetheless significantly diminished the output capacity of Irish sociology. One could speculate with some confidence that this applies to other semi-peripheral countries with similar characteristics and still more applies to countries on the periphery in Europe and beyond. It may succinctly be expressed as the adverse consequences of limited access to intellectual networks and knowledge resources on the capacities of intellectual producers and their influence on non-national academics and national and trans-national civil societal publics.

Could open access improve matters? If the current situation is to be regarded as the outcome of a specific configuration of public goods, markets, network centrality, the nature and significance of nodal agents, normative commitments, and communication media then, with even minimal assumptions about knowledge as a good with universal status, the situation appears unsatisfactory on this geographical plane. In short, economic wealth, manifested through the market or through public institutions, together with factors of scale and centrality, has led to a situation of ongoing inequality between core and semi-periphery. A hypothesis as to what would remedy this situation could perhaps be generated in a comprehensive manner, but let me simply anticipate one possible point of intervention.

Open Access (OA) is already gaining ground in academic life, de jure or de facto, through a variety of modalities, e.g., dedicated journals, general informal sharing, EU research protocols, and big digital databases of various kinds. This is a moment of maximum transformation and hence maximum opportunity with regard to influencing this configuration. The ESA should consider how it could enter the ‘fray’ by first of all analysing the empirical features of the situation and then normatively justifying the direction of its possible interventions. The latter might well be informed by the sense that the increasing power of markets in this sphere must be radically curtailed by means of the assertion of a new politics of the public good in the form of radically expanding OA. And this new politics of the radical expansion of OA must, as an unavoidable prerequisite, appeal directly to transnational solidarities amongst academic communities. And the latter potential political mission of academics coming to terms with their actual – but often misrecognized and under-estimated – powers to directly influence the situation can go very far to create a more even playing field across geographical regions, and, though not the main subject here, various ‘prosumers’. The vision of what should be the case must be the progenitor of what could, through associated practices, become the case. To advance this vision, and to begin the associated practices, would indeed be a worthy purpose for the ESA.

Journal Publishing in French Sociology

The situation of sociological journals in France appears quite specific: an important number of French-speaking journals provides a large set of possibilities of publications for the researchers in their mother tongue.

Journals are regularly created, and this dynamism at least partly explains the remaining importance and vitality of the scientific production in French, before translation in some cases (cf. the example of the Revue française de sociologie), simultaneously with a rise of publications from French sociologists in English-speaking journals. Some bilingual journals already exist, in demography (Population, with a double publication in French and English) or more recently in sociology

(Biens symboliques / Symbolic goods: http://www.puy-editions.fr/collections/biens_symboliques.html), and they will probably develop in the future, in a context of strong pressures towards internationalization.

The perimeter of national and international journals recognized as “sociological” and “scientific” by the national evaluation agency (now called Haut conseil de l’évaluation de la recherche et de l’enseignement supérieur, HCERES) is large, and this recognition occurs after a collective assessment by experts, appointed as members of an ad-hoc commission.

Some of the journals are financially supported by the national science research center (CNRS), after an annual in-depth assessment by one or the two commissions (“sections du comité national”) composed of sociologists (sections 36 and 40).
Some are published by commercial publishers, others by academic ones (often with the direct or indirect support of academic institutions). For example, Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales, created by Pierre Bourdieu in 1975 at the Centre de sociologie de l’éducation et de la culture, is now published by Le Seuil, a very famous generalist publisher, and it benefits from the support of various public institutions (CNRS, Fédération Maison des sciences de l’Homme, etc.).

The Law now states that public research should be freely accessible after six months, which is supposed to limit the private appropriation of a value created mostly in the public sector and for universal purposes. This constraint has given birth to a mobilization of French publishers and the final version of the Law remains a bit ambiguous (https://scinfolex.com/2016/10/31/open-access-quelles-incidences-de-la-loi-republique-numerique/).

A majority of the journals, either published by private companies or not, provides digital open-access through the private platform Cairn (https://www.cairn.info/a-propos.php), which implies a commercial transaction with institutions or individuals (depending on the location of connection) and some time-lag in the accessibility of articles, and which therefore could also be seen as a capitulation of public resources. More cooperative open-access platforms such as revues.org (http://www.revues.org/) provide a more completely free access: the journal of the French Sociological Association, Soco-logos, is for example a digital publication directly and freely accessible online (https://socio-logos.revues.org/).

Hence, the position of the AFS / FSA has been a clear support for free open-access and in favor of the development of on-line free publication as much as possible. This position faces an existing situation which is structurally favorable to prestigious and professional commercial publishers, such as Le Seuil or La Découverte, which have clearly allowed a large diffusion of social sciences outside the academic field. It also has to face the domination of big open-access private platforms which threaten the creation of free diffusion of knowledge.

In France, the centrality of publishers in the intellectual field has been described as an important feature, especially since the explosion of human sciences in the 1960s. The creation of journals is part of the vitality of French intellectual life, and it often implies the quest for a publisher outside academia, taking into account the weakness of academic publishers, and the remaining (though more and more challenged) lowest legitimacy of direct free open-access.

If this situation is particularly relevant in the sector of humanities, especially literary studies, history and philosophy, it is obviously not the case for most of the natural sciences which have adopted another mode of diffusion, internationalized and centered on English-speaking journals or peer-reviewed platforms. Economics and psychology are situated closer to the model of natural sciences, and sociology somewhere in-between.

More coordination of our strategies at the European level, in relation to other close disciplines like political science, is clearly needed.

Open Access: A Pragmatic Choice for Sociology Publishing in China

The Journal of Chinese Sociology is not only mainland China’s first English journal in sociology, but also the only open-access journal among its counterparts in China. There are a few obvious reasons for choosing this publishing mode. For a newly started journal operated in a country with a huge volume of academic output but limited international presence, to choose a most “cutting-edge” publishing strategy in collaboration with the world’s largest publisher, Springer Nature, seems to be an irresistible calling. It is believed to be able to help enhance the presence of Chinese sociology in the larger sociological community. Moreover, and most critically, thanks to generous funding from its sponsor, the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, the Journal is able to pay for the expensive article-processing charge (APC) on behalf of the authors, thus making it a more appealing choice for the authors, i.e. enjoying high visibility for their articles without paying the jaw-dropping open-access fees.

When one looks at a Chinese journal, one has to look beyond the mere academic ambition of the journal itself. SSCI is a challenging, but short-term goal. Underpinning all this, there are two important contexts. The first one is a national strategy to promote the state’s “soft power”, among which academic presence and impact is an important component. This provides great incentives for new English journals to appear, as well as adopting a publishing model that potentially reaches the largest audience in a fastest manner. The Journal has been relieved of the burden of revenue generation and is able to focus all resources on improving the quality of the journal and promoting it. The potential
risk, on the other hand, is the fact that because of its reliance on state funding, a swing in policy may drastically change the fate of the Journal. But in the foreseeable future, introducing research carried out by Chinese scholars to the larger global community (using English as the medium) and acting as a bridge between a bustling but relatively self-contained community of Chinese sociologists and sociologists around the world will be a task of significance and urgency. Although English is chosen as the working language, it would be overly simplistic to assume that it is necessarily surrender to the US hegemony in the discipline. In fact, China adopts a more open approach in its attempt to get involved in the international community. It has been reaching out for collaboration with other BRICS countries, for example. Using English may be more of a pragmatic choice than a flattering gesture.

An embrace of English as the working language of sociological research, of course, is not without controversy. Until today, a group of Chinese sociologists, including prominent ones, are skeptical of adhering to the dominant academic standards and the emphasis on researchers’ ability to publish in English-language journals. An ongoing debate between the indigenization of sociology in China and the international codification of China’s local knowledge is another important context which conditions the future of open access journals in China. Some scholars worry that blindly following “Western” standards of research and publishing will threaten the validity of sociological research on Chinese society. Others believe that established academic standards are proven effective in producing valid knowledge that can be discussed and debated within global academia. In any case, Chinese sociologists are aware of the “imported” nature of sociology as a discipline, which has been introduced to China for merely a few decades (unlike Europe, which is the cradle of sociology). Whether one supports the indigenization of sociology or the international codification of research findings, most researchers go through trainings of the discipline by reading theories and studying methods of “Western” origin. Most understand they need to respect the internationally recognized rules of the game and operate within the current scientific paradigm.

In the future, when Chinese sociologists finally excel at writing and publishing in English, they may start to think more seriously about challenging the hegemonic mode of academic publishing. At the moment, however, the acceptance level of a more “advanced” publishing mode, such as open access, is expected to be relatively high. It seems that pragmatism is taking the upper hand.

Dr Xiao Mei
Institute of Sociology, Chinese Academy of Social Sciences
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For most of us we see little of the work put in by the staff at our office in Paris - aside from receiving welcome email correspondence from the European Sociological Association (ESA), we rarely have cause to contact those whose job it is to keep ESA running day in and day out. In a welcome change to this state of affairs, in the following article we introduce you to three persons without whom ESA would struggle to get by. These people are, ESA’s Executive Coordinator, Dagmar Danko, Andreia Batista Dias while Gisèle Tchinda-Falcucci is on maternity leave, and one our interns, Veronika Riedl. Let’s take a few moments to get to know them...

Dr Dagmar Danko is Executive Coordinator at the European Sociological Association (ESA). She has studied Sociology, the History of Art and European Law at universities in Freiburg, Germany and Paris, France. Her doctoral thesis (2011) deals with the interplay between social theory and contemporary art. Her latest book (2015) discusses the work of the US-American sociologist Howard S. Becker.

Dagmar Danko has been working for ESA since October 2016. She coordinates the academic part of the 13th ESA conference in Athens 2017.

Dagmar, coordinating about 100 ESA Research Network and Research Stream coordinators, is this possible?

Of course! I have to make it happen – and so I do! This coordinative work requires a combination of superior communication skills, thinking ahead, and the ability to put oneself in the RN/RS coordinators' position. This last point is especially something where my own qualification as sociologist comes in handy. It’s all about interaction. My work is not just my work; it is the result of the cooperation with everyone I am communicating with. It also requires stamina and I really have to think on my feet!

So far you have been communicating with hundreds of ESA members from a distance only. Is there nevertheless a sense of an ESA community, or do you think it will be most important to meet all of them in person in Athens?

I already have attended three ESA conferences before: the previous ones in Prague, Turin and Geneva. So I don’t feel like I don’t know all these ESA members. I have seen them, I have heard them give their presentations, I have discussed many interesting topics with them. I think that there is a strong ESA community. My impression is that people feel good at the ESA conferences, like they really belong there. It is not a prestige event – there is real intellectual, and personal, exchange. This is part of the reason why I have wanted to join ESA and support its activities. Now, I am looking forward to seeing all of you in Athens, again!

You published several books, especially on the sociology of the arts. Why have your sociological lenses been attracted by the arts?

The arts are a highly underestimated field of study. People (even our fellow sociologists) think that trying to understand the arts in and as society means that all we sociologists of art do is deal with aesthetics, whereas our focus is the same as everyone else’s: Inequality and precarity, work and market conditions, politics, education, differing values, gender issues, you name it. Yet, artists are often seen as somehow outside of all of this. In my opinion, that makes for an interesting combination! So studying society through the arts is like using an amplifier. And I really like the sound of it.

Slovak, German, French and English. How is it possible that you speak four languages fluently? Did you also study languages?

Not at university, no. I am blessed, biographically speaking. Also I have to admit that I’m a language nerd. Not a day goes by that I don’t look up new words in dictionaries. I love dictionaries. On my smartphone, it’s the only app I really use daily! The languages I speak are very different, too. They teach me lessons in diversity and shifting meanings. Sometimes it’s confusing, but mostly a lot of fun. I consider myself a true European. For quite a while, this kind of went without saying. Nowadays, stating that you are a European has turned into a political statement. This is a backlash which has me worried. Certainly, most sociologists feel the same, and we should make our voice heard. The ESA conference in Athens will be a great place for that!
The face behind the ESA emails currently belongs to Andreia Batista Dias. Andreia has just finished her Master’s degree at the EHESS in Paris. Among other tasks, she has been operating the ESA email account since Gisèle Tchinda-Falcucci has been on maternity leave. She’s actively working on inequalities and health rights for minorities. Next year, she wants to apply for a PhD in order to work about transgender sexual workers living with HIV. Andreia is the author of **Sociopholia**, a website about youth researchers in sociology.

**So far, you have lived and studied in Portugal and in France. What does it mean for you, being European in the 21st century?**

Europe at the moment is a deconstruction of learnings. An open discussion that we will have much to learn about at the next ESA Conference!

**What sparked your interest in sociology?**

My curiosity! Sociology is a box of enigmas for those who are interested in the background scenes. It became an answer to many questions – questions that I owe to Sherlock Holmes who was behind my journey when in that one special summer I started to read about sociology. The main author who made me change my career from social work to graduating in sociology was definitely Erving Goffman! In the first years, I’ve worked with his theories studying the categorization of HIV people in hospitals.

**Is there an eye-opener, a key sociological concept that you have come across during your studies at the EHESS? In how far have your studies changed your perspective on life in society?**

My first conference at the EHESS was with Howard Becker and I was stupefied. Already reading his books, I was shocked how clear Becker is in his writing, how he interacts with his readers. But then also listening to him gave me the certainty that sociology is not made to be opaque, but to translate common life. I was also very lucky that my research director, Janine Barbot, is very open-mind. She gave me the freedom to err during my Master’s!

**How did you come across the ESA? In your opinion, what defines the European Sociological Association?**

After the Master’s, I’ve decided to work for a year before applying for a PhD programme next year. I didn’t know ESA was in the same building as the EHESS! It was a big step, being in the background scene of such a huge conference for the first time! Also, at ESA, you are working with colleagues from everywhere! The most important is to understand just how many colleagues are facing numerous difficulties to keep up their work, research and freedom in their countries. ESA plays a role in this matter as a supportive organisation, for equality and respect.

**From your esa@europeansociology.org emailing you will know more members than we know. What do you think about your interactions with the ESA community?**

Since the beginning I felt like people were very kind and knew ESA and especially Gisèle very well. As newcomer, I wanted to keep up the good work and be operational in order to answer to their needs. The reality is that the ESA community is growing every year and that the office used to be composed of only one person. Now to have Dagmar, myself and the interns (Christine, Veronika and Thomas) changed all the routine! Each one of us is in contact with people that we don’t know in person, but after all the emails, often we feel like we actually know them.

The face behind ESA’s emails earlier this year (and many further headquarter activities) belongs to Veronika Riedl. Veronika is studying sociology for a “licence” degree (Bachelor) at the University of Paris René Descartes, Paris 5.

**Veronika, in 2008-09, at 12 years old, you will possibly have been concerned with other challenges than the ‘Great Recession’. How about today, interacting with students and inhabitants in Paris, is there a crisis in France?**

I wouldn’t say that I have not at all been affected by the financial crisis. My generation is often confronted with remarks that we are the ones who will face its consequences. We are reminded that in order to keep the standard of living of the previous generation, we have to be more determined and more adaptive. The word “crisis” seems to be present on various levels. In a large city like Paris the increased contrasts and tensions between those who get by and those who feel marginalized and excluded become much more visible. The high cost of living especially affects, amongst other groups, students whose expectations for the future seem to be rather imprecise and fluctuate between optimism and the awareness of new limits.
You are studying sociology at Paris 5. Is university education in France still lecture-oriented?

I am currently in my third year of Sciences Sociales at Paris Descartes. Compared to some other countries, teaching in France is less interactive and the possibility to participate and discuss is not always self-evident. However, the ability to think critically, to question and to develop one’s own arguments is highly encouraged. In addition, sociology courses are complemented by courses with a focus on anthropology, philosophy or economics. This somehow compensates for the rather traditional lecture format. I have also met many interesting people at university and our discussions really enrich my thinking.

Is there a major point, an eye-opener, a key concept, that you incorporated into your sociological preferences at Paris Descartes so far?

I think I have learned in two ways. Spending a year abroad for studying always means leaving the everyday life behind and being confronted with new challenges. This new situation teaches you a lot about how to interact with other people, how to solve problems and of course also about yourself. Concerning my education, I got to know the French tradition of social thinking and I benefit a lot from the interdisciplinary approach, as I have already mentioned. I was able to compare the approaches and establish links and interrelations between the disciplines. I consider the capacity to think outside the box very important.

Why did you chose sociology for your studies 2.5 years ago?

It was more or less a spontaneous decision. Like many, I had a rather vague idea of sociology. I wanted to choose a subject that would allow me to have a better understanding of the world we live in and to learn about issues which were not far removed from the concerns of my everyday life. I was convinced that sociology would allow me to grow in many ways. What I like about this field of study is that students are not confronted with prefabricated answers and unalterable facts. During our studies we acquire and sharpen tools which can be applied to various social phenomena and which help to approach complicated questions regarding life in society.

From your esa@europeansociology.org emailing you will know more members than we know. What do you think about your interactions with the ESA community?

Up to now, I was only familiar with university life, where one sometimes gets the impression that the lecturers and researchers realize their projects individually. It is really interesting to look behind the scenes of ESA to see how sociologists network, exchange and organize meetings. From my email contact with the members of ESA I have had the chance to experience the open and cordial atmosphere. I am very happy to be part of the ESA Team and to gain insight into the work of the association.

Greetings from Paris!
The disappearing sociology: On the transformation of a scientific discipline in Finland

Discussions on the crisis of sociology are omnipresent, and you can hardly get through a conference without hearing new stories about funding cuts in the social sciences and about lay-offs at sociology departments. Whenever people realize that I am from Finland, the discussions usually change to assertions that I need not worry about these things, because Finland is well-funded and as the PISA-winner, the Finnish educational system also has to be in good shape. Of these statements, only the one about Finland taking the top rank in Europe in the 2012 PISA test is accurate.

Budget cuts
In the wake of the 2008 economic crisis, the Finnish government cut the budget for higher education as part of its austerity policies. The previous government introduced cuts of about 200 million Euros, and the newly elected government introduced a new round of cuts of about 500 million Euros in the beginning of 2015. To cope with these cuts, universities had to resort to mass lay-offs, sell or rent out some of their buildings, and introduce fees for non-EU-students, among other things. The lay-offs were so extensive that the Finnish government even applied for support from the European Unions’ European Globalisation Adjustment Fund. The University of Helsinki alone had to reduce its staff by about 1000 persons, 600 of which were laid off, the other were non-renewals of fixed term contracts and early retirements. Because of the shrinking university finances, external funding becomes more important. Unfortunately, the government also reduced the budgets for Finnish funding agencies (the Academy of Finland and Tekes – the Finnish Funding Agency for Innovation), which means that universities increasingly need to look for new funding sources. One funding source that gains increasing attention is the market – where companies can fund research or research findings can be turned into commercial products. I will leave it up to the reader to decide how big they consider the chances of sociological research in generating profits. Another funding source that gains increasing attention is the European Union. Several articles in previous issues of European Sociologist have already pointed out that European funding for the social sciences is decreasing and that sociology currently only plays a marginal role in these funding schemes.

A changing discipline
While Finnish universities struggled with dwindling budgets, they were being restructured. For several years now, universities, departments and study programmes were being merged. In 2010, for example, the University of Joensuu and the University of Kuopio were merged to create the University of Eastern Finland. In the same year the Helsinki University of Technology, the Helsinki School of Economics and the University of Arts and Design Helsinki were merged to create Aalto University. The merging of departments within universities follows a similar logic, creating bigger multi- and interdisciplinary units. Individual disciplines run the risk of losing their identity in such units, where even the identification of someone working as a sociologist becomes challenging. Just imagine having to introduce yourself as “I work in the faculty of social sciences, at the department of social research, in the discipline of sociology”. The (intended) side-effect of creating diverse units is that study programmes and collaborations across disciplines become more common. The upside is that more researchers and students are exposed to sociological thoughts. The downside is that fewer people identify as sociologists. The University of Helsinki is currently even pursuing the idea of replacing the current discipline-driven structure of the social sciences faculty with a structure driven by topics. If this idea is carried out, then our self-descriptions may not even include the word “sociology” anymore, but instead shift to phrases like “I work in the social sciences, studying populations.” Changes in Finnish funding agencies, where grants are allocated to new programmes that focus on multidisciplinary studies of pre-defined social challenges, mirror this trend. Previous issues of European Sociologist have highlighted that this development is also currently taking place within European funding programmes. The social challenges that receive a lot of attention (and therewith funding) within Finland at the moment are biotechnologies, digitalization and sustainability. Sociologists who want to apply for grants on these topics may need to become (very) creative.

Finnish sociology – disappearance or transformation?
All in all, the discipline of sociology is undergoing a fundamental transformation in Finland – with disciplinary boundaries eroding and the rationale becoming commercial viability. While some see this as the demise of sociology, other see it as the birth of a new kind of sociology. Sociologists who want to apply for grants on these topics may need to become (very) creative.
The Polish Sociological Congress is a cyclical event held by the Polish Sociological Association, recurrent since 1956. Its sixteenth edition was hosted by the Faculty of Social Sciences at the University of Gdańsk. The Congress motto “Solidarity in the Time of Distrust” called for a reflection on the state of contemporary societies and sociology as a discipline. It proved to hold strong symbolic implications for over 1000 participants from Poland and abroad who gathered in Gdańsk, the cradle of the legendary anti-communist movement “Solidarity”. After the Congress, Jean-Claude Kaufmann, who had given a lecture on solidarity in couples, spoke of Polish sociology as “young and energetic” and made a link between the city’s heroic past and the prospects for the future of sociology. The theme of the hope for sociology as a socially meaningful practice was a leitmotif of the event, which unfolded in a number of contexts.

In his keynote lecture “The Dangerous Nouns of Process”, Hans Joas called for the limited trust in grand sociological notions such as functional differentiation, rationalization and modernization. As a result of social change, these concepts not only overshadow and replace the very processes they were meant to describe and explain but also – and more dangerously – narrow down our sociological imagination. The ensuing discussion by Andrzej Rychard and Hella Dietz revolved around the need for a theoretically grounded sociology.

The plenary session “Fractured Society” was a showcase for sociology’s empirical strength. Henryk Domański pointed out that despite media reports to the contrary, Polish society is not fractured at the level of social structure and that socio-economic cleavages are not deepening; rather the society is divided at the level of life style and discourse, as Marek Czyżewski also noted, while, according to Radosław Markowski, people were unable to recognize their group interests and create strong group identities, including political identities.

As in previous years, the competing models of sociology were discussed, with one plenary session fully dedicated to the public role of sociology. An NGO activist Kuba Wygnański enthusiastically called for being with people instead of producing knowledge about them, while Radosław Sojak suggested the sociological imagination could be better cultivated and shared with society, starting from school education. This stance was echoed in the closing session of the Congress “Not in My Backyard?” by Cezary Obracht-Prondzyński and Anna Giza who appealed for making sociological knowledge useful for social practice. The session on public sociology turned into a site of sociology in action too, when one of the male members of the public and the ISA President Margaret Abraham expressed their vocal disapproval of the fact that there was no woman among the sessions’ six speakers.

The Congress was an exercise in changing sociology as social practice in small but meaningful ways. Academic titles were not included in the program (which is still a common practice in Polish academia). Younger scholars were more visible at the Congress as co-creators of its program, panel organizers and new network founders. The event attracted more people from outside the academic world (social activists, businessmen, politicians and journalists) than previously. The sessions were held not only at the University of Gdańsk, but also in historically and culturally important public places such as European Solidarity Centre or the Shakespeare Theatre.

It was uplifting to see over fifty young sociology students and graduates getting involved in the Congress as volunteers. Thanks to their social skills and engagement the plenary sessions and symposia as well as 90 thematic panels and 30 accompanying events of the Congress all ran smoothly. While making the Congress happen, some of them were practically testing what is means to be a sociologist in Poland.

Let us meet again in 2019 in Wrocław, where the seventeenth edition of the Congress will take place.
From This event was our 3rd mid-term symposium, following those in Jyväskylä in 2012 and Modena in 2014. It followed the same formula of a two-day symposium with restricted attendance and a limited number of papers, in order to enable rich discussion. The theme and scope of the mid-term, Childhood, Children’s Rights and Citizenship, was broadly the same, in order to establish and deepen the discussions of Jyväskylä and Modena in a cumulative way. The symposium was organised around short papers or provocations, with extensive space for open discussion, focused on different aspects of the relationship between childhood, children’s rights and citizenship, with a slightly different theme for each of the three sessions.

The entire mid-term symposium was planned and organised by Professor Griet Roets of Ghent University (Belgium), assisted by Professor Nigel Thomas of the University of Central Lancashire (UK) (joint convenors of RN04) and Professor Bruno Vannobbergen, the Children’s Rights Commissioner in Flanders (the Dutch speaking part of Belgium), who is also a Professor at Ghent University (Belgium).

The first day of the symposium was held in the Het Pand Culture and Congress Center of Ghent University. The first morning was devoted to ‘exploring theoretical approaches to children’s rights that may be suggested as new ways of thinking within the empirical, as disclosed in different social domains and institutional settings children are involved in’. This began with an overview of theories in the sociology of childhood, a critique of children’s rights studies, and an examination of ideas from Butler and Rancière; followed by more empirically grounded papers on the rights of psychiatrised children, children’s rights and their bodies in residential care, and young children’s rights as social institution. In the afternoon, we turned to reflecting on ‘how childhood is defined and constructed within actual discourses and practices of (non)-citizenship’. Papers focused on theorising children’s citizenship in a variety of care and welfare settings and on the use and misuse of the concept of ‘manipulation’ in relation to children.

On the second day we met in Dr Ghislain’s Museum. The morning theme was ‘critically considering paradoxes and ambivalences of the status of childhood as a separate phase in contemporary societies’. The discussion was led by two papers focusing on aspects of the situation of street-connected children and one on children’s participation and agency in disasters. This was followed by a business meeting at which we made plans for the next ESA congress in Athens 2017, and for our next mid-term symposium (which will be organized in Lisbon in 2018). In the afternoon, we had a tour of Dr Ghislain’s Museum.

On the third day, we invited a larger audience from the local area, with a greater orientation to practice. This was hosted at the Flemish Parliament by the Children’s Rights Commissioner Bruno Vannobbergen, who is also a Professor at Ghent University (Belgium). The final day in the Flemish Parliament in Brussels was led by our invited keynote speaker Professor John Wall of Rutgers University (USA), who also participated in the previous two days. Professor Wall spoke on ‘Empowering Children, Empowering Citizens: Human Rights in an Interdependent World’. The response was offered by Professor Nigel Thomas, and followed by an extensive and highly inspiring discussion.
How to Fabricate an Inspiring Paper Session

Inclusion and Exclusion: The Experience of Research Network 04

ESA Research Network 04 (Sociology of Children and Childhood) provides some useful tips for coming up with an inspiring paper session at ESA’s upcoming 13th conference in Athens.

The network has a very strong backbone, based around a group including both established and early career scholars whose work is strongly rooted in the sociology of children and childhood from a diversity of European countries, who attend ESA events regularly and many of whom serve as Board members. It began as a formally established network in 2007, thanks to the hard work of Jo Moran-Ellis and colleagues, and from the beginning it felt like a very coherent grouping which soon established a sense of loyalty.

Selection of papers (and indeed the drafting of the initial call) has tended to be a very collegial process, with a strong element of continuity from conference to conference. This has enabled us to learn from experience, and our aim is now to insist on a relatively high quality threshold for session papers, but to encourage others to bring posters and to ensure that time and attention are given to these contributions. Board members make a point of attending poster sessions and engaging in discussion with the presenters. Board members also chair all paper sessions in an attempt to guarantee consistently open-minded and high-quality discussions and sessions. In this way, knowledge claims can be presented as questionable issues to stimulate democratic debate.

A democratic approach runs through our planning for the conferences. We encourage everyone to attend the business meeting (at which we invite feedback on the organisation of the network sessions), and follow it with a dinner or other social event that is open to everyone attending the network. We think this also helps to create a welcoming atmosphere for new scholars.

The network has been further strengthened since 2012 when we began organising mid-term symposia. These have been held in Jyväskylä (Finland) in 2012, Modena (Italy) in 2014, and Ghent (Belgium) in 2016, and the next is planned for Lisbon in 2018. These are deliberately planned as small-scale events, with a limited number of papers and a limited attendance (up to 35). This approach has been a topic of debate within the network. On the one hand it can feel rather exclusive, even selfish, to restrict participation to a small group. On the other hand it does ensure a high quality of discussion and participation. Sessions have been deliberately focused on theory, with short presentations and extra time allowed for discussion. The payoff is that everyone’s thinking has been moved forward at these events, reflecting the emergent character of childhood sociology, and this feeds into the wider community through the sessions at biennial conferences and through publications (there will be an edited collection from the Modena symposium).

Our mid-term symposia have been co-hosted by external organisations and on each occasion we have had one day with a wider audience. Most recently in Ghent this included a conference on children’s rights hosted by the Children’s Commissioner for Flanders, which attracted a wide audience of practitioners and policy-makers. We have also made efforts to engage with policy and practice in our sessions at the main conferences – for example, meeting with international children’s rights organisations in Geneva 2011. In Athens next year we are planning to engage with local scholars and practitioners, and if possible with children too, through a combination of invitations to our sessions and requests for study visits. As a network we are keen to engage with the place and the people, rather than just breeze in, have our conference, eat and drink and go home.

What we would like to do next within ESA is to make a stronger connection with colleagues outside our network. The work that has been done in the sociology of childhood in recent decades has profound implications for other branches of sociology, and we think it is time for this to be presented on a bigger stage – for example, through a plenary keynote address. We would be very keen to work with the Committee to make that happen.
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Professor Griet Roets
Department of Social Work and Social Pedagogy, Ghent University, Belgium

Professor Nigel Thomas
School of Social Work, Care and Community, University of Central Lancashire, UK
Do ESA Conferences have a quality problem?

Since 1998, I have attended every ESA Conference and enjoyed each of them. As Swiss, I love and feel enriched by, cultural diversity and ESA incorporates it more than most other sociological associations. However, the larger the ESA Conferences became the more I heard colleagues complain about the quality of the presentations. They told me that the intellectual standards at their national association’s conferences are, on average, much higher and that they would learn there much more there. At ESA, they often were so disappointed with the average quality of paper sessions that they left the conference and went sight-seeing. This is always a good option as the ESA conferences usually take place in attractive cities.

For budgetary reasons as well as to recruit new members, ESA has always strived to attract as many conference participants as possible. Each time, a new record was celebrated as a big success. But does this really imply that we should accept nearly every abstract?

On the level of plenary and semi-plenary sessions, it is certainly a positive practice that the Executive Committee and its Programme Committee now invite proposals from the Research Networks (RNs), too. I also welcome the new idea of an RN keynote session.

The quality problem is more often mentioned in regard to the paper sessions of the RNs and Research Streams. As the responsibilities are institutionally highly decentralized in this respect, it is difficult to get it under control. As food for thought, let me just mention some points:

- Obviously, quality assessments of sociological papers are difficult; different people use different criteria, perspectives, and relevancies.
- Taking this into account, it should be standard to establish a real peer review procedure: abstracts should always get assessed by several people, not only by one coordinator. When I was a member of the Executive Committee (2007-11), we not only established the RN Council, we also required the RNs to have a board with several members from different countries. We intended to avoid that RNs can function as one-man- or one-woman-shows, but that the board represents different European perspectives and that the burden of work is spread on several shoulders.
- An additional option is to assign session chairs in advance who take the responsibility for organizing an interesting session on a certain topic they are personally committed to.
- As a board member and coordinator of two RNs, I collected ample experience with the problem of selection. It often proved difficult to assess the quality of an abstract because it was too vaguely formulated and lacked crucial aspects. We then required explicit information on the research question, the theoretical and methodological perspective, the empirical methods employed, and the expected results. This helped.
- I suggest extending the length of an abstract to one page. The more information we get the easier and more adequate an assessment becomes. We also may expect that applicants reflect carefully on what they are going to present.
- Everybody knows: Four presentations in a session of 90 minutes is one too many. To enable a sincere discussion, each paper should get a time-slot of 30 minutes. This would also allow having a discussant for each paper, which could increase a session’s quality significantly.
- We should check to what extent the different formats of presentation are actually used: paper sessions, distributed papers, poster sessions, roundtables. If we want to be as inclusive as possible but keep up certain quality standards, we could basically accept nearly all the abstracts to give our colleagues the chance to attend the conference, but then they should get assigned to the right session format. The problem here is that many universities only grant travel money for oral presentations. If this applies, we should favour roundtables for less sophisticated papers (and plan in advance for adequate space), or invent another label for such sessions.
- In the Executive Committee 2007-11, we also discussed whether the (name and) academic title of an author should be visible for reviewers or not – not to use them for name tags but in order to know if an author is an advanced researcher or a student. We dismissed it as this would just reproduce the hierarchy, and this does often not reflect quality. An alternative way is to ask for the URL of each author. If in doubt about an abstract’s quality, the website of the researcher may provide additional, relevant information (e.g., on the publication record).
- Finally, an additional point to consider is the presenter’s mastery of the English language. Some people have difficulties in expressing their thoughts in English, but it is not a quality issue of their research. Should we ask for a self-assessment?

Any comment on quality issues is apt to generate (sometimes fierce) opposition. So, take this just as a number of proposals for reflection. Actually the RN Council would be the place where such questions should be discussed. Why not initiate a platform where “best”, or at least “good” practices are communicated and discussed?

Thomas S. Eberle
ESA Vice-President 2007-2011
Wikipedia says ‘John Urry was a sociologist of tourism and mobilities’. This is doubly saddening. Mostly saddening because of the ‘was’. But also because John was so much more than a sociologist just of tourism and mobilities. John’s work spanning the last two decades of his life was indeed a fundamental contribution to our understanding of mobilities and climate change. He wrote the best sociology of tourism book there is and is likely ever to be. A book, which reached out to a larger audience than just the academic audience. It is curious that I always thought I was to the left of John. But he and his partner had moved leftward – in defiance of Aristotle’s rule – as they got older. And John’s Offshoring and other recent books were a particularly poignant critique of capitalism.

But Wikipedia seems to have forgotten or at least not properly acknowledged John’s earlier, less accessible work as a more of a social theorist from say 1973 to 1994. These were the years that I was privileged to have worked with him on The End of Organized Capitalism (1987) and Economies of Signs and Space (1994).

Indeed, during these years he also wrote the very important book, coauthored at age 29 with Russell Keat, Social Theory as Science (1976). This was a book of an importance matched by John’s earlier, less accessible work as a more of a social theorist from say 1973 to 1994. These were the years that I was privileged to have worked with him on The End of Organized Capitalism (1987) and Economies of Signs and Space (1994).

I came to Lancaster University for my first job in 1977. John had already been there, I think, since 1972 at the age of 26. We were both age 31 in 1977 but John was already eminent, having published two books in his twenties. Scales fell from my eyes reading Social Theory as Science in 1977. Here the main idea was ‘structural causation’. John was the first perhaps of Anglo-American scholars to absorb Althusser. Structural causation was neither positivism’s Newtonian mechanical causation, nor was it empiricism’s scepticism vis-à-vis causality. In positivism causes come from the outside. In structural causation it comes from sources internal to the system itself. But what here is the structure? In John’s ‘theoretical realism’ the structure is something that we cannot know directly but can only know through its effects.

John also made me think I could write books, even perhaps major books too.

John seemed to recognise that I had some ability which greatly encouraged me. We co-authored a piece for Sociology in 1984 on the “New Marxism of Collective Action”. This was a crucial piece on Jon Elster and others who were doing rational choice Marxism in the early eighties. At the time the assumptions of this game theoretical Marxism seemed to incorporate a homo economicus positon that Foucault was at the same time critiquing. Yet now we can see that game theory like its founder John von Neumann presumes not homo economicus but bounded rationality, and has moved the economic principle from questions of resource allocation to questions of information.

We were going to write a book called Collective Action, etc., but instead decided to write The End of Organized Capitalism (1987). The original draft of this was about 450 book pages and was a quite early book to be published by Polity Press. It incorporated a very long chapter on postmodernism by me. This needed cutting. Two-thirds of this chapter became the basis for my Sociology of Postmodernism (1990), which was the first book John published as editor of the Routledge series he had taken over for John Rex. He edited this for 24 years. The last book in the series was my co-authored China Constructing Capitalism (2014). John commissioned me to write the postmodernism book in 1988 or 1989 over pints of beer in a pub near the tennis club that we both played at in Caton Lancashire. John could always beat me in tennis. I was a sort of McEnroe copycat serve and volleyer, while John had this long reach and killer forehand and super strong forearms.

John was the best head of department ever. He built Lancaster’s Sociology Department, which had people like Jessop and Walby, Brian Wynne, Andrew Sayer, Celia Lury, Alan Warde, Mike Savage, Sara Ahmed. Was there and is there a better sociology department in the UK? In Europe surely the Bielefeld of old – with Offe and Luhmann – was better. But not many others. John also shaped British sociology as a national discipline, including heading up the Research Assessment Exercise, now Excellence Framework, and was a guiding force on it for two decades. These committees are often run by bureaucrats. Few of them have ever been run by writers of major books like John.

John and I stayed very close friends over the years, even though in the second half of his career I remained a theorist and John addressed pressing concerns in a zeitdiagnostische sociology not dissimilar to Ulrich Beck and Anthony Giddens’ later work. I, on the board at Theory, Culture & Society had with Mike Featherstone and others published a number of special issues edited by John, on mobilities and climate change. So this working relationship continued.

John and Sylvia – together from 1979 and Celia Lury and I from 1987 were very good friends as ‘couples’. I left Lancaster in 1998 for London and John stayed
Zygmunt Bauman is identified with the term “Liquid Modernity” which he coined to describe what is usually referred to as post-modernity (Liquid Modernity, 2000); yet he himself stood for a most solid humanism. Bauman was an witness to the enormous historical dramas of the 20th century – starting with Nazism roaming over Europe in World War II, through the Communist takeover of the Eastern Block, and through the fall of the Berlin Wall and the Soviet Union. This experience stamped his intellectual itenerary. He was a senior sociologist in Poland, when in 1968 he was pushed by the regime to leave the country. He first settled in Israel, where his sister lived in Kibbutz Gyvat Brenner, but the local universities failed to recognize his intellectual stature. Together with his wife Janina and their three daughters, he moved to Leeds, where he was offered a university position. With a relentless stream of creative and intriguing publications, he soon after became one of the leading voices of contemporary sociology. After his retirement, the University of Leeds established the Bauman Institute, an international research center informed by the concerns of his sociology.

Bauman never succumbed to the standards of “professional sociology”. He was immensely steeped in European philosophy, history, literature and the arts, and his sociology is imbued with insights and connotations drawn from that background. One can call his endeavor an “inspirational sociology”. His thought is multilayered and multifaceted and the range and variety of his work defines an attemp to sketch a summary of it. He made it his business to peel off the layers of myth and fallacy surrounding modernity and its sociology. Yet, this didn’t turn him into an avowd anti-modernist, but rather into a critical modernist. Perhaps like Habermas, though in his own distinct essayist style, he wanted to salvage the humanist kernel of modernity in a post-modern era.

And so, in the 1990s’, instead of “taking side” in the heated controversy between modernist and post-modernist sociologies, Bauman chose a dialectical approach. He created a unique mixture compomised of critique of “solid modernity” from a Foucauldian perspective, combined with critique of “liquid-modernity” from a Marxian perspective. He thus investigated forms of exclusion as much as forms of exploitation, and repudiated both (cf. Modernity and the Holocaust, 1989; Intimations of Postmodernity 1991; Wasted Life: Modernity and its Outcasts, 2003; Culture in a Liquid Modern World, 2011). “Post-modernist humanism” may be an oxymoron; yet this is the goal which Bauman seems to me to had been aiming at. He detested the mechanical, standardizd, serial order of modernism – whether it manifested itself in Fordist factories, Stalinist regitmeration or in Nazi camps – with all the impotrant differences. Yet he likewise detested post-modernist ethical cynicism. Modest, restrained and self-reflective enlightenment (with a lowercase “e” rather than a capitlaised “E”) may be good appoximation to the Baumanian utopia.

In the few occasions that I met Zygmunt Bauman I was impressed by his grace, elegance, and, frankly, the sportive vigour he dislayed in his old age. I first came in contact with him in 2002, when I was commissioned with writing an introduction to the Hebrew translation of Globalization: the Human Consequences (1998); one of six books of his which have been translated to Hebrew so far. Subsequently, I was invited to host him in Tel Aviv and chair the keynote speech which he delivered in the annual conference of the Israeli Sociological Association in 2013. The audience was gratified to hear a few sentences he stated in Hebrew, and was struck by his familiarity with up to date data on the socio-economic gaps in Israel, in the context of the talk he delivered about the world magnitude of this problem (Does the Richness of the Few Benefits Us All? 2011).

Bauman used to visit Israel occassionaly – despite political pressures to avoid it. His daughter Anna Sfrad is a Professor at Haifa University and his grondeson Michael Sfrad is one of the leading human-rights lawyers in Israel. He saw no contradiction between supporting Israel and repudiating its brutal occupation and opression of the Palestinians. As he put it in an Haaretz daily newspaper interview in 2013, “It hurts me, hurts me tremendously, to watch the forgetting and abandoning of our collective mission and duty, imposed upon us by the tragic Jewish history: the duty to alert the world – not to let it be forgetten – to the evil endemic in all and any nationalist hatred, and to be in the forefront of the ongoing fight against its
at the beginning of 2017, as we part away from Bauman, modernity seems (once more) to go astray, just the way he saw it coming. It is exactly in such times that the legacy of Bauman’s critical and inspirational sociology is called for.

### Dissertation Spotlights

#### Role of Media in Electoral Politics in India

**ARANI BASU**

The primary aim of the study is to understand the manufacture of news through mediated buzzwords. Mediated buzzwords are coined by media houses and disseminated through newspapers or news channels. Here the focus in particular is to explore how newspapers before an election manufacture mediated buzzwords and how these buzzwords condition the influence of news on the electorate. Within this context, the larger goal is to explore media-politics-society interrelationship in one of the biggest democracies in the world and one of the most significant South Asian countries (i.e., India).

The study adopts a society-centric approach that views media as a social institution and aims at analysing its various functions and effects in its relations with other social institutions namely politics and electorate. In that light, this study posits that media’s role vis-a-vis politics (state) and the electorate (society) lies in the extent to which it influences and impacts the latter.

The study explores media’s influence on General Election 2014 in India with the help of mediated buzzwords identified through primary and secondary sources, analyse the relationship between buzzwords and newspapers, represented by the media houses disseminating them and explore the impact and influence of these mediated buzzwords on the electorate cutting across different social locations. This study has three primary foci – to identify mediated buzzwords and issues during General Elections 2014 in India, to analyse how the mediated buzzwords were used by the media houses to manufacture news during General Elections 2014 in India, and to assess the effects of these mediated buzzwords on the formation of political opinion of the electorate during General Elections 2014 in India.

**Supervisors:** B. Reinbein (Humboldt University, Berlin) & V. Sujatha (Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi)

**Completed:** Humboldt University, Berlin (2016)

#### The medico-legal body: Medical Examiners and their Expertise

**ROMAIN JUSTON**

This research focuses on medical examiners and the reports they provide upon requisition from Public Prosecutors. Neither occasional collaborators of the judge, nor holders of a specific specialty title, forensic scientists and medical examiners form a professional body that is quite distant from both the judicial expert assessment model and the medical specialty model. They mainly practice the medico-legal expertise in dedicated hospital units, and have undergone a medical university curriculum, with medical specialties ranging from general medicine to anatomopathology, and from occupational medicine to public health.

This thesis explores the tension between a judicial expert assessment and a medical specialty, and analyses this tension, simultaneously as being enshrined into the formation process of the occupational group, and as a driving force of the coproduction of medical and judicial truths about facts. The research builds on the implementation of an empirical investigation system, associating ethnographic observations, interviews, and documentation. The different locations that were analysed (autopsy rooms, doctors’ offices, Ministerial directions, decentralised administrations, Public Prosecutors’ committee rooms, congress) constitute a two-level analysis of the medico-legal apparatus: on one hand, the protocol level, where medico-legal activities are organised and supervised, from state-level administrations to local departments; on the other hand, the expert assessment level, where medical examiners were studied from medical examination rooms up to courts of law. The first chapter explores the protocol level by studying the genesis, elaboration and implementation of a forensic medicine reform. It highlights how the organisation of medico-legal activities has been oscillating between two definitions of a medico-legal expertise; these two definitions respectively establish the figure of a judicial expert doctor, and the figure of a forensic specialist. The second chapter focuses on the careers of those who embrace the medico-legal expertise field. It reveals how doctors’ positions on medico-legal expertise are reliant on the way they adjust the practising of this activity to their original medical education. Finally, the third chapter analyses the practices of experts and magistrates from the Public Prosecutor’s department, within the organisations where the medico-legal expert assessments are produced and used, from hospitals to courts of law. This ethnography of how medico-legal evidence is created underlines the tensions that come up within this activity stream, as doctors mix up different frameworks in the way they examine assaulted bodies.

This mobile approach of the medico-legal apparatus allows the surfacing of two theoretical concerns. First, the logical hierarchy between the micro level of practices and the meso level of organisations leads to renew the approach for professional segments. Studying segmentation processes is a way of determining if forensic medicine is more driven towards being an activity that is piloted by the judicial administration supervision (which funds and consumes the expert assessments), or towards becoming an autonomous medical discipline with the same regulation mechanisms as a regular hospital specialty. This second concern leads to studying the socialization mechanism as well as the practises of experts in a dynamic way. Ultimately, this thesis proposes to analyse a practise that is stretched between different surroundings in concrete situations, while analysing specific social determining factors of the medico-legal assessment, by dynamically exploring three levels: the organisation of forensic medicine, the socialization of the experts, and the actual activity of the professionals that produce and seize medico-legal assessments.

**Supervisors:** Jérôme Pélasses (Sciences Po, CSO) & Laurent Willemetz (Université de Versailles Saint Quentin)

**Completed:** École Normale Supérieure Paris-Saclay (2016)
FOR SOCIOLOGISTS: A DISCUSSION LIST

Cooperation and discussion are vital to academic life. With an email discussion list academics can collaborate on projects and publications, announce conferences, arrange meetings and share news and views. There is a discussion list on the ESA website – www.europeansociology.org – called European-Sociologist and supported by JISCmail service from the UK.

ESA members can post messages on the list by themselves. To date, there are 1466 subscribers on the list. If you wish to join, you can send the following command to jiscmail@jiscmail.ac.uk: join european-sociologist [firstname] [lastname].

WOULD YOU LIKE TO CONTRIBUTE?

If you have a conference report of your ESA Research Network midterm meeting, if you like to respond to a Viewpoint or other article published in European Sociologist (Reader’s comments), if you’d like to Report from your National Association (we would prefer discussions of current challenges and debates) or to contribute a short piece to one of our new series How to fabricate an inspiring paper session, Five tricks to improve your teaching, Sociologists in the news, In Memoriam, or, particularly, Hot from the spot (from your truly European and EU-funded collaborative research project), please contact the editor.

CONFERENCE NEWS

• ÖSTERREICHISCHE GESELLSCHAFT FÜR SOZIOLOGIE (ÖGS) – AUSTRIAN SOCIOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION CONFERENCE
  Soziologie zwischen Theorie und Praxis (Sociology between Theory and Practice). Graz, Austria. December 7th to 9th, 2017. Languages: German and English.

• 38. KONGRESS DER DEUTSCHEN GESELLSCHAFT FÜR SOZIOLOGIE / 38TH CONGRESS OF THE GERMAN SOCIOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION (GSA)
  Closed Societies. Bamberg, Germany. September 24th to 28th, 2017. Languages: German and English.

• INDIAN SOCIOLOGICAL SOCIETY - 43RD ALL INDIA SOCIOLOGICAL CONFERENCE

• L’ASSOCIAZIONE ITALIANA DI SOCIOLOGIA (AIS) / ITALIAN SOCIOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

• ANNUAL CONFERENCE OF THE LITHUANIAN SOCIOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

• NORDIC SOCIOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION (NORDISK SOSIOLOGFORBUND) CONFERENCE

• SWEDISH SOCIOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION - SOCIOLOGIDAGARNA

• 15TH CONGRESS OF THE TURKISH SOCIAL SCIENCES ASSOCIATION

• 3RD SAU CONGRESS - SOCIOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION OF UKRAINE

• BRITISH SOCIOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION (BSA) ANNUAL CONFERENCE 2018
  Identity, Community and Social Solidarity. Northumbria University, Newcastle upon Tyne, United Kingdom. April 10th to 12th, 2018. Language: English.

If you wish to feature your conference in European Sociologist, please contact the editor.