Dear colleagues,

It is with great difficulty and hesitation that we express some words after the extreme situations we have witnessed, experienced, and have been living with in Paris. We wonder if it would be better to take refuge in passive silence. However, the recent events in Paris – the city in which Ulrike lives – call into question the essential foundations of any society, and we must apply our efforts as sociologists more than ever to understand and find ways to avert their repetition. The IS is recruiting followers who are surfing on a feeling of discrimination. Driven by a "deadly religiosity" and a self-hatred that becomes hatred of the other, French youth are among the many new jihadists. Faced with mass crime committed in the streets of Paris, we need to be quiet first. We need to understand: How could men do that? Which choices
could lead them to foment and to implement such barbarism? Madness, perhaps? That explanation would be too easy.

Please find below a short article from Habibul that discusses some aspects of these crimes. Moreover, you will find in this newsletter some interesting articles and some information on new publications by RC 09 members. Meanwhile, we have finished the acceptance process of the abstracts, so you should receive information on the Vienna Congress very soon. In order to be listed in the program, we invite you to register before the early registration deadline of April 5th, 2016. And last but not least, many thanks to our Newsletter editor, Joshua Dubrow.

We send you Season’s Greetings and look forward to meeting you in Vienna.

Best regards,

Ulrike Schuerkens and Habibul Haque Khondker

Co-chairs, RC 09

Articles

A Plea for Naiveté

by Habibul Haque Khondker, Co-Chair, RC 09

Following the tragic events in Paris on November 13, 2015 where unsuspecting French men and women, and citizens of other nations who visit Paris for the attractions this fine city offers, were attacked with Kalashnikovs and bombs. The mayhem carried out by the members of ISIS left 130 dead and, counting the attackers, the death toll reached 137, the highest casualty in a single day since World War II seven decades ago. A tragedy of such huge proportion forces us to introspect, once the shock is overcome, and to ask: what brought us here? What happened to common humanity? Is the project of a cosmopolitan globalization and a multicultural world ensuring tolerance and peace dead?

What was also intriguing and disturbing is the punditry that followed the sordid act of
merciless brutality. Comparisons were made with tragedies elsewhere which, in the age of inflation of violence, are not in short supply. Objectivity, hard-nosed scientific analysis of the larger global context of war and violence, the notion of “blowback”, the historical antecedents of the role of France as a nation-state and its role in the wars elsewhere were brought in. Op-eds and articles were written and talk-show experts shared their expert-analyses of international affairs on television. From a purely scientific discursive point, these analyses are not without any merit and those who unconditionally empathized with the victims and their families and with their fellow citizens were viewed as naïve. I plead guilty to naïveté.

It is that lack of naïveté, perhaps, which is one of the problems that we are faced with as members of a global community. One of the causalities of the age when hyper-flow of information has joined hands with hyper-wars and violence, we tend to lose our subjectivity, our sense of sadness, and fellow feeling; in one word, our naïveté.

... those who unconditionally empathized with the victims and their families and with their fellow citizens were viewed as naïve. I plead guilty to naïveté.

This is where sociology may play a role, as it reminds us of the importance of the juxtaposition and simultaneous mingling of objectivity and subjectivity in humans. Sociology was born of humanism and was nurtured in the aspirations of enlightenment, a project that has been overly interrogated. And in critiquing humanism as simplistic, we seem to have created a hardened, rationalized world, where innocent, non-combatant human lives are seen as mere collaterals. It is time we regain our humanity and our subjectivity. As Nobel laureate Bengali poet Tagore taught us “a mind all-logic is like a knife all-blade; it makes the hand bleed that uses it.”
In Search of a Sociology of International Cooperation

by Elizeu de Oliveira Chaves Junior, Sociologist, Ph.D in Comparative Politics and Visiting Scholar at Columbia University

The study of international cooperation is located mainly within the disciplines of international relations and political science. The purpose of this article is to demonstrate how sociology, as part of an interdisciplinary approach, can be useful to discuss concepts, assumptions, and motivations behind international cooperation. An interdisciplinary approach is useful because commonly accepted premises – such as the one that investments in international cooperation are merely motivated by the expansion of foreign trade -- are insufficient to explain the nature of international cooperation. What follows is an outline of major issues in the field of international cooperation that an interdisciplinary social science approach could profitably address.

Establishing Analytical Categories in International Cooperation

Although the definition of “State” is contested, the State is the main social actor behind international cooperation and a common denominator for its academic investigation. The concept of the State is related to the exercise of political power. The State's use of power is related to the size of territory and population (USA and the BRICs being examples), and the State is also defined in terms of common languages, beliefs and customs. The State is entitled to lay down common rules and represent individuals in global governance. In addition, the State is responsible for setting parameters for the creation of international organizations, which are the other major actor with a legitimizied voice in international law.

The existence of modern international societies and the application of law are guaranteed by the exclusive ruling power of central governments. International organizations are a result of the combined action of States, but with a crucial difference: they do not share the same power vis-a-vis its members that States maintain over their populations. International
Foreign policy is the mechanism for dialogue between States. The motivations behind international cooperation initiatives may be different across the many departments and agencies of the national government.

**Taxonomies as a Representation of the International Reality**

Taxonomic models are commonly launched by countries and international organizations to categorize, compare and contrast countries. Some universally accepted taxonomies do not represent well the international reality. For instance, a simple north-south definition, or even center-periphery definition, appears to be insufficient to explain differences, similarities and relationships between countries. Yet, these definitions persist as an integral part of official discourses, foreign policies, and even of the work of some international organizations. It seems more plausible to consider that taxonomies function as a transitory representation of reality, rather than a final picture.

**Foreign Policy and International Cooperation**

The history of international cooperation refers to interactions between former colonial powers and former colonies, or between regions marked by higher and lower levels of development. The literature on international affairs argues that the creation of national entities – whose mandate is to promote international cooperation – is often aligned with the activities planned in offices of foreign policy. International cooperation and foreign policy offices are
clearly related, but they can also be analytically distinct. Since 1945, many countries have established national institutions to carry out cooperation in many areas, including management and planning, science and technology, and health and education, just to name a few. In some cases, national cooperation agencies function under the Ministries of Foreign Affairs. In others, they are under Ministries responsible for Planning, and in some countries they are under the Presidential cabinet.

The transfer of knowledge, skills, technology and resources made on a supposedly horizontal basis under cooperative frameworks allows countries to channel both material and non-material resources. This ultimately serves as a means of expanding the political influence of countries who play a provider role. A consequence is that, beyond traditional offices of foreign affairs, various institutional actors are engaged. The coincidence of common ideas, ideologies and trends in different societies helps to legitimize and intensify the cooperation between national institutions.

International cooperation stimulates direct connections and dialogue between bureaucrats and civil servants, and in so doing, it engenders relationships between institutions with direct impact on social life. Foreign policy is the mechanism for dialogue between States. The motivations behind international cooperation initiatives may be different across the many departments and agencies of the national government.

**International Bureaucracy**

A key issue raised by Tilly provides a glimpse into a ‘State apparatus’ that is dedicated to respond to countries’ interests abroad. Tilly argues that the role of embassies allows for "gathering information, expansion of alliances, multilateral negotiations around the royal weddings, greater investment of each individual state recognition from other states and a generalization of war” (Tilly, 1996). Complementary to that, the characterization of Weber’s idea of bureaucracy leads to the idea of a division of labor between individuals with different functions based on standards, chain of command and compensation. This idea enables us to explain the
representation of a particular States’ vision in the form of international cooperation modalities that go beyond bilateral trade, including educational, scientific, cultural, and technical, as well as cooperation for development.

One of the aspects that serve as the catalyst for the advancement of international cooperation in some states is the existence of a differentiated bureaucratic rationalization. My point here is that some states have a more consolidated and mature bureaucracy that serves as an enabler for international cooperation. As predicted by Weber, rationalization is subject to new constraints related to a new economic and technological paradigm. Thus, the increase of a bureaucratic apparatus dedicated to international affairs beyond traditional diplomacy is often dissociated from foreign ministries. At the same time, the bureaucracy pressures the country to establish a structure dedicated to deal with external and internal environments. This bureaucracy is supposedly capable of handling domestic policies linked with, and often in response to, global commitments and frameworks.

Concluding Remarks

Discussing and investigating international cooperation through the lens of the social sciences may help to understand the nature of public entities, and of the social forces that operate in a given country and historical period. The connection between cooperation and economic features is far from being the unique explanation behind the rationale of international cooperation. Among other reasons, the expansion of alliances and collaboration seem to verify cosmopolitan values, of which some are influenced by post-materialist societies within the global network of States.

Suggested Reading

Women under Military Conflict in Ukraine: We Need Better Data

by Nika Palaguta, Graduate School for Social Research, Polish Academy of Sciences and Dorota Woroniecka-Krzyżanowska, Faculty of International and Political Studies, University of Łódź

The conflict in Ukraine that started in Spring 2014 has provoked massive migration from the occupied territories on which Ukrainian central government could not exercise its power. Data from the UN Refugee Agency (UNHCR) from October 2015 indicated that there had been more than 1.5 million registered internally displaced persons (IDPs). Refugees who left to other countries, mainly to Russia and Belarus, are over 1.1 million. A ceasefire agreement was made in September 2015, but the IDP and refugee situation remained difficult in terms of humanitarian assistance provision and affirming the rights and freedoms of the population.¹

UNHCR warns that “forced displacement can expose women and girls to a range of factors which may put them at risk of further violations of their rights.”² Thus, women’s rights protection during military conflict must be specially addressed.

As for legislation that formally protects women’s rights in Ukraine, there are internal policies and international agreements. Ukraine signed the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW), stating that it will protect women rights in interests of humanity,³ and the Istanbul Convention of Council of Europe on prevention of vio-
lence towards women and domestic violence. The Ukrainian Constitution (art. 24) addresses various forms of discrimination, including that on gender grounds. The Law “On Ensuring equal rights for men and women” (art. 6) allows for some types of affirmative action policies that addresses women’s inequality. In 2001, the Ukrainian government adopted a law “On preventing violence in family” and in 2011, the law “On prevention of human trafficking.” In 2009, the Ministry of Education issued order 839 “On introduction of gender equality principles into education,” as a part of government equality programme.

However, the extent of the problems of women who are victims of military conflict in Ukraine is not sufficiently clear. There is little understanding on the conditions of women in the zone of military conflict or even those that escaped this conflict. Official statistics, available from the Ministry of Social Policy, does not provide statistical information on women specifically, although according to the Law “On internally displaced persons” (art. 4), this Ministry is mandated to collect data on the gender of IDPs.

Some minimal actions directed towards addressing the rights of women have been taken since the outbreak of the conflict. According to information available in the official webpage of the Ministry of Social Policy, in February 2015 a conference was held that brought together officials from the Ministry and OSCE, on the rights of women in the context of the Ukraine crisis. Ukraine has also signed UN Security Council resolution 1325 “Women, peace, security” that deals with the protection of women’s rights during military conflicts. As a response to the ongoing crisis, and on adoption of that Resolution, the Ukrainian government announced, but has not implemented, what they call the National Plan of Actions.

Although Ukraine has created internal laws and signed international agreements on
gender equality, the measures it has taken to protect and affirm the rights and freedoms of women IDPs, women in military families, and women living in the zone of military conflict, are insufficient. Moreover, statistics collected by the state do not provide enough information on this issue. Lack of data is a critical failure that makes it complicated to measure the extent of this problem.

Notes

Unequal Country Representation in Conferences of the International Sociological Association, 1990 to 2012

Joshua Kjerulf Dubrow, Marta Kolczynska, Kazimierz M. Slomczynski and Irina Tomescu-Dubrow, Cross-national Studies: Interdisciplinary Research and Training program (consirt.osu.edu), The Ohio State University and the Polish Academy of Sciences

In this article we briefly summarize our recent quantitative research on inequalities in country representation at major conferences organized by the International Sociological Association. For a full discussion, please see our article in Current Sociology.

In general terms, the World Science System (WSS) refers to the economic, political and social factors involved in the production and distribution of, and access to, scientific knowledge on a global scale. The structure of this system is characterized by various kinds of inequalities (Beigel 2014; Patel 2014) some of which last for decades (Martin 2012: 833-36; Mosbah-Natanson and Gingras 2014). Theoretically, the deep and persistent inequalities within the WSS manifest as a core-periphery system in which privileged, Western countries dominate (Alatas 2003). Recognition of the unequal WSS has led to initiatives – both inside and outside of the ISA – that are designed to call wider attention to this issue and promote inequality-reduction policies (Beigel 2014: 619-621).

Empirical studies on inequality across the WSS tend to focus on publishing and on cross-national scientific collaborations (Bentley 2015; Mosbah-Natanson and Gingras 2014; Wagner and Wong 2011). Professional events – conferences, world congresses, forums and similar meetings that feature face-to-face interaction of scholars from across the world – are also vital to the WSS (Godin 1998; Glanzel et al 2006). Regarding sociology, attendance at international scientific events is important for three reasons. The first deals with production of knowledge. Sociological knowledge, as recorded in academic journals, builds on the presentation of papers at international scientific conferences (Glanzel et al 2006; Godin 1998; Lisee,
Larivière and Archambault 2008). The second reason pertains to the processes of scholarly learning and collaboration. Sociologists gain the opportunity to learn from, and connect to, scholars from different countries with whom they do not regularly interact; this spurs creativity and forms the foundation for new scientific collaborations. Third, sociologists gain access to the personal networking that is intrinsic to professional development and status building. Attending international conferences is important in the building and evaluation of academic careers.

...the deep and persistent inequalities within the World Science System manifest as a core-periphery system in which privileged, Western countries dominate.

In the article recently published in *Current Sociology*, we focused in-depth on the International Sociological Association (ISA) to examine inequality in attendance at its flagship conferences. The extent to which ISA’s flagship conferences – the quadrennial World Congress and the mid-term Forum – have successfully included sociologists from all over the world is an open empirical question. We ask: To what extent do countries differ with respect to the number of scholars attending ISA conferences? and What factors drive attendance? As is the case with other WSS elements, we argue that scholarly involvement in international social science events is characterized by unequal cross-national representation.

We develop a set of hypotheses based on the economic, political and social dimensions that likely influence country representation. To test them, we created a dataset containing information on 212 countries and their participation in eight ISA conferences – World Congresses and Forums – held from 1990 to 2012. The data on attendance were generously provided by ISA. One can note that, for the eight conferences between 1990 and 2012, ten countries lead in terms of total number of participants: USA (3,678); UK (1,952); Germany (1,898); Spain (1,811); Canada (1,594); Brazil (1,482); Australia (1,293); France (1,250); Italy (929) and Ar-
gentina (884). Figure 1 illustrates participation from 1990 to 2012 by world regions.

**Figure 1. Number of participants at ISA events, 1990-2012**

While the ISA focuses on economic factors to reduce this inequality – most notably in their A, B, C membership and conference fee schema – we also include political and economic factors. We measure economy with GDP per capita. Political factors are measured with the level of democracy. We argue that greater civil liberties and political rights are usually accompanied by more academic freedom to carry out research and to travel abroad. For social factors, we consider that countries’ participation in large-scale international research projects, such as the major cross-national public opinion surveys, is a reasonable indicator of the social science research infrastructure. Country representation in cross-national public opinion surveys (such as the World Values Survey) is very uneven due to economic and political reasons and reflects the strength of national-level social science research infrastructure required for active participation in such projects (Slomczynski and Tomescu-Dubrow 2006; see also Lynn et al 2006: 12-13; on the importance of cross-national data for ISA internationali-
zation, see Platt 1998: 47).

Results from a series of statistical analyses show that a country's GDP, level of democracy and social science research infrastructure (SSRI) substantially determine their level of representation. SSRI effects are significant above and beyond that of GDP, and of other controls. At the same time, we also find a meaningful decrease of representation inequality according to countries’ GDP for the period 1990 – 2010.

We do not suggest that ISA purposively excludes sociologists from certain countries. On the contrary, the history of the organization shows clearly that the ISA has always been aware of the unequal representation of scholars at its events, and has sought ways to address this problem. Yet, inequality endures. The ISA, as well as key actors in the WSS of the social sciences, should acknowledge the resilient nature of this phenomenon and contend with it.
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Member Publications


RC 09 members Rae Lesser Blumberg and Samuel Cohn have just published a new edited collection in development sociology. Development in Crisis: Threats to Human Well Being in the Global North and the Global South lays out the threats to continued economic growth at the global level and discusses the positive and negative responses to these crisis tendencies. The contributors represent some of the top writers in American development sociology, some of the rising stars in that same discipline, and development-sociology-friendly work from other disciplines that add their own insights into the pathologies and reform capacities of contemporary global trends.

Dr. Valentine M. Moghadam, Director, International Affairs Program, Professor of Sociology, Northeastern University, USA, has written about the book: “This cutting-edge collection expands the domain of the sociology of development to the Global North as well as the Global South, illustrating the explanatory power of Sociology’s analytical tools. A must-read for all those interested in development, globalization, gender, and theory.” Professor Gregory Hooks, Director, Department of Sociology, McMaster University, Canada, writes that the book is “Insightful and authoritative. The contributors to the Blumberg and Cohn volume are charting the course for development sociology. And these contributors do not disappoint. If you are interested in the current and future direction of development sociology, this book is a must.”

Rae Lesser Blumberg is William R. Kenan, Jr. Professor of Sociology at the University of Virginia and Samuel Cohn is Professor of Sociology at Texas A&M University.

Nikolai Genov, Board Member of RC 09, announces two new publications:


Abstract: Cross-border migration is becoming increasingly relevant throughout the world in economic, political, cultural and security terms. The phenomenon is rather complex; therefore, explanatory approaches corresponding to its complexity and dynamics are to be expected. In contrast, the comparative analysis of well-established conceptual models (classic economic theory, the new economics of migration, dual labour market theory, etc.) leads to a different conclusion. Although diverging in their disciplinary backgrounds and explanatory aspirations, the analysed conceptual models covering cross-border migration are, as a rule, one-dimensional and deterministic. They have paradigmatic handicaps preventing them from adequately describing and explaining cross-border migration flows. Creative synergies of available concepts and further conceptual developments are needed for cognitive and policy-related purposes. The new synergetic explanatory approach can only be multidimensional and probabilistic. The implication is that the generalized conceptual frameworks should allow for combinations of variables referring to specific situations in the countries sending and receiving cross-border migrants. This is the first condition for adequate descriptions, explanations, and forecasts, as well as the effective management of cross-border migration. The second condition is the consequent application of the synergetic and probabilistic approaches in the study and in the management of processes linking the societies sending and receiving cross-border migrants.

Dr. Gevorg Poghosyan, Director of the Institute of Philosophy, Sociology and Law, and Professor of Sociology, Full member of the Armenian National Academy of Sciences, and President of the Armenian Sociological Association, announces a new publication:


Abstract: The article deals with the issues of the origin and evolution of social thought and sociological research in Armenia. Since the ancient period Armenian philosophers, they have addressed the problems of people and their environments, social relations and the role of the
state. Many social ideas expressed in the works of medieval Armenian thinkers that are relevant even in our time. The article also addresses scientific research areas of applied sociological surveys, the institutional development of sociology, and sociological education in Armenia from the Soviet times to the modern state.

**Special Section: RC 09 Members’ Sociological Studies of China**


As China becomes increasingly integrated into the global system there will be continuing pressure to acknowledge and engage with non-governmental organizations (NGOs). Suffice to say, without a clear understanding of the state’s interaction with NGOs, and vice versa, any political, economic and social analysis of China will be incomplete.

This book provides an urgent insight into contemporary state-NGO relations. It brings together the most recent research covering three broad themes, namely the conceptualizations and subsequent functions of NGOs; state-NGO engagement; and NGOs as a mediator between state and society in contemporary China. The book provides a future glimpse into the challenges of state-NGO interactions in China’s rapidly developing regions, which will aid NGOs strategic planning in both the short- and long-term. In addition, it allows a measure of predictability in our assessment of Chinese NGOs behaviour, notably when they eventually move their areas of operation from the domestic sphere to an international one. The salient themes, concepts, theories and practice discussed in this book will be of acute interest to students, scholars and practitioners in development studies, public administration, and Chinese and Asian politics.

The emergence of China as a development actor across the global South has raised significant questions regarding the extent to which the country presents new development opportunities to its compatriots in the South. My aim is to reflect on and parse out the experiences and policies that have shaped China's development to assess how it can inform the field of development studies. I argue that we need to critically engage in China's development process, as China's own development has led to the emergence of many more problems than solutions, ranging from increasing inequality to exclusionary development practices pertaining to ethnic minorities.


Roughly 260 million workers in China have participated in a mass migration of peasants moving into the cities, and construction workers account for almost half of them. In Building China, Sarah Swider draws on her research in Beijing, Guangzhou, and Shanghai between 2004 and 2012, including living in an enclave, working on construction jobsites, and interviews with eighty-three migrants, managers, and labor contractors. This ethnography focuses on the lives, work, family, and social relations of construction workers. It adds to our understanding of China's new working class, the deepening rural-urban divide, and the growing number of undocumented migrants working outside the protection of labor laws and regulation. Swider shows how these migrants—members of the global "precariat," an emergent social force based on vulnerability, insecurity, and uncertainty—are changing China's class structure and what this means for the prospects for an independent labor movement.
Upcoming ISA Forum and ISA World Congress

The Futures We Want: Global Sociology and the Struggles for a Better World

3rd ISA Forum of
SOCIOLOGY

July 10–14, 2016
Vienna, Austria

2018 ISA World Congress in Toronto, Canada
Join ISA and the Research Committee on Social Transformations and the Sociology of Development!

Established in 1971, RC 09 strives to represent sociologists interested in the study of social transformations and development around the world, regardless of their theoretical persuasion, methodological approaches or ideological perspective. The goal RC 09 is to advance sociological knowledge on social transformations and development and to support research on this topic among scholars worldwide.

To join, please see visit either the RC 09 website, rc09socialtransformations.org, or the ISA website, isa-sociology.org.
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