



Cultural Difference and Social Solidarity

Second International
Academic Conference
July 3rd - July 6th, 2012

**Building Solidarity
and Protecting Difference:
Meeting Central Tensions
in Contemporary Societies**



Hosted by:
Middle East Technical University
Northern Cyprus Campus

Conference and Registration Information at
www.differenceandsolidarity.org

2012 Conference Beneficiary: Multi-Purpose Community Center, Dipkarpaz, TRNC

**Cultural Difference and Social
Solidarity
Conference Programme**

2nd International Conference of a New International Research Network:
Cultural Difference and Social Solidarity

**Building Solidarity and Protecting Difference: Meeting Central
Tensions in Contemporary Societies**

July 3 - 6, 2012

on the campus of

Middle East Technical University

Northern Cyprus Campus

Organisers and Co-Convenors:

**Scott H. Boyd (Middle East Technical University, Northern Cyprus Campus)
Paul Reynolds (Edge Hill University, UK)**

Conference Committee:

**Scott H. Boyd (Middle East Technical University, Northern Cyprus Campus)
Paul Reynolds (Edge Hill University, UK)
Mary Ann Walter (Middle East Technical University, Northern Cyprus
Campus)**

Cultural Difference and Social Solidarity

Contents of the Pack

1. Contents of the Pack	2
2. Welcome	2
3. Academic Rationale to the Conference – A New Network and Project	3
4. Guidance for Delegates	5
5. Conference Programme - Outline	6
6. Sessional Details	10
7. Conference Outputs (including publications)	38

Welcome!

A warm welcome to the 2nd International Conference on Cultural Difference and Social Solidarity!

After last year's successful inaugural conference, we are delighted to welcome you - whether for the first time or as a returning delegate – to the 2nd Annual Conference of the network.

This pack provides the academic rationale for the conference, the conference programme and abstracts and outlines of the conference outputs in respect of publications. It should provide you with all the details you need to navigate the conference, but Scott and Paul and other members of the conference team will be available to clarify any issues with you during the conference.

We hope you enjoy the conference, which has a pleasurable balance of intellectual and social sessions, and gain from the papers you will listen to and comment on and comments made on your paper.

We hope this conference leads to a longer association than this week, which bears fruit in more lasting ways. CDSS is a network and we envisage this being a space for critical discussion and engagement and for the development of collaborative projects that enrich our understandings of the relationship between difference and solidarity in contemporary societies. There will be an opportunity to feed into the development of the network at the end of the conference.

Scott and Paul

Cultural Difference and Social Solidarity

Academic Rationale to the Conference, or Network and Project

We prefer to describe this as the first meeting of a network and project rather than a conference. Whilst a conference has value in itself and can produce organic links and partnerships from delegates discussions, this initiative was launched with a clear sense of wanting to do more than provide a single opportunity for high quality academic discussion and debate (though we are committed to that as an immediate aim!).

It is styled a network because we wish to develop a trans-disciplinary network of intellectuals with a global reach, across a range of disciplines and spanning theoretical, empirical, cultural and aesthetic and law/policy/politics spans (for us this is not other exclusion for creative intellectual work). The purpose of the network, facilitated by our website (<http://differenceandsolidarity.org/>) will be as follows:

- To exchange information, notification of events, new thinking and proposals for cooperation in the broad areas of solidarity and difference.
- To encourage constructive communication between different intellectuals from different disciplines, global spaces, perspectives and approaches to questions of solidarity and difference and encourage a synergy of thinking.
- To encourage collective endeavours in the production of full funded research bids for projects, publications, seminars, workshops and debates and other collaborative endeavours that enrich understandings of solidarity and difference.
- To promote what is planned as an annual conference on themes closely related to the core interests of those studying difference and solidarity, and such other activities as will promote the network and project.

It is also regarded as a project because there is a definite and specific sense in which this initiative developed – which was a sense of three responses to current scholarship on difference and solidarity:

- A concern at relative critical absences or impasses in conceptual and theoretical scholarship that explore the often contradictory or conflictual relationship between solidarity and difference in exploring communities and societies
- A desire to explore new thinking and new initiatives on solidarity and difference within contemporary societies that both critically engage with and move beyond the conventional vocabularies of multi-culturalism, cultural conformity and cosmopolitanism
- A desire to encourage the exploration of comparative and contrasting examples of solidarity and difference drawn from across the globe, both beyond the hegemonic assumptions of ‘core-periphery’ global models and equally not prone to moralising assumptions about post-modern and post-colonial alternatives.

We therefore seek to develop a network of intellectuals interested in unpacking issues and problems that arise from the juxtaposition of solidarity and

Cultural Difference and Social Solidarity

difference in human societies. In doing so we welcome trans-disciplinary contributions (and also disciplinary contributions); theoretical and conceptual critiques and empirical studies, cases and comparative studies; and contributions from diverse ideological, theoretical and political positions where there is a desire for critical debate and engagement. If your aim for this conference – and of course your aims and desires for the conference are important! – is to deliver your paper, listen to others and seek a publication at the end, then we hope we'll provide a conference setting where you can do that. However, what we seek are:

- People interested in staying connected, passing on information and networking for the best possible impacts in terms of research and contributions to public argument**
- People who may see some benefit from regularly convening and discussing key themes and issues in the broad area of solidarity and difference – by conference, seminar or online forum.**
- People who see the benefit of collaborative projects, whether for funded conceptual or empirical research projects, writing projects, comparative projects or other such initiatives.**

The conference rationale has been shaped with a desire to maximise the opportunity for this discussion, notably in the following ways:

- The conference has a programme of evening events that will allow discussion and debate in enjoyable settings**
- The conference has a free Wednesday afternoon devoted to a social excursion that will allow relaxed discussion time for delegates.**
- The conference structure promotes discussion. Most papers will be presented in pairs (hopefully with some common ground) in sessions of 90 minutes, where papers presentation should not last more than 45 minutes, allowing for 45 minutes discussion. Since the conference will be around 40 delegates involved at one point or another during the conference, the audiences should be small enough to encourage discussion and move away from the CV filling '20 minute paper, 10 minute question or short speech' format that so dominates conferences today to the detriment of real debate.**
- On the final day there will be a roundtable and a development session that will allow summative discussion, and we are hoping to facilitate online dialogue by some form of web-group after the conference (this is still a matter of discussion).**

We hope you find this a sympathetic environment to share ideas, debate points, explore arguments and generally enjoy academic nourishment.

Paul Reynolds for the Conference Team

Cultural Difference and Social Solidarity

Guidance for Delegates

- (1) The structure of the conference comprises 10 sessions – 3 plenaries (one of these a closing roundtable) and 7 parallel panel sessions.
- (2) Each parallel session has 2 papers in a space of 90 minutes. **Papers should be no longer than 20 minutes in presentation length. Chairs will be strict in keeping to this time frame.** This will allow 50 minutes for questions and discussions. This is to encourage discussion and debate around papers and encourage sessions to develop as intellectual enquiries that benefit paper-giver and delegate rather than ‘cv-fillers’ with no discussion.
- (3) Sessions are likely to always have relatively small audiences given the total number of delegates. This allows for more in-depth debate and discussion, whilst plenary sessions will bring the whole conference together.
- (4) It might be useful for you to circulate handouts or paper summaries to facilitate keeping your talk to time – presumably you have given that some thought already. Please ensure Scott has a copy of any handout – preferably electronic - to ensure that we keep a complete record of the event
- (5) Papers have been organized into panels according to greater or less affinities between them– it has not always resulted in a strong match in interests, but each panel has sufficient common ground for discussion across as well as to individual papers.
- (6) All participants are anticipated **to be attending the entire conference** – we have avoided accepting papers from those who wished to ‘parachute’ into the conference and just give their paper before leaving.
- (7) The final roundtable is anticipated as being a **group discussion** with no lengthy speakers, but two people at the conference will be **approached to provide a couple of minutes ‘reflections’** to kick off that discussion.
- (8) Anyone interested in developing a vibrant network to develop the solidarity/difference project is invited to attend the **network development meeting** after lunch on Friday – it is entirely optional but we hope as many of you as possible will.
- (9) This programme has accommodated requested changes and we would expect it to proceed as published here. Please note however that **some changes may occur as circumstances dictate during the week.** We will always ensure up to date information is posted on boards at the entrance of the conference venue and at the end of each session.

Cultural Difference and Social Solidarity

**Cultural Difference and Social Solidarity
Building Solidarity and Protecting Difference:
Meeting Central Tensions in Contemporary Societies
July 3th through July 6th, 2012
Middle East Technical University – Northern Cyprus Campus**

Conference Programme Outline

Tuesday, July 3rd

10.00 to 11.30	10.00am – 11.30am Registration Check-In (Tea and Coffee) Culture and Convention Center (CCC) Foyer	
11.30 to 12.30	<p><u>Introductory Plenary</u> Amfi 1 (ground floor, Culture and Convention Center)</p> <p>Formal Institutional Welcome: Professor Erol Taymaz, Vice-President, METU NCC</p> <p>Welcome to the Conference: <i>Scott H. Boyd</i></p> <p>Academic Programme for the week and Possible Outputs: <i>Paul Reynolds</i></p> <p>Conference Activities and Housekeeping: <i>Scott H. Boyd</i></p>	
12.30 to 14.00	Lunch	
14.00 to 15.30	<p><u>Session 1a: Seminar 2:</u> Solidarity in Theory and Practice I</p> <p>Associative Solidarity <i>Behzad Fallahzadeh</i> & Three Forms of 19th Century Working Class Solidarity and Their Current Relevance <i>Lawrence Wilde</i></p> <p>Chair: Paul Reynolds</p>	<p><u>Session 1b: Seminar 4:</u> Managing Conflict and Difference</p> <p>Federalism: An institutional framework for Managing Afghanistan's Ethno-political challenges <i>Raghav Sharma</i> & Social Cohesion in Israel: Differences between Migrants and Minority <i>Sibylle Heilbrunn, Liema Davidovich & Leah Achdut</i></p> <p>Chair: Mary Ann Walters</p>
15.30 to 16.00	Tea/Coffee Break	
16.00 to 17.30	<p><u>Session 2a: Seminar 2</u> Solidarity in Theory and Practice II</p> <p>Difference, Solidarity and Non-Identity – A Negative Dialectical Approach Towards Identity <i>David Stoop</i> & Solidarity Through Practice? MacIntyre's Revolutionary Aristotelianism: A Marxist Reading <i>Paul Reynolds</i></p> <p>Chair: Scott Boyd</p>	<p><u>Session 2b: Seminar 4</u> Exploring Identity Formation</p> <p>Construction and Reproduction of Pamirian Ethnic Identity in Tajikistan <i>Laylo Sabzalieva</i> & Negotiating identities - impact of immigrants on national urban space. Wrocław case study. <i>Agnieszka Bielewska</i></p> <p>Chair: Mary Ann Walters</p>
17.30 to 19.30	Free Discussions: Anywhere!	
19.30	Opening Reception and Dinner, Outdoor pool at Sports Center	

Cultural Difference and Social Solidarity

Wednesday, July 4th

9.00 to 10.30	<p><u>Session 3a: Seminar 2</u> Multiculturalism Explored</p> <p>The Secret of Canadian Multiculturalism <i>Jennifer Langlais</i> & Tolerance Based Multiculturalism in South Asia: The Case of India <i>Azam Golam</i></p> <p>Chair: David Stoop</p>	<p><u>Session 3b: Seminar 4</u> Critical Pedagogies</p> <p>Justice of English Remedial Courses <i>Hsueh Chen-hua</i></p> <p>+1</p> <p>Chair: Scott Boyd</p>
10.30 to 11.00	Tea/Coffee Break	
11.00 to 12.30	<p><u>Session 4: Amfi 1: Plenary</u></p> <p>Towards Global Solidarity: A Radical Humanist Ethics Lawrence Wilde <i>Professor of Political Theory, Nottingham Trent University</i></p> <p>Chair: Paul Reynolds</p>	
12.30 to 14.00	Lunch	
14.00 to 19.30	<p>Cultural Tour:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Pickup in front of the Guest House at 14:00 -Visit Bellapais Abbey -Visit Girne/Kyrenia Harbour and Castle 	
19.30 to 22:30	Dinner at Archway Restaurant Girne/Kyrenia	

Cultural Difference and Social Solidarity

Thursday, July 5th

9.30 to 10.30	<p><u>Session 5a: Seminar 2</u> Thinking Xenophobia</p> <p>In the North of Ireland: A Genealogy of Xenophobia <i>Erin McElroy</i></p> <p>Chair: Scott Boyd</p>	<p><u>Session 5b: Seminar 4 -</u> Religion and Solidarity</p> <p>Thoughts on Reforming Religious Institutions in Turkey <i>Lami Bertan Tokuzlu</i></p> <p>Chair: David Stoop</p>
10.30 to 11.00	Tea/Coffee Break	
11.00 to 12.30	<p><u>Session 6: Amfi 1: Plenary</u></p> <p>In Search of the Missing Sevgül Uludağ <i>Winner of the 2008 Courage in Journalism Award from the International Women in Media Foundation for her work on uncovering information about the missing from 1963-1974 on both sides of the Cyprus Conflict.</i></p> <p>Chair: Scott Boyd</p>	
12.30 to 14.00	Lunch	
14.00 to 15.30	<p><u>Session 7a: Seminar 2</u> Difference, Solidarity and Boundaries</p> <p>Living with Difference and Dealing with Conflicts – A socio-spatial account of ethnic conflict and its dynamics in contested territories <i>Mohamed Rizvi Noordeen</i></p> <p>&</p> <p>Negotiating Boundaries Of Integration Into ‘New Societies’: The Question Of Neighbours And Foreigners <i>Simona Zavratnik</i></p> <p>Chair: Paul Reynolds</p>	<p><u>Session 7b: Seminar 4</u> Language, Solidarity and Difference I</p> <p>The Social Function of Postcolonial Literature in the 1960s and Now <i>Zuzana Klímová</i></p> <p>&</p> <p>Lessening Language Barriers, Strengthening Borders: Changes in English-Language Education in the Gulf States <i>Mary Ann Walter</i></p> <p>Chair: Scott Boyd</p>
15.30 to 16.00	Tea/Coffee Break	
16.00 to 17.30	<p><u>Session 8a: Seminar 2:</u> Difference and Solidarity between Academia and Activism</p> <p>From Classes to the Streets: Relations between Academy and Activism <i>Esra Gedik</i></p> <p>&</p> <p>Community Service” and Volunteering: Is it a mean for academic noble to climb down the ivory tower? <i>Esra Dabagci</i></p> <p>Chair: Paul Reynolds</p>	<p><u>Session 8b: Seminar 4:</u> Language, Solidarity and Difference II</p> <p>Teaching: Theory, Conflicting Practices and Outcomes <i>Alev Özbilgin Gezgin</i></p> <p>&</p> <p>User Interface Metaphors and Processes of Interaction with Screened Devices: An Insidious Cultural Hegemony as the Basis for Solidarity? <i>Scott H Boyd</i></p> <p>Chair: Mary Ann Walters</p>
17.30 to 19.30	Free Discussions: Anywhere!	
19.30	Closing Reception and Dinner, Outdoor pool at Sports Center	

Cultural Difference and Social Solidarity

Friday, July 6th

9.30 to 11.00	<p><u>Session 9a: Seminar 2</u> Problems of Solidarity in Civil Society in Turkey and Cyprus</p> <p>Changing Position and Self Perception of Slum Dwellers in Turkey <i>Burcu Şentürk</i> & Perceptions of Marriage and Prerequisites for a Successful Marriage: Comparing Greek and Turkish Cypriots <i>Deniz Yucel</i></p> <p>Chair: Mary Ann Walter</p>	<p><u>Session 9b. Seminar 4</u> Planning and Capital in Divided Societies</p> <p>Planning to divide or not to divide? The role of planning in divided cities <i>Gizem Caner and Fulin Bölen</i> & Social Capital in Cyprus <i>Tufan Ekici</i></p> <p>Chair: Scott Boyd</p>
11.00 to 11.30	Tea/Coffee Break	
11.30 to 12.30	<p>Session 10: Seminar 4</p> <p>Closing Roundtable Plenary: Solidarity and Difference: Reflecting on The Conference – Themes and issues</p> <p>Speakers TBA</p> <p>Chair: Paul Reynolds</p> <p>And Closing Remarks: Scott Boyd and Paul Reynolds</p>	
12.30 to 14.00	Lunch (Conference Ends)	
14.00 to 15.00	<p>Network Development Meeting (optional attendance)</p> <p>Chairs: Scott Boyd and Paul Reynolds</p>	

Cultural Difference and Social Solidarity

Sessional Details

Session 1a: Seminar 2

Tuesday 3rd July 14.00 – 15.30

Solidarity in Theory and Practice I

Behzad Fallahzadeh

Department of Political Science University of Heidelberg - Germany

behzadfallah@yahoo.de

Associative Solidarity

In the past there was a fight against plurality and diversity for homogeneity, while nowadays there is a fight for plurality and diversity against homogeneity. Plurality and diversity are accepted as fundamental characteristics of mankind. The result of this fundamental change in the reflection about plurality and diversity is that each community, ethnicity, each religious group etc. lay claim to have the legitimate position. Under this condition solidarity itself and its manner how it is articulated undergoes a fundamental change to an associative solidarity, which is characterized by four qualities:

First of all, solidarity movements of the past, like trade unions, consist of people belonging to the same class and believing the same ideology. As opposed to this, today's solidarity movements consist of people belonging to different classes, pursuing totally different professions and believing in contradicting political positions. That is why we call it associative solidarity.

Secondly, this in turn has the effect that the associative solidarity does not deal with big topics, i. e. ideology, or long living movements, but with very concrete topics. The consequence is that the associative solidarity is not a long living movement; it is extremely ephemeral.

Thirdly, the ephemerality of the associative solidarity has the effect that it is not enough to voice solidarity with one side. You have to generate attention. Today, the generation of attention is the scarce resources of solidarity.

Fourthly, the associative solidarity is not limited to demonstrations, petitions etc. The generation of attention for ones solidarity with one side and not the other can for example also take place by buying a product and avoiding the other one. For the associative solidarity the difference between public and private sphere dose not exists. It can take place anywhere at any time. Thus, it is an everyday solidarity. Examples for associative solidarity are NGOs, the Internet, consumer boycotts or even flash mobs.

Cultural Difference and Social Solidarity

Lawrence Wilde

Division of Politics and Sociology Nottingham Trent University - UK

lawrence.wilde@ntu.ac.uk

Three Forms of 19th Century Working Class Solidarity and Their Current Relevance

When Pierre Leroux first theorised the concept of solidarity in 1840 it presented working class movements with a grand, unifying principle. Politically, it developed in three different forms. Leroux's own brand of Christian socialism lent itself to what can be termed the 'ethico inclusive' model, promoting peaceful struggle for the achievement of full social inclusion. In response to the repressive coercion exercised by the state, another more radical form of solidarity developed, which I term the 'redemptivist' model. Organisationally it focused on tightly organized groups and offered the image of cataclysmic change to bring about the solidarist future. More effectively came the 'class struggle' model broadly associated with Marx and Engels, through which legal activity in trade unions and political parties was designed to combine democratic progress with militant commitment to the abolition of private property. Although the class struggle model prevailed, it became strained by external and internal pressures. First, the emergence of Stalinist dictatorship made a mockery of its democratic claims, and second, its privileging of the manual proletariat made it insensitive to the development of new social needs. For solidarity to flourish in the 21st century, attention should be paid to the original Leroux model of 'ethico inclusive' solidarity.

Chair: Paul Reynolds

Cultural Difference and Social Solidarity

Session 1b: Seminar 4

Tuesday 3rd July 14.00 – 15.30

Managing Conflict and Difference

Raghav Sharma

Willy Brandt School of Public Policy at the University of Erfurt - Germany

sharmarag@gmail.com

Federalism: An institutional framework for Managing Afghanistan's Ethno-political challenges

Ethnic diversity and its accompanying challenges are commonly bestowed with an extra-ordinary explanatory power in attempts to explain the seemingly protracted nature of the conflicts, Afghanistan is no exception. It is argued here that attempt to deconstruct the conflict in Afghanistan far from taking recourse to the convenient argument of 'ancient hatreds' needs to instead examine what factors facilitate a subtle transformation in the fault-line of conflict: from one centering exclusively on ideology to a shift, almost subliminal, towards ethnicity following the collapse of Dr. Najibullah's government in April 1992.

The grave challenge of managing an array of actors and aspirations, given the country's ethnic diversity has been acknowledged, but that has not translated into institutional structures put in place post 2001. The basic argument of the paper is that federal institutional arrangements hold a credible potential to prevent conflict from becoming intractable.

It seems that this push towards an ethnic trajectory was also shaped in considerable measure by a multitude of other factors: ranging from memory and history, entrenched local political-economic interests to the role of powerful external players. The imperative requirement is to uncover the underlying triggers of conflict and identify the factors that impart to it a strong ethno-political direction. That would help in formulating potentially sound mechanisms both at the institutional as well as the social level to help stem the cycle of violence. Foremost, federal arrangements help address one of the root causes of the conflict, namely: existing or perceived denial of access to political and economic capital on the basis of ethnicity.

Fears of federalism opening the way to secession and interference and manipulation by foreign powers seems misplaced. In fact genuine de-centralization can help correct both the fact and perceptions of denial-deprivation. Institutionalized social-cultural autonomy would make local political structures and actors who control them more accountable. Federal institutions could over a period of time modulate and help transform the Afghan conflict towards social reconciliation and a peace that would be meaningful and enduring.

Cultural Difference and Social Solidarity

Sibylle Heilbrunn, Liema Davidovich and Leah Achdut
Institute for Immigration and Social Integration Ruppin Academic Center - Israel
sibylleh@ruppin.ac.il

Social Cohesion in Israel: Differences between Migrants and Minority

In the European sociological literature the subjects of social cohesion, integration, justice, solidarity, etc. are widely discussed and measured, based upon the assumption that processes of globalization, migration and modernization change societies. The main concern of this sociological school is to uncover, investigate, and analyze processes of de-integration and loss of solidarity in modern society in order to be able to deal with tendencies threatening social cohesion. The concept of social cohesion includes an economic, a political and a socio-cultural domain, which are interdependent and therefore allow for trade-off. The economic domain concerns the accessibility to common goods – having ones' part of society. The political domain concerns the participation in the public arena – taking part in society. The socio-cultural domain concerns the feeling of belonging - being part of society.

The Israeli society is characterized by its many cultures since it is composed of several ethnic and national groups, therefore the issue of social cohesion of great relevance. The here presented study investigates relationships and interrelationships between the three domains of social cohesion while comparing between three groups of the Israeli population: Immigrants from the Former Soviet Union, immigrants from Ethiopia and the Israeli Palestinian population. Our method concerns combining data taken from a representative sample of the 2010 Ruppin Survey, carried out by the Dachaf Institute using the stratified sampling method and on data of the Central Bureau of Statistics. We found variance between the three groups as to the level of social cohesion, the interrelationships of its domains and the trade-off patterns between the three groups.

Chair: Mary Ann Walter

Cultural Difference and Social Solidarity

Session 2a: Seminar 2

Tuesday 3rd July 16.00 – 17.30

Solidarity in Theory and Practice II

David Christopher Stoop
University Cologne – Germany
stoopd@uni-koeln.de

Difference, Solidarity and Non-Identity – A Negative Dialectical Approach Towards Identity

Difference and solidarity are often presented as necessarily opposed ideas that need to be "reconciled" because the freedom to be different inevitably creates an inequality that undermines solidarity. Moreover, the multiculturalist „right to be different“ is closely connected to a model of communitarian pluralism. By presenting differences as identifiable „cultural traits“, theories of multiculturalism often fall back into an identitarian logic, whereas solidarity between "different" groups can only be perceived as a consensus about an institutional framework, securing a democratic arena of negotiation. In these approaches, the right of the individual to question the traditions of the group it belongs to, as well as the material pre-conditions of the democratic consensus are equally marginalised.

In contrast to a multicultural construction of identity, the theory of Adorno provides a concept of non-identity that builds upon a negative articulation of difference. This negative identity is, though still constituted by the exclusion of what it is not, reflexively aware of its own construction and directed against a society in which differences are oppressed, targeted by discrimination or commodified as „cultural value“. Defined as the "consequent consciousness of non-identity", the method of negative dialectics provides the means to question "the world as it is" from the perspective of what is different from it, without falling back into an identitarian logic. It can therefore be read as both, a theory of difference, as well as a theory of solidarity.

In the paper, I will discuss, in which way Adornos theory of non-identity and the method of negative dialectics provide the means to adequately theorise difference and solidarity. In a second step, it will be discussed how the logic of negative dialectics differs from postmodern ideas of nomadic subjectivities. Finally, it will be asked, whether Adornos theory of non-identity can provide a suitable ground for a critical analysis of globalised capitalism today.

Cultural Difference and Social Solidarity

Paul Reynolds
Edge Hill University – UK
Reynoldp@edgehill.ac.uk

Solidarity Through Practice? MacIntyre's Revolutionary Aristotelianism: A Marxist Reading

In this paper I want to explore the potential – and the potential weaknesses – of Alistair MacIntyre's deployment of the ideas of Aristotle to construct a politics of possibility within a world view that is enduringly bleak and pessimistic. Blackledge and Knight have led a reading of MacIntyre that corrects the easy and facile characterisation of MacIntyre as conservative and communitarian and more productively explore a characterisation of Revolutionary Aristotelianism in MacIntyre's work. What it particularly offers radical thinking is a focus on practice and a scepticism about institutions that raises questions about agency, process and structure in making the political subject and solidarity in the construction of a project for political agency. In this paper, I want to give a Marxist reading to this analysis and draw out strands that take seriously the possibility of a revitalised Aristotelianism taking its place in contemporary radical theory, whilst at the same time providing a critical framing by which MacIntyre's early Marxism and more recent Marxist critiques might be useful.

Chair: Scott Boyd

Cultural Difference and Social Solidarity

Session 2b: Seminar 4

Tuesday 3rd July 16.00 – 17.30

Exploring identity Formation

Laylo Sabzalieva

Formerly - Sociology Department at the American University of Central Asia

sabzalieva_l@mail.auca.kg

Construction and Reproduction of Pamirian Ethnic Identity in Tajikistan

Despite the increasing amount publication on ethnic identity, there still unanswered questions. This signifies that it is still worthy to continue pursuing the ethnic studies. This study examines the construction process of Pamirian ethnic identity in Tajikistan. Also it attempts to investigate the social processes that reproduce the ethnic division. Pamir as an ethnic marker is relatively new and it is important to give the deserved attention to construction process of this ethnicity. Constructivist approach was used a ground for analyzing the interviews. Though the study focuses processes that construct and reproduce the Pamirian ethnic identity, it still provides some insight into the Pamirian ethnic traits which are involved in creating difference between “us” and “them”. The finding revealed that the construction process of Pamirian ethnic identity starts from self-identification as a different ethnic group and then presenting this difference to others and thus struggle for recognition of Pamirian ethnicity. Both social and territorial boundaries have an important role in constructing “insiders” and “outsiders”. Classification and labeling in-group and out-group are as well main processes of boundary construction and maintenance. Memory from Tajik civil war appears to be as justification of the Pamirian ethnic division from Tajiks.

Cultural Difference and Social Solidarity

Agnieszka Bielewska

Warsaw School of Social Sciences and Humanities, Campus in Wrocław, Poland
abielewska@swps.edu.pl

Negotiating identities - Impact of immigrants on national urban space: Wrocław case study.

The purpose of this paper is the discussion of the character of migrant's community in Wrocław and implication of its existence for the identity of the city as well as the identity of the guest workers. The paper is based on an ongoing study carried out in Wrocław. It presents the research's theoretical background and first findings. Wrocław is the fourth largest Polish city, located in South West Poland, near the German and Czech borders. In the last twenty years, due to the formation of Wałbrzych Special Economic Zone, the city has become a temporary home to many expat workers and their families. The research investigates the everyday routines of these immigrants to conclude what their special needs are, differentiating them from the local population. One of the first findings of the research is the existence of the well – organised and multinational community in Wrocław. It fulfils some functions of ethnic communities; however, calling it diaspora seems very questionable. The spatial routes of the members of this community seem to concentrate around the global spaces of city. The research is one of the voices in a discussion on globalization processes causing the crisis of the nation state. The research looks at the place as a location with particular identity coming from human actions and human attachment. It can be argued that by performing their everyday routines, migrants are expected to transform the character of places from the homogenous and national into more multicultural, hybrid and heterogeneous while at the same time migrants interact with those places learning the Polishness. The paper presents the first field work data to discuss what the migrants' routes say about the possible mutual interaction between the migrants identity and identity of place they temporarily live in.

Key words: national identity, place, everyday routines, globalisation, migration, diaspora

Chair: Mary Ann Walter

Cultural Difference and Social Solidarity

Session 3a: Seminar 2

Wednesday 4th July 09.00 – 10.30

Multiculturalism Explored

Jennifer Langlais

Harvard Law School / Boulton Fellow, McGill Law Faculty

jlanglais@sjd.law.harvard.edu

The Secret of Canadian Multiculturalism

In many European countries, multiculturalism has fallen out of favor since the turn of the millennium. In Canada, however, the 1971 policy of multiculturalism still enjoys a high degree of popularity. Perhaps surprisingly, the reasons for this forty-year old “love affair” are not immediately obvious. The way the policy has been implemented in the last four decades casts doubts on its presumed contribution to Canada’s celebrated record of immigrant integration. In fact, there are many observers who point to the country’s geographical location, its open market and its highly selective immigration policy to explain this enviable record. What is it then about Canadian multiculturalism that has preserved it from the fate of its European counterparts? The question is even more so puzzling because the policy has more or less followed the same trajectory as its European versions and has suffered critiques from both sides of the political spectrum.

In this paper, I will argue that the enduring popularity of multiculturalism in Canada has to do not so much with its capacity to integrate ethnic minorities into the social fabric, but rather with its role in perpetuating national myths. As part of a broader nationalist discourse that started to form in the mid-1920s, Canadian multiculturalism has helped the country differentiate itself from its “Others” (Britain and the United States) by projecting the image of a harmonious mosaic of cultures as opposed to an American melting pot or a British dominion. This image has not only helped construct a distinct identity for those who conceive of themselves as ‘mainstream’ or ‘Canadian-Canadian,’ but it has also served as a powerful narrative device to defuse the sub-nationalisms of the Québécois and the First Nations (Canada’s indigenous peoples). Still today, despite the meager budget allocated to multicultural programs targeting immigrants, the discourse of multiculturalism continues to be deployed by politicians and federal institutions to perpetuate the myth of a “tolerant nation” and neutralize rival conceptions of the nation defended by Canada’s older minorities. Any inquiry into the resilience of Canadian multiculturalism, I contend, must envisage the 1971 policy in good part as a strategic discourse of power.

Cultural Difference and Social Solidarity

Azam Golam
Philosophy La Trobe University – Australia
golam4azam@gmail.com

Tolerance Based Multiculturalism in South Asia: The Case of India

Multiculturalism is considered as an influential and successful political theory for resolving differences among rival groups especially between majority and minorities in western countries. It is concerned with the issues of equality: it asks whether the different communities, living peacefully together, co-exist as equals in the public arena (Mahajan 2002, 11). Will Kymlicka is one of the pioneers of this theory. The paper explains and searches for a suitable theory to resolve differences among groups in a South Asian country. It argues that neither Kymlicka's autonomy based multiculturalism nor Brian Barry's anti-multicultural egalitarian liberalism is an appropriate theory to ensure social solidarity in South Asian countries, for example, India because of age-old traditions, customs, religious awareness and dedication, and cultural deep attachments of the people of these countries (which are different from western secular countries like UK, France, Canada and USA). So far there is no proven theory that can be successfully applied to resolving differences between cultures and beliefs in these countries. Scholars recommend applying western-style liberal multicultural theory for the purpose. But I argue that peoples' understanding of diverse ways of life and the social structure of these countries do not inherently suggest the application of western-style liberal multiculturalism. I explain the case of India to support my hypothesis. Although India is a country where people of different cultures and religions have been living together for centuries, recent events of conflict between cultures and religions resulting deterioration of the status of minorities and depriving them of their basic human rights necessitate conducting research on difference and solidarity between conflicting cultures and religions in India. Different minority groups often claim that although India is a secular and democratic country by its constitution, it fails to do justice among individuals and between groups. The paper examines why the theory of political liberalism based on individual autonomy and neutrality would not be able to do justice among different cultural and religious groups in India. The paper also aims to propose a theory or model, encouraged by Galston's mutualism based on tolerance and mutual respect to minimize injustice and establish solidarity among groups in India.

Chair: David Stoop

Cultural Difference and Social Solidarity

Session 3b: Seminar 4

Wednesday 4th July 09.00 – 10.30

Critical Pedagogies

Hsueh Chen-hua

Foreign Language Center , Chaoyang University of Technology - Taichung, Taiwan
cindyhsueh@cyut.edu.tw

Justice of English Remedial Courses

The goal of this study is to analyze, based on the theory of justice offered by John Rawls, the justification of remedial English courses in some Taiwanese universities. English as a second language is a required course in most universities of Taiwan. Besides, some schools also offer remedial courses for students with inferior performance. Remedial courses tend to provide more benefits including a smaller class size, more class hours and extra tutoring. In other words, more resources are allocated to students in remedial courses. While students' performance is the only criterion when they are assigned to take remedial courses, motivation or diligence of students is not considered at all. That is to say, it is possible that students who are less motivated or diligent get more resources than those who work more diligently with higher motivation. The issue of justice thus arises.

The analysis in this study is conducted from one of Rawls' arguments about justice, Fair Equality of Opportunity which implies that offices and positions open to all under conditions of fair equality of opportunity to insure that persons with similar motivation, skills and abilities enjoy equal opportunities. By contrast, this study shows that students taking remedial courses actually have lower motivation in learning English which contributes to less skills and abilities. Therefore, the fact that they get better opportunities than those with higher motivation is against Rawls' principle of justice. To be more specific, the remedial course breaks the principle of justice. In this study, questionnaires from students taking remedial courses in a university will be collected to show their motivation towards learning English. Some of them will also be interviewed to present how motivation influences their learning. Furthermore, John Rawls' statement about Fair Equality of Opportunity will be elaborated to give a solid foundation for analyzing the issue of justice in remedial courses. It is expected that this study can offer a different perspective upon teaching solidarity of English courses in the university.

+

TBC

Chair: Scott Boyd

Cultural Difference and Social Solidarity

Session 4: Amfi 1

Wednesday 4th July 11.00 – 12.30

Plenary 1 : Towards Global Solidarity: A Radical Humanist Ethics

Lawrence Wilde

Are appeals to 'common humanity' or injunctions to build a society 'worthy of our human nature' anything more than rhetorical vestiges of a discredited metaphysics, or can we ground a normative view of global solidarity in the form of a species ethic? This paper argues for the latter as a corrective to the anti-essentialism that has dominated the social sciences in recent decades. Building on the acknowledgement of human universals, a form of virtue ethics will be offered that identifies four potentials – rationality, productiveness, compassion and cooperation – whose progressive realisation would open the way to the emergence of global solidarity. This theory is humanistic, in the sense that it is based on the principle that the world can be made better by human effort, and it is radical, in the sense that it expressly demands the transformation of the global structures that prevent the realisation of human solidarity.

Professor of Political Theory at Nottingham Trent University, UK. He is the author of *The Marx Dictionary* (Continuum, 2011), *Erich Fromm and the Quest for Solidarity* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2004), *Ethical Marxism and its Radical Critics* (Palgrave Macmillan, 1998), *Modern European Socialism* (Dartmouth, 1994) and *Marx and Contradiction* (Avebury, 1989), editor of *Marxism's Ethical Thinkers* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2001), and co-editor, with Mark Cowling, of *Approaches to Marx* (Open UP, 1989).

Forthcoming books include *Global Solidarity* to be published by Edinburgh University Press (2012).

Chair: Paul Reynolds

Cultural Difference and Social Solidarity

Session 5a: Seminar 2

Thursday 5th July 09.30 – 10.30

Thinking Xenophobia

Erin McElroy

Affiliated Scholar with the Center for Justice and Security

erinmcel@gmail.com

In the North of Ireland: A Genealogy of Xenophobia

Utilizing genealogy as methodology, this paper deconstructs ideological stratifications in Northern Ireland's historical present that solidify conditions in which race-related hate crimes proliferate. It focuses upon a particular moment in time, in June 2009, when 114 Roma from Batar, Romania were burned out of their homes in Belfast by gangs of Loyalist youth affiliated with the neo-Nazi micro-group Combat 18. Upon the violent attack, many families repatriated to Romania, only to find living conditions as rendered through centuries of racism worse than in Belfast. Many have since returned to Northern Ireland, where ongoing threats of eviction and hate crime stew.

In a postnational Europe where we see nation-state borders increasingly softened for those deemed white enough, secular enough, or European enough, the borders of racism only grow bolder upon the body of the Other, in this case upon the body of the Roma—Europe's largest ethnic minority. To meld into the Supranation and transgress the geopolitical boundaries that integration privileges is only to face new forms of racism, particularly if one's integrating refuses cultural assimilation into the order of the same.

Northern Ireland has long been a battleground precipitative of xenophobic formations. In the postcolonial present, one fiercely rendered by failed efforts of globalization and the free market, we are witness to the transformation of ghosts that have lurked the island since the plantation of Ulster. As sectarianism still wields real political violence upon Catholic and Protestant communities, people new to the region now bear the brunt of centuries of ongoing colonial struggle, a struggle often hyper-focused upon mythologies of origin, territory, and ritual. How does this symbolic order in the North expound upon the body of the Other? How is violence situated within larger formations of continental racism?

Chair: Scott Boyd

Cultural Difference and Social Solidarity

Session 5b: Seminar 4

Thursday 5th July 09.30 – 10.30

Religion and Solidarity

Lami Bertan Tokuzlu
İstanbul Bilgi University Law School - Turkey
bertan.tokuzlu@bilgi.edu.tr

Thoughts on Reforming Religious Institutions in Turkey

The Ottoman Empire was based on the 'Millet Model' where religious minorities enjoyed rather broad margin of appreciation in their own religious, civil and cultural affairs. The State had gradually expanded these rights at the Tanzimat era with the intention of strengthening their loyalty to the Empire. This policy however, did not prove to be successful as it led to escalation of the nationalist and separatist movements which resulted in the collapse of the Empire.

The founders of the new Turkish State had carefully crafted a Constitutional system which was built on the above stated negative experience with the non-Muslim religious minorities and the need to control the majority religion in order to pave the way out for a secular transformation. The former resulted in the Turkish reformers to develop a rather sceptic view on granting minority rights to the non-Muslim groups in Turkey. Therefore, minority rights were confined to the 1923 Lausanne Treaty which Turkish authorities had to accept as a condition for independence. Secondly, a Directorate of Religious Affairs was established, within the state apparatus, under the Prime Ministry, in order to control the majority religion. Today, religious institutions in Turkey present a system dominated by this Directorate which is in charge of the Sunni Islam tradition with its enormous funds and powers. In addition to the Directorate, certain non-Muslim groups such as the Greek Orthodox Church, Armenian Orthodox Church and Jewish Chief Rabbinate are subject to the Lausanne Regime without any State support and without an entity status. Moreover, there are a number of Islamic groups that do not feel themselves affiliated with Sunni Islam but are forced into the mandate of the Directorate of Religious Affairs such as the Alevites, Bahais etc. Finally, there are certain non-Muslim religious groups such as the Protestant Church, Catholic Church which do not benefit the rights listed in the Lausanne Treaty, as opposed to its explicit terminology.

With a view to this complex and obviously deficient system, this article aims at critically analysing the current institutional structure of religious groups in Turkey in the light of the jurisprudence of the European Court of Human Rights. In this regard, the following questions will be explored: How to decide who is entitled to the right to have religious institutions? What are the boundaries of the right to establish a religious institutions? What should be the institutional model or representation?

Chair: David Stoop

Cultural Difference and Social Solidarity

Session 6: Amfi 1

Thursday 5th July 11.00 – 12.30

Plenary 2: In Search of the Missing

Sevgül Uludağ

A journalist for nearly three decades, Sevgül Uludağ, 53, is an investigative reporter for Yeniduzen, a Turkish Cypriot daily newspaper in the northern part of the divided island of Cyprus. She also writes for the Greek Cypriot newspaper, Politis, and CYPRUS TODAY. In 2002, Uludağ began to tackle the issue of missing people and mass graves in Cyprus. She devoted herself to uncovering the fates of thousands of people who disappeared during the 1960s and 1970s from mass executions, abductions and targeted assassinations. Uludağ's reporting started a public debate about missing persons and mass graves. In addition, Uludağ called attention to the fact that both Greek and Turkish Cypriots saw themselves as the victims of the conflict, showing them that both sides are both perpetrators and victims.

Uludağ has published several books, including *Oysters with the Missing Pearls*, which brings together stories of missing persons and mass graves from both sides of Cyprus. *Oysters* was originally published in Turkish in 2005 and has subsequently been published in Greek and English. She has various international and local prizes for her work for peace and reconciliation. The International Women's Media Foundation awarded her 'The Courage in Journalism' International Prize in 2008 for her work on 'missing persons in Cyprus'.

She has brought together relatives of 'missing persons' from both sides of the island, helping them to form the 'Bi-communal Initiative of Relatives of Missing Persons and Victims of War' - 'Together we can' association.

Also an activist for peace and gender issues, Uludağ has trained various groups of women on issues of peace, reconciliation and gender. Together with women from both parts of Cyprus, she founded the non-governmental organization *Hands Across the Divide* in 2001, speaking out in public for peace in Cyprus.

Chair: Scott Boyd

Cultural Difference and Social Solidarity

Session 7a: Seminar 2

Thursday 5th July 14.00 – 15.30

Difference, Solidarity and Boundaries

Mohamed Rizvi Noordeen

School of Real Estate and Planning, University of Reading - UK

mohamodrizvi@yahoo.com

Living with Difference and Dealing with Conflicts – A socio-spatial account of ethnic conflict and its dynamics in contested territories

This paper examines the interplay between the spatial dimensions of social relations and the social dynamics of ethnic conflict in shaping the nature and intensity of conflicts in a multi ethnic context with a broader aim to develop a socio-spatial understanding of ethnic conflicts in contested territory. Presently, there is limited literature that explicitly focuses on the role of spatial planning in ethnic conflicts both in theoretical and empirical terms. It is argued in this paper that the 'territoriality of social relations' is a key analytical dimension to theorize ethnic conflicts in the context of territorial contestations – an aspect that has been overlooked in the existing literature. For example, the spatial focus of the works of Boal (2005), Bollens (1998; 2007) and Gaffikin and Morrissey (2011) place greater, if not a complete emphasis on urban context and the conceptual focus has been placed on divided cities which, as indicated above, fails to adequately capture the territoriality of social relations, and also limits the analysis to social divisions. This paper mainly focuses on the theory of Ethnocracy (Yiftachel 2006) - the explanatory power of the same, it is argued in this respect, can be theoretically and empirically challenged and extended. A multi-dimensional framework of analysis has been proposed that interrogates different dimensions of socio-spatial relations, which have been adopted from Jessop, Brenner et al. (2008) and the social dynamics of ethnic conflict. This framework serves as a methodological advancement that informs various methods of systematic inquiry into the analysis of ethnic conflict in light of its spatialities. This, in effect, provides a better understanding of the links between the social dynamics of ethnic conflicts and spatial planning (and hence the role of spatial planning in ethnic conflict) in general, and also leaves space for individual cases to be explained in its specific context. The paper concludes with a future direction for an empirical testing of the theoretical arguments advanced here.

References

- Boal, F. W. (2005). Urban ethnic segregation and the scenarios spectrum. *Desegregating the City: Ghettos, Enclaves, and Inequality*. V. P: 62–78.
- Bollens, S. A. (1998). "Urban planning amidst ethnic conflict: Jerusalem and Johannesburg." *Urban Studies* 35(4): 729.
- Bollens, S. A. (2007). *Cities, nationalism, and democratization*, Taylor & Francis.
- Gaffikin, F. and M. Morrissey (2011). *Planning in Divided Cities*, Wiley-Blackwell.
- Jessop, B., N. Brenner, et al. (2008). "Theorizing sociospatial relations." *Environment and Planning D* 26(3): 389.
- Yiftachel, O. (2006). *Ethnocracy: Land and identity politics in Israel/Palestine*, Univ of Pennsylvania Pr.

Cultural Difference and Social Solidarity

Simona Zavratnik

Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Ljubljana - Slovenia

simona.zavratnik@fdv.uni.lj.si

Negotiating Boundaries Of Integration Into 'New Societies': The Question of Neighbours and Foreigners

The text addresses the question of integration policies in the Slovene context, the evaluation of "retained multiculturalism", and integration policies that create the contemporary framework for migration management policies. Ethnic/cultural diversity concerns the issue of the integration of migrants (quite a new issue in Slovenia) and that of the incorporation of ethnic minorities. Both issues are somehow trapped in between the traditional policies of protecting indigenous ethnic minorities, modern global migrations, and attitudes towards "suspicious ić" (people with surnames ending in -ić) - migrants/communities/minorities from the former Yugoslavia. This point is the main "battlefield" for achieving social cohesion and attempting to cross the boundaries for outsiders.

In the first part we analyse the notion of statehood, the formation of the Slovene national identity, and the challenges to contemporary migration and new ethnic diversity. In the second part the papers addresses the implications of global migration trends in local environments, focusing on social contacts with less desirable social groups, among which migrants rank high on the unpopularity scale. Since public opinion could play an important role in the process of public policies, i.e. in achieving social cohesion, we address the question of the public's perceptions of migrations, integration of migrants, and multiculturalism at the level of empirical research (at the local level, but some European reference surveys are included in the comparative overview).

Chair: Paul Reynolds

Cultural Difference and Social Solidarity

Session 7b: Seminar 4

Thursday 5th July 14.00 – 15.30

Language, Solidarity and Difference I

Zuzana Klímová

Department of English and American Studies Masaryk University, Faculty of Arts, Brno
- Czech Republic

145169@mail.muni.cz

The Social Function of Postcolonial Literature in the 1960s and Now

In my paper I would like to move away from the traditional approach of literary criticism which concentrates on the aesthetic function of literary creation. Instead of offering an unsustainable universalizing solution, my aim is to open a discussion about the possibilities and changes of the social function of postcolonial literature during its evolution since the 1960s. A central frame of reference for postcolonial studies has long been occupied by the analysis of a counter-discourse, and representations of otherness. The application of some of Foucault's ideas to postcolonial theory offers possible interpretations of counter-discourses and their social implications through an analysis of their ability to criticize and even subvert the dominant discourse, but also their ability to reinforce the hegemonic tradition which they try to depose. Western literary criticism predominantly focuses on the aesthetic aspects of literary creation whilst clinging to the illusion of apolitical art. This concept is, however, contradictory to the very idea of postcolonialism itself which arose from the need for more abstract notions of freedom (on all levels of perception) after the formal achievement of political independence. It was, in fact, created as a counterpart to direct political struggles. Within this discussion of the social role of literary counter-discourse I shall consider issues of mimicry, nationalism and ideology in connection to postcolonial hermeneutics and metacritique. With regard to metacritique, I will touch upon the current turn of postcolonial theory towards the early stages of literary criticism – Aristotle's rhetoric, which connects the aesthetic aspects of artistic creation with its social aspects (including ideology). Another important issue is the position and social status of the postcolonial intellectual and his ability (or inability) to represent (vertreten) and represent (darstellen) the subaltern as it was introduced by Spivak. The analysis of postcolonial literature in the social context of its creation and interpretation should offer a space for debate about the cultural mediation of interpretation and the necessity of historical perspectivism.

Cultural Difference and Social Solidarity

Mary Ann Walter

English as a Foreign Language, Middle East Technical University -- Northern Cyprus
Campus

walter@metu.edu.tr

Lessening Language Barriers, Strengthening Borders: Changes in English-Language Education in the Gulf States

The demand for English-language skills and education in the Arab Gulf states (United Arab Emirates, Qatar, Bahrain, Kuwait), as elsewhere around the globe, is extremely high among both citizens and the many non-citizen resident workers, despite some resentment due to its perceived global dominance. Research on the presence of and attitudes toward English in the Gulf has so far focused mainly on tertiary/higher education (Karmani 2005a,b, Findlow 2006, Clarke 2007, Al-Issa and Dahan 2009, et alii).

However, exposure to English begins much earlier than that. In this empirical study, I describe and analyze the state of primary and secondary English-medium education in the Gulf over the last decade. I draw on publicly-available information on schools, their enrollments, fees, offerings, and staff. In addition, personal narratives from school staff are reported. The focus is primarily on Qatar, with some comparative data from its Arab Gulf neighbors.

I document an explosion in Gulf English-medium primary and secondary education in the last decade. New English-medium schools have opened every year during this period, and existing schools have expanded to lavish new campuses, with increased staffing and enrollment.

Crucially, this expansion coincides with the events of September 11, 2001 and aftermath. These events led to a U.S. State Department-led initiative to expand English-language teaching around the globe and in the Middle East in particular, conceived as a sort of inoculation against Muslim extremism (Karmani 2005). At the same time, however, access to English-language medium education in the United States itself was abruptly and dramatically curtailed, with student visa issuance suddenly highly protracted and restricted. Those students who did gain visas may have felt less comfortable in the climate of hostility and occasional hate crimes against (perceived) Muslims in the U.S, and been less willing to make the journey. These intertwined events have led to a situation in which, although English has been promoted ever more strongly as a path toward cross-cultural understanding abroad, actual encounters between citizens of the U.S. and Middle Eastern countries simultaneously lessened (outside of military contexts).

Chair Scott Boyd

Cultural Difference and Social Solidarity

Session 8a: Seminar 2

Thursday 5th July 16.00 – 17.30

Difference and Solidarity Between Academia and Activism

Esra Gedik

Sociology, Middle East Technical University - Turkey

esragedik.34@gmail.com

From Classes to the Streets: Relations between Academy and Activism

Defining academicians as “armchair” researchers or defining academy as “ivory tower” have always been used to explain discontinuity between the activism and academic research at universities. However, universities or the academicians do not just write articles and make researches. At the same time, they are in touch with other academicians and in contact with the society where they live in. In other words, academy and activism are not always separate spheres. Academy (theory) is in relations with activism (practice).

In other words, it is true that academy uses or produces concepts but these concepts have reflections on the activism to produce efficient politics. Academy and activism should be relational and reflexive to each other. For example, “gender” is a well-known concept for academy. However, if we can’t provide the visibility of this concept in the society, this concept stays in the abstract level. On the other hand, when we claim that womanhood and manhood (gender roles) are socially constructed, this takes the issue in a concrete level and makes us consider that these constructions can be changed. When women struggle for their rights, the concept of gender gains the importance to make politics.

In that sense, there is always a question what the relation between women’s studies at the universities and women’s movement as a social movement. All around the world, women’s studies have become very popular at the universities. Studying women or studying gender is very popular issue. There have been thousands of articles and researches about women or gender related issues in the academy whether in women’s studies or not. However, many studies are done without a feminist purpose to strengthen women and feminist movement. In this study, my aim is to question to what extent academy (women’s studies in general) provides the base for the women’s movement or to what extent women’s movement affects the knowledge produced in the academy.

Key Words: Women’s studies, women’s movement, academy, activism.

Cultural Difference and Social Solidarity

Esra Dabagci

Department of Sociology Ankara University - Turkey

esradabagci@gmail.com

Community Service” and Volunteering: Is it a mean for academic noble to climb down the ivory tower?

Being an old metaphor, the term “ivory tower” has been used to represent the distance between university and laypeople for a long time. One can find many discussions on reevaluating the role and position of the academia in order to overcome the intellectual isolation of academic community leading to the distance. Beside many viewpoints have debated for so long, “an emerging paradigm” grounded on neoliberal governmentality has started to invite the “nobles of the tower” to the “streets” through some curricular and extracurricular activities which is students’ and academicians’ engagement in volunteer activities through various clubs and associations within campuses and “Community Service” courses in the curricula. According to this paradigm, the mission of the university or academicians cannot only be “to sit, write and publish”, but also to “serve” the society. Claimed to be a “third space” -neither “indulged in” politics nor encompassed with the greediness of the market-, volunteering and NGO activities is seen as a mean for fulfilling the mission of serving. This new governmentality suggests “participating” directly in to the “solutions” of “social problems” in order to integrate academia with the society. On one hand this idea can be seen as a kind of individually empowering strategy of academicians through encouraging direct involvement in some certain tasks. On the other hand, it limits individual, intellectual and collective space of academia for political demands and opposition, paradoxically. Based on an ethnographic study held with a university-based volunteer group in Turkey composed of academicians and students, aiming at exploring their perceptions, conceptualizations and feelings on their own activities of volunteering and on the mission of university; this study intends to contextualize the abstract-natured problematique of relation between academia and society within a more concrete realm. Whether the “new paradigm” let the noble climb down the ivory tower or consolidates it through reproducing their existing positions is in question.

Key words: Volunteer activities, NGOs, neo-liberal governmentality, academia and activism.

Chair: Paul Reynolds

Cultural Difference and Social Solidarity

Session 8b: Seminar 4

Thursday 5th July 16.30 – 18.00

Language, Solidarity and Difference II

Alev Özbilgin Gezgin

Teaching English as a Foreign Language Programme, Middle East Technical University
Northern Cyprus Campus,
ozbilgin@metu.edu.tr

Teaching: Theory, Conflicting Practices and Outcomes

In this presentation discourses at a language institution are selected and analyzed from a larger collective case study of reading and writing practices in Turkey (Ozbilgin, 2004). Basing her research on this collective study, the presenter discusses how a broad range of social, political and ideological issues of a nation have a conflicting impact on the discourses of an institution and thus the teaching practices of foreign language instructors. In this study, discourse is defined as: “the systematically organized sets of statements which will give expression to the meanings and values of an institution” (Baynham, 1995, p. 6). Any attempt in understanding teaching practices and the values attached to them needs to involve an examination of the culture of the country as well as the investigation of local themes, practices, and conditions. In this specific case the researcher investigates how concepts and values such as “being Western” and “being modern” influence conduct of an administrator and the teaching practice of an instructor.

Case study techniques are employed to understand and explain these practices and values attached to them. The data has been analyzed:

- 1) to elucidate the roles of an instructor and an administrator in creating, distributing, and consuming spoken and written texts;
- 2) to offer an explanation of how these components interact with the teaching and practice of reading and writing in English. In addition, an evaluation of how the context hinders or facilitates practices is provided.

Using the framework of both social and linguistic theory, the interview transcripts, documents, and observation notes are analyzed in order to explore how the university context hinders or facilitates Turkish and English reading and writing practices. In cases in which the context hinders these practices, the analysis will focus on how interactions and ideologies create the restrictions. In cases in which the context facilitates these practices, the analysis will center on how the context provides more opportunities for learning.

The findings offer implications for reading and writing pedagogy. Also it can help administrators recognize how their conduct is viewed and how contexts and discourses actually shape them.

Cultural Difference and Social Solidarity

Scott H. Boyd

Middle East Technical University, Northern Cyprus Campus

sboyd@metu.edu.tr

User Interface Metaphors and Processes of Interaction with Screened Devices: An Insidious Cultural Hegemony as the Basis for Solidarity?

Situating itself within the theory of autopoietic culture, this paper considers how processes of interaction with contemporary screened electronic devices containing user interface metaphors contribute to a hegemonic 'mediation' of users' cognitive and ergonomic responses. One foundation of the theory of autopoietic culture is that culture is a system of unities that contain mostly autonomic processes. In the theory of autopoietic culture, unlike positivist based paradigms, what we do not perceive when we perceive is more significant within the system of unities than the objects and events, artificially isolated, that we do perceive. In our interaction with screened devices we respond as Peircean "interpretants" to metaphoric signifiers designed to elicit specific responses to the systems of the device with which we are interacting. The signifiers 'mediate' or determine a cognitive ergonomic response. This results in two processes that are relevant here. The first is the process of unlimited semiosis as suggested by Umberto Eco, which proposes an ongoing evolution of signifiers. This evolution of the signifier, and interpretant's understanding of what is perceived, is inseparable from the second process, the evolution of inferences, actions, and expectations (ergonomic responses) which unlimited semiosis necessitates (and what we generally do not perceive). If culture is autopoietic then its structures exist in a state of change which are, by the limits of our perceptive abilities, mostly ignored. I argue that the continuing evolution of user interface metaphors and interaction with processes of devices is a mostly autonomic and particularly insidious form of cultural hegemony of which expectant, interactive processes (inferences, intentions, and responses to signs) are more manipulative and hegemonic than the outcomes of the processes (the result of our actions, i.e. the "tweet"). This leads to many questions, but one predominant question will be considered in the context of the conference: if the result of these continuous interactions is the construction of a homogenous 'mediation', which is predominantly manipulated for participation in individualized, consumptive interactions, can this framework be used to overturn consumptive conditioning and be the basis for solidarity?

Chair: Mary Ann Walter

Cultural Difference and Social Solidarity

Session 9a: Seminar 2

Friday 6th July 9.30 – 11.00

Problems of Solidarity in Civil Society in Turkey and Cyprus

Burcu Senturk

Department of Politics University of York - UK

burcusentrk@gmail.com

Dissolving of community: The case of Ege district in Ankara

The periods 1950s and 1980s can be taken as the breaking point for the transformation of rural and urban social structure in Turkey. 1950s were marked by the mechanization of agricultural production in rural areas and the development of domestic industrial production in urban areas with the implementation of import substitution policy as a national development strategy. These ended up with a mass chain migration from rural to urban areas. 1980s were also important for the introduction of structural adjustment policies as a new development strategy in Turkey. In general sense, these policies involved the liberalization of markets, elimination of agricultural subsidies, increasing flexible labour. While these new conditions created push factors and the labour need for newly emerging flexible jobs stood for the pulling factors for rural migrants in 1980s. In the early decades of rural to urban migration, the slum areas were relatively homogenous in terms of political orientation, economic conditions, ethnic and religious identities due to the chain migration and political polarization between 1960s and 1980s. They had collective needs such as being entitles to title deeds, getting infrastructure facilities and had collective struggles for these needs. Their similarities, collective needs and struggles contributed to the establishment of a community. In due time, the slums get more heterogeneous as a result of the facts that (1) majority of slum dwellers moved to other parts of the city, (2) coup d'état in 1980 which erased the political polarization and (3) urban reformation projects. As a result, they lost the sense of community and their demands transformed into individual ones from collective demands and they lost the sense. Basing on a field research conducted in Ege District, a slum district in Ankara this presentation aim to explain these changes and argue that it resulted in dissolving of the community.

Keywords: urbanization, slums, class position, development, community.

Cultural Difference and Social Solidarity

Deniz Yucel

Department of Sociology William Paterson University of New Jersey – US
yuceld@wpunj.edu

Perceptions of Marriage and Prerequisites for a Successful Marriage: Comparing Greek and Turkish Cypriots

With a significantly high divorce rate in most of the Western world, understanding the determinants of divorce as well as what makes a marriage successful is becoming more crucial. Specifically, many researchers and policymakers are concerned about the causes of this trend as well as the future of marriage as an institution. Most prior sociological research on divorce has mostly focused on the United States, whereas the literature exploring this question in other countries is rather undeveloped.

This research contributes to prior literature by empirically testing to what extent individuals perceive marriage as an outdated institution. In the second part of this study, I examine which aspects of couple life are considered the most important prerequisites for a successful marriage. I also test whether the perception of marriage as an institution and the factors contributing to a successful marriage are affected by the age, gender, marital status, or gender ideology of respondents, as well as whether being native-born versus an immigrant makes a difference. Given that one of the significant transformations in the institution of family and marriage has been the increase in divorce rate, especially in Europe, this study's cross-national focus makes a significant contribution to prior literature with a specific comparison between Greek and Turkish Cypriots living in Cyprus. Likewise, it aims to show how changes in the perceptions of marriage as an institution and changes in aspects of couple life considered more important for a successful marriage might reveal some of the mystery behind the decline in family and marriage.

Chair: Mary Ann Walter

Cultural Difference and Social Solidarity

Session 9b: Seminar 4

Friday 6th July 9.30 – 11.00

Planning and Capital in Divided Societies

Gizem Caner and Fulin Bölen

Urban Planning Istanbul Technical University - Turkey

gizemcaner@gmail.com

Planning to divide or not to divide? The role of planning in divided cities

This paper provides a comparative analysis of various planning approaches in divided cities in order to investigate the role of planning in these societies. It analyzes six urban areas—Berlin, Belfast, Beirut, Jerusalem, Mostar, and Nicosia—which experience extreme divisions related to nationality, ethnicity, religion, and/or culture. Each case study is investigated in terms of planning approaches before division and after reunification (if applicable). By doing so, it is aimed to assess the role and influence of urban planning in alleviating or exacerbating urban division. The relation between division and planning is reciprocal: planning effects, and is effected by urban division. Therefore, it is generally assumed that traditional planning approaches are insufficient and that the recognized engagement methods of planners in the planning process are ineffective to overcome the problems posed by divided cities. Theoretically, several scholars have proposed different planning approaches to face this challenge (Boal 1999; Bollens 1998; Benvenisti 1986). But as Yiftachel (2006) puts forward, these theories are concentrated on “planners rather than planning”. In assessing the role of planning in these cities, both attributes of planning practice (planner’s role and planning interventions) are evaluated.

The case studies indicate that even though different planning approaches have different consequences on the ground, there is a universal trend in harmony with the rest of the world in reshaping the urban. This conclusion draws another one; the contemporary planning interventions in divided cities do not address the root causes of division. Hence, incorporation of ‘difference’ as a prominent feature of the city to its plans is not addressed as it should be in these special cases.

References:

- Benvenisti, M., 1986. Conflicts and Contradictions. NY: Villard Books.
- Boal, F.W., 1999. From undivided cities to undivided cities: assimilation to ethnic cleansing. *Housing Studies*, 14(5), pp.585–600.
- Bollens, S. A., 1998. Urban Policy in Ethnically Polarized Societies. *International Political Science Review*, 19(2), pp.187-215.
- Yiftachel, O., 2006. Re-engaging Planning Theory? Towards “South-Eastern” Perspectives. *Planning Theory*, 5(3), pp.211-222.

Cultural Difference and Social Solidarity

Tufan Ekici

Economics, Middle East Technical University, Northern Cyprus Campus
ekici@metu.edu.tr

Social Capital in Cyprus

The island of Cyprus contains two communities that has lived both together and apart over the last 50 years. Even though once cohabitated, these two communities have grown apart over the years. In this paper we will analyze empirically the differences, if any, between two communities in terms of their social capital. We will also address the issue of trust between the two communities. We will utilize European Values Study survey that was conducted in 2008. We hope that our results will have important policy implications especially during such a time when negotiations are going on to re-unite the two communities.

Chair: Scott Boyd

Cultural Difference and Social Solidarity

Session 10: Seminar 4

Friday 6th July 11.30 – 13.00

Closing Roundtable Plenary: Solidarity and Difference: Reflecting on the Conference – Themes and Issues

This session will be a concluding roundtable that will seek to draw out relevant themes and ideas from the conference papers and discussions. Two speakers chosen during the conference will be asked to 'lead off' this session with no more than 3 minutes of sharing one or two observations, before the floor is opened for group discussion. We hope that this will allow some reflection and drawing together of themes, strands and arguments from the conference (and perhaps set the agenda for next year).

Chair: Paul Reynolds

And **Closing Remarks:**

Scott Boyd and Paul Reynolds

Network Development Meeting

In the afternoon on Friday 6th, after lunch at 14.00, there will be a network development meeting to explore how we can move this project and network forward. All delegates are welcome to attend. Scott and Paul will have a broad agenda, but the meeting is open for all and any contributions and ideas.

Cultural Difference and Social Solidarity

Conference Outputs:

Last year the conference yielded an edited volume, currently in press, entitled ***Cultural Difference and Social Solidarity: Critical Cases***, to be published by **Cambridge Scholars Publishing** - Expected availability, summer 2012.

At present – though this will be confirmed at the conference - we anticipate two possible publications emerging from this conference. Please note that acceptance of an abstract for presentation does not mean the paper will be published.

Book one:

All papers presented at the conference will be eligible for publication (NOT guaranteed publication) in an edited book of the conference proceedings. This book will be published under our own imprint, "Cultural Difference and Social Solidarity," printed and given an ISBN in the US, and will be available worldwide through the publishing industry's expanded distribution channels which includes bookstores, libraries, academic institutions, and online booksellers such as Amazon.com. Our goal is world wide availability in printed form by December 2012.

Notification of inclusion, the deadlines for submission, and formatting guidelines will be discussed during and after the conference. This book will have a fast turnaround time. It is expected that final chapters will be due from authors in mid-September.

Authors will be responsible for their own editing. The book editor will NOT edit for grammar, punctuation, spelling, content, etc. The text the author submits is the text that will be published.

Book two:

A continuation of our "Critical Cases" series developed from the themes that emerge during the conference and published by Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

More details will be given during the conference.

Please note: The quality of the papers presented will determine whether or not an edited book is accepted by our publishers. Submission and presentation of a paper does not guarantee publication. We will not publish poorly written, argued, or researched papers.