



UNIVERSITÄT BONN



fiw

N 50° 43' E 7° 7'

RHEINISCHE
FRIEDRICH-WILHELMS-
UNIVERSITÄT BONN

FORUM
INTERNATIONALE
WISSENSCHAFT

FIW WORKING PAPER

NUMBER

21

Rudolf Stichweh

SLAVERY AND STRONG ASYMMETRICAL DEPENDENCIES ESCALATING SOCIAL CONTROLS AND THE DYNAMICS OF EXCLUSION AND INCLUSION

Mai 2025

SLAVERY AND STRONG ASYMMETRICAL DEPENDENCIES. ESCALATING SOCIAL CONTROLS AND THE DYNAMICS OF EXCLUSION AND INCLUSION

RUDOLF STICHWEH

FIW WORKING PAPER NO. 21

Content

ABSTRACT	1
1. SLAVERY AND RELATED INSTITUTIONS	3
2. A PARADIGM OF CONTROL	4
3. A PARADIGM OF BALANCING OPERATIONS	5
4. THE STRANGER/SLAVE CONTINUUM	7
5. 'INCLUDING EXCLUSION' AS A CONDITION OF SLAVERY AND OTHER STRONG ASYMMETRICAL DEPENDENCIES	8
6. 'EXCLUDING INCLUSION' AND OPPOSITIONAL STRUCTURES IN PRE-MODERN AND MODERN SOCIETIES	9
7. AMBIVALENCE, PARADOX, CONTRADICTION IN STRONG ASYMMETRICAL DEPENDENCIES	11
8. SOCIAL DIFFERENTIATION AND STRONG ASYMMETRICAL DEPENDENCIES	11
9. MODERNITY, FUNCTIONAL DIFFERENTIATION AND ASYMMETRY	14
BIOGRAPHY / BIOGRAPHISCHE ANMERKUNGEN	18
BIBLIOGRAPHY	20
FIW WORKING PAPER	23

Impressum

Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelm-Universität Bonn
Forum Internationale Wissenschaft
Heussallee 18-24
53113 Bonn

Tel: +49 228 73 629 82
E-Mail: fiwbonn@uni-bonn.de
Internet: www.fiw.uni-bonn.de

Verantwortlicher Herausgeber: Prof. Dr. Rudolf Stichweh

Abstract

Prof. Dr. Rudolf Stichweh, Professor of Sociology, 'Forum International Science' and 'Bonn Center for Dependency and Slavery Studies', University of Bonn

The paper looks for a general analytical perspective that allows to understand and compare slavery and its related institutions (serfdom, debt slavery, forced labour) in premodern and modern societies. The paper starts with a theory of asymmetrical control that identifies six cumulative dimensions of social control and thereby allows to understand the totalizing character of social relations based on a multiplicity of unilateral controls. In opposition to control arise balancing operations. Any specific institution of asymmetrical dependency can then be described by an equilibrium of control and balancing operations.

In the next step, the paper explores the historical space that creates social role categories such as stranger, guest, slave, member, kin – and looks at all of them as special cases and combinations of inclusion and exclusion. This points to the relevance of the theory of inclusion and exclusion, which makes visible that all strong asymmetrical dependencies are based on combinations of constitutive exclusions (from fundamental societal forms of belongingness) with imposed inclusions that are characterized by their control intensity and totality. These are paradoxical structures and they mirror the other paradox that the ultradependents of premodern societies are as much dishonoured as they are valued because of their extensive contributions to societal functioning. Their totalizing inclusion takes place in households and organizational contexts and therefore they do not build a stratum of their own in society.

Finally, the paper looks at global modernity and its non-hierarchical character. It tries to find out why strong asymmetrical dependencies persist in an egalitarian society. The reason seems to be that asymmetrical dependencies change from being normal institutions in hierarchical societies to being oppositional and deviant institutions in horizontal societies that because of their looseness and complexity are not able to suppress the multiple possibilities of opposition, deviance and alienation.

Keywords: Strong asymmetrical dependency; slavery; asymmetrical control; including exclusion and excluding inclusion; hierarchy and equality; balancing operations; total institutions.

Zusammenfassung: Der Text entfaltet eine allgemeine analytische Perspektive, die es ermöglicht, Sklaverei und die ihr verwandten historischen Institutionen (Leibeigenschaft, Schuldknechtschaft, Zwangsarbeit etc.) in vormodernen und modernen Gesellschaften zu verstehen und systematisch zu vergleichen. Der Aufsatz beginnt mit einer Theorie asymmetrischer Kontrolle, die sechs – mutmaßlich kumulative - Dimensionen sozialer Kontrolle identifiziert und die es erlaubt, den totalisierenden Charakter sozialer Beziehungen zu verstehen, die auf einer Mehrzahl einseitiger Kontrollen ruhen. Im Widerspruch zu asymmetrischer Kontrolle stehen auf Balance abzielende Operationen, die sich evolutionär herausbilden. Eine jede Form asymmetrischer Abhängigkeit kann dann als ein Gleichgewicht von Kontrolle und Balanceoperationen verstanden werden.

Im nächsten Schritt exploriert der Text den historisch-semanticen Raum, der soziale Rollenkategorien wie ‚Fremder‘, ‚Gast‘, ‚Sklave‘, ‚Mitglied‘, ‚Verwandter‘ hervorbringt – und betrachtet sie alle als spezielle Fälle und als Kombinationen von Inklusion und Exklusion. Dies hebt die Relevanz dieser Theorie der Inklusion und Exklusion hervor, auf deren Grundlage verständlich wird, dass alle starken asymmetrischen Abhängigkeiten auf einer Kombination konstitutiver Exklusionen (die sich auf fundamentale Dimensionen gesellschaftlicher Zugehörigkeit beziehen) mit auferlegten Inklusionen beruhen, wobei diese durch ihre Kontrollintensität und Totalität charakterisiert sind. Dies sind paradoxe Strukturen und sie spiegeln das andere Paradox, dass die Ultradependenten vormoderner Gesellschaften sowohl entehrt wie auch wegen ihrer umfangreichen Beiträge zum gesellschaftlichen Funktionieren als wichtig erachtet werden. Ihre totalisierende Inklusion findet in Haushalten und in Organisationskontexten statt und deshalb kann mit Bezug auf sie nicht von eigenen Schichten der Gesellschaft die Rede sein.

Am Ende blickt der Text auf die globale Moderne und deren nichthierarchischen Charakter. Er sucht eine Erklärung für die Persistenz asymmetrischer Abhängigkeiten in einer egalitären Gesellschaft. Der Grund liegt vermutlich darin, dass asymmetrische Abhängigkeiten jetzt nicht mehr normale Institutionen in hierarchischen Gesellschaften sind. Stattdessen werden sie zu oppositionellen und devianten Institutionen in horizontalen Gesellschaften, wobei diese wegen des ‚loose coupling‘ ihrer Strukturen und wegen deren Komplexität nicht in der Lage sind, die vielfältigen Möglichkeiten von Opposition, Devianz und Entfremdung zu unterdrücken.

Schlagworte: Starke asymmetrische Abhängigkeit; Sklaverei; asymmetrische Kontrolle; inkludierende Exklusion und exkludierende Inklusion; Hierarchie und Gleichheit; Ausgleichsoperationen; totale Institutionen.

1. Slavery and related institutions

Slavery is an institution of pre-modern societies which are pervaded by patterns of hierarchy, asymmetry and inequality as their most basic social structures. Often hierarchy is not just the structure of society, but is also perceived as the structure of the universe. As structure of the universe, it then affirms and legitimises the hierarchical structure of society (Davis, 1966) esp. Ch. 2-3).

‘Homo hierarchicus’, as Louis Dumont called him (Dumont, 1980), may therefore not have been surprised to find himself as a ‘slave’ or in any of the other social roles close or similar to slavery in a premodern society, and may have accepted this position as the “will of providence” (Davis, 1966) 47). For sociology it is a major task to analyse and compare these multiple social roles and institutions using a conceptual vocabulary that serves as the basis for a comparative strategy that includes many societies in its analysis. The same conceptual vocabulary should even be able to identify ‘modern slavery’ and the continuities and structural changes that probably condition the persistence of slavery even in the non-hierarchical structures of global modernity.

The core concept for the following argument will be “strong asymmetrical dependency”. The concept was advanced by the excellence cluster “Beyond Freedom and Slavery. Asymmetrical Dependencies in Premodern Societies” at the University of Bonn (Stichweh, 2022b; Winnebeck, Sutter, Hermann, Antweiler, & Conermann, 2023), and it seems to suggest a family of terms that allows for a comparative study of the institutions surrounding slavery. There is “dependence” or “dependency” as the core concept for identifying relevant social relations that imply differentials of power or of influence and control; dependencies are universal in all human societies, they have to be “asymmetrical” to function as building materials for a specific set of hierarchical institutions; finally one may have to add the attribute “strong” to focus on those institutions that radicalise the hierarchical character of an asymmetrical society.

2. A paradigm of control

A first important condition for the emergence of strong asymmetrical dependencies is asymmetrical control. Asymmetrical control means that one participant (alter) can take selection decisions that are binding on another participant (ego) in a way that ego is unable to reciprocate. Six control dimensions can be meaningfully distinguished:

- Control over resources that another person would like to have (Coleman, 1990). In this elementary respect asymmetrical dependency is mainly derived from inequality as it is linked to the unequal societal distribution of resources.
- Rights of control over the actions of another person (Coleman, 1990). If one has rights of control over someone's actions one may by implication control the actions by which a person has access to and makes use of resources. But, of course, this is only a subclass of the whole domain of actions over which an 'alter ego' might have control.
- Determining the social relations a person is able to initiate and maintain (Patterson, 1982/2018). On the basis of the absence of control over resources and actions a person's ability to establish autonomous social relations is often denied (e.g. the ability to propose marriage to another person often depends on the control over resources and rights of control over actions)(Austen, 1811).
- Cutting off opportunities for "voice" (to speak, to protest) (Hirschman, 1970). Without voice you may be unable to change a situation perceived to be unjust.
- Blocking the possibility of "exit" (the possibility to leave an intolerable situation) (Hirschman, 1970). Going away is often the most basic way to escape strong dependencies.
- Limiting and controlling the way another person experiences the world (Luhmann, 1978). If my experience is controlled - e.g. in educational organisations or re-education camps - I may be unable to imagine alternatives to conditions given by strong dependencies.

These six control dimensions are cumulative. The more dimensions are present and institutionalised, the more one can speak of strong

asymmetrical dependencies. When all six are realised, one speaks of a total institution that encompasses all dimensions of life (Goffman, 1961) or of totalitarian control. Another key question is whether there is a sequential order built into this paradigm. This would mean that the later dimensions in the sequence entail the earlier dimensions and enhance the effectiveness of their control (Stichweh, 2022a), 92-4).

3. A paradigm of balancing operations

The hypothesis of cumulative dimensions of control can be complemented by a theory of balancing operations. The rise of strong asymmetrical dependencies can perhaps be understood as a kind of struggle between, on the one hand, control strategies chosen by actors with strong social positions, and, on the other hand, balancing reactions which are forms of resistance and adaptation available to weaker actors. Being “strong” or being “weak” are obviously temporary positions that can be changed on the basis of these struggles between control strategies and balancing operations. This combination of control strategies and balancing operations seems a good tool for building a flexible analytics for the understanding of strong asymmetrical dependencies. Below is a list of plausible candidates for balancing operations (Emerson, 1962), 35-40).

5

A. Withdrawal – motivational disinvestment, indifference. Becoming indifferent towards scarce resources is one of the strongest ways of gaining agency.

B. Extension of network

- Addition of more network addresses.
- Diffusion of dependencies and/or multiplication of dependencies
- Examples: educational organisations, economic organisations

C. Coalition formation

- Evolutionary background in primates – coalitions of weaker animals balance power asymmetries (Boehm, 1999, 2012)
- Transformation of the person-person relationship into a group-person relationship (collective actor vs. individual actor)
- Group formation – role prescriptions, norm formation, value genesis, institution building (the invention of “generalised others” who shape the lifeworld of the group and minimise or interdict dependencies)(Meyer, 2010). The genesis of human rights are a good case in point (Heintz & Leisering, 2015).

D. Status attribution

- Domestication of very powerful individuals through the attribution of very high status – asymmetrical dependency is simultaneously affirmed and limited by status-bound obligations (early modern monarchs who still reign over “subjects”/”súbditos” but are obliged to ensure “welfare”).

6

E. Constraint absorption

- Takeover of the “strong” by the “weak”
- Paradoxical balancing strategy: Merger, marriage, martyrdom

F. Gift exchange

- Excessive gifts and exchanges; destruction of advantages, buildup of dominant social status. Significant resources are given away in order to achieve dominant status (Mauss, 2007/1925). These are paradoxical structures as dependencies are built by the distribution of resources.

G. Exchanges on the basis of communication media

- As soon as there are symbolically generalized communication media, resources that had been embedded into asymmetrical dependencies can be acquired by the use of media. Potentially horizontal market exchange can then substitute for dependency-based access to resources. On the basis of the universality of

inclusion into function systems the other control mechanisms might be weakened too.

H. Socialization

- Training for submissiveness and subordination vs. training for enlightenment. Education as a strategic institution in the buildup as well dissolution of dependencies.

4. The stranger/slave continuum

There are roles for strangers in nearly all human societies (Stichweh, 2010). But these roles often have strong temporal limitations. For a short period of time, the stranger is welcome and is treated as a guest, and as guest he or she can count on a certain amount of generosity, even and especially in societies with limited material resources (Foster, 1965). When a permanent solution must be found, different options are open. One option is to expel the stranger; alternatively the stranger can be adopted into a kinship group and will be treated to some extent as a normal kin member of the group; or, finally, the stranger can be integrated as a slave in a position of strong asymmetrical dependency. There is an interesting essay by Igor Kopytoff and Suzanne Miers that looks at African slavery before European colonisation as a case of social marginality (Kopytoff & Miers, 1977). And if one understands marginality in the way suggested by Robert Ezra Park as a status on the boundary between two social systems (Park, 1964), this is close to the situation described by Kopytoff and Miers: A stranger adopted by one kinship group may later revert to the slave status and as such be sold to another kinship group, which then treats him/her as a slave or as a normal member or both.

5. ‘Including exclusion’ as a condition of slavery and other strong asymmetrical dependencies

The situation just described of the stranger who becomes either kin or slave, or first kin and then slave at a later point in time, implies inclusions and exclusions. The move into a strong asymmetrical dependency starts with an exclusion from kinship (as the most important dimension of inclusion in hunter-gatherer societies).

What is observed here is probably part of a more general pattern. Most if not all strong asymmetrical dependencies begin with an exclusion of the persons involved from a dimension that is constitutive of the core structure of the society in question. These exclusions concern kinship, or political membership and citizenship (in societies that have a set of institutions that can tentatively be called a state), or religion as the constitutive symbolism of many societies. Ethnicity is probably another dimension that could be a candidate for such a fundamental exclusion. Ethnicity, too, is an ascription that can be changed. The persons in question are then called ‘strangers’ again (the Rohingya in Myanmar that are excluded from an ethnicity that had been ascribed to them before are a case in our days). The general hypothesis is that societies need a significant, often dramatic act of exclusion in order to see someone as a potential object of strong asymmetrical dependencies.

If such an exclusion is the beginning of a strong asymmetrical dependency, one has to ask what happens next. The answer is obvious. The society in question has to invent and stabilise an institution of inclusion, specifically designed to make use of and find a place for those who have first of all been excluded. This may be called an institution of *including exclusion*. This term is well established in contemporary sociology, where it has been introduced without explicitly looking at the theory of asymmetrical dependency (Stichweh, 2016). A good example is the sociological theory of the prison in modern society, which clearly identifies the prison as an institution of including exclusion. A prison career starts with multiple exclusions

that are defined and detailed in the penal judgment. Mandatory sentencing relies on the prison as an institution of inclusion for the offender, and there is no doubt that the prison is built on strong asymmetrical dependencies. If the multiple forms of slavery (serfdom, forced labour, debt slavery, galley slaves) are somehow paradigmatic of the strong asymmetrical dependencies of premodern societies, it could be argued that the multiple forms of prisons and camps (camps based on political persecution and political decisions and not so much on legal decisions) are a paradigmatic form of strong asymmetrical dependency in modern society.

6. 'Excluding inclusion' and oppositional structures in pre-modern and modern societies

Slavery and prisons/camps are only two cases that can be compared with other institutions of including exclusion that realise strong asymmetrical dependencies, in premodern and modern societies, respectively. Besides 'including exclusion' there is another form of combining inclusion and exclusion, which may be called *excluding inclusion*.

This form refers to structures that are not institutions of the society as such, but that constitute groups, social movements or organisations that position themselves as being in opposition to society. 'Excluding inclusion' always starts with disaffected people who no longer feel bound by many of the rules of their societies. To these disaffected people inclusion offers are made by oppositional groups and movement organisations (one could also call them deviant groups) (Pitts, 1976a, 1976b). Once included into them, there is often no way out of these groups and back into society. And it is from this state of irreversible exclusion from society that strong asymmetrical dependencies can arise. Examples include religious dissidents in late medieval or early modern Europe and some religious sects in contemporary society, the peasants in the German "peasants wars," the "social bandits" of Eric Hobsbawm (Hobsbawm, 1981), the

members of extreme and marginal political parties, terrorists and many others. In the oppositional groups, strong hierarchies and asymmetries exist from the outset or soon arise. Exit is no longer an option, and other strict forms of control are added. This is why the groups of excluding inclusion soon become total institutions from which it is difficult to escape once you have become a member. Combining the sociology of including exclusion and of excluding inclusion offers a significant potential for analysing the rise and persistence of strong asymmetrical dependencies in pre-modern and modern societies.

10

What distinguishes excluding inclusion from including exclusion is that in the case of including exclusion we are dealing with institutions of strong asymmetrical dependency that find their place at the centre of the respective societies. In the case of excluding inclusion, we are dealing with groups and movement organisations that are oppositional to society and the polity. They negate core norms and values of the societies they arise in – and the strong asymmetrical dependencies they build are entirely internal to the groups/movements and are mostly illegal/illegitimate in the wider societies and polities.

There is a clear difference in legitimacy between ‘including exclusion’ and ‘excluding inclusion’. The first institutional type seems to be favoured by pre-modern societies that are hierarchical at their core. For them, slavery and other institutions of including exclusion add further hierarchies that are congruent with the entire organisation of society and therefore have a high legitimacy. It is entirely different in modernity. Modernity abhors hierarchy and so the hierarchies of excluding inclusion are built by and for people who haven’t found their place in the non-hierarchical structures. The oppositional organisations in which these people find their home defy societal norms and accept the illegitimacy attributed to them. For them, everything revolves around their will to opposition.

7. Ambivalence, paradox, contradiction in strong asymmetrical dependencies

Another important aspect of strong asymmetrical dependencies is that persons who are included in institutions of including exclusion may be perceived as objects of sociological ambivalence (Merton, 1976) from the societal point of view. They are denied constitutive dimensions of societal belongingness. These denials form the basis of the forms of inclusion imposed on them. Inclusion is here an imposition, not a choice, and it is accompanied by a whole range of control strategies, thus creating strong asymmetrical dependency. But these inclusions also confer societal functions and relevancies, and persons who may have been dishonoured in extreme forms may also acquire an importance and value based on the fulfilment of functions expected of them; this acquired value contrasts with the key characteristics of slavery, such as natal alienation, dishonour and totalitarian control (Patterson, 1982/2018).

11

The dependent persons are of value, often of significant economic value, and in many cases they have skills that are otherwise not available in the respective society. This imbalance between the extreme dishonouring of persons living in situations of including exclusion and of the positive valuation attributed to them constitutes the core ambivalence of strong asymmetrical dependencies. This positive valuation that is more implied than articulated is dictated by a realistic perception of why these human individuals, who sometimes are not even considered to be persons, are needed in the midst of the same societies that dishonour them.

8. Social differentiation and strong asymmetrical dependencies

The most general theoretical perspective on strong asymmetrical dependencies and their societal embeddedness is probably to be found in the theory of social differentiation. This theory can be interpreted as integrating the analytical perspectives previously

discussed in this text – and it adds further perspectives. First, there is the question of the relationship between strong asymmetrical dependencies and societal complexity. It is plausible that a certain level of societal complexity is needed to find a place for the institutions of strong asymmetrical dependency. Therefore, in societies with a very low level of institutional differentiation, slavery and other strong asymmetrical dependencies are unlikely to exist. The social structure simply finds no place for the paradoxical forms of including exclusion.

Strong asymmetrical dependencies are most likely to emerge in societies that have both internal and external inequalities (i.e. inequalities in relation to other societies in their vicinity). Using data from G. P. Murdock's *Ethnographic Atlas* (Murdock, 1967), Jack Goody has attempted to quantify the correlation between the type of society and the existence of slavery. He reports the following results on the incidence of slavery (Goody, 1980) 24):

12	Hunting and gathering societies	3%
	Incipient agriculture	17%
	Fishing societies	34%
	Advanced agriculture	43%
	Pastoral societies	73%

Goody argues that the relatively rare hunter-gatherer societies with slavery are most common in the American Northwest. These societies are comparatively rich in resources (e.g. salmon) and are on this basis able to control other societies from which they take slaves.

In more complex societies there arise “status gaps” (Rinder, 1958). That is, a complex order of societal statuses emerges. The more complex it becomes, the more likely it is that a society will not be able to fill all statuses with its own members. Then external solutions become probable. One can look for strangers to whom one grants privileges, or one can make use of persons who can be controlled through strong asymmetrical dependencies (*L'Étranger, Part 1-2 (Recueils de la société Jean Bodin, Vol. 9-10)*, 1958). The difference

between internal and external solutions is fundamental for the creation of strong asymmetrical dependencies. Patterson describes it via the distinction of intrusion and extrusion. In the case of intrusion, humans from foreign societies are enslaved and thus incorporated into an institution of including exclusion. In the case of extrusion, persons from one's own society are involved, and thus strong reasons have to be found to bring about the enormous status degradation that at the beginning is necessary to force them into a strong asymmetrical dependency. In both cases, intrusion and extrusion, inequalities within societies and inequalities relating to relations between societies (here they should be called asymmetries) are necessary in order to find the socio-structural spaces from which humans can be taken and into which they can be placed.

There is another point to be made about inequalities. As soon as inequality becomes stratification, i.e. as soon as there are large corporate structures of strata into which one is born and to which one belongs for one's whole life, the institutions of strong asymmetrical dependency rarely or never – there is obviously a need for further research here – form a stratum of their own. Dependents in strong asymmetrical dependencies are mostly part of households in one of the strata, and this makes a stratum or a caste of dependents unlikely. Patterson even claims that in none of the societies that have both castes and slaves does the slave population constitute a separate caste or outcaste (Patterson, 1982/2018), 50), but there may be exceptions for manumitted slaves and for groups of maroons.

13

A final point is that once strong asymmetrical dependencies are embedded into social structures, ongoing processes of social differentiation are slowed down. Strong asymmetrical dependencies have a fossilizing effect on macro-societal features. They are coupled to extremely powerful positions for individuals and families who are on the controlling side in the strong asymmetrical dependencies (e.g. planter households in the antebellum South or households of the Russian nobility before World War I). New social practices and new manual skills are often institutionalised as additional tasks for the dependent persons who never achieve a sufficient level of specialised competence. The very fast processes of professional and occupational differentiation and specialisation that are a central feature of nineteenth- to twenty-first-century modernity often do not occur in regions and states shaped by strong asymmetrical dependencies. Slavery societies are often perceived as backward societies (Goodwin,

2009). A good example of this are Islamic countries in which marriage relations between men and women function as strong asymmetrical dependencies. These countries pay for this degrading of women with low occupational differentiation and low per capita income (Goldin & Katz, 2008) (pp. 16-18).

9. Modernity, functional differentiation and asymmetry

From the perspective of strong asymmetrical dependencies, there is a clear boundary between pre-modern societies and global modernity, insofar as modernity is a social order that is no longer compatible with dependency values but is based on non-hierarchical structures of functional differentiation and value preferences for equality and freedom. Human individuals are seen as autonomous, and in terms of governance structures in states and organisations, self-organized forms of democracy have become a normative expectation in many regions of world society, even though democracy is an improbable and fragile order that is constantly under attack from power holders, ideologues, kleptocrats, populists and all those who believe that current decision-making processes are biased against them. Therefore, the non-hierarchical character of modern society cannot be guaranteed by democracy as the preferred political form. Instead its primary societal basis is functional differentiation itself as a symmetrical societal order, which is much more stable than any specific structure in any of the individual function systems. It is relatively probable that deviant orders will succeed in any function system of world society (and the breakdown of democracies or the failure of markets are good examples), but it seems highly improbable that alternatives to functional differentiation can be established anywhere in world society, and it is this improbability that is at the root of the ultrastability of modernity.

What does this mean for the reality and probability of strong asymmetrical dependencies in the modern world? An answer will be found by looking once more at prominent cases of 'including exclusion' and 'excluding inclusion' in modern world society.

I will start with ‘including exclusion’. Processes begin on the exclusion side. There are deficiencies and deviances that are attributed to persons, and these deficiencies and deviances are used as reasons for excluding these persons from the complexity of life in a modern functionally differentiated society. Persons for whom this is the case have to switch or are transferred to a relatively specific, functionally limited inclusion context, which functions for some time as a near-total environment or near-total institution.

Form of deficiency legitimising exclusion	Organisation for including the person
Deviance, criminality	Prison
Illness	Hospital
Lack of income and property	Labour administration
Lack of knowledge and education	School and university
Political dissent, cultural difference	Re-education camps
Infirmity in old age	Care
Commercialization of sexuality	Programs for rehabilitation and exit

15

In these near-total institutions, asymmetrical dependencies or even strong asymmetrical dependencies can arise, as can even be the case in schools and universities. It was no coincidence that Thorstein Veblen called some of the American undergraduate universities “penal settlements” (Veblen, 1918)¹. But these asymmetrical dependencies – and this is the core difference with “pre-modern” institutions – are *benevolent asymmetrical dependencies*. Their function is to bring about a significant improvement in the situation of persons included into them. The hospital claims to cure the sick, schools and universities provide relatively young people with knowledge and education, employment agencies provide people without income with a new job, care institutions should offer old people a life context of reduced complexity and decent living conditions, rehabilitation programs claim

¹ „... for the adequate control of immature and reluctant students. ... Such a system of authoritative control, standardization, gradation, accountancy, classification, credits and penalties ... the school takes on the character of a house of correction or a penal settlement; in which the irresponsible inmates are to be held to a round of distasteful tasks.” (Veblen, 1918)(Ch. VIII, I).

to help workers and prostitutes (Haas, 2025). But there are ambivalences and failures in the institutions of including exclusion. Rehabilitation programs for sex workers are a case of structural ambivalence as they arise in a society that induces expectations of sexual adventure and fulfilment that probably need a complementary market of commercial offers.² Two obvious failures of modernity are the prison and the camp. The Enlightenment version of the prison is based on benevolent intentions called “resocialization”. But in the lived experience of prisons this often does not take place. Instead strong asymmetrical dependencies arise that lack benevolence, and sometimes (in the USA after 1865) prisons are explicitly understood as substitutes for slavery (written as the 13th amendment into the constitution of the United States, 13.01.1865). And the labour and re-education camps that emerge after the breakdown of democracies destroy people and dishonour them. They even lack the positive valuation of dependents that is often characteristic of slavery. In contemporary World Society there exists in the case of North Korea a totalitarian state that is based on the strange combination of potentially universal male inclusion into unpaid enforced labour in camps, military service and workers brigades with informal markets where the modern slaves and especially their wives exchange the basic necessities of life they either produce in their households or alternatively transport over the long border with China (United Nations, 2024)(pp. 16-40)(Fifield, 2019).

The other side is excluding inclusion. As global modernity is only a loosely coupled social system, there are greater spaces for deviant and illegal institutions. There are many persons who are marginal in their regional societies, and who, unlike Robert Ezra Parks’ “marginal men” (Park, 1928), do not have a second membership. For them, a second and new context of inclusion is offered by deviant organisations based on disrespect for ‘official’ norms and values. There are many such deviant organisations: organisations involved in the global transfer of labourers, whom they often force into indebtedness; networks and organisations of sex slavery, transferring female migrants from far distant countries that are forced to become prostitutes (Haas, 2025; Patterson & Zhuo, 2018); local and global gangs active in drug trafficking and other illegal activities; religious sects; terrorist groups; radical parties seeking to overthrow political power; ships that exploit

² In Mertonian terms this is a case of anomie. Societal values and norms establish expectations that can’t be realistically fulfilled (Merton, 1949).

the possibilities of total control provided by the ocean as a stateless space. All these organisations start with offers of inclusion (to the marginalised and poor) and create escalating exclusion from other social systems (there are always mechanisms to prevent exit from the organisation). And using this structure of excluding inclusion, they build strong asymmetrical dependencies that subordinate the marginalised they claim to help. In this way, they point to a core aspect of strong asymmetrical dependencies in modernity. In contrast to pre-modern societies, strong asymmetrical dependencies are no longer a constitutive and legitimate part of a hierarchical world. Instead, they are oppositional structures. At the global level and in regional social structures, however, there are insufficient control capacities to combat them effectively. It is the liberality, complexity and looseness of the global order that gives rise to oppositional structures and thus to new strong asymmetrical dependencies.

Biography

Rudolf Stichweh is a senior professor of sociology and the director of the department for democracy research at the 'Forum Internationale Wissenschaft' of the University of Bonn. He is a permanent visiting professor at the faculty of cultural and social sciences at the University of Lucerne, Switzerland, and a senior research fellow of the Lise Meitner Research Group 'China in the Global System of Science' at the Max-Planck-Institute for the History of Science. Furthermore, he is a member of the North-Rhine Westphalian Academy of Sciences and the Arts, Düsseldorf, and of the Leopoldina, National Academy of Sciences, Halle.

Stichweh's primary research fields are the theory of world society, the history and theory of science and the universities, the comparative sociology of democratic and authoritarian political systems, and the theory of sociocultural evolution as an instrument for understanding the history of human social systems. Book publications he prepares are the "Theory of World Society" on which he works since the mid-nineties, a 'Luhmann-Lexicon' that will be published in 2027 on the occasion of Luhmann's hundredth birthday and a monograph on the sociology and history of the United States of America as a democracy. Finally, he prepares two collections of his articles on "Science, University, Professions" (Vol. 2) and "Functional Differentiation of Society".

rstichweh@yahoo.de

Biographische Anmerkungen

Rudolf Stichweh ist Seniorprofessor für Soziologie und Direktor der Abteilung für Demokratieforschung am Forum Internationale Wissenschaft der Universität Bonn. Er ist ständiger Gastprofessor der Kultur- und Sozialwissenschaftlichen Fakultät der Universität Luzern und ein Senior Research Fellow der Lise Meitner Research Group 'China in the Global System of Science' am Max-Planck-Institut für Wissenschaftsgeschichte, Berlin. Er ist außerdem Mitglied der Nordrhein-Westfälischen Akademie der Wissenschaften und der

Künste, Düsseldorf, und der Leopoldina, Nationale Akademie der Wissenschaften, Halle.

Stichweh arbeitet zur Theorie der Weltgesellschaft, zur Theorie und Geschichte der Wissenschaft und der Universitäten, zur vergleichenden Soziologie demokratischer und autoritärer politischer Systeme und der soziokulturellen Evolution und Geschichte menschlicher Gesellschaften. Buchveröffentlichungen, die er vorbereitet, sind die „Theorie der Weltgesellschaft“, an der er seit Mitte der neunziger Jahre arbeitet; ein „Luhmann-Lexikon“, das 2027 im Jahr von Luhmanns 100. Geburtstag bei UTB erscheint, und ein Buch zur Struktur- und Verfassungsgeschichte der amerikanischen Republik von 1776 bis heute. In Vorbereitung sind auch Sammelbände seiner Arbeiten über „Wissenschaft, Universität, Professionen“ (Vol. 2) und „Functional Differentiation of Society“.

rstichweh@yahoo.de

Bibliography

- Austen, Jane. (1811). *Sense and Sensibility*. Whitehall: T. Egerton.
- Boehm, Christopher. (1999). *Hierarchy in the Forest. The Evolution of Egalitarian Behavior*. Cambridge, Mass./London: Harvard. U.P.
- Boehm, Christopher. (2012). Ancestral Hierarchy and Conflict. *Science*, 336, 844-847.
- Coleman, James S. (1990). *Foundations of Social Theory*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Davis, David Brion. (1966). *The Problem of Slavery in Western Culture*. New York/Oxford: Oxford U.P.
- Dumont, Louis. (1980). *Homo Hierarchicus. The Caste System and Its Implications*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Emerson, Richard M. (1962). Power-dependence relations. *American Sociological Review*, 27, 31-41.
- Fifield, Anna. (2019). *The Great Successor. The Divinely Perfect Destiny of Brilliant Comrade Kim Jong Un*. New York: Public Affairs.
- Foster, George M. (1965). Peasant Society and the Image of Limited Good. *American Anthropologist*, 67, 293-315.
- Goffman, Erving. (1961). *Asylums: Essays on the Social Situation of Mental Patients and Other Inmates*. New York: Doubleday.
- Goldin, Claudia, & Katz, Lawrence F. (2008). *The Race between Education and Technology*. Cambridge, Mass./ London: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Goodwin, Doris Kearns. (2009). *Team of Rivals: The Political Genius of Abraham Lincoln*. London: Penguin.
- Goody, Jack. (1980). Slavery in Time and Space. In James L. Watson (Ed.), *Asian & African Systems of Slavery* (pp. 16-42). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Haas, Barbara. (2025). *Asymmetrische Abhängigkeit, Exkludierende Inklusion, Skalenfreie Netzwerke. Theoretische Ressourcen zur Erklärung moderner Sklaverei, sexueller Knechtschaft und des Menschenhandels in der Weltgesellschaft*. Forum Internationale Wissenschaft, Universität Bonn, Working Paper No. 22.
- Heintz, Bettina, & Leisering, Britta (Eds.). (2015). *Menschenrechte in der Weltgesellschaft. Deutungswandel und Wirkungsweise eines globalen Leitwerts*. Frankfurt/New York: Campus.
- Hirschman, Albert O. (1970). *Exit, Voice and Loyalty. Responses to Decline in Firms, Organizations, and States*. Cambridge/Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Hobsbawm, Eric. (1981). *Bandits*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson.

- Kopytoff, Igor, & Miers, Suzanne. (1977). African 'Slavery' as an Institution of Marginality. In Suzanne Miers & Igor Kopytoff (Eds.), *Slavery in Africa. Historical and Anthropological Perspectives* (pp. 3-81). Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press.
- L'Étranger, Part 1-2 (*Recueils de la société Jean Bodin, Vol. 9-10*). (1958). Bruxelles.
- Luhmann, Niklas. (1978). Erleben und Handeln. In *Soziologische Aufklärung 3* (pp. 67-80). Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag 1980.
- Mauss, Marcel. (2007/1925). *Essai sur le don. Forme et raison de l'échange dans les sociétés archaïques*. Paris: Presses universitaires de France.
- Merton, Robert King. (1949). Social Structure and Anomie. In Robert King Merton (Ed.), *Social Theory and Social Structure* (pp. 185-214). New York: Free Press 1968.
- Merton, Robert King. (1976). *Sociological Ambivalence and Other Essays*. New York: Free Press.
- Meyer, John W. (2010). World Society, Institutional Theories, and the Actor. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 36, 1-20.
- Murdock, George P. (1967). *Ethnographic Atlas*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Park, Robert Ezra. (1928). Human Migration and the Marginal Man. In Robert Ezra Park (Ed.), *Race and Culture* (pp. 345-356). New York: Free Press 1964.
- Park, Robert Ezra. (1964). *Race and Culture. Essays in the sociology of contemporary man*. New York: Free Press.
- Patterson, Orlando. (1982/2018). *Slavery and Social Death. A Comparative Study (With a new preface)*. Cambridge, Mass. and London: Harvard University Press.
- Patterson, Orlando, & Zhuo, Xiaolin. (2018). Modern Trafficking, Slavery, and Other Forms of Servitude. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 44, 407-439.
- Pitts, Jesse R. (1976a). The Hippie Movement as a Socialization Agency. In Jan J. Loubser (Ed.), *Explorations in General Theory in Social Science. Essays in Honor of Talcott Parsons* (Vol. 1, pp. 377-390). New York: Free Press.
- Pitts, Jesse R. (1976b). The Millenarian Movement Organization as a Socialization Agency. In Jan J. Loubser (Ed.), *Explorations in General Theory in Social Science. Essays in Honor of Talcott Parsons* (Vol. 1, pp. 367-376). New York: Free Press.
- Rinder, Irwin D. (1958). Strangers in the land: social relations in the status gap. *Social Problems*, 6, 253-260.

- Stichweh, Rudolf. (2010). *Der Fremde. Studien zu Soziologie und Sozialgeschichte*. Berlin: Suhrkamp.
- Stichweh, Rudolf. (2016). *Inklusion und Exklusion. Studien zur Gesellschaftstheorie (2. erweiterte Auflage)*. Bielefeld: Transcript
- Stichweh, Rudolf. (2022a). How Do Divided Societies Come About? In Helmut K. Anheier (Ed.), *The Future of the Liberal Order. The Key Questions* (pp. 86-99). London/New York: Routledge.
- Stichweh, Rudolf. (2022b). Values, Norms, and Institutions in the Study of Slavery and Other Forms of Asymmetrical Dependency. *Dependent*, 3(5), 4-8.
- United Nations, Human Rights Office of the High Commissioner. (2024). *Forced labour by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea* (<https://seoul.ohchr.org/en/node/572>).
- Veblen, Thorstein B. (1918). *The Higher Learning in America: A Memorandum on the Conduct of Universities by Business Men*. New York: Augustus M. Kelley.
- Winnebeck, Julia, Sutter, Ove, Hermann, Adrian, Antweiler, Christian, & Conermann, Stephan. (2023). The Analytical Concept of Asymmetrical Dependency. *Journal of Global Slavery*, 8, 1-59.

FIW Working Paper

Stichweh, Rudolf (2015): Zum Forschungsprogramm des Forum Internationale Wissenschaft der Universität Bonn.
FIW Working Paper No. 1, Bonn. ISBN 978-3-946306-00-9.

Kaldewey, David/ Russ, Daniela/ Schubert, Julia (2015): Following the Problems. Das Programm der Nachwuchsforschergruppe „Entdeckung, Erforschung und Bearbeitung gesellschaftlicher Großprobleme“.
FIW Working Paper No. 2, Bonn. ISBN 978-3-946306-01-6.

Stichweh, Rudolf (2016): Politische Demokratie und die funktionale Differenzierung der Gesellschaft. Zur Logik der Moderne.
FIW Working Paper No. 3, Bonn. ISBN: 978-3-946306-02-3.

Moser, Evelyn (2016): The Logic of the Soviet Organisational Society. Political Control, the Soviet Village, and World Society.
FIW Working Paper No. 4, Bonn. ISBN: 978-3-946306-03-0.

23

Goeke, Pascal /Moser, Evelyn (2016): Market, Ordner and Noise. Two Contributions to a Comprehensive Understanding of Modern Markets.
FIW Working Paper No. 5, Bonn. ISBN: 978-3-946306-04-7.

Krichewsky, Damien (2017): CSR Public Policies in India's Democracy Ambiguities in the Political Regulation of Corporate Conduct.
FIW Working Paper No. 6, Bonn. ISBN: 978-3-946306-05-4.

Hamann, Julian (2017): The making of the 'Geisteswissenschaften'. A Case of Boundary Work?
FIW Working Paper No. 7, Bonn. ISBN: 978-3-946306-06-1.

Chumtong, Jason / Kaldewey, David (2017): Beyond the Google Ngram Viewer. Bibliographic Databases and Journal Archives as Tools for the Quantitative Analysis of Scientific and Meta-Scientific Concepts.

FIW Working Paper No. 8, Bonn. ISBN: 978-3-946306-07-8.

Ahlers, Anna L./ Stichweh, Rudolf (2017): The Bipolarity of Democracy and Authoritarianism. Value Patterns, Inclusion Roles and Form on Internal Differentiation of Political Systems.

FIW Working Paper No. 9, Bonn. ISBN: 978-3-946306-07-8.

Ahlers, Anna L./ Åsnes Sagild, Rebekka (2019) Working for Harmony and Innovation? Political Inclusion of Diversified Elites via the Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference.

FIW Working Paper No. 10, Bonn. ISBN: 978-3-946306-09-02.

Eulberg, Rafaela/ Jacobsen, Annika/ Tillesen, Petra (2019): The Label of 'Religion': Migration and Ascriptions of Religious Identities in Contemporary Europe.

FIW Working Paper No. 11, Bonn. ISBN: 978-3-946306-10-8.

Maltese, Giovanni (2019): Towards a Poststructuralist Approach to Religion: A Response to "The Label of 'Religion': Migration and Ascriptions of Religious Identities in Contemporary Europe" and a Critique of 'Multiple Religious Identities'.

FIW Working Paper No. 12, Bonn. ISBN: 978-3-946306-12-2.

Kovac, Ariane (2020): Redeemed, Reborn, Forgiven: Local Processes of Forgiveness and Reconciliation in Post-Civil-War Evangelical Communities in Ayacucho, Peru.

FIW Working Paper No. 13, Bonn. ISBN: 978-3-946306-13-9

Stenzel, Julia (2021): Demagogie und Volkstribune: Beobachtungsverhältnisse in Praxen charismatischer Stellvertreterschaft.

FIW Working Paper No. 14, Bonn. ISBN: 978-3-946306-14-6

Priester; Stefan (2021): Plattformsoziologie.
FIW Working Paper No. 15, Bonn. ISBN: 978-3-946306-15-3.

Goeke, Pascal/ Moser; Evelyn (2021): Transformative Foundations.
FIW Working Paper No. 16, Bonn. ISBN: 978-3-946306-16-0.

Hendriks-Kim, Eric (2021): Adapting to an American World.
FIW Working Paper No. 17, Bonn. ISBN: 978-3-946306-17-7.

Bahrami, Ramin (2022): Stiftungen und der Faktor Partizipation.
FIW Working Paper No. 18, Bonn. ISBN: 978-3-946306-18-4

Morikawa, Takemitsu (2023): Autoritarismus und periphere Moderne.
Bemerkungen über die Verfassungskrise Japans.
FIW Working Paper No. 19, Bonn. ISBN: 978-3-946306-19-1

Berger, Pascal (2023): Paradigmen der Pandemiebekämpfung und
ihre Öffentlichkeit.
FIW Working Paper No.20, Bonn. ISBN: 978-3-946306-20-7

25

Stichweh, Rudolf (2025): Slavery and strong asymmetrical
dependencies. Escalating social controls and the dynamics of
exclusion and inclusion.
FIW Working Paper No.21, Bonn. ISBN 978-3-946306-21-4

Haas, Barbara (2025): Asymmetrische Abhängigkeit, Exkludierende
Inklusion, Skalenfreie Netzwerke. Theoretische Ressourcen Zur
Erklärung Moderner Sklaverei; Sexueller Knechtschaft und des
Menschenhandels in der Weltgesellschaft.
FIW Working Paper No. 22, Bonn. ISBN 978-3-946306-22-1