

ISA RCHS INTERIM CONFERENCE  
UMEÅ UNIVERSITY, SWEDEN, AUGUST 21-24, 2008



# Perspectives from the periphery

International Conference on the History of Sociology and the Social Sciences

ABSTRACTS

BY 080810

## PLENARY SESSIONS

### **KEYNOTE LECTURES.....9**

Raewyn Connell

*Periphery and Metropole in the History of Sociology.....9*

Eileen Yeo

*Central not Peripheral: Class and Gender in Social Science 1830-1930.....10*

Saïd A. Arjomand

*Provincializing the Metropolitan Theory: Can Concept  
Formation from the Periphery Redeem the Promise of Comparative Sociology? .....11*

Johan Heilbron

*Toward a transnational history of the social sciences.....12*

### **PLENARY BOOK SESSION.....13**

Jennifer Platt, Sanja Magdalenic and Neil McLaughlin

*The British Sociological Association: A Sociological History.....13*

PARALLEL SESSIONS  
(IN ALPHABETICAL ORDER)

**ALTERNATIVE HISTORIES OF SOCIOLOGY ..... 15**

Zohreh Bayatrizi

*Early Modern Statistics and the Emergence of the Sociological Imagination (1662-1897). .... 16*

Thomas Kemple

*Toward a Genealogy of Bio-sociality: Freud and Spencer on the 'Propping' of Nature onto Culture..... 18*

Frans Lundgren

*A new medium for reform? The pedagogical and political rationale of social museums around 1900 ..... 19*

Marianne Winther Jørgensen

*The terms of debate: The negotiation of legitimacy of a marginalized perspective..... 20*

**COMING TO TERMS WITH THE RED PAST:  
SOCIOLOGY AND COMMUNISM I AND II..... 21**

Joanna Bielecka-Prus

*Social Roles of Sociologists in Poland after 1945 ..... 22*

Christian Fleck

*For a sociological history of sociology: Criticisms, methodological and substantial remarks ..... 23*

Andreas Hess

*Liquid Memory: The Discussion of Zygmunt Bauman's Stalinist Past in the Light of Collective Memory Approaches..... 24*

Jarosław Kiliński

*The local and the universal in Polish sociological textbooks of the Communist period ..... 25*

Katerina Mishuris	
<i>Polling the Public Mind under Late Soviet Socialism, 1960-1967</i> .....	26
Markus Schweiger	
<i>The Relationship between social engineering and social sciences: Collaboration or Criticism?</i> .....	27
Adrian Scribano	
<i>Sociology and Epistemology in Studies on Social Movements in Latin America</i> .....	28
Markéta Škodová	
<i>Czech and Slovak citizens' reflections on the year 1968. The history and topics of the Public Opinion Research Institute of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences (1967-1972)</i> .....	31
<b>CONCEPTS</b> .....	<b>32</b>
Åsa Andersson	
<i>Disengagement or successful aging? Reflections on two Concepts in 20th Century's Sociological Gerontology</i> .....	33
Carl-Göran Heidegren	
<i>The introduction of the concepts of Lebensführung and Lebensstil into sociology</i> .....	34
Andreas Langenohl	
<i>Two Idioms of Reflexivity in Sociology: The Construction of the Impact of Poststructuralism on Social Thought</i> .....	35
Akin Olutayo	
<i>Social Constructionism in the creation of the periphery in Africa</i> .....	37

## **GENDER AND THE HISTORY OF SOCIOLOGY .....38**

Ronny Ambjörnsson

*Equal but separate: Ellen Key, early social science, and the idea about a female labour market ..... 39*

Barbara Reiterer

*Women Sociologists from Foreign Lands: Female Intellectual Migration from Austria and Germany to Minnesota 1900-1950..... 41*

Sanja Magdalenic

*The reception of Harriet Martineau's work in Sweden ..... 42*

## **GEOPOLITICS AND TRANSNATIONALISM.....43**

Calin Cotoi

*Geopolitization of Sociology. The Romanian Interwar Case..... 44*

João Marcelo Ehlert Maia

*Brazil, Russia, America: social thought in large territories ..... 46*

Rolf Hugoson and Olle Stjernström

*The Quality of Geopolitical Knowledge in 20<sup>th</sup> Century Sweden: Scholars vs Practitioners ..... 47*

Hae-Yung Song

*Against Methodological Nationalism in Sociological Analysis: What Can be Learned from the Racialisation of Labour Relations in Korea after the Financial Crisis ..... 48*

**IMPERIALISM AND INDIGENOUS KNOWLEDGE.....50**

Patricia Lorenzoni

*Where did the Savage Go?: Some Concerns in the Reading of J. G. Frazer's Understanding of Violence and Civilization..... 51*

Rhoderick V. Nuncio

*Filipino sociology and the indigenization of Philippine social sciences..... 53*

Ayokunle Olumuyiwa Omobowale

*An Elder's Character: An Analysis of Atari Ajanaku's Agbalagba and Agba Langba Poetic Expressions Using Akiwowo's Asuwada Theory of Sociation..... 54*

Nilay Ozok-Gundogan

*In Search of "Peripheral" Voices in the Ottoman History: Social History of Ottoman Kurdistan in the Nineteenth Century..... 55*

**NORDIC COUNTRIES: HISTORY OF SOCIOLOGY AND THE SOCIAL SCIENCES .....57**

Anna Larsson and Kirsti Suolinna

*Between ethnology and modern sociology: K. Rob. V. Wikman as a mediator in Finland and Sweden..... 58*

Carl Marklund

*From Exceptionalism to Normalweg..... 59*

Hans Petter Sand

*Periphery in the Political Sociology of Stein Rokkan ..... 61*

Fredrik W. Thue

*American Sociology as Academic Marshall Help? The Case of Norway in the 1950s..... 62*

## **POWER AND LOYALTIES IN SOCIOLOGY..... 63**

Juan José Navarro Fernando Quesada

*The debate on the external financing to the Latin-American Social Sciences: the scandal of the Project Camelot* ..... 64

Albert Tzeng

*Negotiating Western Sociology in East Asia and Challenges of Academic Globalisation Cases from Taiwan, Hong Kong and Singapore* ..... 65

Raf Vanderstraeten

*Changing Scientific Communication Structures: The Evolution of Scholarly Journal Publishing in Sociology* ..... 66

## **PUBLIC SOCIAL KNOWLEDGE ..... 67**

Niklas Eklund and Anna Larsson

*Teacher Education in Social Science in Sweden in Historical and Comparative Perspectives* ..... 68

Azat Zana Gundogan

*“We Were Like Fish in the Sea, but We Didn’t Know the Sea”: Remembering Eastern Demonstrations and the Peripheralized Kurdish ’68ers in Turkey* ..... 69

Karl Malmqvist

*Re-imagining the (post-) industrial periphery* ..... 71

Eleanor Townsley

*The public intellectual in the United States and beyond: margins and centres in intellectual life* ..... 73

**THE HISTORY OF EMPIRICAL SOCIAL RESEARCH AND STATISTICS ..... 74**

Marja Alastalo

*Social statistics in the EU: rationalities and technologies ..... 75*

Jonas Harvard

*Asking the ones who know: Qualitative polling in Sweden around 1900 ..... 76*

Raymond Lee

*Focus Groups: The Missing Years ..... 77*

Werner Reichmann

*The Quantification of Social Science Research Methods : A Comparative View on the 20<sup>th</sup> Century. .... 78*

**THE RISE OF EUROPEAN SOCIOLOGY..... 80**

Christina Kelly

*A Catholic Sociology for a Catholic Nation: The Institutionalization of Sociology in the Republic of Ireland ..... 81*

Marcel Stoetzler

*The ambivalent role of antisemitism in the formation of 'classical' sociological theory..... 82*

Antoni Sułek

*Le suicide in Poland. A case of receiving a classic by the semi-peripheral nation. .... 84*

Jan Surman

*Periphery goes to the centre: the reception of Austrian sociology in France before 1918..... 85*

**THE SOCIOLOGY OF OCTAVIO PAZ.....87**

Jorge Capetillo

*Octavio Paz and Georg Simmel* ..... 88

Eduardo González Di Pierro

*The Discussion Bartra-Paz: Two Different Perspectives on Sociology* ..... 89

Oliver Kozlarek

*The Sociology in the Work of Octavio Paz* ..... 90

**TRANSATLANTIC RECIPROCITY .....91**

Sven Eliaeson

*The Myrdals: Made in the USA?* ..... 92

Johan Goudsblom

*Dutch and American Sociology in the Mid-twentieth Century. A view from behind the one-way mirror* ..... 93

Suzie Guth

*Robert Park in the periphery of the German Empire and the problem of assimilation of the African American peasant* ..... 94

Yusef Semlali

*Some new details of the life of Pitirim A. Sorokin* ..... 95

## KEYNOTE LECTURE 1

**Raewyn Connell**

University of Sydney

### **Periphery and Metropole in the History of Sociology**

This address will explore the social mechanisms by which centre/periphery relations are accomplished, and sustained, in the history of sociology. Connell's starting-point is the account of colony/metropole relations in the production of knowledge in Hountondji's "Endogenous Knowledge" and her own "Southern Theory". She will explore concrete questions of career structure, publication systems, the financing of research, and networks among teachers and researchers, as the underpinning of metropolitan hegemony in intellectual paradigms and leadership reputations among sociologists. From this basis, she hopes to cast light on two problems. The first is the tension between cultural pluralism, indeed incommensurability, and metropolitan hegemony – revealed with particular clarity in the sociology of gender, in Bulbeck's "Re-Orienting Western Feminisms". The second is the question of historical changes in the form of metropolitan hegemony, over the 150 years of sociology's existence as an intellectual project – through the collapse of Comtean sociology, decolonization, neocolonialism, the formation of bodies such as UNESCO and the ISA, the creation of the Internet, and the rise of neoliberalism.

## KEYNOTE LECTURE 2

**Eileen Yeo**

University of Strathclyde

### **Central not Peripheral: Class and Gender in Social Science 1830-1930**

The paper will raise questions about class issues in the choice of subject for scientific analysis and about different class practices of social scientific work. It will then examine gender divisions of labour in the production of social knowledge, paying special attention to the work of social science couples at the turn of the 20th century where she will include her new research on Patrick and Anna Geddes. She will end by considering how canonical knowledge is created and who is excluded from the centre and on what grounds.

## KEYNOTE LECTURE 3

**Säid A. Arjomand**

State University of New York at Stony Brook

**Provincializing the Metropolitan Theory:  
Can Concept Formation from the Periphery  
Redeem the Promise of Comparative Sociology?**

The thesis put forward and defended is that a number of major concepts have emerged from the periphery in recent years which require reconsideration and at times drastic modification of some of the core concepts of metropolitan social theory. Some of these concepts emerge out of self-consciously distinctive approaches to theory such as subaltern studies, but they mostly come from the works of public intellectuals and social scientists dealing with social phenomena which have been significant in the recent history of the periphery but were marginal or unnoticed in the Western historical experience generalized into metropolitan social theory. These include revolution, the nation-state and civilizational perspectives on tradition, and on secularity and secularization. By forcing us to acknowledge unsuspected variety in developmental patterns in different civilizations and thus provincializing the metropolitan theory, the analysis should serve us as a reminder of Durkheim forgotten dictum to the effect that all sociology is comparative sociology.

## KEYNNOTE LECTURE 4

**Johan Heilbron**

Centre de sociologie européenne (CSE), Paris, and Erasmus University, Rotterdam

### **Toward a transnational history of the social sciences**

Historical accounts of the social sciences have too often accepted local or national institutions as a self-evident framework of analysis, instead of considering them as being embedded in transnational relations of various kinds. Evolving patterns of transnational mobility and exchange cut through the neat distinction between the local, the national and the international, and thus represent an essential component in the dynamics of the social sciences, as well as a fruitful perspective for rethinking their historical development. In this paper it is argued that a transnational history of the social sciences may be fruitfully understood on the basis of three general mechanisms, which have structured the transnational flows of people and ideas in decisive ways: a) the functioning of international scholarly institutions, b) the transnational mobility of scholars, and c) the politics of transnational exchange of non-academic institutions. Each one of these mechanisms will be briefly discussed.

## PLENARY BOOK SESSION

<b>Jennifer Platt</b>	<b>Sanja Magdalenić</b>	<b>Neil McLaughlin</b>
University of Sussex	Stockholm University	McMaster University

### **The British Sociological Association: A Sociological History**

The plenary book session will take the form of a conversation on the role of international and national organizations in the history of sociology, centred around Jennifer Platt's *The British Sociological Association: A Sociological History* (Durham: Sociologypress, 2003), with Sanja Magdalenić and Neil McLaughlin as discussants. The book is about the development of sociology in Britain told through the story of its learned society, the British Sociological Association. Learned societies have been neglected in the history of the discipline, though they are a vital part of the social structure of academic life. The BSA has had its internal dynamics, but it has also been affected by external factors relevant to wider academic life, which range from government policies to the rise of feminism. These have had an important effect on all the social sciences, but their impact upon sociology has been particularly marked.

# ALTERNATIVE HISTORIES OF SOCIOLOGY

CHAIR: ZOHREH BAYATRIZI

**Zohreh Bayatrizi**  
zohreh.bayatrizi@SMU.CA

**Early Modern Statistics and the Emergence of  
the Sociological Imagination (1662-1897).**

According to its canonized historical narrative, sociology's current day preoccupation with social problems originates in nineteenth century concerns over increasing crime rates, overpopulation, and urban poverty. The story of the birth of sociology is usually told as the morally uplifting tale of a handful of geniuses who invented theoretical frameworks for analyzing urban social and cultural problems caused by industrialization in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

In contrast, my paper seeks to unhinge the genealogical origins of sociology from its familiar place in the moral conscience of nineteenth century reformers and rebels, such as Karl Marx, Emile Durkheim, Auguste Comte, and Henri Saint-Simon. Instead, it locates the birth of the *sociological imagination* within the context of the security concerns of European states going back to the mid seventeenth century, when an intense public interest in managing life and how it is lived began to be formed and when statisticians (e.g., John Graunt) and statistical political economists (e.g., Sir William Petty), started to make a connection between security and prosperity, on the one hand, and the questions of mortality, fertility, marriage rates, and population gain or loss, on the other.

I will examine early modern vital and moral statistics, focusing in particular on works produced between the publication of John Graunt's *Observations on London Bills of Mortality* (1662) the first book in statistics, and Emile Durkheim's *Suicide* (1897), which played a decisive role in the struggle to establish sociology as an autonomous academic discipline. I will argue that statistical studies conducted within this time span contributed to the formation of the sociological imagination on three interrelated fronts: first, *it presented a deeply political understanding of life not as a personal destiny but as a public project*; secondly, *it contributed to the formation of the concept of risk as a category for the statistical*

*understanding of the aggregate dimensions of life; and, thirdly, it highlighted the public ramifications of the moral conduct of one's private life.*

This historical line of inquiry consists of primarily empirical and statistical studies in a broad area that later branched off into epidemiology, nosology, moral statistics, and, eventually, quantitative sociology. As such it contributed to the development of *methodological* techniques for establishing systematic, statistical correlations between the personal (e.g, fertility, marriage, divorce, suicide) and the social (e.g., urbanism). The *epistemological* achievements of these early scholars, however, are even more decisive and comprehensive: the work of later sociologists, both quantitative and qualitative, would not have been possible had these earlier statistical figures not made conceptual connections between the private and the public, the personal and the social.

**Thomas Kemple**  
kemple@interchange.ubc.ca

**Toward a Genealogy of Bio-sociality:  
Freud and Spencer on the 'Propping' of Nature onto Culture**

This paper takes a fresh look at Sigmund Freud's somatic conception of social life and Herbert Spencer's biological model of historical change in light of recent claims regarding the bio-medical constitution of subjectivity and power by social scientists, such as Nikolas Rose and Paul Rabinow. In particular, where Freud's *Civilization and its Discontents* (1931) represents the propping (*Anlehnung*) of culturally inflected drives onto the elements of bio-physical nature, Spencer's *The Principles of Sociology* (1884) projects an agonistic vision of development through natural selection onto the evolving social plane of human culture. In this way, each thinker articulates a distinctive 'bio-social' understanding of life which is distinct from -- and yet anticipates -- its therapeutic and medical appropriation by later generations of social and physical scientists.

**Frans Lundgren**  
frans.lundgren@idehist.uu.se

**A new medium for reform?**

**The pedagogical and political rationale of social museums around 1900**

This paper discusses the characteristics a new kind of institution of the late 19th century—the social museum, i.e. the many temporary and permanent exhibitions on issues such as health, social relations, living conditions and welfare institutions that were being organized in Europe who became known as “social exhibitions” or “social museums”. The phenomena can easily be identified with the general aim of the social sciences at the time, to promote social reform, but my interest here is to investigate the ways that this was supposed to be done through the actual audiences. I am arguing that a particular interest among organizers of social museums was to develop representations of everyday life and contemporary society that were capable of both attracting and reforming the visitors, i.e. to change their perception of themselves as citizens and members of society. The empirical examples in this paper includes well known exhibitions such as Patrick Geddes “Outlook tower” in Edinburgh, but also less familiar sites and events at this time.

**The terms of debate: The negotiation of legitimacy of a marginalized perspective**

A growing body of knowledge within the social sciences is produced from the perspectives of marginalized groups of people, and often, Western science is criticised for its complicity in a male-dominated and/or Eurocentric hegemony where alternative voices are excluded. This paper investigates the terms of debate of this kind of knowledge in the international scientific community: Who can partake, with which kind of commitment, in the discussion?

The empirical material analysed are the reviews of Linda Tuhiwai Smith's book *Decolonizing Methodologies. Research and Indigenous Peoples* (London: Zed 1999). Smith's book includes a lengthy and critical discussion of the history of Western science as an accomplice in Western imperialism and colonialism, and also in the reviews, this history is charted and condemned. The reviewers welcome a break with the past, and many of them stress the need to further develop a more inclusive and just practice of scientific knowledge production. The question of the analysis is how the reviews, understood as examples of one kind of scientific practice, themselves put this ambition to practice.

The analysis demonstrates that even if the reviewers welcome Smith's critique of Western science, many of them hesitate to fully entering the debate. The analysis also traces the use of two different social scientific paradigms in the reviews. On the one hand, a paradigm of cultural relativism is applied, drawing on a long tradition within the hermeneutically oriented parts of the social sciences of understanding cultural differences in terms of bounded cultural units. On the other hand, in the last decades of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, this approach was challenged by the post-modern critique, on which the reviewers also draw. The paper argues that these two paradigms are systematically but asymmetrically applied in the material, and that an unaddressed tension between them leaves the reviewers in an impasse. Consequently, the question of how Western science can be discussed in a globalised world remains: how is legitimacy distributed between different voices, how do we modulate our own voice – which are the terms of the debate?

COMING TO TERMS WITH THE RED PAST:  
SOCIOLOGY AND COMMUNISM  
I AND II

CHAIR: CHRISTIAN FLECK AND ANDREAS HESS

**Joanna Bielecka-Prus**  
prus@pronet.lublin.pl

### **Social Roles of Sociologists in Poland after 1945**

In the paper, social roles of Polish sociologists are discussed in the period between 1945 and 1989, i.e. until regaining sovereignty by Poland. Sociologists in Poland are assumed to have constituted a heterogeneous group, representing various attitudes towards the political system:

- attitude of active legitimation of the system;
- attitude of passive consent;
- attitude of an objective expert;
- critical attitude towards certain elements of the system;
- critical attitude towards the entire system;
- attitude of survival in the safe niches of research.

Depending on the adopted attitude, Polish sociologists defined their intellectual role differently in the public discourse. Their definitions changed, rather than remained fixed, as the sociopolitical conditions transformed. Basically, the following division into periods can be adopted: 1945-1947: struggle against the new order; 1948-1953: Stalinism; 1954- 1970: thaw and small stability; 1970-1980: propaganda of success; 1980-1989: from crisis to democracy.

The paper analyzes the roles adopted by sociologists in the periods specified above and their participation in social transformations in Poland after 1945. The following issues are also discussed: whether the actual practice of sociology was possible during that period, ways in which sociologists neutralized their participation in building the regime, and techniques of evasion and “legal criticism” of the system. The research material includes comments made by well-know sociologists in the press and book publications from that period, in which they specify their attitudes towards the following matters: the function of sociology and the tasks of a sociologists in a socialist country, and the position of sociology among other sciences and political doctrines.

**Christian Fleck**  
christian.fleck@uni-graz.at

**For a sociological history of sociology:  
Criticisms, methodological and substantial remarks**

Sociologists don't hesitate to make nearly everything becoming the subject of their investigation. Usually they transform the subject from something familiar to lay people into a sociological entity (e.g. 'crime' becomes 'innovation'). Sometimes ordinary folk react embarrassed vis-a-vis such distancing effects. Such Brechtian strategies are, however, seldom used when sociologists investigate their own tribe's past. Immediately they start to talk high brow about theories, paradigms, thought systems, influences ideas had, etc. This paper will challenge these old fashioned, idealistic approaches and offer an alternative: ordinary sociology of sociology, applying well know instruments of sociological analysis to sociology itself. In doing (trying to do) this one realizes quickly that sociologists protect themselves against becoming guinea pigs the same way other elite groups erect fences around them. Crucial steps in academic careers are seldom reported in autobiographies, elementary socio-demographic data aren't available, and theft, plagiarism or any other misdoing simply seems not to exist.

**Andreas Hess**  
a.hess@ucd.ie

**Liquid Memory: The Discussion of Zygmunt Bauman's  
Stalinist Past in the Light of Collective Memory Approaches**

The revelation of Zygmunt Bauman's Stalinist past has shocked the sociological community. However, the reaction to the revelations were of different intensity, quite passionate in Poland and German-speaking countries (Ger, A, CH) less strong in the UK and Ireland, and occasionally even defensive, as in the case of South Africa and in other pockets of Bauman fan communities around the world. When compared with the hotly debated topic of intellectuals and their relationship with NS and Fascism, the debate about intellectuals and Stalinism seems to follow a different logic. In my paper I will take a closer look at the Bauman debate and I will try to link the different reactions to the discussions about collective memory.

**Jarosław Kilias**  
kilias@chello.pl

**The local and the universal in Polish sociological  
textbooks of the Communist period**

The paper deals with the inclusion of local experience and ideas into the body of the Polish textbook sociology of the Communist period. Textbooks of that period appealed to both Western ‘bourgeois’ and Marxist tradition, and they combined these ‘universal’ ones with some domestic sociological ideas. The paper aims at describing ways, in which local concepts were included, without being clearly demarked from the ‘universal’ sociological heritage. It reveals why, contrary to some earlier Polish sociological traditions, the domestic experience was no longer seen as a corrective to it.

**Katerina Mishuris**  
mishuris@umich.edu

### **Polling the Public Mind under Late Soviet Socialism, 1960-1967**

The 1960's are usually associated with a period of revival and consequent expansion of empirical social research in the Soviet Union. The Twentieth Party Congress of 1956, which had repudiated the suppression of social sciences under Stalin and called for a redefinition of their role in communist construction, created a space for social scientists to radically reformulate their ideas of the social realm and the categories they had hitherto applied to it. New areas of sociological research (as varied as religion, criminology, youth, marriage and others) were being developed, yielding such innovative scientific techniques as surveys of public opinion and social statistics.

This paper examines a series of public opinion polls undertaken by the newly established Public Opinion Institute, which was operative from 1960 until its closure in 1967. Looking at the organization and design of social surveys and retracing their findings, first published in the popular youth newspaper *Komsomol'skaia Pravda*, the paper seeks to explore the ways by which knowledge about the 'typical' Soviet citizen was produced. What were the scientific models of social research available to the Soviet pollsters and what were the determining factors in their appropriative process? How did the interplay between the pollsters' theoretical assumptions and their amassing of empirical data affect the imaging of the 'ordinary' Soviet citizen? Attempting to answer these questions, this paper traces the coming about of scientific polling in Soviet society during the late 1950's and the 1960's as a novel technique of production and communication of knowledge about the Soviet self, and examines its intersection with the formation of Soviet sociology as a distinct scientific discipline of empirical research.

**Markus Schweiger**  
Markus.Schweiger@vaeb.at

**The Relationship between social engineering and social sciences:  
Collaboration or Criticism?**

Very early in his work Friedrich A. Hayek argued that one of the most important problems of a socialist economy is that central planning wouldn't be possible especially in advanced technological societies. He further argued that this kind of social engineering which would be necessary for such a central planning would lead societies straight forward into dictatorship. Anyhow a lot of intellectual, technological and financial energies were drawn to this experiment for over 70 years in the former socialist countries in Eastern Europe. An important role for this endeavor played the social sciences by delivering the intellectual foundations for it.

This paper thus addresses the following questions: (1) what are the main arguments of liberal and socialist scholars concerning the calculation and social engineering debate? (2) Which information is for a successful planning necessary and were the social sciences able to provide this information? (3) Can we find some evidence in an empirical example e.g. the 'Transformationsforschungsindustrie' of the former German Democratic Republic (GDR).

**Adrian Scribano**  
adrianscribano@gmail.com

### **Sociology and Epistemology in Studies on Social Movements in Latin America**

Social Movements and Protest are a central topic for Latin American Social Science. Since the 19th century, scientists and social thinkers have elaborated various approaches to understand the relationship between conflict, collective actions and social structure. From Martí, Ingenieros and Mariátegui, to Germani, Florestan Fernandez and González Casanova, the central issue was to make comprehensible the particularity of Latin American social forces. Also, from Development Theory to Marxist approaches, the central issue was social change. Theories of collective action became important to analyze social movement and protest in the early 80's<sup>2</sup>.

The epistemology of Social Science underwent a great transformation for the last three decades of the 20th Century. From the 70's to the 90's the "received view" was broken as the orthodox consensus of social science, and a more pluralist paradigm of the philosophy of social science emerged. The importance of the relationship of epistemology, sociology and history of science appears in this context.

The epistemological task is now understood, as an articulation among history, sociology and the philosophy of science. In this sense, the evaluation and analysis of social theory are complex activities that involve the reconstruction of the social and academic context in which they were elaborated.

The history of natural science developed in two main directions: to explain the internal factors of the construction of theory like a reconstruction of "moments of experiments" and to show how external features of scientific endeavor impact the process of exploring the validity of theories.

In the social science field the situation was and is very different. The philosophy of social science does not pay much attention to topics like internal or external constraints on social

research. Conversely, social theorists wrote about the influence of “historical and social context” on the production of theories. Foucault, Bhaskar, Bourdieu, Habermas, and others, despite their differences, showed how social structures determine social and scientific knowledge. In Latin American social sciences the situation is similar. We have good work from the history of ideas and intellectual history, but not very much research on social science to understand the impact of the time-space context on scientific explanations of society. The work of Latin American sociologists, anthropologists, and political scientists are deficient in the way that the histories of their own academic disciplines are related to concrete sociohistorical processes.

One example of this situation is in the studies of social movements or collective actions. Although South America has been wholly involved in social and economic changes since at least the 19th century, social scientists have not given an explanation of how scientific knowledge of protests and collective behavior was constructed. However, since the 80’s, many studies of social movements have been done, and the challenge now is to try to understand the connections between social conditions, theory production, and the paradigms used by social scientists.

Social phenomena such as the reconstitution of the labor movement in context of the neo-liberal policies produced a change within a specific profile about relations between state and working class. Social reality is present in our conceptual reading of social world. Social phenomena mark and involve some epistemic and methodological commitments, such as the decision to take class analysis into consideration in order to explain social conflict.

The delicate and multifaceted relation among the weight of social features and analytical approaches is a complex question and it is very ambitious for this paper to try to give a response. In any case, we can think about it, to attempt to show what kind of agenda we will have in the near future in this social scientific field.

This paper aims to show the changes of social scientific approaches to explain and understand social protest and movements in the Latin American scientific context. We pretend to point out the possibilities of getting lost in the logics of a reason geo-politically centered .

To achieve this goal I will make the following argument: First, I will summarize the social context of the different social movements and protest forms since the 60s. Second, I will present a synthesis of the theoretical perspectives on social protest and movements. Third, I will underline some epistemological and methodological issues of collective action studies. And finally I will explore the connection between historical context and the studies of collective action in Latin America today, in order to identify a current agenda for such studies.

An agenda that must be alert to absences, symptoms and messages written in the same Latin-American focus which does not pay attention to shrewdness of the academic reason, so as to not be dissolved in the look of the Other.

**Markéta Škodová**  
marketa.skodova@soc.cas.cz

**Czech and Slovak citizens' reflections on the year 1968.  
The history and topics of the Public Opinion Research Institute  
of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences (1967-1972)**

This contribution sums up results of opinion polls carried out by the Public Opinion Research Institute of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences in 1968. The respondents were expressing their opinions on whether the social changes that were taking place in the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic at that time would strengthen or weaken socialism or democracy. In the period from May to August 1968, researchers were surveying the public opinion on the leading role of the Communist Party, the degree of the freedom of speech, or ability of the dominant party to ensure development of socialism and democracy. The sheer possibility to carry out an opinion poll on such questions gave a signal that revolutionary changes were taking place in the social order of the country. Free choice of the topics and open publication of results in the media had been undreamed of until then.

The contribution also covers a relatively short history of the Institute. Even though it was born in a socio-political context which could not be marked as “democratic”, from the very beginning of its existence it established frequent contacts with, for example, Elisabeth Noell-Neumann or Hadley Cantril. Gallup's follower, Čeněk Adamec, the head of the Czechoslovak Public Opinion Research Institute in the post-war period 1946-1948, considerably contributed to the high professional level of the Public Opinion Research Institute of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences. The latter Institute carried out more or less free research of public opinion even for several months after the invasion into Czechoslovakia by the Warsaw Pact armies in August 1968. From 1969, the Institute had to focus on politically neutral topics under the pressure “from above”. Nevertheless, it was dissolved in 1972, in the so-called “normalisation” period.

# CONCEPTS

CHAIR: TBA

**Åsa Andersson**

aasa.andersson@idehist.umu.se

## **Disengagement or successful aging?**

### **Reflections on two Concepts in 20th Century's Sociological Gerontology**

The aim with this presentation is to describe some aspects of sociological influences on the gerontological research field, and discuss the reciprocity between sociological theories on aging and historical notions about activity and inactivity. The sociological commitment in gerontology began in the midst of the 20th century. It's not an exaggeration to state that the research field until then had been dominated by biologists and physicians, but in the 1950's and 1960's different disciplines from the social and behavioural sciences entered the scene and the research field on aging and old age grew. The field seems to have been vitalized by new theories and concepts, not the least from sociology and psychology. Although gerontology expanded, it wasn't at the centre of a larger scientific community. Research about aging appears to have been considered a peripheral task, both within the different disciplines and in the scientific community in general. This is in contrast to the increasing societal and political attention that was paid to aging and old age during the past century. The needs for social interventions and theoretical understandings have been, and still seem to be, urgent.

From a history of science perspective two theoretical courses within sociological gerontology are of particular interest, i.e. theories implicitly or explicitly associated with the concepts of *disengagement* and *successful aging*. In brief, the concept of disengagement associates aging with leaving the labor market and disengaging from social bonds - unlike this the concept of successful aging implies an aging process characterised by activity and health. A simplified image of the two opposed concepts would be that successful aging is about activity and that disengagement is about inactivity. Today the concept of disengagement partly appears to have lost its bonds to gerontology, while successful aging - although it has been debated and criticised - still is of current interest. In my presentation I will describe and discuss those concepts, the ideas and theories that underpin them, and their historical connections.

**Carl-Göran Heidegren**  
carl-goran.heidegren@soc.lu.se

### **The introduction of the concepts of *Lebensführung* and *Lebensstil* into sociology**

The concepts of *Lebensführung* and *Lebensstil* belongs to the sociological tradition. However, due to certain problems of translation the two concepts have in English language sociology more or less coalesced into one: *lifestyle*. The paper traces the introduction of the concept of *Lebensstil* in a sociological context back to Simmel's *Philosophie des Geldes* from 1900, and reconstructs Weber's use of the concepts of *Lebensführung* and *Lebensstil* in "Die protestantische Ethik und der Geist des Kapitalismus" from 1904-05 and in his later writings. Furthermore, some comparisons will be made with later uses of the two concepts, and with related concepts, in the sociological tradition. An underlying hypothesis is that it might prove valuable to uphold a distinction between the two concepts.

**Two Idioms of Reflexivity in Sociology:  
The Construction of the Impact of Poststructuralism on Social Thought**

Why has the category of “reflexivity” assumed such currency among sociologists in the 1990s and since? The proposed paper explores accounts of that phenomenon and relates them to each other, introducing the category of the “idiom” as an heuristic device.

The paper focuses on the use of reflexivity in sociological discourse insofar as it refers to the thematization of sociological research practices as a necessary precondition for sociological investigations (cf. for instance Bourdieu). The notion is usually conceived of as having been imported from debates in anthropology and critical literary studies in which, in the 1970s and 1980s, it indicated that anthropological accounts and literary criticism, and the representation of the “Other” in general, have to be subjected to at least the same scrutiny with which the research “object” is treated. This is mirrored by the fact that many uses of reflexivity in contemporary sociological debate refer to preceding debates in literary studies and especially anthropology. Proceeding from that observation, one might attribute the rise of reflexivity to a shift in structures of institutional legitimacy governing the discourse in the social sciences and humanities: in a post-scientific episteme, in which the claims of the sociology of (scientific) knowledge were applied to sociology itself, research could not be conducted anymore without problematizing the researcher’s positionality and practices. Due to this account, the impact of poststructuralism on sociological reasoning might be characterized as having caused a destabilization of epistemic positivism which, then, was reacted to by the import of the concept of reflexivity.

The proposed analysis, however, will go further, arguing that the use(s) of reflexivity in current sociology is/are characterized as *idiomatic* in three respects. First, they gain their plausibility from taken for granted discursive devices which are hardly ever forced into the open. Second, they produce a surplus meaning by virtue of the interlocking of their semantic components in certain use(s); the consequence being, third, that they co-constitute the

discursive field in which a given concept is deployed, thus contributing to the production of the thematic object of investigation. Seen from this angle, “reflexivity” appears not so much as a reaction to poststructuralism or postmodernism, but as a device which in certain uses helped to conceive of abstractions like “poststructuralism” and “postmodernism” in the first place. Reflexivity is not a “consequence” of postmodernism but makes the latter imaginable for sociology.

In an exemplary discourse-analysis the paper singles out two idioms of reflexivity currently in use in sociology which construct the “postmodern” impact on sociology quite differently. First, in qualitative methodology “reflexivity” is used to designate an investigative stance which reads poststructuralist approaches as *abandoning* any claim to objectivity. Consequently, progress in investigations is understood as ever-growing differentiation and contextualization of research results which do not lay claim to objectivity. Second and contrasting the first use, in social theory – especially as regards Bourdieu’s “scientific reflexivity” – reflexivity is used to outline a self-objectification of the researcher which is seen as a precondition to *arrive* at sociologically objective accounts of social reality. This use of reflexivity comes along with a massive distancing from “poststructuralism” and/or “postmodernism”.

**Akin Olutayo**  
lantopamtu@yahoo.com

### **Social Constructionism in the creation of the periphery in Africa**

Borrowing from other spheres of knowledge, social constructionism seems to have seeped into sociological thinking through micro-sociological theories. Unlike earlier classical and 'modern' sociological theories, micro-sociology tends to circumscribe analysis of human behavior to 'everyday sociology' and the social construction of experiential knowledge. Thus, human behavior is not perceived as being informed by a 'top-bottom' /society/individual but that in which individuals create and re-create their social situation. As such, rather than the colonial creation often adduced for the underdevelopment of Africa, the argument drops in the lap of Africans! What have they made of their independence?

The paper argues that the construction of the history of sociology, in its micro-sociological bent, has continued to perpetuate the peripheral status of Africa as it delimits the impact of received knowledge in the reconstructions of African societies. In other words, it is almost inconceivable to understand the cultural creations, or otherwise, without the impact of the 'global' requirements.

# GENDER AND THE HISTORY OF SOCIOLOGY

CHAIR: SANJA MAGDALENIĆ

**Ronny Ambjörnsson**  
ronny.ambjornsson@idehist.umu.se

**Equal but separate: Ellen Key, early social science,  
and the idea about a female labour market**

The industrialization of Swedish society is rather late, compared to most western societies. It is regarded by most historians to take place in the second half of the nineteenth century and the first decades of the next. I am interested of the new ideas that were developed in Europe and Sweden to understand the new structure of the family within the urban middleclass. In the more affluent section of the middleclass the traditional function which women had had in the preindustrial society had no substitute. The duties allotted to them were all directly or indirectly connected with women's reproductive function: to bear children, stimulate the man, supervise the care of children and the home. These duties are difficult to describe, being more of an indirect than of a direct and or formal nature; they all fell within the emotional sphere. During the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, repeated attempts were made to define the new role which was the lot of these women. What these theories have in common is that on the one hand they affirm woman's emotional characteristics, on the other emphasize her individuality. Woman is no longer subordinated to the man, but (according to the theory) is his equal, although as separate individual. Man's superiority over woman on the intellectual plane is balanced by woman's superiority on the emotional plane.

One Swedish writer is in the centre of my study, Ellen Key (1849-1926), known for her book *The Century of Childhood* (1900), translated to twelve languages. In French positivism (Comte) and English theory of evolution, especially in Herbert Spencer, Key found a solution which satisfied the requirement for a secularized morality at the time. According to this philosophy, the individual's aspirations must be judged after taking into consideration the effect these will have on the lives of future generations, since the life-styles chosen by the individual tend to be inherited. When choosing how to live, the individual must consider the future: each choice presents the individual with the task of formulating his (her) utopia. If women chose to go out and work under the same conditions as men, there was according to Spencer's evolution theory a risk that the woman-type might change, and become more

masculine. This would not be the case if there was a special labour market for women that could be defined.

Such a labour market - with low wages - was also developed in the last century in Sweden as in other countries. Ellen Key had a more visionary idea of a society, in which the female, caring characteristics could influence society and make a balance to the male. This vision was not a uncommon one, but Ellen Key gave it a “scientific” rationale, taken from Spencer and Comte, fathers of sociology.

**Barbara Reiterer**  
reite053@umn.edu

**Women Sociologists from Foreign Lands:  
Female Intellectual Migration from Austria and Germany to Minnesota 1900-1950.**

The migration of scholars, forced or otherwise, and its implications for the respective disciplines in the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century has been subject to historical analysis for many decades. Studies on “intellectual migration” between Europe and the United States also included social scientists, among them many sociologists. However, a big part of this research focused on prominent individuals, mostly male, who migrated to the important centers of social research at the time, e.g. Columbia University in New York.

This historiographic focus on big, famous places like Chicago or New York diverts the attention from also relevant, but less well known areas, for example Minnesota in the Midwestern part of the United States.

In this paper I investigate the migration of women, who we would now classify as sociologists, from Austria and Germany to an area which traditionally strongly attracted German speaking emigrants in the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. The institutional unit within which this analysis is placed is provided by the University of Minnesota and its institutions in sociology and social work. Gender and status as immigrants represent two categories of marginality; the combination potentially aggravated the individual’s situation in a professional context. By examining their work and placement in relation to academia I attempt to add one more piece to fill in the existing gap of historiography of women in sociology, specifically in the framework of intellectual migration.

**Sanja Magdalenic**  
sanja.magdalenic@sociology.su.se

### **The reception of Harriet Martineau's work in Sweden**

Over the past decades, the work of Harriet Martineau (1802-1876) has been recognized as an early attempt to develop theoretical and methodological principles of sociology. Less is known that in mid-19<sup>th</sup> century several of Martineaus' works were translated into Swedish. Drawing on letters, autobiographical material and secondary sources, the paper seeks to trace which of Martineaus publications were made available for the Swedish readers and who referred to Martineau and her work/ideas. The aim is to expand the existing knowledge about the dissemination of sociological ideas during the early period of the history of sociology. The findings are discussed in relation to the emergence of sociological thought in Sweden.

# GEOPOLITICS AND TRANSNATIONALISM

CHAIR: TBA

### **Geopolitization of Sociology. The Romanian Interwar Case**

One of the important figures involved in a ‘geopolitization’ of interwar Romanian sociology is Anton Golopenția, a member of the so-called Bucharest Sociology School but also a collaborator of Hans Freyer. The nation-building project of the so-called Bucharest Sociological School was to be ‘geopoliticized’ by Golopenția via Hans Freyer’s sociology.

The social sciences, born during the liberal XIXth century, have to undergo, in A. Golopenția’s view, great changes to adapt to the heavily administered XXth century. The essential goal of the renewed social sciences consists in informing the governments on the processes taking place in their own states and in the foreign states with which they have contacts (Golopenția 2002: 7). He, specifically, defined this new structure of social sciences as ‘geopolitical’.

The ‘proper’ German geopolitical discourse is quite rarely used in Golopenția’s geopolitics that favors the freyerian construction of a kind of “cameralistic” sociology in the service of the state. Anton Golopenția debated, in various guises, his own brand of geopolitical sociology with “dissidents” from the Bucharest Sociological School such as Dumitru Amzăr, with Durkheimians like Celestin Bouglé or with former students of Hans Freyer like Helmut Klocke.

To the Romanian sociologist, geopolitics will represent a new “science of reality” – in the sense Hans Freyer ascribed to this concept – that will concretize the new tendency in social sciences leaving the liberal formalist and autonomist period in order to put themselves, like rebred administrative, “cameralist” sciences, in the service of the state. In this way, Golopenția distanced himself from a part of geopolitics “classical” definitions that associates it especially to political geography.

As described and positioned by Anton Golopenția, geopolitics assumed a hegemonic tendency in the disciplinary field of social sciences, trying to realize a concentration of those sciences which refer to certain autonomous aspects of the state and society in a single perspective and assuming the construction of political myths.

The ‘proper’ German geopolitical discourse, especially that of the Haushofer school, is quite rarely used in Golopenția’s geopolitics, who favors Hans Freyer’s construction of sociology in the service of the state. The reference to the European (German) scientific “canon” is creative through a selective lecture and a transformation of the discourse recognized as “geopolitical” in the European scientific space. This adjustment, translation, can be framed, when successful, in the limits of the recognizable. We have, with Golopenția but also with the entire interwar Romanian “geopolitics”, an example of the complex and ambiguous relationship wrought between the “center” and the “periphery”, of the adjustment and transformation of western scientific languages in Romanian social sciences and of the perpetual double game between the modification of the discourses and the scientific instruments and the maintaining of the criteria through which they can be accepted and recognized by the “central” western canon.

**João Marcelo Ehlert Maia**  
jmehlert@gmail.com

### **Brazil, Russia, America: social thought in large territories**

In my PhD's research on Brazilian social thought during the First Republic (1889-1930), I was surprised by the existence of comparisons between Russia, Brazil and USA in classical essays by Brazilian thinkers, much of them based on geographical ideas. In fact, some authors that I have studied (such as Euclides da Cunha) seemed to treat these nations as forming a kind of peripheral map, which would be characterized by its distance from the European experience and its moral and historical background.

In this paper I briefly explore this strange map and suggest that there are, in fact, some interesting points of comparison if we focus our attention on a central issue: the central role performed by geographical imagination in these nations. In order to do so, I present the Brazilian intellectual context that I have studied in my PhD, focusing on the geographical themes presented in the works of Euclides da Cunha (1866-1909) and Vicente Licínio Cardoso (1889-1931), and analyze it by using some contemporary works concerning Russian and American experience. The aim of this method is to produce an empirical ground that allows some theoretical remarks about the nature of this peripheral imagination centered on spatial images such as "empty spaces", "frontiers" and "wilderness".

The purpose of the discussion presented is to highlight some connections and intellectual affinities that are not usually noticed, due to our tradition way of reflecting on civilizations (West x East, Orient x Occident, South-North etc). Finally, I suggest that we should work with a de-centered conception of global and intellectual history, and that this approach enables us to recognize distinct conceptions of modernity that were available in social thought between mid-nineteenth and the early twentieth century.

**Rolf Hugoson**                      **Olle Stjernström**  
rolf.hugoson@pol.umu.se      olle.stjernstrom@geography.umu.se

**The Quality of Geopolitical Knowledge in 20<sup>th</sup> Century Sweden:  
Scholars vs Practitioners**

It is safe to assume that each social science scholar know much about his or her political community, its regime, geography, history and culture. Not all such knowledge is academic, but rather stems from the political culture – an experience always somewhat marked by conflicts. Yet, there is typically a continuous exchange of knowledge between scholars and practitioners. Looking back on the 20th century – could we say something about the intellectual strong-points of practitioners as opposed to the accomplishments of the scholars?

In our presentation, we will answer this question through the study of a subject area which received much interest among experts of in international politics during the 19<sup>th</sup> century, namely geopolitics. The subject area of geopolitics has been chosen because of its interdisciplinary character. Our study thus includes scholars from political science, geography, law and history. As for the practitioners, we have studied politicians, diplomats and the military. Academic and political doctrines on geopolitics at two decisive moments have been compared: (1) the interwar period 1918-1939 and (2) the post-cold war period 1990-2005.

Swedish scholars and practitioners are focused. However, since the subject area is geopolitics, the experts on each side have been dependent upon intellectual achievements in other places, notably in the “great powers” and among the Scandinavian “neighbours”. The dominant intellectual regimes have of course changed drastically between the two periods studied. Interestingly, scholars and practitioners did not rely upon the same sources. Furthermore, our preliminary findings also indicate, that interchange among disciplines and between scholars and practitioners, improves the quality of the geopolitical doctrine.

**Hae-Yung Song**  
haeyoungsong@hotmail.com

**Against Methodological Nationalism in Sociological Analysis:  
What Can be Learned from the Racialisation of Labour Relations  
in Korea after the Financial Crisis**

This paper aims to address the inadequacy of nation-state centred concepts of society as a unit of analysis with reference to recent developments in Korea where labour relations are increasingly becoming complex, global and polarized. I argue that sociological analysis of labour relations and social peripherisation (gender, race, class) need to transcend conceptions of society that implicitly understand societies to be bounded, defined and enclosed by the nation-state.

Rapid industrialisation of Korea from the 1960s to the 1980s were characterised amongst others by an oppressive labour regime and a high level of labour intensity and long working hours. Korean labour relations in this period were based on large-scale immigration from the rural to the urban areas, the gendered division of labour relations and super-exploitation of female workers in the light and assembly manufacturing industry. However, these labour relations have been undergoing transformation in line with neo-liberal restructuring especially since the financial crisis in 1997-8. With changes in industrial and family structures, together with labour and democratisation movements, it has become increasingly difficult for capital operating in Korea to maintain the previous form of coercive labour control and gender discrimination. With a rising wage level in Korea, intensifying competition from newly industrialising countries in Asia and the dry-out of surplus population in the rural areas, capital in Korea has been seeking to invest abroad since the early 1990s, moving production sites to less developed parts of East Asia and China. At the same time, small and medium-sized firms that cannot afford to build factories abroad increasingly depend on labour immigrants from East Asia willing to bear bad working conditions and low wages. An outcome is the sectoral polarisation between Korean and non-Korean workers and an increase in disparities between core and contractual workers amongst Koreans, in terms of wage levels and employment security. While the demand for immigrant labour outside Korea poses a

policy problem to the government and society as a whole, it further complicates labour relations and makes a single-dimensional approach to gender and domestic labour relations problematic. In the face of these changes, this paper will assess how neo-liberal globalisation reorganises inter-Asian production relations as an integral part of the global economy, and how it brings about a new trajectory of labour relations domestically (demonstrated here using the case of Korea) by globalising domestic labour relations themselves and hierarchically organising labour not only in terms of gender but also in an inter-Asian racialised form.

By addressing new labor relations in the inter-Asian and global context, especially with reference to the case of Korea, which forms the classical examples of the developmental state paradigm, I hope to highlight that global dimensions of labor relations become a more and more compelling reality even for countries such as Korea (alongside Japan and Taiwan) that have been culturally homogenous and historically have had a strong legacy of statism and nationalism. In so doing, I wish to emphasise the inadequacy of nation-state bound concepts of society as have often been taken for granted as the framework of sociological analysis.

IMPERIALISM AND  
INDIGENOUS KNOWLEDGE

CHAIR: PER AXELSSON

**Patricia Lorenzoni**  
patricia.lorenzoni@globalstudies.gu.se

**Where did the Savage Go?:  
Some Concerns in the Reading of J. G. Frazer's  
Understanding of Violence and Civilization**

In an article from 2002 Alfred Hiatt discusses the white spots of Occidental cartography as produced on African maps by literary emptying the map during the second half of the 18th century, so as to then *re-fill* it during the classical age of imperial expansion in the 19th century. If the white spots are visualized where empire ends, they conceptually, as is Hiatt's emphasis, lie at its heart.

This paper presents a reading of British anthropologist James George Frazer's texts, working from a relation between outside and inside similar to that Hiatt points out in relation to cartography. Like cartography, early anthropology was a practice of mapping – trying to understand "man" in all places and in all aspects. Frazer was a late representative of this generation of armchair anthropologists, synthesizing great amounts of data into totalizing systems of human evolution. With the methodological breakthrough for modern fieldwork, Frazer was in the early 20th century dethroned as an authority within the social sciences, but increasingly read and influential among writers, poets, artist and intellectuals in general.

Although Frazer has become an almost caricatural representative for Eurocentric speculations within the history of anthropology, he has thanks to the shift in area of his direct influence, also escaped much of anthropology's own struggle with histories of imperial complicity. Most readings of Frazer are in the area of literature studies, and to a large extent dissociate him from the imperial context that offered the conditions for his work. Arguing the problematic character, both from an ethical and epistemological perspective, of these readings, I take departure in the spaces of early anthropological imagination where the outside and the inside coincides, just as in Hiatt's white spots. Through Frazer's emphasis on the savage nature of the origins of civilization, the savage that is mapped through anthropology constitute precisely such a place. This place should be read, not only from it's ambiguous position as both outside

civilisation and in its heart, but also from the geopolitical conditions for the anthropological production of knowledge. Savagery is in Frazer's writing associated with a violence that is understood as contradictory to that civilization which in his time nevertheless is spread through military expansion. Reading Frazer from the violence placed outside modern civilization but at the same time constitutive for it, raises not only questions about the specific case of Frazer and his relation to imperial expansion. It also raises questions on Occidental notions of society, modernity and civilization, with wider relevance for the reading of the classical texts of social science.

**Rhoderick V. Nuncio**  
nuncior@dlsu.edu.ph

### **Filipino sociology and the indigenization of Philippine social sciences**

"Filipino" in Filipino Sociology is an epistemic and a political designation which pronounces and announces a politics of difference. For some it is an essentialist, nationalist attempt in categorizing social, cultural and epistemological realities. Even in the age of globalization and postmodernity, self-assertion and self-determination (biography) must counter totalization. As there are German, French, American, British philosophies/ sociologies/ histories, why can't we have our own? French and American scholars, among others, are very much aware of the disciplinal/traditional variations/differences of their schools of thought in sociology. Unfortunately, Third World social scientists (sad to say) having made to think orientalistically, accepted as a totalized knowledge the undifferentiated, Westernized, logocentric "Social Sciences" in general and "Sociology" in particular. This paper lays down the premise for a sociology from below that is part and a continuation of the indigenization movement in Philippine social sciences. History, Anthropology, Psychology, Political Science and even Philosophy and the Humanities have been framed/contextualized in/on "Filipino" by Filipino scholars as far as disciplinal paradigms, theories and methodologies are concerned. Filipino sociology has two agenda: *teoretikang sosyolohiya* (theoretical sociology) and *sosyolohiya ng pagbubuo* (sociology of unity). The first agenda talks about the need to sociologically imagine, conceptualize and theorize in Filipino language and on Filipino social realities. The second agenda refers to on how sociology can be used for imagining and constructing the "nation". Scholars tend to conflate sociological imagination and social actions. Filipino sociology contends that imagination can become the endpoint of sociology. This paper will explore a standpoint and critical valuation of sociology as it crisscrosses from center to the periphery and vice versa, from Western hegemonic totalization to an indigenized, Filipinized reframing of the "social" and "sociology".

**Ayokunle Olumuyiwa Omobowale**

muyiwaking@yahoo.com

**An Elder's Character:**

**An Analysis of Atari Ajanaku's *Agbalagba* and *Agba Langba***

**Poetic Expressions Using Akiwowo's *Asuwada* Theory of Sociation**

Among the Yoruba of South-Western Nigeria, elders are accorded a place of reverence and awe, because of the belief that they are repository of experience, knowledge and blessings among other virtues. However, in spite of the enormous respect accorded them, they are expected to eschew noble character as embedded within the context of the local culture. These expectations, Atari Ajanaku seemingly present in his *Agbalagba* and *Agba Langba* poetic expressions. This study therefore analyzed these poems using the *Asuwada* Theory of Sociation; an indigenous sociological theory propounded by Professor Akiwowo in the early 1980s for the understanding of social relations among the Yoruba, most especially. Akiwowo's theory came forth as an indigenous theoretical postulation to explain aspects of the local culture (especially with respect to the concepts of *iwa*, *ihuwasi*, *isesi* and *ajumose*), which Western theories predominantly taught and used in sociological enquiries, might not adequately explain.

Both secondary and primary data were collected for the study. The secondary data were collected through the review of published literature while primary data were gathered through oral interview with Atari Ajanaku and 4 other interviewees (2 males; 2 females) with profound indigenous knowledge on the contextual expectations of the elder. Data gathered were subjected to content analysis.

**Nilay Ozok-Gundogan**  
nilayozok@gmail.com

**In Search of “Peripheral” Voices in the Ottoman History:  
Social History of Ottoman Kurdistan in the Nineteenth Century**

My paper focuses on the social history of Ottoman Kurdistan, which has long been pushed to the peripheries of historical writing both as a spatial and thematic unit of analysis. Ever since it became a part of the Empire in the sixteenth century Kurdistan had stood at the margins of Ottoman political, social and administrative system as a frontier region. The geographical distance of Kurdistan from the Ottoman center was reflected on contemporary Ottoman historical writing. Focusing on the social history of Ottoman Kurdistan my paper aims to bring two issues, which has stood on the margins, to the center of historical analysis: Kurdistan, as a spatial unit, and non-elite groups in the region as the subject of history.

In the late 1980s and early 1990s there emerged a new literature within Ottoman historical writing on the “frontiers” or “provinces” of the Ottoman Empire. This frontier literature has examined the social and economic changes the frontier regions underwent in the context of the new administrative centralization policies of the Ottoman state in the post-Tanzimat period and the growing integration of the Empire into the world capitalism. My paper criticizes this literature from two respects:

First, to a great extent, this literature focused on the “Arab” provinces. Thus, Ottoman Kurdistan has not been the spatial focus of historical analysis and the social, economic and political developments that the region underwent in the post-Tanzimat era have remained unexamined.

Second, notwithstanding their contributions, this new literature still presents an elite-centered historical analysis. Although they present a dynamic picture of the relations between the central state elites and local notables, the experiences of the non-elite sectors of society are pushed to the periphery of the historical analysis. These studies, for example, focus on the centralization policies of the Ottoman state. However, they do not question to what extent or

how the central state's policies changed the lives of its ordinary subjects. Also, they devote great effort to the analysis of the relations between the central state elites and Kurdish notables. But the question of how the lower classes – peasants for example – acted against or through these alliances or conflicts is unexamined.

In other words, literature on Ottoman provinces could debunk the center-periphery dichotomy which has been prevalent in Ottoman historical writing, but the experiences of the ordinary subjects have still remained at the periphery of the historical analysis. Thus, major aim of my research is to show how ordinary subjects (ahali), which were pushed to the peripheries of the historical narrative, experienced these same transformations in the post-Tanzimat period in Ottoman Kurdistan. The paper that I intend to present in this conference will present the preliminary findings of my research in the Ottoman archives together with a debate on the historical writing on Ottoman provinces/periphery.

NORDIC COUNTRIES:  
HISTORY OF SOCIOLOGY  
AND THE SOCIAL SCIENCES

CHAIR: ANNA LARSSON

**Anna Larsson**

anna.larsson@educ.umu.se

**Kirsti Suolinna**

ksuolinna@abo.fi

**Between ethnology and modern sociology:**

**K. Rob. V. Wikman as a mediator in Finland and Sweden**

K. Rob. V. Wikman, professor in sociology at the Åbo Akademi University in Turku, Finland, played a central role both within Finnish and Swedish sociology in the 1940s and 1950s. He was a student of Westermarck and thus his own research represented an ethnosociological tradition, which at that time was challenged by modern, American-influenced sociological ideas. The aim of this article is to discuss the adaptation of “modern sociology” and the drawing of boundaries in Nordic sociology after the Second World War by focusing on Wikman’s work in Finnish as well as Swedish sociology, especially the assessor assignments he was given, and by giving emphasis to some of those that served as border poles or border markers in this process. The comparative starting point gives us reason to discuss some nationally characterized similarities and differences that can be observed in the establishment process of modern sociology in Finland and Sweden.

**Carl Marklund**  
Carl.Marklund@EUI.eu

### **From Exceptionalism to *Normalweg***

The seemingly ubiquitous centre-periphery division has both enriched and bedevilled social thinking since its inception. This distinction has played an important role in the way the concept of ‘modernity’ has been developed and applied by social scientists from countries that would today regularly qualify as ‘central.’ Taking interwar social science in the United States and Sweden as starting point, this paper explores how notions of ‘centrality’ and ‘peripherality’ were coded with regard to the imaginations of national identity of these two societies. In particular, the paper inquires how these notions have been tied to American and Swedish ideas on ‘exceptionalism’ with regard to the multiple trajectories taken by modernity in these two countries. The juxtaposition of Sweden and the United States will also serve to illustrate how peripherality has not always been negatively coded, and how, by inference, centrality has not always been considered positive. During the interwar era, ‘America’ was not only seen as a test-bed for modernity but also served as a very tangible alternative future to many people across the world. Not the least so in Sweden, as about a million Swedes had already settled there *circa* 1900 and continued to send letters to their families and friends back “home,” comparing the relative merit of their new setting with that of their past in what worked as a kind of simultaneous temporalization and localization of the future. Eventually, the idealization of America brought about by the emigrant experience and the frontier myth served as an impetus for social reform and modernization in both Sweden and the United States, both of which were later on epitomized in the concepts of the ‘American Dream’ and the *folkhem*, the ‘Peoples’ Home,’ respectively. While both of these ideals initially relied upon a strong sense of historical exceptionalism—an American and a Nordic *Sonderweg* towards modernity, respectively—they were to become important ‘models’ for the transference and translation of modernity to other parts of the world in the post-war years. Part of the pattern of explanation as offered by these exceptionalisms were the notion that both Sweden and the USA represented peripheries and sidetracks in relation towards a Western European centre and its historical trajectory. Important to note is that the eventual ‘success’ of these national paths towards modernity—implying some sense of ahistorical

teleology—continued to be discussed as uncertain and highly contingent until the end of the Second World War. Furthermore, both these countries included vast internal peripheries—social as well as geographical—which continued to present a ‘challenge from within’ to the self-proclaimed identities of both Sweden and the USA of being ‘the most modern country in the world.’ This paper addresses the question of how these exceptions were gradually released of their marginality and exceptionality and turned into models for a normatively founded *Normalweg* towards modernity.

**Hans Petter Sand**  
hans.p.sand@uia.no

### **Periphery in the Political Sociology of Stein Rokkan**

In this paper I will describe the role of the periphery in the theoretical models of nation-state formation developed by the Norwegian political sociologist Stein Rokkan (1921-79). I write models in the plural, because Rokkan wrote a series of papers dealing with this theme. But in most of his writing the periphery; geographically, socially and culturally, played an important role. His concern with the periphery can, in my opinion, be traced back to his background, growing up in a small local community in Northern Norway. At the same time Rokkan became one of the most cosmopolitan social scientists of his time, as he, among many other international positions of social research, became vice-president of ISA and president of IPSA.

**Fredrik W. Thue**  
f.w.thue@iakh.uio.no

### **American Sociology as Academic Marshall Help? The Case of Norway in the 1950s**

Norway seems to have been among those countries that proved most susceptible to massive American influences in the social sciences after World War II. An obvious and immediate cause of this receptivity was the existence of a scholarly group who invited American social scientists and research foundations to invest in their venture. Its aim was to introduce a new interdisciplinary complex, known from the US as the “behavioral sciences”, into the national university system. In 1950 these efforts led to the formation of the *Institute for Social Research*, which became seminal to the development of Norwegian sociology and political science in the following one and a half decades. This institute functioned as a liaison between academic cultures: A succession of distinguished American visiting professors from leading US research departments and survey institutes were brought in through the Fulbright exchange program. This constituted a model of successful bilateral research cooperation frequently invoked by American scholars and foundation officers in their dealings with European universities and governments in the 1950s.

The US-led, transatlantic integration in the social sciences after WWII has often been construed as an integral dimension to the Cold War. The case of Norway illustrates that the political implications of “Americanized” sociology proved much more complex and ambiguous. Scholars from each side of the Atlantic were driven by a common interest in exploring constructive *alternatives* to anti-Communist containment. But their cooperation was nonetheless caught up in the cold-war framework. Norwegian sociology soon became divided into various traditions with strikingly different political implications. This paper will compare and discuss this process of diversification, and discuss a major unintended outcome of sociology’s transatlantic integration: the New Left.

# POWER AND LOYALTIES IN SOCIOLOGY

CHAIR: RICKARD DANELL

**Juan José Navarro**      **Fernando Quesada**  
jjnavarrogi@yahoo.com.ar   fernandoquesada77@yahoo.com.ar

**The debate on the external financing to the Latin-American Social Sciences:  
the scandal of the *Project Camelot***

The Project Camelot, social research orientated to measuring, predicting and controlling internal conflicts tending to the social destabilization of countries of the periphery, arose in the Special Operations Research Office, SORO, belonging to the American University and was contracted by the Department of Defense of The United States, to be applied in Chile within four years. From the irruption in the public sphere, in 1965, it was constructed around the Project Camelot, a myth with regard to the flow of money for espionage across sociological researches. In the present work, without detaining in the different fields that intervened in his conformation, we refer to the characterization of the Project, to the itinerary of arrive at Chile and to the impact that had on the Latin-American social sciences in relation to the external financing.

**Albert Tzeng**  
albert.tzeng@alumni.lse.ac.uk

## **Negotiating Western Sociology in East Asia and Challenges of Academic Globalisation Cases from Taiwan, Hong Kong and Singapore**

Taiwan, Hong Kong and Singapore are three Chinese-dominated East Asian societies where higher education was first 'implanted' under colonial rule and subsequently developed as part of the national project toward the Western modernity. Sociology, under this historical pattern of development, was imported from the West and applied by a group of Western-trained scholars. The common trajectory presents three dilemmas for local sociologists: (1) the epistemological dilemma on negotiating Western paradigms in seeking local relevance and (2) the strategic dilemma between 'integration with international academia' and 'academic autonomy' (3) the sociologists' role dilemma between an 'internationally recognized scholar' and a locally-engaging 'public intellectual'. All these dilemmas have long existed but are recently sharpened in the processes often discussed in terms of 'academic globalisation' in regional discourses.

In my research, the three dilemmas are placed under what I conceptualized as 'the world system of knowledge flow' for a critical understanding of the power structure underlying how sociology had been developed in these areas so far. Perspective from cultural globalization debate, post-colonial studies, sociology of knowledge and organizational science will also be integrated to provide an analytical frame for looking into the ongoing micro-politics in the subject. In the empirical front, I plan to (1) explore how sociologists in the three societies respond to the three dilemmas by both interviewing their view and empirically mapping their activity/attitude patterns, (2) evaluate to what degree has 'academic globalisation' impact on the local research agenda, and (3) critically interpret the observed patterns from a comparative-historical perspective. Methods employed include interviews, biographical/bibliographical analysis, archival analysis and possibly a survey. In this presentation, I shall outline both my analytical framework and some preliminary findings from my interviews.

**Raf Vanderstraeten**  
raf.vanderstraeten@ugent.be

**Changing Scientific Communication Structures:  
The Evolution of Scholarly Journal Publishing in Sociology**

In recent years, research into the social characteristics of science has taken an empirical and constructivist turn. The classical types of reflections on the institutional and normative embedding of science are being replaced by empirical research that focuses on how scientific knowledge is actually manufactured and shared with the wider scientific community. An important issue which has been brought to the fore in this context concerns the structure and evolution of scientific communication. As some authors have clarified, this issue provides a strong impetus for the analysis of scientific journal publishing. Communication in a scientific community is to a considerable extent dependent on journal publications. Analyses of the evolution of particular aspects of scientific journal publishing might therefore add to our understanding of the construction of the social identity of scientific disciplines.

Against this theoretical background, this paper will present a case-study of the evolution of scholarly publishing in the field of sociology. I will focus on the history of core scholarly journals which carry, channel, and give shape to our fields' communicative processes. On the one hand, I will present analyses of scholarly publishing in the major Dutch journals in the field: *Mens & Maatschappij* (founded in 1925), *Sociologische Gids* (1954) and *Tijdschrift voor Sociologie* (1980). On the other hand, I will present analyses of the major British journals which represent sociology: *The British Journal of Sociology* (1949), *The Sociological Review* (1953) and *Sociology* (1967). These analyses hence allow comparing developments in the centre and the periphery of the social sciences in Europe. I will pay particular attention to changing patterns of inclusion in science, to changing forms of gate-keeping, and to the increasing internationalization and globalization of our field.

# PUBLIC SOCIAL KNOWLEDGE

CHAIR: TBA

**Niklas Eklund**                      **Anna Larsson**  
niklas.eklund@pol.umu.se      anna.larsson@educ.umu.se

**Teacher Education in Social Science in Sweden  
in Historical and Comparative Perspectives**

In the history and sociology of social science central areas of analysis are the production, formation and distribution of social scientific knowledge. Studies concerning the organisation of knowledge production and distribution focussing for example boundaries or disciplinarity/interdisciplinarity have concerned mainly the university level in the educational system. Often research is focused, less often education although there are exceptions. In this paper, we will examine an area which has not been much discussed in this field, namely teacher education in social science. In the Swedish context, teacher education is part of the university system, but teacher education in social science is differently organized than social science education for other students. Teacher education in social science is also, as a result of the deregulation at all levels of the Swedish educational system in the 1990s, today locally designed and show severe differences at different universities. The aim of this paper is to discuss the current situation by on the one hand exploring the history of teacher education in social science in Sweden and on the other hand comparatively discuss how this education is organized at a number of different Swedish universities today. In the centre of the analysis are questions about disciplinarity, organisation and teacher education as a “trading zone” between the traditional academic disciplinary organisation and the conceived needs of a school subject.

**Azat Zana Gundogan**  
azat.gundogan@binghamton.edu

**“We Were Like Fish in the Sea, but We Didn’t Know the Sea”:  
Remembering Eastern Demonstrations and  
the Peripheralized Kurdish ‘68ers in Turkey**

This paper examines Kurdish political mobilization in the 1960s by focusing on the case of Eastern Demonstrations (*Doğu Mitingleri*). These demonstrations were organized by the “Easterners” (*Doğulular*) group of the Turkish Labor Party in 1967 with the aim of voicing the demands and the grievances of Kurdish regions and the Kurds in Turkey. Eastern Demonstrations stand at the crossroads of the socio-political transformation that Turkey went through during the 1950s and the 1960s and the accompanying remarkable political mobilization in Turkey. A wide range of social groups engaged in collective political action and negotiated with the state elites in different forms. To these various contentious groups of the decade, one should add the Kurds.

The goal of this paper is to show the importance of remembering Kurdish ‘68ers in Turkey. Although they got organized and acted in the same political organizations as their Turkish comrades, they constructed their own political identity as Kurds. However, today the Kurdish ‘68ers are not taken as a distinct group having different political sensitivities and thus, different political agenda and strategy than their Turkish counterparts. The distinctiveness of Kurdish ‘68ers stems from the fact that they created different forms of resistance to central authority than Kurdish revolts of the early Republican period. By remembering, and hence, creating a reminder of this collective action and this generation of Kurdish left, this paper intends to shed light on a somewhat neglected, if not totally forgotten, phase of Kurdish political activism which adopted peaceful means as the vehicle of making their demands.

Kurdish studies, since their inception within the orientalist scholarship in the nineteenth century, have long been under the hegemony of a nationalist/ethnic agenda. Recently, however, with the emergence of critical studies of nationalism, Kurdish studies entered a new phase which deconstructed the concepts such as “identity” or “nationalism.” In this context,

there emerged a new literature that examined social and economic bases of identity conflicts. My paper can be situated within this new literature in terms of reflecting the political activism of a group of politically active Kurdish intellectuals who underwent political socialization among their Turkish comrades yet created their own alternative interpretation of the leftist politics in Turkey during the 1960s. However, notwithstanding their organic links with the “Turkish” left, Kurdish 68ers have not been a part of the historical narratives on ‘68 Movements in Turkey. Therefore, the analysis of Kurdish ‘68ers in Turkey provides us with a discussion of the Kurdish ‘68ers who were pushed to the peripheries of the historical/sociological analysis by the mainstream scholarship on the Kurds as well as the intellectual production by the Turkish left. Likewise, the literature on 1968 experience in Turkey, has mainly shown the tendency to consider Kurdish ‘68ers as a natural part of *Turkish* 1968 movement, if not label them as nationalists. Therefore, this paper is an attempt to discuss a peripheralized generation (Kurdish ‘68ers) of a peripheralized area study (Kurdish studies) through the analysis of the Eastern Demonstrations.

**Karl Malmqvist**  
karl.malmqvist@sociology.gu.se

### **Re-imagining the (post-) industrial periphery**

My paper deals with the cultural-historical context in which Umeå University was founded in 1965. This context – as expressed in public investigations and travel reports – may be described as, on the one hand, a strongly felt disbelief in the future possibilities of Northern Sweden as an industrial region and, on the other hand, a strong positive belief in these possibilities. These two competing images of Northern Sweden may in turn be conceived of as two conflicting intellectual views on change and continuity in the region developing simultaneously during the 1960s, one of which may be referred to as 'post-industrial', while the other may be termed 'industrialist'. One reason for calling the first of these views 'post-industrial' is that it shares certain elements with the discourse on post-industrial society, which was being developed by some American sociologists in the 1960s. But this view also shares some concerns with the discourse on post-modernity that was soon to emerge in social theory, such as the idea of the contingency of contemporary society or the critique of the 'iron cages' of instrumental reason and action. Therefore, the 'post-industrial' view is not narrowly concerned with the future of industrial society, but deals also with more general processes of social change.

Having described these two images of Northern Sweden in the 1960s, I will make two claims. Firstly, I will argue that the emergence of what I call the 'post-industrial' view of Northern Sweden indicates that the discourses on post-industrial society and post-modernity would have been reasonable ways of trying to grasp the changes that were going on in the region during the 1960s, had they actually been explicitly developed here (which of course they were not). In addition to this, I suggest that the public investigations and travel reports in which the industrialist and post-industrial images of Northern Sweden are presented may be seen as a kind of non-academic sociological writings. Secondly, I will argue that although the affinity between the images of Northern Sweden described in this paper and the discourses on post-industrial and post-modern society may indeed seem understandable in the context of the changes that were going on in the region during the 1960s, this does not entail that the images

of Northern Sweden are indicators of a transition toward some entirely new condition (for instance, post-modernity). On the contrary, the images of Northern Sweden in the 1960s are in fact essentially modern, since they are all based on a fundamentally modern promissory note: the idea of progress.

**Eleanor Townsley**  
etownsle@mtholyoke.edu

**The public intellectual in the United States and beyond:  
margins and centres in intellectual life**

My ongoing research traces the figure of the public intellectual as it has emerged, circulated, and travelled in the contemporary United States and beyond since the late 1980s. Originating in the periphery of academic life in the United States, I trace the circulation of the public intellectual in the elite public sphere of the United States from the coining of the trope by Russell Jacoby in 1987 until the present. I argue that the public intellectual trope was successful as a cultural criticism of the academy, and especially of the social sciences and humanities. The second part of the project asks questions about cultural traffic in public intellectuals between centres and peripheries not only in the United States but beyond, examining how the term was adopted, altered, and redeployed in and between other publics – between the academic, journalistic and political fields, in Canada, Australia, the United Kingdom, and beyond. In each case, the relationships within and between the academic and journalistic fields and their centres and peripheries are examined as zones of contest among different kinds of intellectuals competing to define “the social”.

THE HISTORY OF EMPIRICAL SOCIAL RESEARCH  
AND STATISTICS

CHAIR: IRMELA GORGES

**Marja Alastalo**  
marja.alastalo@uta.fi

### **Social statistics in the EU: rationalities and technologies**

Social statistics shape our understanding of social reality. They make social phenomena visible and also give existence to social phenomena by naming, creating statistical categories and classifications. This paper investigates the history of social statistics in the European Union that dates back to 1960s, but intensified after the Hanover Summit in 1988, when social dimension was recorded to be an integral part of the EC.

The analysis is inspired by the theoretical ideas of Peter Miller, Ted O’Leary and Nikolas Rose, who have distinguished rationalities from technologies for instance in a context of the government of economic life. In the analogous way here the analysis will firstly focus on “rationalities” guiding the compilation of social statistics. Secondly, the attention is focussed on “technologies” of the social statistical work that can be understood as methodological procedures, statistical classifications and so on.

The data consists of extensive documentary material on the EU definitions of social policy and social statistics as well as on the specific data series such as ECHP and EU-SILC.

**Jonas Harvard**  
Jonas.Harvard@miun.se

### **Asking the ones who know: Qualitative polling in Sweden around 1900**

The history of opinion polling has long had a bias towards the development of quantitative techniques. From early straw-polls up to the implementation of modern scientific statistical methods, the interest has been focused on capturing the voice of the many. In the decades around 1900 another form of polling emerged in the Swedish press: qualitative so called "enquetes". These collective questionnaires were mostly aimed at persons who were experts in their respective fields, and the respondents were allowed to give lengthy replies. The newspapers chose the topics, and the number of published answers could go up to 70. This paper presents an analysis of the relationship between how the enquetes gauged "public opinion", and how it was done in the social sciences at the time. The conclusion is that there was a significant interplay between the public and scientific spheres, and that an understanding of the historical development of the media is needed to fully understand the development of the social sciences.

**Raymond Lee**  
r.m.lee@rhul.ac.uk

### **Focus Groups: The Missing Years**

In the 1980s Robert Merton drew attention to the continuities and discontinuities between contemporary uses of focus groups in sociology and work on focused interviewing that he and his colleagues at the Bureau of Applied Social Research conducted in the 1940s. He speculated that while this work had largely been forgotten in sociology it had lived on in market research. Drawing on a variety of online resources, this paper looks at group interviewing practices in market research between 1950 and 1980, what David Morrison calls the 'missing years' of focus group research.

**Werner Reichmann**  
werner.reichmann@uni-konstanz.de

**The Quantification of Social Science Research Methods :  
A Comparative View on the 20<sup>th</sup> Century.**

Nowadays the use of quantitative methods in the social sciences is a common way to find out something about "the social". But the idea to divide and count the objects of interest was quite unusual ~120 years ago. The basic questions I try to answer in my paper are: (1) To what extent did social scientists use quantitative methods since ca. 1900? and (2) Is it possible to identify factors which explain different usages of quantification and quantitative methods? I'm quite aware that the quantification of the world began far before 1900. But for good reasons in my empirical work I focus on the 20<sup>th</sup> century.

There are different ways to analyze the history of the social sciences. In general we look at the development and diffusion of ideas or "academic schools" which are often associated with "big names". I try to go another way: First, I'm more interested in the use and fashions of different methods. I'm aware that methods in general base on ideas too but they mark a different dimension of the history of the social sciences. Second, I try to avoid just to analyse the high-visible "big names" in the social sciences by looking at scientific journals which were and are open to all social scientists.

In order to analyze the implementation and diffusion process of quantitative methods in the social sciences I present a deep analysis of the main "products" of social sciences: articles in scientific journals. The sample of articles (n=1611) are taken out from leading scientific journals dealing with sociology and economics from Europe and the US covering the period from the 1880s until now. I gathered a number of attributes for every article and counted a theory driven quantification-index for every article.

My research enables me to compare different levels: The use of quantitative methods in the US vs. in Europe, in applied vs. academic disciplines, by male vs. female authors, etc.

My analysis shows at at least tow things: (1) We can be sure that the history of the implementation of quantitative methods is a history of big success and (2) there are many extra-scientific reasons for choosing qualitative or quantitative methods.

# THE RISE OF EUROPEAN SOCIOLOGY

CHAIR: TBA

**Christina Kelly**  
Ch.Kelly@ucd.ie

**A Catholic Sociology for a Catholic Nation:  
The Institutionalization of Sociology in the Republic of Ireland**

Ireland in the 1930s was a post-colonial, developing nation in an already industrialized (Western) Europe. Its nation-building project embraced the ethos of self-reliance and self-sufficiency, with Catholicism being recognised as a national religion, romanticising rural life and thereby creating an idyllic image of life in the republic.

The 1930s also saw the emergence of the Catholic social movement in Ireland. Greatly influenced by the publication of the 1931 Papal Encyclical, which offered a framework for a new social order based on the ideology of vocationalism, it developed into a potent force of Irish Catholicism.

It was within this social, cultural and political climate that the institutionalization of sociology in Ireland occurred. What emerged was a Catholic Sociology, which for the next few decades would become the only form of sociology practiced in Ireland.

In my presentation I will trace the institutionalization of the first chair, the first society and the first journal of sociology and situate them within the social, political and cultural climate of Ireland at the time.

**Marcel Stoetzler**

Marcel.Stoetzler@manchester.ac.uk

### **The ambivalent role of antisemitism in the formation of ‘classical’ sociological theory**

This paper will explore the thesis that the formation of sociological theory and that of (‘modern’) antisemitism are related, or even co-substantial, while at the same time competing, or even antagonistic phenomena. This thesis is based on two observations: first, sociological theory emerged as a predominantly liberal response to the crisis phenomena of modern (capitalist) society; second, modern antisemitism is likewise understood to be a ‘travesty of a social theory’ that offers in its phantasmagorias of ‘the Jew’ and ‘Jewification’ an explanation of the same society’s deficiencies and crises. As a case in point, the major themes of Durkheim’s sociology, the cohesion of modern liberal society in the face of the threats of atomization and disintegration that are inherent to it, are also central concerns of nineteenth-century antisemites: they blamed what Durkheim called ‘anomies’ on the Jews. Durkheim developed and employed elements of his sociological thought in his intervention into the most emblematic dispute on antisemitism of the time, the Dreyfus Affair, while one of the formative influences on Max Weber’s thought was a dispute amongst German National Liberals on antisemitism in 1879-80, the Berlin Antisemitism Dispute. In the German context, the boundaries between classical sociology, National Liberalism, the ‘Verein fuer Sozialpolitik’, ‘Kathedern’, or state-socialism and the public discussions shaped by the emerging antisemitic movement are ambiguous, while indeed the writings of some of the most influential radical French antisemites were formulated with reference to the tradition of Saint Simon and Comte’s ‘positivism’, which are likewise concerned with safeguarding the threatened coherence of modern liberal society. Conversely, Georg Simmel’s celebrated 1896 paper, ‘Money in Modern Culture’, containing crucial elements of his later works, was given in Schmoller’s seminar and can be read as a comment on emerging sociology’s ambivalent attitude to modern (capitalist) society and the antisemitic subtext of critiques of ‘Manchesterism’ and the ‘cash nexus’.

The development of sociology responded to, but also paralleled and was intermeshed with that of antisemitism. This is seen in this paper as an intriguing case of social and institutional peripheries decisively shaping the formation of what was to become classical 'sociology'.

**Antoni Sulek**  
sulek@marymont.pl

***Le suicide in Poland.***

**A case of receiving a classic by the semi-peripheral nation.**

In 2006 a Polish translation of *Le suicide* (1897) by Émile Durkheim was published in Warsaw. Polish sociology is known as being one of the most active and most contributing to the European sociological tradition. It has been developing in close touch with the world's renowned sociological centers. In spite of that the *Le suicide* translation into Polish was made available only more than one hundred years after the French edition of this fundamental sociological work. In many other countries of significantly weaker sociological tradition it has been published much earlier than in Poland. The author makes an attempt to explain this paradoxical situation. He discusses acceptance/non-acceptance of *Le suicide* in Poland against the background of the Durkheim classical work reception by world's sociology and history of sociology in Poland.

**Jan Surman**  
jan.surman@univie.ac.at

### **Periphery goes to the centre: the reception of Austrian sociology in France before 1918**

The proposed paper analyses the reception of Austrian sociology in France before 1918, highlighting the personal and institutional linkages as well as the theoretical arena. In the centre I put the question of “double periphery” which concerns to what extent a peripheral science in a peripheral country manages to find a way to influence the “scientific community”, in this context in France in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Linking the analysis of scientific discourse with the question of the social structure of scientific system allows putting the general question of reception in a new light.

In the first part I will highlight the situation of sociology in Austria, arguing that due to its innovativeness and social(istic) approach, as well as because of personal conflicts, Austrian sociology was hindered in becoming a mainstream trend. Though it is often argued that Austrian sciences were “sociologised”, the discipline had barely institutionalised before 1918. Its main representative Ludwig Gumplowicz, was a typical outsider in the “scientific community”, partly due to his Jewish-Polish roots, but mainly because of his controversial character of fighting scientific conflicts.

Based on these facts I will then present France as a possible “back door” for his ideas. Gumplowicz himself understood that his positive reception in France would encourage the reception of his ideas also in Germany. I will highlight his engagement in the *Institute International de Sociologie* of René Worms as well as his numerous publications in this context. Following this, I will show examples of reception of Gumplowicz’s ideas in France, showing to what extent the perception of his ideas was biased due to his alleged connexions to Social Darwinism and the political context of the time such as the military pact with Russia. At the end of this section I make some general remarks on influence of the Austrian Professor on several authors, like e.g. Céléstin Bouglé.

In the last section I will show how other Austrian sociologists were perceived in France. Here I will refer mostly to Anton Menger and Gustav Ratzenhofer. Finally, Wilhelm Jerusalem's "sociology of knowledge" will be presented as the most notable Austrian contribution to the French sociology.

As a recapitulation I will argue that the reception cannot be seen as a linear process, but rather as interaction between contributor and recipient. This takes place in a crossroad of politics, scientific "inner politics", and social discourse, which outweighs the purely "scientific" reasoning.

# THE SOCIOLOGY OF OCTAVIO PAZ

CHAIR: OLIVER KOZLAREK

**Jorge Capetillo**  
Jorge.Capetillo@umb.edu

### **Octavio Paz and Georg Simmel**

Octavio Paz has been known worldwide as a talented poet and essayist, but not as a sociologist. And yet his seminal work The Labyrinth of Solitude, published in 1950 and containing Paz's interpretation of Mexican history, arrived at via his analysis of Mexican "myths" or cultural forms, is rich in sociological content -- particularly sociology of culture and sociology of knowledge. The author of this essay, after noting that very few of the experts on Paz's work have tried to analyze in a serious and sustained manner its sociological content, has determined not only to decipher Paz's method but to reveal its strong links to the sociology of form and content produced by the German sociologist and philosopher Georg Simmel. Thus, the main goal of this paper is to apply Simmel's methods to The Labyrinth of Solitude and to thereby (1) finally shed some light on the sociological aspects of Paz's seminal work, thus bringing him the credit he deserves as an early Mexican sociologist, and (2) reveal the Simmel's hitherto ignored or at least very much minimized extent of influence upon the Labyrinth.

**Eduardo González Di Pierro**

feryedo@yahoo.com.mx

### **The Discussion Bartra-Paz: Two Different Perspectives on Sociology**

One decade before the end of 'real-existing' socialism, an important debate was taking place, in which two important Mexican intellectuals, Octavio Paz and Roger Bartra (as well as Luis Villoro and Carlos Monsiváis), were engaged. The debate was precisely about the essence of socialism as well as about leninism, stalinism, the Soviet Union, the revision of the 'original' marxism, the interpretations of Lukacs, Castoriadis and others, the internal contradictions of the 'socialist states', the 'class struggle', trozkism, and so on. The debate provoked interesting sociological ideas and the question as to which extend these ideas could be applied to the realities of the Mexican society. The end of the real-existing socialism, one decade later, seems to have affirmed to a large extent Paz' ideas. But it also motivated Bartra to reconsider his ideas in an act of intellectual honesty that is characteristic for this thinker.

Now, the aim of this paper is, first of all, to summarize the discussion between Roger Bartra and Octavio Paz. Secondly, it will emphasize that Octavio Paz' ideas can be seen as some kind of 'prediction' of the internal contradictions of the so called real-existing socialism in all those countries under of the influence of the Soviet Union, but also of possible applications in Mexico. Finally, it will talk about the sociological but also philosophical ideas of Roger Bartra, and how these changed in the last decade. I will try to make the point that what is needed is that the sociological ideas of both authors and essayists have to be complemented by some sort of cultural philosophy.

**Oliver Kozlarek**  
okozlarek@yahoo.com

### **The Sociology in the Work of Octavio Paz**

The aim of the paper is twofold: On one side, it will present the work of one of Latin America's most prolific and profound thinkers of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. It will try to show that Paz's ideas about modernity are indeed of great value for our 'global modernity,' and that they are not only a footnote to global history from one of its relegated margins. On the other side, the paper will try to defend the theses that very substantial parts of the work of the Mexican poet and essayist can be read as genuine contribution to sociology. There is, for instance, his permanent reflection and critique of modernity that contains ideas similar to those of the 'multiple modernities' approach by Eisenstadt and others. There are interesting leads for an anthropologically rooted theory of 'human action' (Joas). And finally, there is a humanist dimension in Paz's sociology that has been missing in many of the expressions of contemporary mainstream social theory.

# TRANSATLANTIC RECIPROCITY

CHAIR: SVEN ELIAESON

**Sven Eliaeson**

sven\_eliaeson@hotmail.com

### **The Myrdals: Made in the USA?**

The Myrdals were both frequent visitors the USA. Gunnar regarded USA as his second home country, and sometimes introduced himself as a “worried American”. Alva worked at the UN for years. Their trans-Atlantic travels were formative experiences and they started to cultivate numerous scholarly contacts, in Chicago and other places, during their first US-sojourn, on Rockefeller scholarships 1929-30, only to mention the Thomases. Gunnar’s work on *An American Dilemma* was interrupted, since they returned to Sweden on a dangerous voyage after the German occupation of Norway and Denmark, for nine months. America as *Selbstbetrachtung aus der Ferne*, an identity giving other in a positive sense, is evident in their joint book on *Kontakt med Amerika* (Contact with America), esp. on educational matters (e.g. Dewey). The USA are in some senses the first “European Union”, getting many constitutional arrangements for free which in Europe social movements have to organize to accomplish and in addition meeting many phenomena before they are on the European agenda, such as mass democracy, migration, integration, lobbying, ethnic conflicts in big cities, now again on the pan-European agenda. Europe invents Enlightenment while the USA make it real. Trans-Atlantic reciprocity and Europe and the USA as “communicating bowls” is an old story that could be traced back to Samuel Pufendorf, who influences the Fathers of the US constitution. Alva and Gunnar bring Chicago school concepts into Swedish sociology in its cradle. Gunnar is into high age recurrently visiting professor in the USA. Gunnar also has early formative experiences in Germany and is much imprinted by his Swedish context.

**Johan Goudsblom**  
j.goudsblom@uva.nl

**Dutch and American Sociology in the Mid-twentieth Century.**

**A view from behind the one-way mirror**

The paper develops and illustrates the model of the one-way mirror effect in intellectual relations. The situation of intellectuals and academics in peripheral societies resembles that of observers behind a one-way mirror. They are in a good position to register what is going on in their field in the outside world, especially at the centre. Their own activities, however, remain unobserved - by those at the centre as well as by those who find themselves in similar situations behind one-way mirrors of their own. The model of the one-way mirror can be combined with that of the wagon wheel in communication. The relations between Dutch and American sociology between 1950 and 1980 serve as a striking empirical illustration.

**Suzie Guth**  
rets.guth@wanadoo.fr

**Robert Park in the periphery of the German Empire  
and the problem of assimilation of the African American peasant**

Robert E.Park, student at the Kaiser Willhelm's Universität in Strassburg (Germany) became interested in the German peasant question.He attended the lectures given by Professor Friedrich Knapp a national economist, who gave also talks as Rector in the Strassburg's aula about the freeing of slaves in the colonies and during the Stein -Hardenberg period of the Prussian peasants. .In his first article on racial assimilation in secondary groups Robert E.Park relates his European experience and draws a parallel with the African -American situation in the Southern states of America.The Prussian Instleute as Max Weber will describe them, have lost their belongings (acres, cow and house) and enter now in the competitive labor market.The African-American may now leave freely the plantation and go from one estate to another but as Robert E.Park mentions it, they belong now to a new proletariat.The comparison between the Prussian peasant and the African American insists on the consequences of freedom and the difficulty to integrate and assimilate in society at large.

**Yusef Semlali**  
semlali@centrum.cz

### **Some new details of the life of Pitirim A. Sorokin**

In 1992 was published for the first time in Russia the translated version of the autobiographical work of Pitirim A. Sorokin, *A Long Journey*<sup>1</sup>. It is not the unique autobiography of Sorokin but the second. The first one, entitled *Leaves from a Russian Diary*<sup>2</sup> was published in 1925. One year after the publication in Russian of *A Long Journey*, was reprinted for the first time too, his great sociological work *Sistema sotsiologii*<sup>3</sup> (The System of Sociology) banished from the Russian libraries during long times. Sorokin is known to American and Western sociologists primarily for his works in English, published after his arrival in the United-States. This applies for his autobiographies too, all published in his new country of adoption. That means that almost all what we know about his life in Russia comes from his writings.

The reasons for presenting herein the Russian versions of *A Long Journey* and *The System of Sociology* are: 1) They illustrate the desire of reappropriation and reutilisation by the Russian sociologists of the works of Sorokin; 2) The importance for us, western sociologists, to pay more attention to the publications in Russia dealing with Sociology and especially with the History of Sociology. And naturally this means that we have to make some translations or to learn Russian.

The first reason will not be discussed here. It would be more appropriate and more interesting that a Russian sociologist presents the phenomena of the nowadays re-emerging of the classical Russian Sociology into the field of contemporary Russian academic land. In my presentation, I will focus on the second reason: why do we have to pay more attention to the sociological publications in Russia? The answer is relatively simple: in Russia there are also a

---

<sup>1</sup> Sorokin P. A., *Dalnaya Doroga*, Moskovskii Rabichik Press, Moscow, 1992.

<sup>2</sup> Sorokin P. A., *Leaves from a Russian Diary*, E. P. Dutton, New York, 1924.

<sup>3</sup> Sorokin P. A., *Sistema Sotsiologii*, Nauka Press, Moscow, 1993. The unique commentary of the first publication of this book was made by Isajiw W. W., "Pitirim Sorokin's *Sistema sotsiologii*: A Summary", in *The American Catholic Sociological Review*, Vol. 17, n°4, 1956, pp. 290-319.

great number of first class sociologists working in the field of the History of Sociology, like A. B. Gofman, N. Davidov, A. V. Lipskiy or V. V. Sapov and others. Concerning the Russian publication of *A Long Journey* it was A. V. Lipskiy who made the translation, wrote the preface and the commentaries. *The System of Sociology* was reprinted in the collection *Sotsiologicheskoe Nasledie* (Sociological heritage) established and managed by N. Davidov, V. V. Sapov, B. Gofman and others, members of the Institute of Sociology in Moscow. The preface of Sorokin's sociological book was also written by A. V. Lipskiy; a kind of biography very similar to the preface of *A Long Journey*. A. V. Lipskiy made a really remarkable historical research. He consulted a large number of archives concerning the life of Sorokin and the information he is giving us are at least surprising and colourful.

I would like, in this paper, to present you two aspects of the life of Sorokin that mostly caught my attention. The first one concerns his childhood period and particularly his date of birth. Sorokin writes in his autobiography that he was born the 21<sup>st</sup> of January 1889 in the village of Turya<sup>4</sup>. And that is his official date of birth for all the scholars who made some investigations on his life and worked on his theories (Matter, Johnston, Cowell, Zimmermann, Ford, Vagero, Talbutt, Tiryakian, Allen and others). In 1990, Lipskiy and Krotov published an article intituled *The Trace of Zyrian in Pitirim Sorokin's Biography*<sup>5</sup>. They first discovered that his passport delivered in 1917 mentioned the 20<sup>th</sup> of January as his date of birth and not the 21<sup>st</sup>. So to make it clear ones for ever they decided to look at the parish registers from the place of birth of Pitirim. From these documents some new clarifications came to light. They revealed first that he was born the 23<sup>rd</sup> of January, baptised the next day and second that his godfather was I. A. Panov the teacher of the Turya School. But that's not all. In 1918 the communist government decided to adopt the new calendar; so we have to add 12 days in order to obtain the real date of birth of Sorokin, and that is the 4<sup>th</sup> of February.

The second aspect of the life of Sorokin concerns his Ph.D. He wrote that he was graduated doctor of Sociology in April 1922 after the presentation of his *System of Sociology*. But once again this is not the truth. This academic defence concerned his master degree and the report of this event was written by Sorokin himself in the journal *Ekonomist* (The Economist).

---

<sup>4</sup> Sorokin P. A., *A Long Journey*, College and University Press, New Haven: Connecticut, 1963, p. 11.

<sup>5</sup> Lipskiy A. V. and Krptov P. P., "Zyryanskiy sled v biografii Pitirima Sorokina", in *Sotsiologicheskoe Issledovaniya*, vol. 17, no. 2, 1990, pp. 117-134.

These aspects and more information of the life of Sorokin will be developed and discussed during my eventual intervention.