



**Contents**

Andreas Hess (Secretary of RCCHS): RCCHS Executive Nominations..... 1

Draft Programme for Gothenburg..... 3

Some More Reflections on How to Teach Sociology..... 26

Job advertisement..... 27

Latest Members Publications, RCCHS’s Dublin Account, Membership Renewal..... 29

**Secretary**

Andreas Hess  
 University College  
 Dublin  
 School of  
 Sociology  
 Belfield, Dublin 4  
 Ireland  
 phone +353 (0)1  
 716 8531  
 fax: +353 (0)1  
 716 1125  
 E-mail:  
[a.hess@ucd.ie](mailto:a.hess@ucd.ie)

**RCCHS Executive Nomination Results**

I am glad to report a successful outcome in relation to the RCCHS executive nomination process. Since we had enough nominations and just the right number of volunteers to fill the executive jobs, and since no candidature and candidate were seriously challenged, we do not have to embark on a lengthy and complicated election process.

I have written and informed all those individuals who received multiple nominations. I have heard back from most but yet not all candidates on whether they accept the nomination. This is mainly due to the short time span that was left between the nomination process and putting out this newsletter before my departure from Yale – hence the announcement of only *preliminary* results.

Let me briefly point out that the nomination process is a compromise under complex conditions. One of the issues we should discuss in Gothenburg is a change of or some form of amendment to our statutes in relation to the selection process. For this last

nomination process we went by the book, but the book itself is incomplete, and to have another alternative, i.e. a full vote by proxy from five continents is, organizationally speaking, very difficult (particularly since there is no reliable electronic voting system). The biggest problem is that this all has to be done in the year prior to the World Congress, and the actual process has been a mix somewhere between co-option, individual initiative and feedback from the more active members and finally a formal consultation and nomination process. My understanding is that the other ISA committees function pretty much along similar lines. Perfect it ain't, and it might never be, but maybe a few practical issues can be addressed at our next business meeting.

Let me also take this opportunity to point out that Per Wisselgren, the new Secretary elect, will not take over until after Gothenburg. Per has an extremely busy academic schedule until early autumn. Having started myself late and under similar pressures when I took over as secretary, I can fully understand that situation and will volunteer my services until Per takes over.

I would finally like to point out that last time in Umea we agreed to hold the next RCHS interim conference in 2012 in Dublin, Ireland. I'll be the main contact person and will update you on the progress and exact dates at our RCHS business meeting in Gothenburg.

The new Executive

**Peter Baehr** (President, Hong Kong)

**Irmela Gorges** (Vice President, Germany)

**Marcel Fournier** (Vice President, Canada)

**Per Wisselgren** (Secretary, Sweden)

The ten members of the Executive Steering Committee

**E. Stina Lyon** (UK)

**Nilgun Celebi** (Turkey)

**Gina Zabludovsky** (Mexico)

**Laurent Jeanpierre** (France)

**Johan Heilbron** (Netherlands and France)

**Hans-Peter Mueller** (Germany)

**Eleanor Townsley** (USA)

**Hedvig Ekerwald** (Sweden)

**Cherry Schrecker** (France)

**Stephen Turner** (USA)

Congratulations to all!

Thanks must also go to the outgoing Executive members, particularly to our President Christian Fleck, who has steered RCHS successfully through a good number of years.

*Andreas Hess*

## **DRAFT RCHS PROGRAMME FOR GOTHENBURG (11-17 JULY 2010)**

### ***Session 1***

**Monday 15.30-17.30**

#### **Agenda Setting for National Sociologies**

Chaired by Jennifer Platt and Charles Crothers

Contact: [j.platt@sussex.ac.uk](mailto:j.platt@sussex.ac.uk), [charles.crothers@aut.ac.nz](mailto:charles.crothers@aut.ac.nz)

Jennifer Platt (Emeritus, Sociology, University of Sussex, UK)

[j.platt@sussex.ac.uk](mailto:j.platt@sussex.ac.uk)

#### **Making Them Count: How Effective has Encouragement of Quantitative Methods Been in Britain?**

The British national funding body, the Social Science Research Council (SSRC, later ESRC) has at various times directly or indirectly encouraged the cultivation of quantitative skills and the application of quantitative methods, and this campaign strengthened in the 2000s. However, empirical articles in the main British general journals have remained predominantly non-quantitative, and indeed become increasingly so more recently, and there is some evidence that levels of quantification are higher in comparable national sociologies. Why has attempted intervention by the major funding body not been more effective? This paper explores a variety of historical factors which may be relevant.

Charles Crothers (Sociology, Auckland, New Zealand)

[charles.crothers@aut.ac.nz](mailto:charles.crothers@aut.ac.nz)

#### **Agenda Setting and Steering Mechanisms in Anglo-American Sociologies**

External attempts have often been made to influence the directions of national sociologies including government agendas which indicate the topics and types of research that are being encouraged – often through the provision of funding opportunities. These have been counter-balanced to a limited extent by internal steering mechanisms within national associations and more general disciplinary contexts, but any collective sense of directions for sociology may be only slightly developed. Nevertheless there are some mechanisms which may attempt to create an internally-directed set of research questions and approaches: Presidential addresses, editorials, inaugurals and on occasion more explicit agencies such as disciplinary task-forces or submissions concerning policy made to government bodies. Other unintentional means are more indirect, with the effects of cues emanating from book reviews, symposia and disputes. This paper describes these mechanisms as they have influenced several Anglo-American national contexts, and assesses the extent to which they have in fact affected the direction of sociology in that country.

Zorheh Bayatrizi (Sociology, University of Alberta, Canada)

[bayatriz@ualberta.ca](mailto:bayatriz@ualberta.ca)

#### **Agenda Setting and Steering Mechanisms in Iranian Sociology**

The academic discipline of sociology was created in Iran five decades ago as a technocratic field; that is, as an instrument to help solve state problems. The 1979 Revolution does not appear to have altered this course in any significant way.

Today the state remains the main sponsor and client of sociological research. The absence of independent sources of research funding outside the government has left sociology dependent on state agencies and organizations. This situation has significant effects both on sociology and on the direction of policy making in Iran. State-sponsored research is almost exclusively quantitative, narrowly problem-oriented, often secretive, and unable to offer concrete policy solutions. Furthermore it does not lead to theoretical and conceptual advances. Independent sociology has survived but it is in need of greater support.

The situation in Iran is not unique: it reflects, in a magnified way, problems faced by sociologists everywhere in the world as they come under increasing pressures to undertake applied and policy-relevant research.

My paper investigates the origins of sociology in Iran and the extent to which state preferences have influenced the direction of research in Iranian sociology. It will also briefly discuss sociological research undertaken outside the boundaries of state policy interests.

## ***Session 2***

**Monday 17.45-19.45**

### **The History of Sociology (1): How and Why Do We Write the History of Sociology? What is the Role of Biography?**

Chaired by Cherry Schrecker and Suzie Guth

Contact: [cherry.schrecker@univ-nancy2.fr](mailto:cherry.schrecker@univ-nancy2.fr)

Marcel Fournier (Sociology, Université de Montréal, Canada)

[Marcel.fournier@umontreal.ca](mailto:Marcel.fournier@umontreal.ca)

#### **How difficult is it to write a biography in social sciences? Durkheim and Mauss.**

The difficulties of writing a biography in the social sciences are: 1) the (marginal) status of biography in the field of social sciences, 2) the relation between the study of a life and the study of a work, 3) the theoretical perspective (conception of action and conception of society) which, often implicit, supports the analysis, often descriptive, of the life and work of the authors. Is there something to say about the life (private and public) of a scholar? What's a work (« oeuvre ») in the social sciences? Is there coherence from the beginning to the end or are there many oppositions or contradictions (Young/old)? I will discuss these difficulties or problems with reference to the two biographies I have published : those of Émile Durkheim and Marcel Mauss.

Suzie Guth, Strasbourg University, France

[rets.guth@wanadoo.fr](mailto:rets.guth@wanadoo.fr)

#### **Turning points in Robert E. Park's career**

The life history of Robert E. Park shows many turning points. The first was when he ran away from his home in Red Wing and joined a train track gang, it was a turning point which led, astonishingly, to a scholarly career. The second one, better known, shows a change of career when he attends Harvard University and later Berlin, and then Strasbourg's Kaiser Wilhelm University in the newly conquered provinces of the German Empire. The next shift can be found after his Viva in Heidelberg University, it might be considered almost as a failure since from now on he considered himself as a second-class fellow. He wrote to his father in law that he worked with first class people: he meant Booker T. Washington and it was worth it as he found an ideal. Despite this, when he invited W. I. Thomas in 1913 to the Tuskegee Conference he underlined the fact that he was the Congo Reform secretary. In this paper we will insist on the three turning points mentioned above and give an interpretation of his life history in term of career, self and family.

William F. Woodman and Dan Krier (both Sociology, Iowa State University)

[woodman@iastate.edu](mailto:woodman@iastate.edu), [krier@iastate.edu](mailto:krier@iastate.edu)

#### **Thorstein Veblen in Iowa: Crucible for the Theory of the Leisure Class**

Biographers of Thorstein Veblen have focused upon his childhood in Southern Minnesota and his various wanderings from failed academic appointments, but have left unexplored his post-doctoral period while living in remote Stacyville, Iowa. This paper reports our exploration of this crucial but little-known episode in Veblen's life that would turn out to define enduring themes in his writings. These themes include: Absentee ownership and control by banks and railroads; The system of grain distribution and marketing controlled by speculators on boards of trade that made serfs out of "independent" farmers;

The metaphor for speculation, risky endeavors and the “main chance” was provided by his friendship in Stacyville with a prominent participant in the California Gold Rush of 1849; and The powerful role that beliefs and ethics play in economic behavior was demonstrated by observing his German Catholic, Irish Catholic and English Congregationalist neighbors that contrasted so strongly with the Leisure-Class ethics of Tidewater Baltimore where he had attended Johns Hopkins University and the Norwegian Lutheran values of his rural Minnesota family upbringing.

While the small-town boosterism and provincialism of a remote railroad outpost like Stacyville, Iowa would seem an unlikely setting for the development of a world-class public intellectual, our investigations have revealed that Veblen’s time in Stacyville was not sterile time away from productive scholarship but rather a fertile period of observation, reflection and intellectual ferment whose traces can be read throughout Veblen’s work.

Andreas Hess (Sociology, University College Dublin)

[a.hess@ucd.ie](mailto:a.hess@ucd.ie)

### **Whose history? Biographical accounts between the traditional sociology of knowledge, intellectual history and the new sociology of ideas**

The new sociology of ideas – the work of Camic and Collins but also the new attempt by Richard Rorty biographer Neil Gross come to mind –, is trying to distance itself from other attempts that have tried to address the complex relationship between ideas and individual life stories. But how successful is it, both in theory and in practice, when compared to the more traditional sociology of knowledge and the intellectual history approach? In this paper I will discuss the main arguments of some of the most prominent exponents of the various approaches. The sociology of knowledge, intellectual history and the new sociology of ideas have all tried to find answers to the challenge of finding a plausible way through the complex constellation of social environment, the making of ideas and that intellectual ‘surplus’ that is generated through individual life trajectories. Yet, despite all theoretical sophistication, all attempts have remained somewhat incomplete. This incompleteness, I will argue, is not due to the lack of theoretical awareness or sophistication but can rather be explained by looking at the complex ways in which individual creativity plays out under challenging social conditions.

### ***Session 3***

**Monday 20.00-22.00**

### **The History of Sociology (2): How and Why Do We Write the History of Sociology? What is the Role of Biography?**

Chaired by Cherry Schrecker and Suzie Guth

Contact: [cherry.schrecker@univ-nancy2.fr](mailto:cherry.schrecker@univ-nancy2.fr)

Anne Collinot, (CNRS Centre Alexandre Koyré: UMR 8560)

[Anne.Collinot@ehess.fr](mailto:Anne.Collinot@ehess.fr)

### **From the making of pioneers to the writing of obituaries**

I would like to discuss a biographical inquiry aimed at achieving a deeper understanding of the emergence of computer science as an academic discipline in French Universities (1960-70). My talk will focus on the way one can draw on the actors’ narratives to investigate the role of individual logics in the collective making of an institution. This work in progress is part of a research framework built upon a heuristic principle that advocates, on the one hand, considering scientific work through the culturally shaped patterns that scientists draw up in order to represent and rationalize both their professional and extra-professional activities and on the other hand, the social context in which, to a large extent, these activities take place. I will also rely on a preliminary investigation on the use of biography in the cultural history and sociology of science in order to take part in the epistemological reflection on the telling of individual lives.

Shoji Ishitsuka (Media and Cultural Studies, Tokyo University, Japan)

[ishituka@edu.tuis.ac.jp](mailto:ishituka@edu.tuis.ac.jp)

### **G. Lukacs alive in Karl Mannheim**

This presentation aims to fill the place left vacant by studies on Lukacs and Mannheim respectively. Lukacs and Mannheim started their intellectual interaction in 1911 at Budapest, preparing themselves for the 1919 Hungarian Revolution. Both scholars: the philosopher and the sociologist, reacted to their experience of the great transformations of their time with their seminal works, *Geschichte und Klassenbewusstsein* (Berlin 1923) and *Ideologie und Utopie* (Bonn 1929). As conclusion, I'd like to show a living influential line of Lukacsian thinking in Mannheim from 1911 up until 1946, giving also evidence from their letters.

[Cherry.schrecker@univ-nancy2.fr](mailto:Cherry.schrecker@univ-nancy2.fr)

### **What can a biography contribute to the history of sociology?**

Several strategies can be used in the writing of the biographies of sociologists, these range through personal historical narrative, intellectual biography or an intellectual standpoint which the biography is used to illustrate or support. With reference to various biographical accounts concentrating on important thinkers in the social sciences such as Alfred Schutz and Claude-Lévi-Strauss, this paper will examine the advantages and disadvantages of the different approaches, the effects of their application and question their relevance for the writing of the history of sociology.

Jarosław Kiliński (Sociology, Warsaw University, Poland)

[kiliński@chello.pl](mailto:kiliński@chello.pl)

### **From social memory to non-history: Czech and Polish narratives on the sociology's past**

The paper deals with two Czech and two Polish general histories of sociology (or “classical sociologies”), written by Emanuel Chalupný (two volumes, 1922 and 1948), Jan Keller (2004), Jan Szczepański (1961) and Jerzy Szacki (1979). These books are the most important local works on the subject, as well as good examples of the development of such literature in general. The paper aims to analyse them as forms of social memory as well as historical narratives. Three of the books were written by sociologist-theorists without any historical training, and one by Jerzy Szacki, a renowned historian of ideas. Yet, his methodological self-consciousness did not seem to influence his work in any significant way. Two earlier works resemble “short time” (mostly oral) forms of social memory, while the later two seem to be canonical memory forms used to build the identity of contemporary sociology rather than attempts to reconstruct the discipline's past. The narrative structure of all four books is loose, and none of them exhibits narrative patterns typical for historical narratives. Such a development might be explained not only by the growing time distance from the described phenomena, but also by the formation of classical sociology as an autonomous sub-discipline of sociological theory.

Iván Eliab Gómez Aguilar (Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México)

[todaslastormentas@gmail.com](mailto:todaslastormentas@gmail.com)

### **Tradition and Breaking point. Diagnosis of the late twentieth century sociology in Mexico**

In his brief history, one of the principal problems of sociology in Mexico has been the scarcity of soundness of his academic discourse. This difficulty has his expression in the permanent lack of clarity in the task of demarcating his epistemic competence. Nevertheless, some attempts to convert this condition have taken place, even if latent, in the last generations of sociologists in Mexico.

The objective of this paper is to review one of the historical stages of sociology in Mexico, that occurred around twenty years ago, and that was characterized by the self-reflective attitude against the discipline. The main achievement of this stage was to elaborate a serious and critical diagnosis about sociological tradition in the country. This diagnosis was very useful as a source of new criteria to demarcate the field of sociology with stricter academic basis.

Around the question of how and why we need to write about the history of sociology, I will argue that the works I'm going to review, written twenty years ago, still very relevant today. And that is because they condense, as historical products, important theoretical reflections about the identity of the discipline. Returning to the past will help us seeing how sociology in Mexico has reached his actual condition of social science. It will allow us as well to identify the permanent tension of what can be and what should be constitutive of an academic sociological discipline.

#### **Session 4**

**Tuesday 10.45-12.45**

#### **The History of Empirical Social Research and Statistics**

Chaired by Irmela Gorges

Contact: [i.gorges@gmx.de](mailto:i.gorges@gmx.de)

Hynek Jerabek (Charles University in Prague, Czech Republic)

[hynek.jerabek@gmail.com](mailto:hynek.jerabek@gmail.com)

#### **Three stages of the institutionalization of empirical social research**

This paper analyses the process of the development of research methodology. This development occurred in three steps in the institutionalisation of empirical social research in the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. The first stage of this process is most comprehensively represented by the Chicago School at the start of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Ten key decisions were made in Chicago that built up the Department of Sociology as one of the most important sociological research centres of its day in the United States: 1) generous funding; 2) the foundation of the department of sociology; 3) PhD. studies; 4) AJS; 5) R.E. Park; 6) Chicago as a “social laboratory”; 7) “the green bible”; 8) PhD. seminar; 9) publication series; 10) service centre. The second stage in the institutionalisation process was initiated by the use of mass data on social units. The character of this kind of data processing was usually descriptive. Four demands brought about this development: 1) organized teamwork; 2) sample techniques; 3) standardization and 4) technological development. In the third stage a decisive turning point was reached when the creators of the “survey analysis” model began to use the same data to test hypotheses about causal relationships between relevant research variables. Two projects and two names are connected with these changes: “The Princeton Radio Project” (P. F. Lazarsfeld) and BASR as its continuation at Columbia University, and a large-scale project “The American Soldier” (S. A. Stouffer). These two sociological workshops led to the development of research methodology as a tool for causal analysis. An entire series of practical and organizational changes had to be carried out and new methods of data analysis were introduced into practice. This institutionalisation of empirical social research as part of academic sociology then formed the natural foundation for cumulative social science.

Keywords: institutionalisation, empirical social research, survey analysis, cumulative social science

Theresa Wobbe (Sociology, University of Potsdam, Germany)

[theresa.wobbe@uni-potsdam.de](mailto:theresa.wobbe@uni-potsdam.de)

#### **Creating the woman worker: Sociology's contribution to the making of a social and statistical category in late 19<sup>th</sup> centuries German Kaiserreich**

Since sociology contributes to an understanding of our world by defining new objects of research and re-evaluating its rich heritage, the history of empirical research is of prominent interest. The contribution will be concerned with this history with respect to the German sociology context through a gender lens. (1) In the first step the gender dimension of the discourses on the *social question* and the *woman's question* will be sketched as developed during the 19<sup>th</sup> century in Germany. (2) Then the sociological discourse, that of the *Verein für Socialpolitik* and that of the feminist movement will be elaborated regarding women's paid work. (3) Against this background the emerging category of the *Arbeiterin/woman worker* will be traced. The presumption of this contribution is that both social science and sociology contributed to the creation of the social and statistical category of *Arbeiterin/woman worker* by gendering the meaning of work. The paper will show that in the context of the discourses on protective labour legislation restrictions in working

hour and site as well as in occupational tasks contributed to the statistical creation of a sociological category and to its institutional birth.

Zohreh Bayatrizi (Sociology, University of Alberta, Canada)

[bayatri@ualberta.ca](mailto:bayatri@ualberta.ca)

### **The Metropolis in Early Statistical Writings: A Conceptual History of the ‘Urban Type’**

This paper investigates eighteenth and nineteenth century statistical writings on urbanization and urban populations, and in particular the writings of the statistical societies in England. These writings helped construct concepts to describe the character of urban dwellers as a social type and also helped develop techniques to study this and other social type. Of particular interest is the use of questionnaires and door to door surveys of the working class.

Keywords: urban types, UK statistical societies, development of questionnaires and surveys

Christian Dayé (Sociology, University of Graz, Austria)

[ch.daye@uni-graz.at](mailto:ch.daye@uni-graz.at)

### **Notes on the History of Political Gaming**

Between those institutions that have been on the forefront of the development of game theory in the United States, the RAND Corporation is of special interest. RAND was established towards the end of WWII by the US Air Force and Douglas Aircraft Company to keep experienced researchers of the war effort within government service. It specialized in research that could inform the strategy of the US Air Force. In 1948, a Social Science Division was set up. This division's first director was Hans Speier, an German born sociologist who emigrated to the US in 1933. He remained in this position until 1963.

Beginning in 1954, the social science division developed a procedure for the study of foreign affairs they called „political gaming“. The word game can be taken literally: the players are teams of experts represent either nations or government agencies. They are confronted with a fictitious though possible situation, a scenario. Consequently, they have to determine their strategy and their actions and submit them on paper. These papers are then distributed for preparing the next round. Political games endured for several days, sometimes weeks. Its results were mostly used to identify lacks of adequate knowledge and stimulate the outcome of situations no foreign policy expert has thought of before.

Clearly, this is an conceptualization of the term game quite different from the one that forms the core of the mathematically oriented game theory. In my paper, I will explore the relation between political gaming and the contemporaneous work in game theory. Based on archival materials, I will explore the intellectual and cognitive level of both branches of research as well as institutional and personal factors involved in the formation of political gaming. I will then end by outlining the trajectory political gaming took after its conception at RAND, trying to provide an answer to the question why political gaming has not seen the same academic success as game theory.

## ***Session 5***

**Tuesday 15.30-17.30**

### **The Entangled History of Gender and Sociology**

Chaired by Theresa Wobbe

Contact: [theresa.wobbe@uni-potsdam.de](mailto:theresa.wobbe@uni-potsdam.de)

Per Wisselgren (Umea University, Sweden)

### **Social reform collaborations and gendered academisation: Three Swedish social science couples at the turn of the 20th century**

The paper deals with three social science couples in Sweden at the turn of the 20th century of which the husbands are all well-known in the Swedish context as pioneers of academic sociology and economics: Knut Wicksell (1851-1926), Gustaf Steffen (1864-1929) and Gustav Cassel (1866-1945). The three men have much in common. Most important in this context, however, is that they all had life-long partners by their sides: Anna Wicksell, née Bugge (1862-1928), Oscara Steffen, née von Sydow (1864-1956), and Johanna Cassel, née Möller (1870-1936). But, in stark contrast to their husbands, the wives are more or less unacknowledged in the history of sociology and the social sciences. One way of problematizing the traditional historical accounts from a gendered perspective is to employ a more systematic "couples"-perspective. The basic research question posed is *if* and, if so, more exactly *how* Anna Wicksell, Oscara Steffen and Johanna Cassel contributed to their husbands careers and efforts to establish themselves as representatives of the new social science disciplines in Sweden?

Theoretically, the study draws on earlier research that have emphasized the importance of paying attention to, on the one hand, the wider historical, social and cultural contexts of the social sciences, and, on the other, the "private", relational, family-centred and routinised everyday practices of scientific knowledge production. The study will show that the three wives, too, had much in common with their husbands, that they shared a deep commitment to the social issues of the time, but also that they made contributions of their own to the rapidly expanding field of social research. Furthermore, it will be pinpointed in what ways Anna Wicksell, Oscara Steffen and Johanna Cassel acted as a kind of combined "moral supporters", "research assistants", "secretaries", "discussants" and in some respects even "managers" for their husbands. The main argument developed is that the revealed patterns of gender division preferably can be interpreted in the historical context of the contemporary, mainly urban and middle class-based, social reform movement – in which all six individuals were actively involved. The social reform movement, it is argued, not only provided an important arena for cross-gender collaborations, but was also a vehicle for the making and reproduction of the socially and culturally defined gendered spheres of action that circumscribed the three couples' marital collaborations.

Thomas Lenz (Sociology, University of Luxembourg, Luxembourg)

[thomas.lenz@uni.lu](mailto:thomas.lenz@uni.lu)

### **Sociology of consumption and the "new women" of the "Kaiserreich"**

The emergence of the consumer society in the German „Kaiserreich“ is closely linked with a moral discussion dealing with one of the most important manifestations of this new era of consumption: the department store. At the turn of the century department stores rapidly spread in most of the bigger German cities. The German discourse on this diffusion of department stores was quite pessimistic and loaded with misogynic stereotypes, especially compared to the more moderate French discussion on this topic. In my paper I intend to show how this discussion was not only a debate on the social implications of a emerging new consumer society but also an attempt to fight against the "feminization" of the „Kaiserreich“.

Pamphlets, medical and juridical journals, newspapers, a vast amount of dime novels released between 1850 and 1914 and sociological texts by Weber, Veblen, Simmel and Sombart dealing with the consumer society in Germany were analysed and the discourse about the department store and women was reconstructed by me. The sociologists helped constructing the "new women" of the "Kaiserreich", defining the boundaries of a social discourse that evolved within the general public. While novels, articles or even pamphlets cannot be treated as a mirror of the society they attempt to portray, they can be seen as a repository of social discourse. These textual documents show Germans wrestling with the new experiences of consumption, nationhood and modernity. Three main topics can be identified that were discussed within the discourse on department stores and consumption: (a) the "threats" of the department stores for the women of the "Kaiserreich" (e.g. stealing, prostitution and agoraphobia) (b) the role of Jewish entrepreneurs who were thought to destroy the German "Mittelstand" (middle classes) and to endanger their female workforce – financially and sexually and (c) some enthusiasm for the architecture and the techniques of the modern department stores that was linked with a cultural-pessimistic and misogynic view on the social consequences of modernity as a whole.

Marcel Rebenack (Potsdam University, Germany)

[marcel.rebenack@uni-potsdam.de](mailto:marcel.rebenack@uni-potsdam.de)

### **Georg Simmel and Women – Tracing Spencer’s Legacy in Simmels differentiation theory**

While the idea of differentiation is without doubt part of the basic sociological toolbox there remain two (interrelated) desiderata: while Simmel and Durkheim went to considerable length to separate the notion of differentiation and division of labor, the two concepts seem to be interchangeable if not synonymous in many contemporary textbooks. Additionally, the effort to sketch out Simmels contribution to a *gendered division of labor* is marginal while Durkheims ideas regarding differentiation and division of labor have already been analysed through a gender lens.

(1) While starting with Spencers original conception of differentiation the contribution will show that there is no value-free or even neutral/objective version of differentiation that could serve as a point of departure. On the contrary it will be shown that Spencers legacy consists in a *gender-infused idea of differentiation*, which then took its way into the sociological mainstream.

(2) Against this background I will focus on Georg Simmels interpretation of this concept. (3) The attempt to integrate Simmels ideas on ‘subjective and objective culture’ and its foundation in a mix of sociocultural evolution and gendered differentiation into a distinct ‘differentiation theory’ will unpack the limits of Simmels analysis which can be traced back to the foundation of differentiation he inherited from Spencer legacy. This closer reading at Simmels collected works on both his ‘gender sociology’ and his prominent essays on differentiation will reveal the legacy that he adopted from Spencers gender-infiltrated views on the division of labour and the interrelated concept of differentiation. The paper argues for the necessity of a genealogy of the ‘differentiation theory’ that we are all familiar with and to reflect on its emergence through a gender lens.

Isabelle Berrebi-Hoffmann and Michel Lallement (Lise-CNRS-Cnam, Paris, France)

[Isabelle.berrebi-hoffmann@lise.cnrs.fr](mailto:Isabelle.berrebi-hoffmann@lise.cnrs.fr), [michel.lallement@cnam.fr](mailto:michel.lallement@cnam.fr)

### **Durkheim, the Durkheimian School and the Woman Question**

Contrary to the social question, socialism, biologism or racism, relations between sociology and the woman question were not extensively debated in the Durkheimian studies. However, the woman question was as central in the third Republic political and academic debates as were the other questions. P. Besnard was instrumental in introducing the debate when demonstrating in a 1973 seminal article (« Durkheim et les femmes ou le *Suicide* inachevé », *Revue française de sociologie*, XIV, 1, p. 27-61), how highlighting the complex relations between the woman question and sociology was a necessary condition to fully understand the suicide complex demonstration. Following this path, this contribution wish to offer a similar lecture of a selection of Durkheim’s works and of the less known Durkheimians works. It will try to show that the generally assumed conservative position of Durkheim on women has to be partly revised. The Durkheim’s publications on divorce and sexual education will be used to provide some evidence for this argument. Building on the ambiguities of Durkheim positions we will stress, the Durkheimian school’s works show two different positions toward the woman question. One group of scholars (like M. Mauss) analyses the women/men relations in a fundamental anthropological approach. Others (like D. Parodi, C. Bouglé, G. Richard) show an interest in the question itself, addressing the “culture/ nature debate” for instance in books and conferences.

## **Session 6**

**Tuesday 17.45-19.45**

### **Public Intellectuals**

Chaired by Christian Fleck

Contact: [christian.fleck@uni-graz.at](mailto:christian.fleck@uni-graz.at)

Shinsaku Shimizu (Tohoku University, Japan)  
[shimizus@sal.tohoku.ac.jp](mailto:shimizus@sal.tohoku.ac.jp)

### **Daniel Bell as a Public Intellectual and Sociological Controversies over Neoconservatism**

This study focuses on Daniel Bell's sociological works and intellectual style within the history of public intellectuals in sociology because he can be considered a typical public sociologist with a considerable global impact through such intellectual, not academic, journals as *The Public Interest*, *Commentary*, and *Dissent*. However, most sociologists regard him as only a has-been because they consider him a typical neoconservative. For example, Michael Burawoy, who promotes public sociology, has never referred to Daniel Bell as a public sociologist. However, Bell denies that he is a neoconservative and insists that he is "a socialist in economics, a liberal in politics and a conservative in culture." I attempt to overturn the negative evaluation of Daniel Bell by describing his disagreement with the godfather of neoconservatism, Irving Kristol, who co-edited *The Public Interest* with Bell and is considered his political partner in constructing a new public philosophy to replace neoconservative and old liberal viewpoints. Examining Bell's intellectual history leads us to understand the points on which we can criticize neoconservatism. In this study, I redefine neoconservatism in sociology as "sociological neoconservatism" by reviewing it in the historical context of sociology. In sociology, early controversies over neoconservatism focused on modern cultures and religion, not economic and foreign policies. For example, Habermas regarded Bell as a typical conservative because Bell criticized postmodernism and stressed the importance of religion. However, the original controversies regarding sociological neoconservatism do not directly relate to the recent neo-conservative promotion of the Iraq war under the Bush administration after September 11, 2001.

Barbara A. Misztal (Sociology, Leicester, UK)  
[bm50@leicester.ac.uk](mailto:bm50@leicester.ac.uk)

### **The source of intellectuals' public standing: the lesson from a Nobel Trinity**

The paper's aim is to debate what public intellectuals can earn the attention of a general audience. By focusing on unusual achievements of three women sociologists who won the Nobel Peace Prize, the paper demonstrates what social scientists can offer in the role of public intellectuals and shows what does provide intellectuals with the authority to speak to a non-academic audience. Jane Addams, Emily Greene Balch and Alva Myrdal's achievements as public intellectuals and their input into public life document that the essential feature of public intellectuals' authority is their professional knowledge and their standing in the field. Their idea of sociology's contribution to improving the quality of public discussion, like Burawoy's project of public sociology, stresses an organic relation between sociology and its various publics. Their accomplishments as public intellectuals and their ability to put important issues on the public agenda can be seen as a result of their ability to courageously uphold and act upon their core civic values. The paper concludes by arguing that Addams, Balch and Myrdal's successful realization of their goals was possible because of both: their professional credential and their courage to take on risky actions for purposes to institutionalise social or cultural change.

Eleanor Townsley, Mount Holyoke College (USA) and Lisa Kowalchuk, University of Guelph (Canada)  
[etwonsle@mountholyoke.edu](mailto:etwonsle@mountholyoke.edu)

### **Defining "the social" in Canada and the United States: public intellectuals, media intellectuals and academic intellectuals**

Analyzing representative samples of newspaper op-eds published in Canada and the United States (1993-1994, 2001-2002), this paper examines the conditions under which different kinds of intellectuals (including sociologists) compete to define "the social". We ask: to what extent are the elite spaces of opinion similar in the two countries? Do they possess a similar internal composition? To what extent is the nature (performance, rhetoric, content, strategies) of opinionated speech similar or different in Canada and the United States? We find that different national, cultural and political histories shape the institutional conditions of opinion quite differently in the two countries, while at the same time, transnational intellectual networks as well as the forces of institutional isomorphism in the academy, politics and the media work to standardize the intellectual conditions, formats and scope of opinion.

Philipp Korom (Sociology, European University Institute (EUI), Florence, Italy)

[philipp.korom@eui.eu](mailto:philipp.korom@eui.eu)

### **Who talks to the public and why? A quantitative and comparative analysis of Op-Eds in two Austrian dailies**

Op-eds in newspapers represent a crucial site where the public debate takes place. This paper takes a closer look at two high-quality dailies, “Die Presse” and “Der Standard”, that are known for shaping public opinion in a meager media landscape with only 17 daily newspapers on the print market. An analysis of a time-period of seven years allows for investigating whether the space of the op-eds is dominated by certain actors (journalists, politicians, corporate leaders, academics, etc.). Furthermore this article takes time as a central dimension and analyses whether op-ed writers react to world affairs or try themselves to make certain issues a topic in the public sphere. By synchronically tracing the discourse in two dailies I aim also at exploring whether we deal with two fundamental different public spaces of critical intervention (liberal versus conservative) that give the most place only to a certain type of public intellectual.

Sven Eliaeson (Sweden)

[Sven.eliaeson@soc.uu.se](mailto:Sven.eliaeson@soc.uu.se)

### **The Significance of Gunnar Myrdal for the understanding of post-1989-transformations: a contribution to the conceptual history of a public intellectual**

The relevance of the classics for the understanding of post-1989 transformation processes is a partly unploughed field, for reflection, evaluation, and selection. Stage models such as Rokkan’s, based on a number of North-West European cases, seem to have some general value, but do not exclude “exceptionalisms” concerning the design of modern nations. Various classical scholars are relevant. Schumpeter has a double relevance, about capitalism overburdening itself and the historical tendency of *demos* to define itself. Carl Schmitt, Norbert Elias, and Talcott Parsons are difficult to ignore. Myrdal’s institutionalist approach, e.g. his ideas about the soft state, vicious and virtuous circles and cumulative causation, remains relevant; for pan-European problems in the era of EU-enlargement. Friedrich List is an institutionalist pioneer, bringing the state into the political economy. Veblen could also be mentioned. Samuel Pufendorf is as a theoretician of civil society *avant la lettre* an a peacemaker between religions, just as Axel Hägerström later on is a peacemaker between secular religions (ideologies), in the post-Enlightenment predicament of value-incommensurability. Secular Scottish-Enlightenment four stages theories (Ferguson, Adam Smith) are pivotal. Marx remains relevant. Many classic authors carry straws to the same stack, promoting secularized Western Modernity. Which contributions are still relevant? And where? We cannot answer this question on behalf of post-Communist societies. Perhaps we can help the classics serve as sparring partners.

Gunnar Myrdal’s increasing relevance for post-1989 affairs, in the perspective of EU enlargement processes and the consequences of the implosion of the Soviet (read Russian) empire is intriguing. During his travels in Central Asia between two assignments, as director of ECE and the giant project *Asian Drama*, in 1957, he wrote a very long and as yet unpublished letter to his wife Alva, filled with acute observations and predictions. He does not exactly predict the events 1989 and 1991 but he identifies the tensions, demographic and other, leading up to these events or, more precisely, have a steering effects upon events in the wake of *die Wende*.

Ragnvald Kalleberg (Sociology, University of Oslo, Norway)

[ragnvald.kalleberg@sosgeo.uio.no](mailto:ragnvald.kalleberg@sosgeo.uio.no)

### **Academics as public intellectuals in media society. Achievements, problems and prospects.**

Universities have four main tasks: scientific and scholarly research, academic studies, dissemination and public discourse, and training of professionals (most typically in the old and new professions). The third task can be conceptualized in terms of what was called “the unity of science and enlightenment” in the classic Humboldt university, be it the model’s European or American version. In dissemination specialized knowledge and insight is made relevant and understandable for interested people outside of the research specialty, specialists in other fields included. Here the outsider is active in the role of a cultural citizen, for

instance as reader of popular science books. The academic may also take part in public discourse and contribute with his or her specialized knowledge to democratic discourse. Here, the academic as debater is communicating with other people in their role as political citizens. How is this task understood and practiced today? Is it adequately institutionalized? What are its problems and prospects? The paper is focused on Norwegian academics as a special case of general phenomena in contemporary media societies.

Patrick Baert (Sociology, University of Cambridge, UK)

[pjnb100@cam.ac.uk](mailto:pjnb100@cam.ac.uk)

### **Sartre's public performances**

This paper is part of a broader sociological project about French existentialism as an intellectual movement. The notion of public performance is crucial to this analysis. The paper explores how, in the course of the 1940s, French existentialists used (often carefully orchestrated) public performances to promote, defend and disseminate their ideas. Particular attention will be given to Sartre's famous lecture 'L'existentialisme est un humanisme' (which took place on 29 October 1945 at the Salle des Centraux in Paris) and to two long visits by Sartre to the United States (a semi-ambassadorial visit in 1945 and a lecturing tour in 1946). The paper also explores how, in various subtle (and sometimes not so subtle) ways, those performances dealt with the traumatic experience of the war.

## *Session 7*

### **Sociological Perspectives on Conceptual and Intellectual History (I)**

**Wednesday 10.45-12.45**

Chaired by Andreas Hess

Contact: [a.hess@ucd.ie](mailto:a.hess@ucd.ie)

Dominik Bartmanski (Sociology, Yale University, US)

[dominil.bartmanski@yale.edu](mailto:dominil.bartmanski@yale.edu)

### **How to become an iconic social thinker. A new cultural sociological framework for intellectual history**

This paper sets forth a cultural approach to the emergence and lasting of formidable intellectual reputations. Its central questions are: (1) what it takes to win a modern struggle for recognition within broadly conceived humanities and (2) under what conditions one can enjoy a major impact across time, space and professional boundaries as a social thinker.

The sociological approaches that have dominated the field in recent decades have not systematically thematized the cultural aspects of making influential claims in social sciences. Likewise, the interdisciplinary power and trans-generational appeal of social thinkers, two major criteria of their professional success, are not fully explained. For one thing, the traditional sociology of knowledge focuses too heavily on material and institutional factors. It offers models that would attempt to explain intellectual success in terms of network belonging and material/structural support. The newer approaches include symbolic and emotional aspects but they tend to incorporate them in auxiliary rather than fully systematic manner. While doing that they rely too much on the language of intentionality or else make use, explicitly or implicitly, of such adjacent notions as talent, genius, or emotional energy. These metaphors are fine but their significance is not systematically assessed in relation to other explanatory factors.

My paper develops a new argument in three stages. First, I position it vis-à-vis the key existing approaches by exposing their deficiencies. I focus mostly on the seminal works of Pierre Bourdieu, Michel Lamont and Randall Collins. Second, I lay out a new framework that makes up for the omissions of the contemporary standard literature. It draws mainly on the work of Jeffrey Alexander, i.e. it offers an interpretation of pertinent phenomena in performative and symbolic terms. The cultural factors of this kind are consistently treated as relatively independent variables. Finally, I apply this new framework to two examples, namely the intellectual careers of Bronislaw Malinowski and Michel Foucault.

Matteo Bortolini (Sociology, University of Padua, Italy)

[matteo.bartolini@unipd.it](mailto:matteo.bartolini@unipd.it)

### **“To put it bluntly, religion is true.” Robert N. Bellah, Religion, and Disciplines**

A student of Talcott Parsons at Harvard, Robert N. Bellah debuted in the mid-1950s as a specialist of Japanese religion and society and a general theorist in the sociology of religion, working within a clearly recognizable functionalist framework. Around 1965, however, his writings took an unexpected turn. His theoretical vocabulary changed, he started using poetry as part of his arguments rather than as an empirical fact to understand, and he incorporated the work of mavericks as Herbert Fingarette and Norman O. Brown into his own. As he was becoming better and better known thanks to “Civil Religion in America,” Bellah’s methodological writings and his understanding of his role as a religious scholar – rather than a scholar of religion – were distancing him from both Parsonian functionalism and the mainstream of the sociology of religion of the previous twenty years.

In some essays published in the early 1970s Bellah explained his shift as a personal *coupure*. In this paper, I will contend that such an individualistic, biographical explanation is only partly satisfying. I will show how Bellah’s shift was part of a wider crisis within the sociology of religion of the early 1970s: All of a sudden, some sociologists started to question the adequacy of the understanding of their discipline as a branch of scientific sociology devoted to the observation of actual behavior and hypothesis testing of “religious phenomena.” As one of the protagonists of this attempt at changing the direction – the word “paradigm” is not really adequate, – of the social-scientific study of religion, Bellah did *not* fashion his position and his new vocabulary from scratch. Rather, he somehow “translated” within the social sciences some of the debates that had been going on for almost twenty years in the neighboring fields of comparative religion and the history of religion.

My hypothesis is that the visibility gained by his ideas depended, at least in part, on the fact that he continued to self-identify himself as a *social scientist* and presented his views as a rethinking of the social sciences, not as a mere individual change of allegiance from sociology to religious studies or the history of religion. This exercise, however, is not intended to merely “doing justice” to Bellah’s past work. Rather, I will use this portion of Bellah’s intellectual career to show the complexity of a sociological study of ideas when catchwords as “fields” and “disciplines” are taken seriously.

Keywords: Bellah, religion, academic disciplines, symbolic boundaries, empirical social science

Filipe Carreira da Silva (Institute for Social Sciences, University of Lisbon)

[fmsilva@ics.ul.pt](mailto:fmsilva@ics.ul.pt)

### **Intellectual History Matters: G.H. Mead and Social Theory Today**

In this paper I discuss a new edition of Mead’s writings I recently edited for Routledge “Classics in Sociology Series”. *G.H. Mead. A Reader* is a single volume, comprised by texts whose authorial status is undoubted, and that covers the three main areas around which Mead’s thinking developed: 1) the human self, 2) science and epistemology, and 3) radical democratic politics. By bringing together these three key aspects of Mead’s philosophical inquiry, this book allows the reader to appreciate the webbed quality of Mead’s work, and search out commonalities and connections across the different areas it covers. *G.H. Mead. A Reader* offers three things. First, at least a third of the texts included in this selection have never been published before. The importance of this fact needs no further justification beyond the observation that Mead is generally considered to be one of the most neglected figures in American social thought. The publication of these texts will make a decisive contribution to changing this situation. Second, the way I organize the volume sheds completely new light on the previously published articles. I refer to their relative location in the development of Mead’s ideas over time, the conceptual links relating them to each other, and their relevance from the point of view of Mead’s system of thinking. Third, students and academics will no longer have to resort to multiple volumes, sometimes poorly edited, in order to grasp the whole range of Mead’s interests. By covering all major aspects of his work, this book provides a comprehensive presentation of Mead’s contributions to contemporary social and political theory. These are but three reasons why intellectual history matters.

Marcia Consolim (Federal University of Sao Paulo, Brasil)

[m.consolim@terra.com.br](mailto:m.consolim@terra.com.br)

### **Collective Psychology and Sociology in the French Intellectual Field at the End of the 19<sup>th</sup> Century**

This paper intends to present some motives for the so-called “collective psychology” did not emerge as academic discipline in French universities at the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. This subject opposed the new practices and representations about the function of the intellectual, particularly the ones created by the Durkheimian sociology since the foundation of *L'Année sociologique*. The theme of “collective psychology” was mainly adopted by so-called “free intellectuals” and scientific magazines that were in concurrence to the durkheimian group, such as the *Revue internationale de sociologie* and the *Revue de synthèse historique*. For them, social sciences should be subordinated to the social and pedagogical demands of the political and economical elites. Together with these elites, the “free intellectuals” formed a *status* group defending the “historical and biographical individualities”, which was in opposition to some kinds of scientific methods they judged subverting the moral-intellectual order. Although it had the appearance of a modernist discipline - once adopting natural and scientific explanation -, “collective psychology” became a conservative discipline fighting against the specialization of social studies at the university and the progressive social distinction of the intellectual, political and economical elites.

Roberto Motta (Univ. Estadual da Paraíba, Brazil)

### **The Protestant Ethic Thesis: Some Forerunners of Max Weber in France and Brazil.**

It is well known that the “Protestant Ethic” thesis had existed for a long time prior to Max Weber’s own formulation. Some specific cases of anticipation of the thesis are represented by Émile de Laveleye and Napoléon Roussel, in the French speaking world of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, and, in the same century, by the Brazilian writers T. Bastos, E. Carlos Pereira and a certain number of missionaries of English and North-American background who worked in Brazil, like Zachary Taylor and several others. While such precursors do not necessarily reach the same level of theoretical, indeed of theological refinement development as does Weber, they view adhesion to Protestantism (albeit, at times, in a rather secularized and cultural sense) as a necessary condition for modernization and economic development. Weber’s own formulation of the thesis seems to represent a secularized version of a central tenet of Protestant apologetics. And, again in largely secularized terms, this is still, in early 21<sup>st</sup> century, a fully living, indeed a burning issue in both France, Brazil and elsewhere, being but a continuation of the *Kulturkampf* that has for so long opposed the traditional Protestant and Catholic conceptions of society and modernization.

## ***Session 8***

**Wednesday 15.30-17.30**

### **Sociological Perspectives on Conceptual and Intellectual History (II)**

Chaired by Andreas Hess

Contact: [a.hess@ucd.ie](mailto:a.hess@ucd.ie)

Klas Gustavsson (Sociology, University of Lund, Sweden)

[klas.gustavsson@so.lu.se](mailto:klas.gustavsson@so.lu.se)

### **How to Theorize the Relation between Ordinary Language and Theoretical Concepts – A Pragmatic View**

This paper examines three different answers to the question of how to comprehend the relation between ordinary languages of common sense knowledge vis-à-vis abstract conceptualisations in social sciences. From a rationalist point of view there is a need for the social scientist to make a radical epistemological break with the common sense knowledge and ordinary language, in order to formulate clear scientific concepts. This position is for example represented in Durkheim’s rules for sociological method and repeated in different theoretical formulations since then. For example Pierre Bourdieu, drawing upon

Gaston Bachelard, discriminate between the ‘spontaneous sociology’ of the lay people and the theoretical knowledge of the professional social scientist. From an empiricist point of view this epistemological break is denied. The logical empiricist approach, propose that all theoretical statements rest on, and directly correspond to, concrete and reportable observations. This argument is in some way reformulated in the ethnomethodological tradition where the distinction between the everyday knowledge of the lay members and the scientific knowledge of the social scientist is blurred. Drawing upon Alfred Schutz as well as the later Wittgenstein, I argue in favour of a pragmatic version of the rationalist break. The break between the everyday language and theoretical concepts is understood as a shift from a ‘natural attitude’ to a ‘scientific attitude’ and a movement from first-order-constructions, to constructions of the second order. In this pragmatist view, the epistemological break is not seen as a rupture between uninformed knowledge to true science, but rather as a kind of gestalt shift and a change of different language games.

Carl-Göran Heidegren (Sociology, Lund University, Sweden) and Henrik Lundberg (Education and Behavioral Sciences, University College of Borås, Sweden)

[henrik.lundberg@oru.se](mailto:henrik.lundberg@oru.se)

### **Towards a Sociology of Philosophy**

The article presents and discusses the sociology of philosophy as a theory-based empirically practiced sociological subdivision that came to the fore in the 1980s. In the first part the type of empirical material and the forms of data presentation that are available to the sociology of philosophy are discussed. In the second part the focus is on two important attempts, those of Randall Collins and Pierre Bourdieu, to develop general sociological theories about the relationship between social being and thought. The main lesson to be drawn from them is that in normal circumstances philosophical thought cannot be reduced to socio-political conditions outside the attention space (Collins) or the philosophical field (Bourdieu). In the concluding part we tentatively sketch a program for a future sociology of philosophy. All in all, the sociology of philosophy is seen as a lately emerging new subdivision within sociology whose potential is far from exhausted, both with respect to theoretical development as well as empirical approaches.

Lena Lindgren (Sociology, Lund University, Sweden)

[lena.lingren@soclaw.lu.se](mailto:lena.lingren@soclaw.lu.se)

### **Concepts of Legitimacy: Continuity and Change**

My paper discusses sociological perspectives on conceptual and intellectual history, between classical history of ideas and sociology of knowledge. I use the concept of legitimacy as an example and give a brief historical account of shifting attitudes towards the normative concept of political legitimacy, extending from the Comtian disdain of its metaphysical heritage to today’s use of it as an uncontested part of common sociological knowledge and vocabulary. I am particularly interested in how this change came about.

Magnus Ring, Department of Sociology, Lund University, Sweden.

[magnus.ring@soc.lu.se](mailto:magnus.ring@soc.lu.se)

### **The concept formation of social movements**

The proposed paper deals with the conceptual history of ‘social movements’, relating the formation of this analytical concept within the field of sociology to historical experiences and a world “in motion”. The point of the departure in this paper is a short etymological discussion, after which the ‘original’ sociological meaning given by Lorenz von Stein in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century is discussed, followed by a discussion on the importance of Karl Marx for the birth of a more modern understanding of the concept. The paper goes on to treat two variants of how social movements was conceptualised in North America and in the European context, clarifying possible reasons for differences in these traditions. More contemporary definitions of the concept are then advanced. The paper ends with a discussion of the possible meaning of ‘social movement’ today, summarizing the discussion on the relationship between historical development, “a world in motion”, and sociological conceptual development. This text is partly inspired by Reinhart Koselleck’s conceptual history, although his methodology is not applied in a strict sense. The paper builds on an understanding of concepts as necessarily ambiguous maintaining that the context that concepts refer to also constitute a part of their inherent meaning. In other words, the ambiguity of concepts reflects the ambiguity of the phenomena. Moreover it is proposed that

changes and differences in sociological definitions of 'social movement' and meanings associated with the concept reflect the actual socio-political conditions to which they refer.

Danilo Mandić (Harvard University, USA)

[mandic@fas.harvard.edu](mailto:mandic@fas.harvard.edu)

**The Legacy of Power Elite Theory: A Study of the Treatment of C. Wright Mills' *Power Elite* in Sociology and Political Science**

This paper accounts for the conditions of intellectual delegitimation of C. Wright Mills' power elite theory (PET) in the fields of sociology and political science in the US. I argue that Mills' relative disappearance in both fields is best understood as a result of a legitimacy crisis of elite theory as a whole in the social sciences, and that the differences between the two fields will reflect different reactions to this legitimacy crisis. Concretely, I expect PET to disappear gradually in both fields in different ways (with political science being less attentive and sympathetic), I expect dismissal of PET to be based primarily on delegitimation of elite theory in general, and I expect non-empirical approaches to PET to be more frequent than empirical ones. I rely on Lamont's study of the legitimation of Jacques Derrida (1987), adopting her general approach to the case study of PET with several methodological innovations. As a rough indicator of the intellectual legitimation of the work, I investigate citation patterns of PET in political science and sociology journals, and engage in in-depth content analysis of a subset of articles. I also consider the ways elite theory in general and Mills' PET in particular have been coupled or decoupled over the last fifty years in the two disciplines. I conclude with remarks on the implications for the sociology of knowledge more broadly.

***Session 9***

**Wednesday 17.45-19.45**

**Author(s) Meet(s)-Critic(s)**

**TBA**

***Session 10***

**Thursday 10.45-12.45**

**National Traditions and Trajectories (I)**

Chaired by Christian Fleck

Contact: [christian.fleck@uni-graz.at](mailto:christian.fleck@uni-graz.at)

Ragnvald Kalleberg (Sociology, University of Oslo, Norway)

[ragnvald.kalleberg@sosgeo.uio.no](mailto:ragnvald.kalleberg@sosgeo.uio.no)

**The establishment of Norwegian sociology as a university discipline after the Nazi occupation**

The social sciences have generally a much longer intellectual than institutional history. As intellectual enterprises they emerged as part of the scientific revolution in Europe during the seventeenth century. As organizational units they started to emerge at the end of the nineteenth century, but rapid growth came after WWII. The development of Norwegian sociology fits into this pattern, with a history dating back to the early Enlightenment, although its first department, positions and formalized academic study were founded only in 1950. The young people that built up Norwegian sociology after the German occupation of Norway ended in May 1945, belonged to a generation deeply influenced by their experiences of war and resistance to the Nazi-occupation, with strong pro-democratic convictions and a desire to contribute critically and constructively to the development of a peaceful world and social equality in a democratic welfare society.

Before WWII Norwegian academics oriented themselves toward Germany, but the war experience made the new social sciences orient themselves to American social science, not at least as it was practiced by Robert Merton and Paul Lazarsfeld. Main lines in these developments are presented and discussed, with a focus on the late 1940s and 1950s.

Włodzimierz Winclawski (Nicolaus Copernicus University, Toruń, Poland)

[winc@umk.pl](mailto:winc@umk.pl)

### **The reasons for the success of Polish sociology between the two World Wars (1918-1939)**

The rebirth of the Polish state in 1918 took place after almost 150 years. Polish society had to organise a modern state with all its institutions, including sciences. This task was particularly difficult for those who wanted to develop sociology in Poland, because there were no academic sociological traditions or any non-academic research institutions. The occupying states (Russia, Prussia and Austria) were resistant to the development of science in Poland, especially of social studies, and in particular sociology. In spite of this sociological institutions were established at the dawn of the second Republic of Poland (1918). And, as it soon turned out, these institutions were not phoney. The accomplishments of Polish sociology in the period between the two World Wars are much appreciated. In the classical history of sociology “Masters of Sociological Thought” written by Lewis A. Coser we read, that in the first 30 years of the 20 century, there were three sociological schools: First there was “the group of sociologists Durkheim brought together in 1898, and who were to stay together and contribute to the “Année Sociologique” (...). The other two schools which have appeared so far in sociology included the Chicago school, created by Albion Small [and] the Polish school, founded by Florian Znaniecki” (Coser 1971: 165).

How was it possible for new sociological institutions to be created in a new state and how did Polish sociology became one of the three sociological schools of that time? Its founders Ludwik Krzywicki, Florian Znaniecki and Leon Petrażycki, to name few, did not appear from nowhere. They represented a generation of Poles who had introduced the ideas of the new study of society into Polish culture about 50 years before Poland regained its sovereignty. At that time they studied and worked in circumstances their peers who built sociology in the West would not have known. The growth of sociology in Poland cannot be only explained by their enthusiasm, vitality and engagement that went along with rebuilding the state. I put forward a thesis that the success of Polish sociology in the years 1918-1939 was possible because of historical and sociological circumstances such as the early introduction of sociology into Polish culture, the relationship between Polish elites and the Western culture during the Partition, the heroic efforts of the elites in fighting the occupiers, and the matching of the developing Polish sociology with the new world paradigm of this science

Marek Skovajsa (Sociology, Czech Academy of Sciences, Prague)

[marek.skovajsa@soc.cas.cz](mailto:marek.skovajsa@soc.cas.cz)

### **The Return of the Repressed? Dealing with Communist-era Legacies in Czech Sociology**

This paper analyzes the continuities and changes in the conceptual apparatus and theoretical underpinnings of sociology practiced in the Czech Republic before and after 1989. It proposes that sociologists after 1989 have used several distinct strategies to deal with the legacies of the past: rejection and avoidance – adjustment to new conditions – preservation. These strategies have been used with varying frequency by representatives of the principal segments of the social science community after 1989: pre-1989 social scientists of Marxist orientation active in the official sphere who continued to work in some version of Marxism after 1989 – pre-1989 social scientists of various types of background who, sooner or later in their career, moved towards Western-type social science - new generations of scholars socialized into social science community after 1989. The analysis documents how the scope of the post-1989 sociology expanded, moving from rejection, marginalization or disregard for concepts, themes and approaches perceived as being too closely associated with official Marxist-Leninist social science in the immediate aftermath of 1989 towards a more inclusive approach and more explicit engagement with the “leftist” concepts and theories in the 2000s. This process, however, involves an intense reception of Western social science rather than a return to the local Marxist tradition. Especially through the youngest generation of

researchers, Czech sociology ceases to perceive certain approaches and concepts as taboo and becomes more pluralist and open to a wide variety of theoretical influences.

The empirical base of the research is provided by publications representative of Czech sociology. The starting year for the pre-1989 period is 1965. The inclusion of mid- to late 1960s is important, because in this half-decade of political liberalization the Czechoslovak social sciences such as sociology and political science could develop under conditions of relative freedom. Social scientists purged after 1968 who returned to their profession in 1990s continued to use the conceptual instruments and terminology current in the 1960s. The principal source of empirical evidence is the main journal of the Czech sociological community, *Sociologický časopis / Czech Sociological Review* whose history stretches over three very distinct historical periods: 1965-1969, 1970-1989, and 1990-2009. Other journals and monographs are also included in the analysis. Hermeneutical method is applied to identify principal conceptual schemes typical for the pre-1989 social sciences and the post-Communist literature and to find continuities and discontinuities.

The paper will engage with available literature on post-Communist social sciences, such as, among others, volumes edited by Keen and Mucha or Kaase, Sparshuh and Wenninger. Parallels will be drawn with the situation in some other countries of East Central Europe, most notably Poland, Hungary, Slovakia and Rumania.

Márcio de Oliveira (Sociology, Federal University of Paraná, Brazil)

[marciodeoliveira@ufpr.br](mailto:marciodeoliveira@ufpr.br)

### **A chapter in Brazilian sociological history: the UNESCO research about racial relations and the unexpected racism against Poles in Curitiba (Paraná).**

The history of Brazilian sociology has been very influenced by the UNESCO's fight against racism just after the Second World War. In Brazil this fight culminated in a research program about racial relations which took place between 1951 and 1952 in the cities of Recife, Salvador, Rio de Janeiro and São Paulo. The UNESCO option for Brazil had one great reason: the country was considered to be a successful model of harmonic racial relations and, in this sense, it would be a paradigm for other racial conflictive countries all around the world. Nevertheless, Brazilian history and society disappointed UNESCO's officials because the Brazilian research team had discovered that the model of democratic racial relations – as described by the most famous Brazilian anthropologist, Gilberto Freyre (1900-1987) – was glaring overestimated. So, after the UNESCO research, a new Brazilian team – headed by the most important sociologist of this period, Florestan Fernandes (1920-1995) – engaged a new research about racial relations on Southern Brazil. This area was left out the first UNESCO research apparently because of the small number (even the lack) of black people. Nevertheless, in the city of Curitiba (capital of the state of Paraná), they were surprised by discovering a new type of racism: the racism against white people, particularly, against the descendants from Poles. This paper, by returning at this period, intends to recover the details of this unexpected discovery, to analyze these untold dimensions, placing it in its real position in Brazilian sociology history. In order to do so, we analyze the context of the research made in Paraná, so as the articles and books produced after that and published by the researches Octávio Ianni and the former president of Brazil, Fernando Henrique Cardoso, between the years of 1959 and 1966.

Larisa Titarenko (Sociology, Belarusian State University, Minsk, Belarus)

[larisa166@mail.ru](mailto:larisa166@mail.ru)

### **Post-Soviet Russian/Belarusian Sociology: National Traditions and Innovations**

When discussing sociology of post-Soviet states one can talk at least about two different sources of ideas, or two different roots of sociology in this region. First, it is the so called pre-revolutionary (pre-1917) period of sociology development when Russian sociology had several national schools of thoughts competing with each other. Second, it is the Soviet period of sociology development, mainly since the end of the 1950<sup>th</sup> when sociology was re-born in the Soviet Union as a Marxist school of thought. The first period was characterized as multi-paradigmatic: positivist schools co-existed with subjectivist and Marxist schools; the most famous in the 19<sup>th</sup> c. was probably a subjectivist school of narodnik N.Mihajlovskij, however, other schools also had followers. In the early 20<sup>th</sup> century P.Sorokin became the most famous sociologist in Russia, however, soon the national traditions (represented by Sorokin and other scholars) were broken.

During the Soviet period only one school was officially developed, Marxist-Leninist one, that transformed sociology into a part of the dominant ideological system (at least, on the official level). Even those scholars who were not “pure Marxists” had to use its terminology and present their concepts within the approved theoretical framework. Other traditions of Russian sociology have been forgotten.

During the post-Soviet period only a few ideas of pre-revolutionary sociology were recalled, mainly, the necessity of national schools and a recognition of the “special Russian way of development”. As a result, some nationalist sociological concepts were constructed that became close to the current ideology of “Great Russia” and its “original Orthodox culture”. Such Russian sociologists as Sorokin and Kovalevskij have been recognized as “classics” (although there were no new concepts developed on the basis of their ideas). In order to keep Russian sociological heritage alive and at the same time learn the global trajectories, it is necessary to unite all national sociological associations as constitutive parts of International Sociological Association and support the comparative research where national sociologists will participate together. The ISA journals can provide a space for presenting the results of transnational research and history of sociology in different countries/regions. Such activities may help the national scholars to learn the world heritage and keep the national traditions.

### *Session 11*

**Thursday 15.30-17.30**

#### **National Traditions and Trajectories (II)**

Chaired by Christian Fleck

Contact: [christian.fleck@uni-graz.at](mailto:christian.fleck@uni-graz.at)

Barbara Hönig, FH Feldkirchen and University of Graz (Austria)

[barbara.hoenig@uni-graz.at](mailto:barbara.hoenig@uni-graz.at)

#### **Trajectories Towards and the Impact of the European Union: Comparing Sociology in Slovenia and Austria**

Located in the Central European region, the neighbouring countries Slovenia and Austria share a conflict-riddled history characterized by several historical breaks and continuities reflecting itself in different national traditions and trajectories of sociology. However, the countries’ recent accessions to the European Union (Austria 1995, Slovenia 2004) prompts the question on the basis of which experiences and interests an integration of different sociologies within an European framework can be realized. Conceptually led by Robert Merton’s sociology of knowledge, there is developed a comparative approach towards the formation of sociology in the respective countries: from its beginnings in the Habsburg monarchy, during the National Socialists’ politics of “germanization”, after World War II in socialist Yugoslavia and in Austria, and since the transformations of 1989 and the foundation of the Slovenian state in 1991. Moreover it is investigated a possible causal relationship between the countries’ EU accessions and its impact on sociology in its historical, institutional and cognitive dimensions. The research design has been characterized by a combination of methods as documentary analysis of research policies, a bibliometric analysis of sociological journals, a group discussion and focused interviews with sociologists as well. Results show that under European conditions sociology is subject to particular restrictions but also encounters new forms of trans-national co-operation and of contributing to a growing stock of knowledge imaginable as an European sociology. Europeanization of research policies at the same time supports a regionalization of European tasks; globalization is accompanied by an increasing differentiation among states and regions; and internationalization of sociology results in a decreasing internal cohesion of the countries’ scientific communities.

Christina Kelly (Sociology, University College Dublin, Ireland)

[ch.kelly@ucd.ie](mailto:ch.kelly@ucd.ie)

### **From Moralistic Doctrine to Empirical Science: Shifts in Irish Sociology during the 1950s**

The institutionalization of sociology in Ireland occurred during the 1930s and 1940s. The emerging Irish clerical sociologists defined sociology as that which embraced catholic social teaching and principles. The dominant sociological discourse was one of moralistic doctrine. By 1955, however, Rev Jeremiah Newman [professor of sociology at St Patrick's College and editor of *Christus Rex*] argued that there was more to the study of society than the application of social ethics and ethical principles. In order to have a greater understanding of Irish society he called for an empirical approach to sociology.

In this paper I examine the ideological and methodological shifts in *Christus Rex* the Irish journal of sociology, and explore debates between sociologists and economists, within the context of a changing economic and social environment. At the time of institutionalization, sociology in Ireland emerged within an insular social, political and economic landscape. During the 1950s, however, Irish political and economic policies aimed at ending insularity accompanied by increased spending on the welfare state. This paper also examines the type of empirical research proposed by Newman and its influence on the formation of Irish sociology during institutional expansion in the following decades.

Kristoffer Kropp (Sociology, University of Copenhagen, Denmark)

[kristoffer.kropp@sociology.ku.dk](mailto:kristoffer.kropp@sociology.ku.dk)

### **The field of sociological research in Denmark**

Sociological research in Denmark has a peculiar history, involving a late institutionalisation and closing of the two main departments in the 1980s. As a consequence of this historical trajectory Danish sociology is today mainly conducted at trans-disciplinary department and in mode-2 like settings. Drawing on Bourdieus notion of field the paper analyse how the field of sociological research in Denmark is constituted. In the paper I construct using multiple correspondence analysis two homological spaces to show how objective positions and ways of practising sociology are related. I do in other words look in into how different sociological practices (choice of method and subject and view on cognitive properties of sociology, modes of publication etc.) are related to specific research institutions (university departments, governmental research institutions etc.) and other social properties. Here through I show how different sociological forms of practise have different functions, both in regard of producing legitimacy within the field and in relation to other fields. Simultaneously the paper shows that the different ways of practising sociology is not only a division of labour, but also represent different ways of taking position in a struggle on what should be regarded as good sociology. Or using the concepts of Bourdieu, who are entitled to define sociology as an academic discipline in Denmark.

The data analysed in the paper steams for a questionnaire among Danish social scientists carried through in November 2009 and is analyse using multiple correspondence analysis (MCA).

Joao Marcelo (Center for Research and Documentation in Brazilian Contemporary History, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil)

[jmehlert@gmail.com](mailto:jmehlert@gmail.com)

### **Peripheral Geopolitics: Ideas and State-Building in Central Brazil**

Why did intellectuals in the periphery employ European geopolitical ideas in order to understand nation-building in their own country? How did they draw on these ideas? This paper takes Brazilian social thought in the decades of 1920 and 1930 as a case-study in order to discuss such questions. My paper analyzes major and minor works in Brazilian geography during this period and explains how these texts provided a cognitive framework that shaped state action in the 1940s. I focus on the case of Fundação Brasil Central (FBC), a state bureau created in 1943 by Estado Novo dictatorship in order to promote colonization and economical development in Brazilian hinterland. Thus this paper also explores the relation between social sciences and public policy in Brasil.

Hans Peter Sand (University of Agder, Norway)

[hans.p.sand@uia.no](mailto:hans.p.sand@uia.no)

### **The Fall and Rise of Danish Sociology**

In 1989 the only university institute of sociology in Denmark was closed by the government. The background was an evaluation report stating that sociology in the country had got into a blind alley of exegesis of Marxian text. It dealt particularly with the Marxian variety of capital logics. However, soon after new institutes were opened at the universities of Copenhagen and Aalborg, an astonishing blooming of sociology in Denmark took place. In my paper I will try to describe and analyze this development.

Kirsten Harley (Sociology, University of Sydney, Australia)

[kirsten.harley@usyd.edu.au](mailto:kirsten.harley@usyd.edu.au)

### **Questioning the Historical Trajectory of Australian Sociology**

This paper outlines how a careful institutional history can challenge the conventionally agreed historical trajectory of a national sociology. In historical accounts of Australian sociology, the University of Sydney commonly figures curiously as both the earliest, and one of the latest, sites for the discipline's introduction. Early twentieth-century attempts to introduce sociology teaching at Sydney via philosophy and Workers' Educational Association tutorial classes have been seen as 'abortive', with a department of sociology only established there in the late twentieth century, some three decades after sociology found its feet at other Australian universities (Zubrzycki 2005: 220). However, evidence gathered from systematic examination of course descriptions in University of Sydney calendars and handbooks and related archival material shows both a longer, and in some ways more substantial, 'pre-history' than has previously been understood, and continuous teaching of sociological content in a host of departmental contexts throughout the twentieth century. Thus for this institution, the explanandum becomes not the disappearance and longstanding absence of sociology, but its endurance and proliferation within other departmental contexts and (yet/hence) delayed establishment as an independent discipline. For the history of Australian sociology this suggests that its so-called 'pre-history' must be taken more seriously, so as to shed light on matters of disciplinary competition, the legacy of sociology's disciplinary hosts, the role of theory, and intersections with other national sociologies.

## ***Session 12***

**Thursday 17.45-19.45**

**RGHS Business meeting**

## ***Session 13***

**Friday 10.45-12.45**

### **History of Sociology in Japan (I): Sociological Theories and Empirical Applications**

Chaired by: YUI Kiyomitsu (Sociology, Kobe University, Japan)

Contact: [k-yui@cf7.so-net.ne.jp](mailto:k-yui@cf7.so-net.ne.jp)

SAKO Teruhito (Sociology, Tokyo Metropolitan University, Japan)

[telsako@tmu.ac.jp](mailto:telsako@tmu.ac.jp)

### **On the Concept □□(Society) in Chino-Japanese Intellectual Traditions**

Today we are in a transition phase of social evolution from nation-based political-economic-cultural conglomerate to some other, unknown form of social life. Coupled with it, today's academic communities need critical reflections on, and radical reorganizations of, basic concepts of their own. For sociology and

social sciences ‘society’ is the very concept that needs most thoroughgoing reconsideration. So every finest contemporary social thinker --Immanuel Wallerstein, François Dubet, John Urry, Zygmunt Bauman, Kazuo Seiama, Michael Mann, Ulrich Beck, Chantal Mouffe...-- never miss to express his/her own view on this subject.

To make the debate fit to the width and depth of the present global transition we are facing, I'd like to introduce Chino-Japanese history of the concept of 社会(society). About 140 years ago, Japanese intellectuals translated ‘society’ as 社会, at the beginning moment of Japanese modernization and industrialization. At the time, for Japanese, the term 社会 was alien as well as ‘society’. Because 社会 was a Chinese word only appeared in the 10-11<sup>th</sup> century literatures. In some sense, the Meiji Japanese intellectuals translated what they did not know (society) by what they did not know (社会). Since then until now we Japanese have been using the word 社会 as the equivalent to ‘society’ as it dominantly indicates nation-based political-economic-cultural conglomerate. So, today the existential crisis we Japanese sociologists are suffering might be more serious than that of the Westerners. You Westerners can go back to the “original” meaning of the word ‘society’ --ex.Bauman employs ‘company’ as such an “origin”-- and make your identity secure. But we Japanese have no “original” meaning of the word 社会! However, we may make a foothold in the 10-11<sup>th</sup> century Chinese literatures that used the term 社会 as it meant ‘peasant’s meeting to praise the god of soil’, i.e., the festival. According to the chronicles of the era, 社会 (the feast) grew unbelievably bigger under the wide diffusion of the monetary economy, thousands of people gathered around the major shrines, enjoyed gorgeous cuisines, dramas, dances and lynchings. Finally 社会 --people’s power displayed in it-- was regarded by the imperial court as a menace to their rule. The medieval Chinese conception of 社会 connotes 1) the gathering that stands against the official rule. 2) It is the cooperative body beyond everyday social ties --blood, region, class, gender, language, age...-- 3) It is transient and volatile, but quite powerful concentration. The on-going debate on sociological reconceptualization of ‘society’ can be more fruitful if it reflects some aspects of 社会. Or, I assert it must be so. Because Japan is now the second largest market of sociology next to the U.S., and China shall be the world largest in the near future.

IKEDA Yoshifusa (Literature, Waseda University, Japan)

### **The theory of imitation by Gabriel Tarde and the contemporary Japanese society: Assimilation or Differentiation?**

The purpose of this paper is to clarify how the theory of imitation, devised by 19<sup>th</sup> century French sociologist, Gabriel Tarde (1843-1904), permits a better understanding of contemporary Japanese society. It is said that the modernization of Japan came about due to Japanese people’s ability to successfully imitate foreign things. After the *Meiji* Restoration (1868), many foreign scholars and technicians imported highly advanced sciences, technologies, laws and cultures of the West to Japan, which the Japanese people assimilated greedily. This explains why Tarde’s theory of imitation is indispensable to the study of Japanese society. According to his principle of sociology, it is not only imitations, but inventions which people can imitate and oppositions among several flows of imitations of which a society is composed. It is certain that the process of imitation contains the assimilation of different things, but as long as there are, at the same time, innumerable different models to imitate, which compete with each other, it can be the differentiation that can be brought about by the process of imitation.

In contemporary Japanese society, what is more important, assimilation or differentiation? When we notice the influences of the Americanization in Japan, we consider that the Japanese society became gradually uniform, assimilating into the United States. On the other hand, we can regard the differentiation as more important, considering diverse information we can access on the Internet. We clarify these problems, taking for example the various issues on globalization in Japan, communication on the Internet, or Japanese popular culture, such as animation, *manga*, *otaku*, etc.

Keywords : Gabriel Tarde, imitation, Japanese society

ISO Naoki (Hitotsubashi University, Japan and L’ EHESS, Paris, France)

### **Bourdieu and the Notion of “champ” and the Research Program in Japan in relation to the legacy of French sociology and Tarde**

## ***Session 14***

**Friday 15.30-17.30**

### **History of Sociology in Japan (II): Sociological Theories and Empirical Applications**

Chaired by: YUI Kiyomitsu (Sociology, Kobe University, Japan)

Contact: [k-yui@cf7.so-net.ne.jp](mailto:k-yui@cf7.so-net.ne.jp)

Sayana Mitupova (Socio-Political Research Institute, Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow)

[smit78@mail.ru](mailto:smit78@mail.ru)

#### **Post-war development of Japanese sociology**

The history of various approaches to sociology to be an interesting subject. When we look at the history of sociology in a particular country, we see a very particular set of intellectual problems and theories. We see personalities and universities; and we see specific prominent social problems that come in for study. And the resulting framework of assumptions about topic, scope and method are very different. So there is a lot of contingency and path-dependency involved in the development of a sociological research tradition. Here I'd like to reflect a bit on complexities involved in doing a history of Japanese sociological tradition after World War II. The burden of my argument here is to track the post-war narrowing of sociology's intellectual diversity in Japan. The first aim is to look at the impact of social events on the development of Japanese sociology – the events of World War II and examine the institutions and the funding mechanisms that influenced the development of sociology in Japan between 1945-1965. It is important also to provide an examination of how the social context of the 1960s affected the discipline of sociology.

A key foundational question in considering this subject is this: what is a historian of sociology trying to accomplish? What does he/she hope to discover? There are a range of possible questions: where did the fundamental concepts and methods come from? How were the Japanese founders influenced in their theories and methods by prior intellectual frameworks? How did institutions and funding mechanisms influence the particular directions that were taken in the Japanese research tradition? How did individual innovators and path-breakers impose their own innovations into the emerging tradition? How do the concepts and methods reflect background social conditions and events? These are all questions of causation and genesis, and they can be treated empirically - even sociologically.

KATO Gentaro (Associate Professor, Poole Gakuin University, Japan)

#### **Acceptance and Development of the Arguments on Scientific Knowledge in Japan**

This presentation is intended to show the framework of the recent arguments on scientific knowledge in Japan. The three dominant disciplines of dealing with scientific knowledge, i.e., history of science, philosophy of science and sociology of science have been united into STS studies since the late twentieth century. STS means “science, technology and society” and its main claim is to see science and technology in a dynamic relation involving wider society.

In the last two decades of the twentieth century, many discussions of scientific knowledge have tended to include social constructivism. They have stated that the activity of science is political with compromises and negotiations, and for that reason, science is not to be privileged on the epistemological and on the practical levels, e.g., resource distribution. Japanese STS has also imported those discussions since Thomas Kuhn's *The Structure of Scientific Revolution*. This condition has continued to what we call the Science Wars, in very simple terms, a controversy between scientists and proponents of social constructivism of scientific knowledge.

After the Science Wars, STS has turned to the practical aspects, which is clearly influenced by discussions about civil society. Especially in experimental studies about risks or environmental issues, they advocate that the legitimacy of decision making is to be in the domain of public opinion. When a certain decision is needed but a scientific solution is not suggested, the wider society has the political right to make a decision. In Japan, some examples of consensus conferences are introduced and many young researchers agree with

the arguments on public understandings of science such as Brian Wynne's 'misunderstood misunderstandings'.

In that mood, recent discussions tend to be more practical, for example, reports on operating science cafe, and have increased instead of political criticisms on scientific- technological problems. It can be said that theoretical development has slumbered. The term science communication is used ambiguously at such anecdotal levels. This presentation underscores the division between political communication (between experts and lay people) and anecdotal, therefore educational or sometimes illuminative, communication. The concept, "science for the public", has attracted new polemicists from museology, pedagogy and practical workers from public outreach of scientific researchers, so that the political aspects of the public, which are the original focus of the concept, are becoming less important.

Keywords: STS, scientific knowledge, science for the public

TAKENAKA Katsuhisa (Meiji University, Japan)

### **The Concept of Organizational Culture and Sociology of Organization in Japan**

Sociology of organization in Japan is different from Western countries on the method to treat concepts of organizational culture.

In Western traditional theory of organization, researchers consider that organization *is* the rational system firstly, and which *has* non-rational components such as organization culture and climate, secondary. In 1980's studies of organization analyzed the concept of organizational culture as a variable which was able to be controlled and managed.

However, in sociology of organization in Japan, from the first, researchers treat organization as the non-rational culture itself and argue that organizations are the process in which conflicts of rationality and non-rationality are reconciled.

In other words, although Western theories tend to differentiate organizational Culture from rational systems of organizations, Japanese theories tend to consider organization as a non-rational symbol itself.

In this presentation, I will argue that the latter perspective will be useful to analyze not only for recent themes such as an organizational identity and image which are constructed by many symbols and artifacts, but also for the traditional themes such as the dysfunction of bureaucracy and the difficulty of changing organizational culture.

Keywords: Organizational culture, symbol and artifact

### **Joint session: Details TBA (Organisers: Larisa Titarenko and Sven Eliaeson)**

---

## Some more reflections on how to teach sociology

I tend to feel a bit rebellious when I see texts in which it is sort of implied that sociology starts with Comte; a very partial truth. Sociology starts with Scottish Enlightenment's so called four stage theories, by Adam Smith, Adam Ferguson, John Millar, and others. Also in France there is sociology before Comte, if we take into account de Bonald and de Maistre, whose "paradigm" looks like a blueprint for Saint Simon/Comte. This is very much visible in Irving Zeitlin's widely spread textbook *Ideology and the Development of Sociological Theory* from 1968 (1<sup>st</sup> ed.). There is however no breakthrough in France, possibly because of J-J

Rousseau, the "Stalinist of Enlightenment", and his confused but very eloquent and influential thoughts. Mentioning Scottish Four stages theories, it is natural to mention also Samuel von Pufendorf as a forerunner, for a secular theory of civil society, an early bird.

But to understand Pufendorf implies Hobbes, and before him Machiavelli. There is a chicken and egg-problem.

**Teaching sociology?** Hobbes and Machiavelli, however, are not sociologists, but belong to an older

tradition of proto-rational choice. But the same is true of several classics we have become used to regard as "sociologists", not the least Max Weber, who is an anti-sociologist within sociology and arguably a proto-rational choice scholar. Parsons made him into a sociologist.

These comments from the hip somehow illustrate the risks with disciplinary

"over-commitment". Science starts with problems (Popper, Wallerstein, Myrdal) and the methodology does not differ a lot; same basic principles apply to all social science problems; possible to study from various perspectives. Now of course we do have problems where the sociological aspect is urgent, such as popular mass movements, especially during transformation processes and class formation and - structure.

But it is probably significant that Max Weber even very late in life - in one of his so called twin-lectures - chose to characterize himself not as a sociologist but as a political economist, which is also Myrdal's basic identity.

If we have a look at various syllabuses in for instance political sociology such classics as de Tocqueville, Myrdal, Weber, von Stein, Rokkan, Lipset are represented, none of them typical sociologists. Electoral behaviour is one of the fields of inquiry where sociology and politics "merge", but the same goes for lobbying, interest groups, city politics, etc, etc.

Too much of disciplinary enthusiasm might be an inhibition in problem formulation and conceptualisation; yet disciplines have a long history promoting cumulativeness in knowledge production.

Moreover, sociology is not the only academic discipline with a soft core, and overlaps with neighbouring disciplines. These reflections are inconclusive. Wallerstein's vehement call for abolishing specialized disciplines in favour of problem based organisation of

research appears as “overkill” and might affect cumulativity in a negative way – but it is an important task to be on the alert against disciplinary “isolationism”. One very “hands on”-aspect is the way libraries tend to be organized in several

institutions for higher learning and teaching, for instance psychology in a building far remote from philosophy, etc.

*Sven Eliaeson*

---

## **Vacancies in the research project “Social scientific knowledge”**

The research project “Universality and potentials of acceptance of social scientific knowledge. The circulation of knowledge between Europe and the global South” at Freiburg University, Germany, invites applications for the following positions

**1 x 75% post-doctoral position**

**1 x 50% doctoral position**

**1 x 50% position for administrative support to the project management**

The project shall be funded through the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF) initiative “Freedom for Research in the Humanities”, under the topic “Europe seen from the outside”. The project aims at building a junior research group and will be located at the Global Studies Program of the Sociology Institute at Freiburg University.

### **Research Positions (Post Doctoral and Doctoral)**

Both research positions (75% post-doctoral and 50% doctoral) shall each deal with one sub-project of the overall project. Researchers are expected to acquire academic qualifications (PhD or qualifications relevant to pursue an academic career in the post-doc-phase).

Applications should include a short research proposal. In order to prepare proposals, more detailed information on the overall project and on the sub-projects in which positions are opened are available with the project coordinator (contact see below). Very good oral and written competency in English are a requirement, competency in further languages is an advantage. Experience in the international scholarly community as well as in team work are an advantage.

Post-doctoral positions are generally funded in accordance with the 13 or 14 TV-L pay scale, doctoral positions with the 13 TV-L pay scale.

### **Administrative Position**

This position has been opened for the administrative support of the project leader. This comprises administrative tasks, support of the project leader with respect to the organisation of project activities such as conferences or publication projects, organisation of the stays of international fellows to the project in Freiburg.

Solid competency, written and oral, in English and German is a condition for employment on that position. Experience in higher education or research administration, especially being familiar with administrative processes, and experience in the international academic community are an advantage.

All administrative positions are funded in accordance with the relevant TV-L pay scale.

### **Application details**

All positions are limited to the duration of the project for four years. The project starts on 01.07.2010 subject to the provision of funds. Application deadline is 20.01.2010. The university aims at increasing the participation of women and explicitly encourages qualified women to apply.

Applications including a motivation letter, an extensive CV, and research proposals for the research posts should be sent via email or postal mail to the project coordinator, Dr. Wiebke Keim:

[wiebke.keim@web.de](mailto:wiebke.keim@web.de)

Postal address:

Wiebke Keim

Institut für Soziologie

der Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg

Rempartstr. 15

D-79085 Freiburg im Breisgau

Germany

Reception of your application will be confirmed by email. For further information, please contact: Wiebke Keim: [wiebke.keim@web.de](mailto:wiebke.keim@web.de)

The official advertisement (in German) is to be found on the website of Freiburg University under:

<http://www.uni-freiburg.de/universitaet/organisation/stellenboerse/?stellenid=6681&layout=v3> (for the research positions) and

<http://www.uni-freiburg.de/universitaet/organisation/stellenboerse/?stellenid=6682&layout=v3> (for the administrative position).

## Latest Publications:

Welz, Frank (2009) “100 Years of Indian Sociology: From Social Anthropology to Decentring Global Sociology”, in: *International Sociology*, Vol. 24, No 5, 2009, 635-655

Zabludovsky Kuper, Gina (2009): *Intelectuales y burocracia – Vigencia de Max Weber*, Mexico City: Anthropos Editorial. (The book was awarded the 2009 Social Science Research Prize of the National University of Mexico)

### Free advertisement

*If you have a **new** publication out, please let us know. Just send a note to the secretary and we will be happy to include your latest publication(s) in our next newsletter.*

## RCHS Subscription

The basic RCHS subscription is US\$10 for one year, or \$30 for 4 years. For students, however, it is \$5 or \$15. This reduced rate also applies to others from non-OECD countries who can't afford to pay the full rate. If unable to arrange even the reduced rate, please write to the Secretary to explain the circumstances and ask for free membership. RCHS is a Research Committee of ISA, so RCHS members are expected to be ISA members. The ISA membership registration form is available on <http://www.ucm.es/info/isa/formisa.htm>. There is also now a new facility for paying directly with credit card to the central ISA; further details are available from the ISA website.

If you are not an ISA member you should pay your membership fees directly into the new RCHS bank account (see details below) and by additionally notifying the secretary via e-mail: [a.hess@ucd.ie](mailto:a.hess@ucd.ie) or via post: Dr. Andreas Hess, School of Sociology, University College Dublin, Belfield, Dublin 4, Ireland. Please do NOT send cheques since extra charges apply.

Research Committee on the History of Sociology RC08

AIB Bank  
Campus Banking  
Belfield, Dublin 4  
Ireland  
BIC: AIBKIE2D  
IBAN: IE93 AIBK 9301 5619 2760 21

Membership in the RCHS is open to anyone interested in the field. You become a member as soon as your application form and money have been received by the secretary

