See you all in Umea

Our interim conference is scheduled for next month. You will find all the information needed in this issue of the RCHS newsletter. For the first time the local organizers had chosen a topic for such a coming together of the history of sociology group: "Perspectives from the periphery". This theme seems to be appropriate for more than one reason. Not only the meeting place but also our position in the still expanding field of sociological research seems to be peripheral. In other social sciences history plays a more prominent role. Historians of sociology often experience a lack of recognition, we don't have a specialized journal, and our location inside the curricula is peripheral too. On the other hand our Research Committee is one of the oldest inside ISA and work on the history of sociology is as old as sociology itself. Therefore a feeling of an inferiority complex is not appropriate. Quite the contrary, I think. A glance at the program of the conference strengthens the impression that our small endeavor is doing well. A lot of new ideas, new topics, and promising themes will make the 2008
interim conference a remarkable coming together.

Many thanks in advance to the team in Umeå from my side and looking forward to see you all in the northern part of Sweden in August.

E-mail: christian.fleck@uni-graz.at

**Conference programme:**

Perspectives from the Periphery
ISA RCHS Interim Conference
Umeå University, August 21-24, 2008

As most readers of this Newsletter already know, the next ISA RCHS Interim Conference will take place at Umeå University, Sweden, in August 21-24, 2008. The general theme of the conference will be “Perspectives from the Periphery”. Hence, in the call for papers we have been welcoming contributions that address issues relating to the conference theme, broadly conceived, as well as papers on other aspects of the history of sociology and the social sciences.

After having reviewed all submitted paper proposals and organised the accepted ones into sessions, we are now pleased to announce the full programme for the four conference days. Altogether there will be 61 papers, fifteen parallel sessions, four keynote lectures and one plenary book session. The contributions cover a wide range of topics – thematically, historically and geographically – all with connections to the history of sociology and the social sciences. More than 30 countries will be represented, with delegates from or papers dealing with Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Botswana, Brazil, Canada, China, the Czech Republic, Denmark, England, Finland, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Kurdistan, Mexico, the Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, the Phillipines, Poland, Rumania, Russia, South Korea, Sweden, Singapore, Taiwan, Turkey and USA. We expect that there will be 100 participants.

The information given below – about the conference programme, the different sessions, the social activities and the practical arrangements – is meant to offer an overview. More detailed information can be found on the conference website: [www.periphery2008.se](http://www.periphery2008.se). As the website will be completed in due course and changes in the programme may appear, we encourage you to visit it more than once in the two months to come to keep you updated with the latest changes.
PROGRAMME OVERVIEW

The preliminary programme for the four conference days looks as follows:

Thursday, August 21
10-12 Pre-Conference Guided City Walk
12-15 Registration
15-16 Opening Ceremony: Welcome Addresses
16-18 Keynote lectures I-II
18- Reception

Friday, August 22
10-12 Parallel sessions I-II
13-15 Keynote lectures III-IV
15-17 Parallel sessions III-V
18-19 Visit at Umeå University’s Musem of Art and Visual Culture

Saturday, August 23
10-12 Parallel sessions VI-VII
13-14 Plenary book session
14-16 Parallel sessions VIII-IX
16-17 RCHS Business Meeting
18- Outdoor Conference Dinner by the Baltic Sea

Sunday, August 24
9-11 Parallel sessions X-XII
11-13 Parallel sessions XIII-XV
13-14 Closing ceremony
14-18 Post-Conference tour to Norrbyskär

KEYNOTE LECTURES, PLENARY BOOK SESSION, PARALLEL SESSIONS

There will be three types of sessions: four keynote lectures, one plenary book session and fifteen thematic parallel sessions.

Our four invited keynote speakers are:
I. Professor Raewyn Connell (University of Sydney) who will give a talk, “The Marginalization Machine”, in which she will explore the social mechanisms by which centre/periphery relations are accomplished and sustained in the history of sociology.
II. Professor Eileen Yeo (University of Strathclyde) will present a paper, ”Central not Peripheral: Class and Gender in Social Science 1830-1930”, in which she will consider who is excluded from the centre on what grounds.
III. Professor Saïd A. Arjomand (State University of New York, Stony Brook). The title of Professor Arjomand’s talk is: "Provincializing the Metropolitan Theory: Can Concept Formation from the Periphery Redeem the Promise of Comparative Sociology?"
IV. Professor Johan Heilbron (Centre de sociologie européenne, Paris, and Erasmus University, Rotterdam) will give a lecture entitled “Toward a transnational history of the social sciences”.

More information about the keynote speakers and their abstracts can be found on the conference website, under “Keynote speakers”.

The plenary book session will take the form of a conversation on the role of international and national organizations in the history of sociology, centred around Professor Jennifer Platt’s *The British Sociological Association: A Sociological History* (Durham: Sociologyypress, 2003), with Dr Sanja Magdalenić, Stockholm University, and Ass. Professor Neil McLaughlin, McMaster University, as discussants.

The fifteen thematic parallel sessions planned up to date are:

**I. Alternative Histories of Sociology (Chair: Zohreh Bayatrizi, zohreh.bayatrizi@smu.ca)**
* Zohreh Bayatrizi, ”Early Modern Statistics and the Emergence of the Sociological Imagination (1662-1897)”
* Thomas Kemple, ”Toward a Genealogy of Bio-sociality: Freud and Spencer on the 'Propping' of Nature onto Culture”
* Frans Lundgren, ”A new medium for reform? The pedagogical and political rationale of social museums around 1900”
* Marianne Winther Jørgensen, ”The terms of debate: The negotiation of legitimacy of a marginalized perspective”

**II. Nordic Countries: History of Sociology and the Social Sciences (Chair: Anna Larsson, anna.larsson@educ.umu.se)**
* Anna Larsson and Kirsti Suolinna, ”Between ethnology and modern sociology: K. Rob. V. Wikman as a mediator in Finland and Sweden”
* Carl Marklund, ”From Exceptionalism to Normalweg”
* Hans Petter Sand, ”Periphery in the Political Sociology of Stein Rokkan”
* Fredrik W. Thue, ”American Sociology as Academic Marshall Help? The Case of Norway in the 1950s”

**III. Gender and the History of Sociology (Chair: Sanja Magdalenić, sanja.magdalenic@sociology.su.se)**
* Ronny Ambjörnsson, ”Equal but separate: Ellen Key, early social science, and the idea about a female labour market”
* Sanja Magdalenić, ”The reception of Harriet Martineau's work in Sweden”
* Barbara Reiterer, ”Women Sociologists from Foreign Lands: Female Intellectual Migration from Austria and Germany to Minnesota 1900-1950”
* Jan E. Thomas, ”Incorporating Women in Classical Sociology Courses”

**IV. Power and Loyalties in Sociology (Chair: Rickard Danell, rickard.danell@soc.umu.se)**
* Juan José Navarro and Fernando Quesada, "The debate on the external financing to the Latin-American Social Sciences: the scandal of the Project Camelot”
* Andrea Stöckl, "Medical sociology and the 'new' medical eduation: Are sociologists contributing, criticising or selling out?"
* Albert Tzeng, ”Negotiating Western Sociology in East Asia and Challenges of Academic Globalisation Cases from Taiwan, Hong Kong and Singapore”

V. The History of Empirical Social Research and Statistics (Chair: Irmela Gorges, I.Gorges@fhvr-berlin.de or I.Gorges@gmx.de)
* Marja Alastalo, ”Social statistics in the EU: rationalities and technologies”
* Christian Fleck, ”For a sociological history of sociology: Criticisms, methodological and substantial remarks”
* Jonas Harvard, ”Asking the ones who know: Qualitative polling in Sweden around 1900”
* Werner Reichmann, ”The Quantification of Social Science Research Methods: A Comparative View on the 20th Century”
* Raymond M. Lee, ”Focus Groups: The Missing Years”

VI and VIII. Coming to Terms with the Red Past: Sociology and Communism I-II
(Chair: Christian Fleck and Andreas Hess, christian.fleck@uni-graz.at and a.hess@ucd.ie)
* Joanna Bielecka-Prus, ”Social Roles of Sociologists in Poland after 1945”
* Sara R. Farris, ”Radical sociology in 68 Italy. Social science as a political project”
* Andreas Hess, ”Liquid Memory: The Discussion of Zygmunt Bauman's Stalinist Past in the Light of Collective Memory Approaches”
* Jaroslav Kiliás, ”The local and the universal in Polish sociological textbooks of the Communist period”
* Katerina Mishuris, ”Polling the Public Opinion: The making of the ’average’ Soviet Citizen in post-Stalinist Russia, 1960-1967”
* Markus Schweiger, ”The Relationship between social engineering and social sciences: Collaboration or Criticism?”
* Adrian Scribano, ”Sociology and Epistemology in Studies on Social Movements in Latin America”
* Michael Voříšek, ”The Reform Generation: Generational Dynamics and Communism in 1960s Czechoslovak Sociology”

VII. The Sociology of Octavio Paz (Chair: Oliver Kozlarek, okozlarek@yahoo.com)
* Jorge Capetillo, ”Octavio Paz and Georg Simmel”
* Eduardo Gonzáles Di Pierro, ”LA DISCUSIÓN BARTRA-PAZ: DOS PERSPECTIVAS SOCIOLÓGICAS DISTINTAS”
* Oliver Kozlarek, ”The Sociology in the Work of Octavio Paz”

IX. Imperialism and Indigenous Knowledge (Chair: Per Axelsson, per.axelsson@cesam.umu.se)
* Patricia Lorenzoni, "Where did the Savage Go?: Some Concerns in the Reading of J. G. Frazer's Understanding of Violence and Civilization”
* Rhoderick V. Nuncio, "Filipino sociology and the indigenization of Philippine social sciences”
* Ayokunle Olumuyiwa Omobowale, ”An Elder’s Character: An Analysis of Atari Ajanaku’s Agbalagba and Agba Langba Poetic Expressions Using Akiwowo’s Asuwada Theory of Sociation”
* Nilay Ozok-Gundogan, ”In Search of ‘Peripheral’ Voices in the Ottoman History: Social History of Ottoman Kurdistan in the Nineteenth Century”

X. Public Social Knowledge (Chair: TBA)
* Niklas Eklund and Anna Larsson, ”Teacher Education in Social Science in Sweden in Historical and Comparative Perspectives”
* Maria Grahn-Farley, ”Center and Peripheries in International Law”
* Karl Malmqvist, ”Re-imagining the (post)-industrial periphery”
* Eleanor Townsley, ”The public intellectual in the United States and beyond: margins and centres in intellectual life”

XI. Geopolitics and Transnationalism (Chair: TBA)
* Calin Cotoi, ”Geopolitization of Sociology. The Romanian Interwar Case”
* João Marcelo Ehlert Maia, ”Brazil, Russia, America: social thought in large territories”
* Rolf Hugoson and Olle Stjernström, ”The Quality of Geopolitical Knowledge in 20th Century Sweden: Scholars vs Practitioners”
* Hae-Yung Song, ”Against Methodological Nationalism in Sociological Analysis: What Can be Learned from the Racialisation of Labour Relations in Korea after the Financial Crisis”
* Jan Surman, ”Periphery goes to the centre: the reception of Austrian sociology in France before 1918”

XII. Concepts (Chair: TBA)
* Åsa Andersson, ”Disengagement or successful aging? Reflections on two Concepts in 20th Century's Sociological Gerontology”
* Carl-Göran Heidegren, ”The introduction of the concepts of Lebensführung and Lebensstil into sociology”
* Andreas Langenohl, ”Two Idioms of Reflexivity in Sociology: The Construction of the Impact of Poststructuralism on Social Thought”
* Akin Olutayo, ”Social Constructionism in the creation of the periphery in Africa”

XIII. The Rise of European Sociology (Chair: TBA)
* Christina Kelly, ”A Catholic Sociology for a Catholic Nation: The Institutionalization of Sociology in the Republic of Ireland”
* Marcel Stoetzel, ”The ambivalent role of antisemitism in the formation of ‘classical’ sociological theory”
* Antoni Sułek, ”Le suicide in Poland. A case of receiving a classic by the semi-peripheral nation”
* Michael Volfšek, ”Europe, the Province: Post-war European Sociology in a
Comparative View"

**XIV. Transatlantic Reciprocity (Chair: Sven Eliaeson, sven_eliaeson@hotmail.com)**

* Sven Eliaeson, "The Myrdals: Made in the USA?"
* Johan Goudsblom, "Dutch and American Sociology in the Mid-twentieth Century: A view from behind the one-way mirror"
* Suzie Guth, "Robert Park in the periphery of the German Empire and the problem of assimilation of the African American peasant"
* Yusef Semlali, "Some new details of the life of Pitirim A. Sorokin"

**XV. 68 (Chair: TBA)**

* Anthony Paul Farley, "Ghost Nation"
* Azat Zana Gundogan, "We Were Like Fish in the Sea, but We Didn’t Know the Sea’: Remembering Eastern Demonstrations and the Peripheralized Kurdish ’68ers in Turkey”
* Scott MacFarlane, "Understanding the Rise of Postmodern Culture through the Dionysian Dialectic of the North American Countercultural Epoch”
* Markéta Škodová, "Czech and Slovak citizens' reflections on the year 1968. The history and topics of the Public Opinion Research Institute of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences (1967-1972)”

In case you are interested in taking a closer at any or all of the 61 paper abstracts you will find them in a (106 pp.) pdf-file on the conference website, under “Paper abstracts”.

**SOCIAL PROGRAMME AND ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES**

Besides the scientific programme there will be social activities on each day. On Thursday August 21, there will be a Pre-Conference Guided City Walk for those arriving early, and in the evening, directly after the first two keynote lectures, there will a Reception. On Friday August 22, there will be an arranged visit at Umeå University’s Musem of Art and Visual Culture. On Thursday August 23, after the RCHS Business Meeting, there will be an outdoor Conference Dinner at the nature reserve Kont by the Baltic Sea. And on Sunday August 24, directly after the closing ceremony, there will be an arranged Post-Conference Tour to the Norrbysskär Islands outside Umeå. More information about these activities can be found on the conference website, under “Social programme”.

There will also be some extra activities around the conference. In the University Library, for example, there will be a small exhibition in relation to the conference. We are also planning to arrange a small collective book display, to which everyone is encouraged to bring one or two recent publications. Furthermore, each conference participant will be provided a temporary internet account during the conference days. Stationary computers will be available in the University Library. You will find more information (in due course) about these and other practical details on the conference website, under “General information”.

PRACTICAL INFORMATION AND QUERIES

Everyone who has already registered online on the conference website will get a regular snail mail from our Conference Secretary Kaarina Streijffert before the end of July, with information about your hotel reservation, how to get around in Umeå, maps and more.

If there are any queries regarding the conference, please do not hesitate to contact us in the local conference organization. If the queries concern the scientific program please direct them to us in the conference organizing committee on: periphery2008@histstud.umu.se. If they concern practical issues (registration, travel arrangements, hotel bookings, etc) please direct them to our Conference Secretary Kaarina Streijffert at: kaarina.streijffert@umea-congress.se. However, during July there may be some delays in our response because of vacations, but we will try to get back with replies as soon as possible.

We are greatly look forward to seeing those of you who are coming to Umeå in August!

And, those of you who are not able to come this time: please visit our conference website and enjoy all the interesting paper abstracts published there!

Yours sincerely,

Hedvig Ekerwald
Per Wisselgren
Björn Wittrock

Local Organising Committee of the ISA RCHS Interim Conference

Latest Members Publications (2007-08):


Free advertisement
If you have a new publication out, please let us now. 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 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.
Counting and Judging

Everywhere now in higher education a new managerial spirit can be encountered. To make matters worse, it seems not just to be a short-lived fashion but is likely to be with us for some time to come. Almost a hundred years back, Thorstein Veblen was the first social scientist to take notice of the prevalence of “received schemes of use and wont” and how they made their way into higher education. For Veblen the new attitude had its origins in the conditions of the state of the industrial arts i.e. the requirements imposed by a new system of ownership and its pecuniary values. The link to higher education was obvious, after all “captains of solvency” were not that far away from the “captains of learning”. A consequence, at least according to Veblen, was that modern learning turned into “a matter-of-fact, mechanistic complexion”, which in turn lent itself to dry exercises, “statistically dispassionate test and formulations”. The net result would be a “highly stylised, germ-proof system of knowledge, kept in a cool, dry place”. (The Higher Learning in America, New York: Sagamore Press: [1918] 1957, pp4-5).

Veblen thought that such an attitude was the end of what he called “idle curiosity”. By idle curiosity he meant “the sense that a knowledge of things is sought, apart from any ulterior use of the knowledge so gained.” (p4) Veblen also appears to echo the argument of another thinker across the Atlantic, Max Weber, who, almost at the same time, argued that whereas the quest for knowledge had once been regarded as an end in itself (“a calling”), higher education had now reached a situation in which the search for knowledge had turned into a mere employment of a means towards simple premeditated ends.

Reading Veblen and Weber it seems in many ways that the prediction of bureaucratisation in higher education has been with us for at least a century. However, while Veblen and Weber were astute observers of the bureaucratization tendencies in their time, their critique does not fully explain the latest turn in higher education a hundred years after their predictions. Something else is happening now for which we have to find new, additional explanations.

Luc Boltanski and Eve Chiappello in their groundbreaking 1999 study The New Spirit of Capitalism (English version: London: Verso, 2005) have provided us with an updated account and critique of the latest management follies, which have also wormed their way into higher education. In many ways their critique can be read as an up-to-date version of Veblen and Weber; however, the two authors also argue that the latest wave of managerialism is somewhat different when compared to what went on before. While in the past there was still a distinction between managers and employees, the new managerial philosophy now is pretty much about the dissolution of old top-down command structures. What is also new is the level of internalisation, the appeal to the subjective dimension. These days, it’s all about motivation and projects that people can deeply identify with. Money still matters - but only to a certain extent. The new driving force now consists of the appeal to the employee’s own imagination, creativity and dream of self-realisation. In other words, life and work
may not only overlap but have actually become identical.

Direct and personal supervision and control are no longer needed; rather, people are now kept on the long electronic leash. An ideal seems to have been reached. Translated into higher education, this means that the professorial head of department is dead now, he/she has been replaced by the new cadre type. Employability and flexibility rather than excellence in research and teaching are crucial in recruitment to the new cadre. It’s not so much about having a long record of achievements - only one good work, one success, one achievement, one publication will do. It does not take that much to see that this new managerial attitude, which Boltanski and Chiappello identify as being conceptualised in the late nineties, has become omnipresent. News from the UK, Ireland, France and the German-speaking countries reveals a true international horror story and makes clear that even the remaining pockets of academic freedom have now become subject to the ‘benign’ treatment of those who pretend to know better.

The “treatment” always follows the same pattern: new managerialism and the quest for obedience and loyalty have first to clean from the university all those creative forces that are potential obstacles to the restructuring process – the independent minded, the last intellectuals, the anti-totalitarian liberals, in short, all those who think differently. But how squeeze them out? The answer is by re-designing the objectives – hence taking stock, including the numerous counting and auditing exercises. This is then followed by the reconstruction work, that is, the actual streamlining of departments.

What makes the whole “reform” package so effective (and even more worrisome) is that the new management style in higher education is helped simultaneously by the major restructuring efforts in academic publishing. Monographs and edited books are the great losers, a giant ‘no-go’ area for any publisher these days. Instead, printed and electronically available journals are now considered to be the academic publishers’ true money makers. Library subscriptions guarantee a steady profit and will keep the lights on in the publisher’s office. In the meantime, as in the Wonderbra-effect, scholars and researchers are pushed into the middle and into mainstream paradigms by the two players who were once their greatest supporters, the university and academic publishing. Unlike the magical workings of the Wonderbra, however, academics are almost never pushed upwards these days – instead, they are squeezed out.

The consequences of this academic revolution are disastrous: not only has the new audit and evaluation philosophy replaced judgement with counting; worse, because the ways the counting takes place - usually in a science-style fashion - the process is not neutral or a zero-sum game (that is, one in which scholars and researchers will get as much out of the process as they have put in), particularly not in relation to the work that we do, the history of sociology. It is in this context where the new “scientific” managerialism is most dangerous. Be it in form of a legitimation exercise vis-à-vis the taxpayer with mainly the higher education authorities and ministries in charge, or be it for departmental assessments at university level or individual promotion purposes - listing,
ranking and counting are the only activities that matter. People now even get promoted because they designed the very process by which some of their colleagues are being evaluated – and side-lined. Just to avoid misunderstandings, I don’t mean to argue for a second that the problem is compiling factual information, neither do I question evaluations or other attempts of making higher education and universities more transparent. The worrying trend derives rather from the new cadres’ reluctance to make use of their human facilities of judgement. Doing the sums has replaced judgement entirely. On the other side, not making the entry into what counts – namely the top-list of peer-reviewed, high impact journals – has lead to a state in which a sense of failure mixes with a hard to specify fear. Kafka’s K. and Orwell’s Winston have become the new academic prototypes. One feels constantly guilty of having somehow failed or not having done the right thing.

There are now qualitative studies available which confirm that the new managerialism and audit culture have detrimental consequences. In a study of Germany’s search for academic excellence, entitled Die akademische Elite [The academic elite] (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 2007) the German sociologist Richard Münch has identified major problems already, such as streamlining research, rewarding the already successful (another example of the Matthew principle) and following science models independent of whether it makes sense or not for the humanities and social sciences. Furthermore, new dimensions of inequality are created by ranking and auditing exercises which reward and cement new division of labour amongst academics (with the separation of teaching and researching now becoming manifest, replacing the Humboldt ideal of combining research with teaching).

Other social scientists who have studied the new audit culture have come to similar conclusions. In the 2007 yearbook of the German social science journal Leviathan, Wissenschaft unter Beobachtung [Science under observation] (Berlin: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften) several experts pointed to a number of difficulties arising from the managerialism and the audit culture which have come to represent the new cadres’ “scientific” ethos. Two of the most urgent problems that the authors of the said volume identify are the lack of accountability in terms of power (who controls the controllers?) and the dangers of unintended and unwanted consequences. Higher education is, by its very institutional nature, internally complex and will therefore always remain somewhat unpredictable in terms of any planned outcome. However, it is as if the new cadres knew this already, otherwise their preventative power and control games would be hard to comprehend. If this is true we have encountered a new and very cynical power game indeed. It also means that the new cadres either don’t listen anymore to advice or that they are simply resistant to better arguments. As one Leviathan author put it, the new audit culture is already aware of a major problem at hand: it does not know how to deal with not-wanting-to-know dimensions (such as the interest and value-based forms of rationality), and it is unable to deal with not-being-able-to-know issues (such as the fact that decisions are made based on future
assumptions which are then re-projected into the present state of audit exercises). That we should have become part to and subject of a human experiment on such a grand scale with clearly very little scientific rationale - but with a lot of power and politics involved - is one of the saddest things ever to have happened in academia. As it turns out, in the republic of knowledge there are quite a few bad citizens. It’s now time to stand up and be counted.

*Andreas Hess*

e-mail: a.hess@ucd.ie