

NORDIC EUROPEAN COUNTRIES

PRE-CONGRESS VOLUMES

GENERAL EDITOR:
MARÍA LUZ MORÁN

**SOCIAL
KNOWLEDGE:**
*HERITAGE,
CHALLENGES,
PERSPECTIVES.*



*From a Doll's
House to the
Welfare State:
Reflections on
Nordic Sociology*

Editors:
Margareta Bertilsson
Göran Therborn



INTERNATIONAL SOCIOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION
ASSOCIATION INTERNATIONALE DE SOCIOLOGIE
ASOCIACIÓN INTERNACIONAL DE SOCIOLOGÍA

**PRE-CONGRESS VOLUMES
SOCIAL KNOWLEDGE:
HERITAGE, CHALLENGES, PERSPECTIVES**

GENERAL EDITOR: MARÍA-LUZ MORÁN

The Pre-Congress Colloquia are intended to prepare the discussion at the 14th World Congress of Sociology (1998) on its theme "Social Knowledge, Heritage, Challenges, and Perspectives". The International Sociological Association sponsored, in conjunction with local associations, ten regional colloquia in ten different regions of the world. These volumes are the edited, and sometimes abbreviated, versions of the papers given at these colloquia. In addition, ISA commissioned an eleventh, worldwide volume, of essays written from a feminist perspective. After the volumes were prepared, ISA convened an "integration" colloquium in which the editors of the eleven volumes discussed with each other the findings on a series of major themes. These discussions were filmed and exist in form of four video-cassettes.

The object of this collection of volumes and cassettes is not to present the state of knowledge in a region (or of feminist studies) but the state of social knowledge throughout the world from a regional or feminist perspective. ISA hopes thereby to underline the fact that, however general the propositions we hope to put forth, they often tend to come out differently when the social contexts within which the authors write are different. We hope that these differences (and of course the similarities that we may find despite the different perspectives) may be a starting-point for our collective effort to look at our heritage, at the contemporary challenges that are being made to the heritage, and the possible paths that may be taken by the social sciences in the twenty-first century.

Immanuel Wallerstein
President, ISA.

ISA REGIONAL CONFERENCES

**From a Doll's House to the Welfare State:
Reflections on Nordic Sociology**
*Coordinators: Margareta Bertilsson
and Göran Therborn*

**Proceedings of the ISA Regional
Conference for Northern Europe
Copenhagen, Denmark, June 12-13, 1997**

LIST OF VOLUMES

1. **Arab World**
Editors: Abdelkader Zghal and Ahmed Iadh Ouederni
2. **East Asia**
Editor: Su-Hoon Lee
3. **East-Central Europe**
Editor: Piotr Sztompka
4. **Feminist Perspective**
Editor: Linda Christiansen-Ruffman
5. **Latin America**
Editors: Roberto Briceño-León and Heinz Sonntag
6. **Lusophone World**
Editor: Ana Nunes de Almeida
7. **North America**
Editor: Janet L. Abu-Lughod
8. **Nordic European Countries**
Editors: Margareta Bertilsson and Göran Therborn
9. **South Asia**
Editors: Partha Nath Mukherji, Jacop Aikara and Chandan Sengupta
10. **Southern Africa**
Editors: Ari Sitas and Teresa Cruz María e Silva
11. **Southern Europe**
Editor: Caglar Keyder

CONTENTS

List of Contributors	p.7
Foreword	p.11
Introduction <i>From a Doll's House to the Welfare State, and Then?</i> Göran Therborn and Margareta Bertilsson.....	p.13
Chapter 1 <i>Lessons from the Rise of a National Sociological Heritage</i> Erik Allardt.....	p.27
Chapter 2 <i>Structural Tradition and Cultural Studies in Finnish Sociology</i> Risto Alapuro.....	p.33
Chapter 3 <i>Norway: Sociology in a Welfare Society</i> Frederik Engelstad.....	p.39
Chapter 4 <i>Sociology in Sweden: Challenges, Renewals and/or Retreats?</i> Johanna Esseveld.....	p.45
Chapter 5 <i>Danish Sociology: The Need for a New Beginning</i> Peter Gundelach.....	p.51
Chapter 6 <i>Youth and Sociology: The Nordic Contribution in a Global Perspective</i> Gestur Gudmundsson.....	p.57
Chapter 7 <i>Nordic Comparative Historical Macrosociology</i> Lars Mjøset.....	p.63
Chapter 8 <i>Organic Solidarity in the Phase of Reflexive Modernisation</i> John Andersen.....	p.71
Chapter 9 <i>Causal Realism and Swedish Sociology before 1968</i> Thomas Brante.....	p.77
Chapter 10 <i>Icelandic Sociology and the Social Production of Criminological Knowledge</i> Helgi Gunnlaugsson.....	p.83

Chapter 11 *Gender and Health - The Hidden Asset in Finnish Sociology*
Elianne Riska..... p.89

Chapter 12 *The Contradictory Logics of Institutions*
Søren Christensen and Ann Westenholz.....p.95

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

RISTO ALAPURO

Professor of Sociology, University of Helsinki. His works include *State and Revolution in Finland* (1988), and in Finnish, *Suomen älymystö Venäjän varjossa* (Finnish Intellectuals in the Shadow of Russia) (1997), as well as *Suomen synty paikallisena ilmiönä 1890-1933* (Formation of Finland in 1890-1933: A Local Perspective) (1944).

ERIK ALLARDT

Professor of sociology at the University of Helsinki 1958-1991, Member of the ISA Executive 1982-86, Chairman of the Committee of Political Sociology of ISA and IPSA 1980-86, Vice President of the European Science Foundation 1990-92.

JOHN ANDERSEN

Associate Professor at the Department of Social Science at Roskilde University, Denmark. He worked as a researcher and consultant for the European Commission in the third European Programme to Combat Poverty from 1992-94. He has published on social stratification, social exclusion, the underclass & citizenship discourse and the welfare state.

MARGARETA BERTILSSON

Professor of Sociology at the University of Copenhagen. Her interest is mainly in sociological theory, especially the relation between social and normative theory. Her latest publications (in Swedish) include "Rätten i förändring", 1995 (The changing structure of law and the role of the legal profession), and an edited volume on "Det Goda Livet", 1996 (Essays on the Good Society).

THOMAS BRANTE

Professor of sociology at the University of Lund. He has written books and articles in philosophy and sociology of science, sociology of the professions, "science-based controversies", and medical sociology. He is a former President of the Swedish Sociological Association.

SØREN CHRISTENSEN

Senior Associate Professor at the Institute of organization and Industrial Sociology, Copenhagen Business School. He has published books on decision making, organizational culture, and project leadership. His current research interests involve a study of the nonprofit sector in Denmark from a comparative perspective.

FREDERIK ENGELSTAD

Director, Institute for Social Research, Oslo, Professor of sociology, University of Oslo, Chairman, Joint Committee of the Nordic Social Science Research Councils. His latest publications include *Likhet og styring. Deltakerdemokratiet på prøve. 1990* (Equality and Governance. An Experiment in Participatory Democracy). His fields of interests are stratification, allocation and social justice, and the sociology of literature.

JOHANNA ESSEVELD

Professor of sociology at the University of Lund. Her main area of interest concerns methodological issues; she has also carried a number of concrete studies of labour markets, unions and the Swedish political elite from a feminist perspective. Johanna Esseveld is currently president of the Swedish Sociological Association.

PETER GUNDELACH

Professor and Head of the Department of Sociology, University of Copenhagen, and President of the Nordic Sociological Association 1995-1997. Has written several books and articles on social movements, voluntary associations, social values and on Danish sociology. His present work is about "the need for a new beginning".

HELGI GUNNLAUGSSON

Associate Professor of Sociology at the University of Iceland. He received his B.A. in Sociology from the University of Iceland (1982) and his M.A. (1985) and Ph.D. (1992) at the University of Missouri - Columbia in the United States. His major fields of interest are criminology and social theory.

GESTUR GUDMUNDSSON

M.S.S. in Sociology from University of Copenhagen (1981), Ph.D. (1991), lecturer at the University of Iceland since (1994). Main research fields are sociological theory and youth research, youth cultures, vocational education, youth unemployment, fishing communities, the Nordic model.

LARS MJØSET

Professor of Sociology at the University of Oslo, and Leader of the Oslo Summer School in Comparative Social Science Studies at the same university. His main work has been in sociological theory, comparative political economy and historical sociology. He is currently completing a sociological history of environmental problems.

ELIANNE RISKA

Ph.D. State University of New York at Stony Brook, 1974. She was an Assistant and Associate professor at Michigan State University during 1974-1981 and has been Professor of Sociology at Åbo University since 1985.

During 1997-2002, she is Academy professor, the Academy of Finland. Elianne Riska has done research on the medical profession and on gender and health and published e.g. *Gender, Work and Medicine* (Sage, 1993) and *Gendered Moods* (Routledge, 1995).

GÖRAN THERBORN

Professor of Sociology at Göteborg University and Director of the Swedish Collegium for Advanced Study in the Social Sciences in Uppsala. He chairs a national committee on Global Processes. His latest book is *European Modernity and Beyond. The Trajectory of European Societies 1945-2000*, London: Sage, 1995. His research interests include globalizations and modernities, comparative social policy and family forms, social theory, and urban political iconography.

ANN WESTENHOLZ

Associate Professor at the Institute of Organization and Industrial Sociology, Copenhagen Business School. Her interests are in workplace democracy and organizational theory. She is currently involved in a project on how and why Danish employee representatives are constituted as strategic actors in their firm.

FOREWORD

The Nordic Regional Conference of the International Sociological Association was held in Copenhagen, Denmark, June 12-13, 1997, just prior to the regular biannual Meeting of the Nordic Sociological Association. The Executive Committee of the Association invited the participants, and asked us to take responsibility for organizing the ISA regional conference and, subsequently, to edit the present volume. Two representatives of each Nordic country were asked to participate in addition to the nestor of Nordic Sociology, professor Erik Allardt from Finland. However, as the conference was held in Copenhagen, where the Department of Sociology recently was reconstructed after its closing seven years ago, we asked professor Peter Gundelach to contribute to the present volume as well. From outside Norden, ISA president Immanuel Wallerstein and scientific secretary María-Luz Morán and professor Loïc Wacquant also took an active part in our meeting.

We hope that the final volume fulfills two purposes: for the global communities of sociology, to give a fair representation of Nordic sociology toward the end of the millennium, and for the communities of Nordic sociologists, to stimulate further debates and reflections. The chapters are arranged in the following order: firstly, surveys of national sociological traditions; secondly, Nordic overviews of special themes; and thirdly, specific national topics.

Margareta Bertilsson has been responsible for the editorial work, while Göran Therborn drafted the Introduction. We are of course jointly responsible for the final outcome as a whole.

In preparing this volume we want first of all to thank all the contributors who kindly have accepted our, sometimes, drastic reductions of texts in the submitted articles. We were under tight pressures to adhere to ISA guidelines which prescribe no more than 150 pages. We also want to thank Vinni Steffensen, Hans Jacob Kirk, Myra Lewinter and, particularly, Jeanette Østergaard, from Copenhagen University for their secretarial and technical help in preparing the final manuscript. The financial assistance of the Sociology Department at Copenhagen University in arranging both the regional conference and in preparing this volume is gratefully acknowledged.

Copenhagen and Uppsala in October 1997

Margareta Bertilsson and Göran Therborn

INTRODUCTION

FROM A DOLL'S HOUSE TO THE WELFARE STATE, AND THEN?

Göran Therborn, Göteborg University, Sweden

Margareta Bertilsson, University of Copenhagen, Denmark

A Family of Nations

The Nordic countries are a family of nations, consisting of five small sovereign states, Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway, and Sweden, and three autonomous islands, Åland, the Faroe Islands, and Greenland, in total 24 million inhabitants. Except for the Inuit of Greenland, there is a strong cultural affinity among the Nordic peoples, although Finnish is a completely different language.

Pre-modern Norden was undeveloped and contained much poverty. But it had three important assets by mid-19th century: a fully literate population having also a considerable amount of technical training, an independent peasantry, an international economic orientation with an efficient primary sector and primary sector products in international demand, a very efficient agriculture (Denmark), huge forest resources (Norway, Sweden, Finland), and iron ore (Sweden). The conditions resemble in part those of *Southeast Asia* about a century later. In the 20th century the area has had a spectacular economic development, and all the Nordic countries are now among the richest in Europe and in the world.

The organizations and political parties of farmers and of workers have had a predominant political influence for the last two thirds of the century. Private capitalism has thrived alongside popular political power, considerable income and status equality and advanced welfare states.

The institutional links between the Nordic countries are old and extensive. The connections took new forms and even a new vigour in modern times. Nordic jurists began an effort at legal coordination and harmonization in the 1870s. The national trade union confederations were constituted as parts of a common Nordic movement, which gave them their curious name, The National Organization (LO). After WWII a parliamentary Nordic Council and a Nordic Council of Ministers were instituted. The Nordic Sociological Association, with its journal *Acta Sociologica* (since 1956) is only one among many Nordic organizations.

Social changes in recent times include great new oil and gas wealth in Norway, a rapid de-agrarianization and successful economic catching up of

Finland in the 1960s-1980s, a drastic de-industrialization in Sweden after 1965, and a depression hitting Finland and Sweden hard in the early nineties, leaving a legacy of persistent unemployment. "The rate of employment in Sweden, 72.7% of the 15-64 population is still well above the OECD average of 66.5. Iceland and Norway have the highest rate of employment of all" (OECD, 1997, p.163).

The religiously and ethnically homogenous countries of out-migration have become to some extent multicultural and immigrant. Sweden has had the most change of this kind, now having a proportion of the foreign-born slightly higher than USA (10.6% of the population in 1995, Statistics Sweden, 1997, p. 63). Geopolitically, the area is moving from a somewhat self-sufficient periphery towards the centre of Europe. Denmark joined the EU with the UK in the 1970s, Finland and Sweden in 1995, while Norway again opted out.

Nordic social thought has been characteristically neither provincial nor imitative. There is a long, *outward-looking tradition* in all branches of Nordic culture, combined with a considerable amount of national pride, mainly drawing upon the distinctive cultural and social traditions of the nations, rather than on past power and glory.

In the second half of the 18th century, Linneaus sent his disciples around the world, to all the continents, across all the oceans, to collect data and specimens. At about the same time, the king of Denmark patronized German-Danish Oriental research expeditions.

The development of extra-European expertise has continued in Nordic social research. In the beginning of the 20th century the founding father of Finnish sociology, Edward Westermarck, went to Morocco, and the fieldwork of his disciples ranged from South America to New Guinea, via Palestine. In the interwar period, the Danes Kaj Birket-Smith and Knud Rasmussen developed arctic ethnology. Bernhard Karlgren became world-famous for his contemporary study of Chinese dialects, and H.S. Nyberg, another Swede, became a world authority on old Persian languages. This rich tradition depended on a few outstanding individuals, and was never consolidated. Third World concern is strong in Norden, but the rigid academic disciplinary structure has not provided resources and incentives for world class extra-European research. The anthropological contribution of the Norwegian Fredrik Barth is an exception. Gunnar Myrdal, another one, left Sweden in 1947.

From the battle of Sedan to that of Stalingrad, the predominant *cultural orientation* of Norden, both left and right, was towards Germany, although there were always other significant influences as well. Liberalism was generally British-oriented. Economic ties to Britain have always been important to Scandinavia. The strong Evangelical and Temperance

movements grew mainly from American impulses. French influence came a distant third, outside artistic milieu, but was not negligible.

After World War II, the Anglo-American orientation has been clearly dominant, and most so in Sweden. Influential non-Anglo-Saxon authors, like Bourdieu and Habermas, are most often read in English or local translation. But among the "68 generation" there were very important influences from elsewhere, politically from Vietnam and China, intellectually from West Germany (in Denmark), from France (Sartrean in Norway, Althusserian in Sweden). Among the Finnish 68'ers there was also a Soviet turn. More significantly, mainstream Finnish sociology, from the 1970s and on, opened up and cultivated contacts and cooperation with colleagues in Russia, Estonia, Poland, and Hungary, utilizing Finland's neutrality.

Norms and the State: the Parents of Nordic Sociology

Nordic sociology is an offspring of moral philosophy and the social state. However, the former is not the legitimate child of a marriage between the two latter, because that marriage never took place. Rather, sociology grew up as a single parent child, living first with philosophy - often turned ex-philosophy - and then with the welfare state. In both cases, it may be argued that the parent-child relationship was too close, not allowing sociologists much play with their peers, even when interests touched each other.

Sociology in the Nordic countries emerged most directly out of moral philosophy. It established its current regional standing and imprint as investigations on and for the welfare state. An important link, especially in Norway, was the legal philosophy of "realism" which asserted itself in the interwar period.

Different Exits from Moral Philosophy

Nordic sociology was set up in two long waves. One was before World War II, and involved Finland only. Edward Westermarck obtained a post at Helsinki university in sociology in 1890, and the first chairs of sociology were established in Turku in 1926 and in Helsinki in 1927. That is, Finland was the only country where sociology was to some extent institutionalized, although even there a major intellectual rupture occurred. The first Nordic chair of sociology (and economics) was put up in 1903 in Göteborg for Gustaf Steffen, but after his death in 1929 the chair became de facto an economic one. The same fate befell the sociology chair which the Danish university of Aarhus awarded the German exile Theodor Geiger in 1938.

The second wave began rolling after World War II, and involved all the countries, except Iceland, where sociology emerged only in the 1970s, then coming both from Anglo-American training and the rest of Norden.

Moral philosophy was behind both waves, but it played a more passive and restraining part in Denmark, whose academic sociology had most difficulties in taking off.

The key figure of the first wave was Edward Westermarck (1862-1939). In 1904 he was appointed teacher of sociology at London School of Economics, where he got a chair in 1907. From 1906 he had also a chair of moral philosophy at Helsinki University.

His first major work dealt with *The Origin of Human Marriage* (1st. ed. 1889), and his second with *The Origin and Development of Moral Ideas* (2 vols. 1906 and 1908). The title of the latter pinpoints the first wave connection of sociology with moral philosophy. The former was seen as providing a historical, evolutionary approach to the concerns of the latter.

Both major works start from certain assertions about human nature and psychology, then lay out their unfolding in long series of ethnographic examples. In anthropology, this focus on traits and their origins was succeeded by the functioning of totalities, by Westermarck's successor at the LSE, Bronislaw Malinowski. In Finnish sociology, the historical and ethnographic orientation of Westermarck's disciples was replaced, after World War II, by a focus on contemporary, national society.

The Norwegian, mainly post-World War II exit was also gentle, more opening a door than closing it behind you. Here the overpowering figure was Arne Naess, a precocious (Ph.D. in 1936 at the age of 23) disciple of the Vienna Circle. Already in the late 1930s Naess was pursuing a program of chasing philosophy out of its armchairs, a program of "empirical semantics", studying for instance, how ordinary people conceived the "truth" by questionnaires.

Naess later left positivism for Oriental philosophy and ecosophy, but not philosophy. On the other hand, he was the main teacher of the first postwar generation of Norwegian social scientists, of the political scientist Stein Rokkan, of the sociologists Wilhelm Aubert and Johan Galtung and many others, as well as a central point of reference to later generations.

The legacy of Naess had many facets, interpretations, and challenges. Common to it though, was a combination of empirical orientation, analytical rigour and moral concern. Aubert used this background on critical analyses of law, Galtung brought it to founding of peace research, and Rokkan on analyses of democratic polities. The umbilical cord to philosophy was not cut from Norwegian sociology.

Swedish philosophy of the interwar period produced no father-teacher equivalent of Naess. Its main figure was Axel Hägerström, professor of moral philosophy in Uppsala 1911-1933, a militant proponent of moral subjectivism and legal realism. But sociological seminars developed among moral philosophers first in the mid-1930s, first in Lund. Sociological interest

among Swedish philosophers was stimulated by the state threat of merging the chairs of theoretical and practical philosophy into one (Olsson, 1997).

In Sweden sociology became ex-philosophy with the then professor of moral philosophy in Uppsala, Torgny Segerstedt leaving his philosophy chair for a new one in sociology in 1947. The empirical study of the operation of social norms was the original question.

This original choice, of philosophy *or* sociology, left an enduring mark on Swedish sociology, let it wide open to the most ultra positivism around in the US, that of George Lundberg. Here the door from moral philosophy to sociology was slammed by the sociologists walking out into the empirical world. Philosophers and philosophical arguments have never been allowed back into Swedish sociology so far. Even the original intention of studying the actual operation of social norms was soon lost to more mundane concerns, to the point that, when economists discovered and became interested in norms in the 1980s, Swedish sociology had hardly anything to offer.

Danish interwar philosophy also had a strong positivistic orientation, but the generative connection between moral philosophy and empirical sociology was not really established in Denmark, in spite of some personal trajectories, such as the postwar philosopher-cum-social psychologist Svend Ranulf. However, when the first chair of sociology was set up at Copenhagen University and given to a Norwegian disciple of George Lundberg, Kaare Svalastoga, this was also meant to put up a discipline having severed all ties to philosophy.

Rendez-vous manqués I: Sociology and Cultural Modernity

Looking back on the history of Nordic sociology, in spite of its quite respectable academic record, there is an important non-encounter to be noticed. The Nordic countries have produced some of the most penetrating analyses of the moral contradictions of modernity, while the sociological contribution to moral issues was short-lived and limited despite Nordic sociology's origin in moral philosophy.

Against the background of some dazzling Nordic works of early cultural modernism, even the best later products of Nordic social science tend to shrink. The world-wide most important Nordic contribution to modern social thought was made by the Norwegian playwright Henrik Ibsen. His *A Doll's House* (1879) inspired cultured oppressed women, Feminists and male modernists all over the world, and became central to the first global wave of attention to "the Woman's Question". The play reached North America and Russia in the first years of the 1880s, Japan by the late 1900s, and China a decade later.

August Strindberg, Ibsen's slightly younger Swedish contemporary, also wrote a play of universal social significance, about the dangerous dialectic of class and desire (*Miss Julie* 1888).

Both plays express penetrating social insights, and both were central parts of the early modernist culture. Neither found an academic echo at the time, nor did they later. This separation of *sociology in art* from the art of sociology has continued in the postwar period. The problematics of religious belief and disbelief and the intricacies of marriage, which Ingmar Bergman has put on the world screen, and the traumatic dynamics of family relationships, which Lars Norén has placed on at least the European centre-stage, have few equivalents in Nordic sociology. Furthermore, there has never been any significant Nordic sociology of art, nor, until recently, of culture.

Although sociologists have largely neglected the sociology in art and left the analytical potentialities of the interpersonal dynamics of modernity largely untapped, the latter has not been unexplored. Wilhelm Reich left some traces after his exile in Norway in the 1930s. One of them led to an original combination with Parsonian arguments in Erik Grønseth's (1971) work on family and sexuality. Among Wilhelm Aubert's (1965) beautiful essays there is also one on Love.

More recently, Elina Haavio-Mannila, Osmo Kontula, and J.P. Roos (Kontula and Haavio-Mannila 1995) have conducted several studies on the sexual behaviour of Finns, finding, among other things, a considerable increase in sexual activity and satisfaction over the last two decades. European values studies also indicate that the great majority of the Nordic people are happier than their most brilliant artists portray them, happiest in Europe in fact (Therborn 1993).

Sociology in Norden came later than the first attacks of cultural modernism, or, as in the case of Westermarck and his school in Finland, left the main battles of the contemporary for ethnographic evolutionism. Strindberg once employed Sweden's future first sociology professor, Gustaf Steffen, as an assistant for his reportage *Among French Peasants* (1889), but the writer soon got dissatisfied with his young helper and sent him away. Ibsen's son Sigurd tried to push sociology at Oslo University in the 1890s, but he was in the end turned down by the university (Mjøset 1991, p. 127).

That encounters were missed is not difficult to understand. However, when taking stock of social thought and social analysis over the last century, contributions from outside academia should be paid attention to. In the Nordic case, their brilliance may even serve as a source of inspiration.

Post-modernism has had less impact in the Nordic countries than in France, the UK, or the US, so its pale reflection in current sociology is less surprising.

The Long Waiting: Sociology and the State

The current close relationship between Nordic sociology and the Nordic welfare states took a very long time to mature. One reason was, of course, that before World War II European sociology in general, with only sporadic and local exceptions, had not developed into an empirical science of the contemporary world, in spite of Durkheim's *Suicide* and in spite of Weber's studies of agrarian conditions east of the Elbe. Even successful academic institutionalizations, like those of Durkheim's in France and Westermarck's in Finland, wandered off into exotic anthropology.

On the other hand, examples from Poland, the Netherlands, and some other countries show that a pre-World War II modern Nordic sociology would have been conceivable.(1)

Alternative Sources of State Information

One major reason why Nordic sociology did not take off before WWII was that there was no need for it, from a rational state point of view. The Nordic states and their rulers were among the best informed in the world about the societies they were governing. The world's first modern national census was the Swedish-Finnish one of 1749. The same year Sweden set up the world's first *statistical bureau*. Denmark got its first statistical office in 1797, Norway in 1832, Finland in 1865, and Iceland in 1914 (Kuhnle, 1989). The Lutheran state clergy was crucial as local gatherers and recorders of information. But the provincial governors were also obliged to provide regular socio-economic reports.

In the course of the 19th century, a system of thorough information gathering and analysis for specific political purposes was developed, the institution of *public investigation committees*, usually made up of central civil servants and a sprinkling of academics. At least two of these public investigations constituted landmarks of national social science. One was the Finnish Subcommittee on the Landless Population, directed by Hannes Gebhard, reporting 1908-1918 (cf. Allardt 1997, pp. 66-67). The other was the Swedish Emigration Investigation 1907-13 by Gustav Sundbärg. Both were multi-volume, penetrating studies into the most burning socio-political issues of their time.

Alternatively, the state could support an individual, non-academic researcher to do the job. The most famous Nordic example of this is the Norwegian clergyman Eilert Sundt, who in 1857 published two major demographic-cum-sociological reports *On the Moral Condition of Norway*.

Apart from the state's own information gathering and analysis, there were also other disciplines of social research, which for a long time occupied the place of later sociology. There were two main ones in Norden. One was

statistics, still largely an empirical discipline. Sundbärg, for instance, was appointed professor of statistics in Uppsala in 1910, largely on the basis of his public investigation contributions. In Finland, Hannes Gebhard was since 1899 professor of agricultural statistics and economics. Denmark still has a solemn office of National Statistician.

Economics in the Nordic countries emancipated itself relatively early from law. The first internationally renowned Nordic economist was Knut Wicksell, professor of economics and financial law in Lund 1901-1916, though somewhat older belonging to the same generation of cultural radicals as the Finnish sociologist/anthropologist Westermarck. More important to social research, however, was the impact of the German Verein für Sozialpolitik and German "historical economics" in particular, but not exclusively in Finland.

Social policy as an academic subject developed in Scandinavia out of economics. In Sweden it was always a marginal part of the discipline, petering out altogether in the 1960s. In Finland, it developed into an independent discipline early, and in recent decades has been brought into the ambit of sociology. The most enduring impact of economic social policy occurred in Denmark. In 1939, a chair of social policy was set up for the distinguished economist Fredrik Zeuthen.

In contrast to the UK, and to a certain extent West Germany, social policy in Norden did not develop into a major macrosocial discipline of its own. The subject went from the economic to the sociological orbit by abdication, and social work became a micro-oriented academic discipline much later, then largely colonized in the first generation by sociologists.

Rendez-vous manqués II: State Modernity

Nordic sociology also missed the encounter with state modernity. The major state-making discipline of Norway after 1905 and of Finland after 1918 was historiography, largely conservative in Finland - representing the White victors of the civil war of 1918 (2) -, mainly Socialist in Norway, extrapolating the radical tradition of Norwegian nationalism. In Denmark and, particularly, in Sweden, before World War I the most conservative of the Nordic countries, the interwar period was settling accounts with pre-democratic metaphysics. In political science it was a vindication of anti-monarchist constitutionalism, in historiography a debunking of national mythology, in economics and in legal philosophy an attack on "objective values", an assertion of positivism in law.

In international terms, the 1930s was a decade of breakthrough for Nordic social science, and of modernist victory. In the course of the 1930s, Social Democracy came to power in all the four major Nordic countries and began major processes of social reform.

The *international scientific breakthrough* was confined to economics, of the Stockholm and Oslo "Schools" and to Danish social economics, breaking out of the liberal straitjacket of post-historical economics, and to political science (Herbert Tingsten's pathbreaking *Political Behaviour*, 1937). Sociology did not exist outside Finland, where it was immersed in bygone anthropology.

The pinnacle of Nordic social science in the 20th century was also a product of the interwar period, mainly, i.e. the contribution of Gunnar Myrdal, an archetypical exponent of Nordic political modernity.⁽³⁾ Myrdal was officially an economist of the Stockholm School, but his most famous work was a sociological one, *An American Dilemma* (Myrdal 1944), a full-scale, theoretically and methodologically very sophisticated investigation into American racism or "The Negro Problem and Modern Democracy". A number of later well-known US sociologists worked for Myrdal's project, e.g., Arnold Rose, Edward Shils, Dorothy Thomas, Louis Wirth. The width of Myrdal's achievement is perhaps best briefly indicated by mentioning his second major international contribution, *Asian Drama* (Myrdal 1968).

Myrdal and his wife Alva also played an important part in Swedish social policy-making, successfully turning the "population question" of the 1930s from Natalism to social policy reform, including the women's rights of employment and parents' right to family planning.

Nordic sociology did not quite miss its rendez-vous with political modernity, though. It did meet and match the later political modernism of Norway and, to a more delimited extent, Finland. Lately, Risto Alapuro (1988) made a decisive sociological contribution to the socio-political history of Finland.

The Norwegian sociology that developed after World War II was in many ways an intellectual reflection of and on political modernity, debunking the social pieties of the nation in ways similar to the anti-nationalist and anti-monarchical debunking of Swedish inter-war political scientists and historians. Typically, it is only in Norway that this period is conceivable as a "Golden Age sociology" (Mjøset 1991, p. 106ff.). The political science/sociology of Stein Rokkan (e.g. 1970) was a lasting contribution to an understanding of modern European political development.

Evaluators of the Maturing Welfare State

When the Nordic welfare states began to be built, sociology was absent, i.e., not in Finland where both sociology and social policy had academic chairs while the welfare state was slowest to develop, but in Denmark, Sweden, and Norway. Economists like Myrdal and Zeuthen provided the intellectual software in addition to the well-informed and socially sophisticated, though still for a long time paternalistically stern bureaucracies.

Postwar sociology in the Nordic countries had the task of studying contemporary society, a mission that was interpreted first of all as surveys of experiences, opinions, "morale". "Industrial society" was the broadest definition of the object of research. Early postwar sociology had a strong micro-orientation, of social psychology and community studies. The welfare state was still embryonic as part of Nordic society and was left in the background by the new sociologists. Policy and the state were within the confines of the old discipline of political science, with which the new upstart had better not compete.

This all changed in the second half of the 1960s. That was when the Nordic welfare state rose to international prominence, that was when the economic emancipation of Nordic women asserted itself, and that was when Nordic sociology became the sympathetic, state-paid but academically oriented evaluator of the welfare state and its concrete policies.

The starting-point was the Swedish Low Income Investigation Committee, set up by the government in 1965, on parliamentary initiative. In Sweden, in contrast to contemporary USA, the issue was not "poverty", but was originally organized labour's concern with low wages, broadened in the political debate to "low income". The Committee was first set up as an economists' investigation, but it was soon broadened to include a major sociological project, launched by a young lecturer in Uppsala, Sten Johansson, to study a number of dimensions of people's level of living, by a national survey.

The Level of Living investigation of 1968 was a great success, politically as well as academically. It was crucial to the establishment of the Institute for Social Research (SOFI) in Stockholm in 1972. Under the leadership of Walter Korpi, the latter developed a high academic profile of first-rate empirical research, much of it cross-nationally comparative, e.g., Korpi (1983), Erikson and Goldthorpe (1992), Erikson and Jonsson (1996).

Level of living investigations spread to the other Scandinavian countries in the 1970s. A comparative, longitudinal overview is Hansen and Erikson (1993). A special contribution, with a somewhat different analytical approach, was a Nordic comparison made by Erik Allardt (1983).

Another major track of Nordic welfare state research has concerned comparative social policies. Korpi, his students and associates have been the major Swedish players, e.g. Palme (1990). Other internationally remarkable contributions have been made by members of a Scandinavian academic diaspora, such as Gösta Esping-Andersen (1990) and Stein Ringen (1989).

A third major strand of welfare sociology concerned the study of *industrial relations*, which took off in the second half of the 1970s in Sweden as evaluations of the *Co-Determination Act*. In the 1980s, a Norwegian model of action research for and about more participatory industrial relations

became predominant quantitatively. Industrial research was stimulated by an internationally rare richness of data, both from workplace censuses and through access rights. A key promoter has been a Norwegian researcher Björn Gustavsen, but it is difficult to single out special scholarly contributions in a predominantly applied field. Diaspora scholars as Aage B. Sørensen and Trond Petersen (recently returned to Oslo) have been most internationally noticed.

All three tracks also developed gender foci. But one should also distinguish a fourth track of Nordic welfare sociology, *Welfare Feminism*, a strongly socioeconomically oriented Feminism, going back to Alva Myrdal and the 1930s, but taking off in the 1960s. The Norwegian Harriet Holter and the Finnish-Swedish Rita Liljeström were path-breaking figures. An interesting overview in English was written by Hernes (1987).

The main focus tended to be on aggregated outcomes, alternatively more qualitative micro-processes, with little attention to the dynamics of institutions be they of the state, the family, or the market. In this way, critics may perceive a tendency of welfare state sociology to flatten the social landscape.

University sociology was turned heterogeneous by 1968, ranging from Marxist theorizing to youth sociology and high level mass communication research. Nevertheless, what gave Nordic sociology its collective international profile and standing in the 1970s and 1980s, - singularly individual contributions apart - and still does, was its welfare state sociology. Its egalitarian, socio-economic orientation was very much in tune with the times of the 1960s and 1970s, times still not quite turned upside down in Norden.

The research program of Nordic welfare sociology is not exhausted, and in Norway, least affected by middle class questioning of the welfare state, Gudmund Hernes, with the help of several others, has established the topicality of sociology in public debate. While related and having significantly contributed to welfare sociology, Hernes is primarily an outstanding political sociologist - lately turned politician with ministerial success -, who introduced James Coleman's concept of power as co-director of the mid-1970s public *Norwegian Power Investigation*.

The Flame Is Burning Down, and Then?

The inspiring light of the welfare state is now going out, without any strong, attractive alternative in sight. New orientations are visible among Nordic sociologists, most widely into culture and ethnicity, and there is also, for instance, the new field of economic sociology pushed by Richard Swedberg (Smelser & Swedberg 1994).

Whether the new interests will generate another world significant-current of sociology is quite another matter. The strongest candidates in sight seem to be Finnish cultural studies (see Alapuro in this volume) and sociologies of organizations in the other countries (e.g. Ahrne 1994, and the ongoing work of Peter Hedström, Trond Petersen and others). Both face crowded international fields, though, and competition from other Nordic disciplines such as anthropology and ethnology, and the sciences of public administration and economics, respectively. Norwegian feminism is also an intellectually vibrant force, albeit so far perhaps more visible outside than inside sociology (Gullestad 1996; Moi 1993).

However, Nordic sociologists are by and large unshaken in their self-confidence of contributability. Nordic sociology tends to arrive on stage late, but then with force. Vanguard thought still belongs to artists rather than to scholars. We hope, though that a wider intellectual perspective and novel combinations of thought and craft than those of conventional academia may make new potentials of sociology come true.

Notes

1. Still a missed opportunity was a project on The Swedish peasant, which Dorothy S. and W.I. Thomas worked on the 1930s, in collaboration with the Myrdals.
2. The re-orientation of hegemonic Finnish conception of modern history, the White conception of the Civil War of 1918 as a War of Independence, took place in the 1960s and was started by the novelist Väinö Linna. But the sociologist Erik Allardt did play a prominent part in the re-integration of the Red side of Finnish modernity.
3. On a short list of world social scientists (Sills 1979), Myrdal is one of three Scandinavians, with the economists Ragnar Frisch and Bertil Ohlin, Myrdal being given most space by far. The index lists him under three rubrics, as demographer, economist, and sociologist.

Bibliography

- Ahrne, G. (1994), *Social Organization*, London: Sage.
- Alapuro, R. (1988), *State and Revolution in Finland*, Berkely: University of California Press.
- Allardt, E. (1983), *Att ha, att älska, att vara*, Lund: Argos.
- Aubert, V. (1988), *The Hidden Society*, Totowa N.J.: Bedminster Press.
- Erikson, R. and Goldthorpe, J. (1992), *The Constant Flux*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

- Erikson, R. and Jonsson, J. (1996), *Can education be equalized? The Swedish case in comparative perspective*, Boulder Co.: Westview Press.
- Esping-Andersen, G. (1990), *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Grønseth, E. (1971), *Familie, seksualitet og samfunn*, Oslo: Pax.
- Gullestad, M. (1996), *Everyday Life Philosophers, Modernity, Morality, and Autobiography in Norway*, Oslo: Scandinavian University Press.
- Hansen, E.J. and Erikson, R. (1993) (ed.), *Welfare Trends in the Scandinavian Countries*, Armonk N.Y.: M.E. Sharpe.
- Hernes, H. (1987), *Welfare State and woman power: essays in state feminism*, Oslo: Norwegian University Press.
- Kontula, O. and Haavio-Mannila, E. (1995), *Sexual Pleasures - Enhancement of Sex Life in Finland 1971-1992*, Aldershot: Dartmouth.
- Korpi, W. (1983), *The Democratic Class Struggle*, London: Routledge.
- Kuhnle, S. (1989), "Statistikkens historie i Norden", in *Nordiska statistikermötet 18, Norden förr och nu*, Stockholm: Nordiska statistiska sekretariatet, 21-45.
- Mjøset, L. (1991), *Kontroverser i norsk sosiologi*, Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Moi, T. (1993), *Feminist theory & Simone de Beauvoir*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Myrdal, G. (1944), *An American Dilemma*, New York: Harper & Bros.
- Myrdal, G. (1968), *Asian Drama 3.vols.*, New York: Twentieth Century Fund.
- OECD, (1997), *Employment Outlook 1997*, Paris: OECD.
- Olsson, A. (1997), "En ny sociologi", in L. Hansen et al. (ed.), *Sociologi i tiden*, Göteborg: Daidalos, 203-30.
- Palme, J. (1990), *Pension Rights in Welfare Capitalism*, Stockholm: Institute of Social Research.
- Ringen, S. (1989), *The Possibility of Politics: A study in the political economy of the welfare state*, 2nd ed., Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Rokkan, S. (1970), *Citizens, Elections, Parties*, Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Sills, D. (1979) (ed.), *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences* vol. 18, New York: The Free Press.

Smelser, N. & Swedberg, R. (1994), *The Handbook of economic sociology*, Princeton N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Statistics Sweden (1997), *Statistisk Årsbok 1997*, Stockholm: Statistics, Sweden.

Therborn, G. (1993), "Modernità sociale in Europa 1950-1992", in P. Anderson et al. (ed.), *Storia d'Europa* vol. I, Torino: Einaudi.

CHAPTER 1

LESSONS FROM THE RISE OF A NATIONAL SOCIOLOGICAL HERITAGE

Erik Allardt
Roskilde University, Denmark

The 1990s have brought radical changes to Europe. The revolution of 1989 put an end to the Socialist systems of the East European countries, and in Western Europe the European Union has emerged as a new political power bloc. These transformations have been accompanied by profound technological advances and gigantic changes in the social structure and demography of the European populations.

Is there a Decline in the Responsiveness of Sociologists?

For sociologists the sensitive question is whether sociology as a field of study has been able to respond to the present changes in a fruitful manner. There are indications that this has not been the case. The Spanish sociologist José E. Rodríguez-Ibañez (1997, p.6) bluntly states that sociology has dramatically lost reputational ground everywhere since the golden years of the fifties and sixties. Similar views have in recent years often been expressed in the Nordic countries, not by sociologists as a rule, but by scholars from other academic fields and by public commentators. The assumption here is that studies of the rise of the sociological heritage may be helpful in understanding the present predicament of sociology.

The information used here is mainly based on a study of the development of the social sciences in Finland during the 19th century up to the end of the First World War (Allardt 1997). The 19th century in Finland was an intense period of national awakening. One important aspect of the national development was the emergence of social science. Although Finland did not have professional chairs in the basic social sciences, there was an abundance of social research. The main intellectual currents came from large and leading countries, in the Finnish case notably from Germany, Great Britain, and France in that order.

The Opposition Between Statism and Liberalism

A crucial ideological tension existed in the 19th century which had clear implications for the rise of sociology; this was related to perceptions of the relative importance of the state and of the individual. There was a tension between statism and liberalism, and between a preference for statist or individualistic policies. The opposition between statism and liberalism was almost conspicuously related to other 19th century contrasts of importance for the development of the social sciences. Statism was strongly emphasized in the emerging social sciences in Germany, whereas the liberal views basically had a British origin. France was somehow located between the two.

The opposition between statism and liberalism had a clear relationship to the increasing intellectual division of the social sciences. Modern economics had its roots in liberalism and the emphasis on individual action. Not only Adam Smith but also representatives of marginal economics such as William Stanley Jevons, Leon Walras, and Alfred Marshall focused on individuals making calculations and choices. In theorizing of marginal economics on the other hand, institutions and social structures could largely be omitted. Marginal economics, with its roots in liberalism, never really caught on in Germany. There the historical school of political economy, represented by such scholars as Gustav Schmoller and Adolph Wagner, maintained a crucial position. They emphasized the role of the state in maintaining social peace and avoiding class conflicts through systematic social policy. The emerging Finnish social science received strong impacts from Schmoller's and Wagner's historical school. One of the consequences in Finland was a slow development of theoretical economics but a proliferation of research in social policy. On the other hand, liberalism became particularly emphasized in the field of sociology. The founder of Finnish sociology, Edward Westermarck, simultaneously professor in Finland and Great Britain, emphasized individual moral sentiments.

Hegelianism and Verein für Sozialpolitik

During the 19th century Finland was an autonomous grand duchy within the Russian empire, with the Czar as grand duke. The main academic influences, however, came from Germany. In the social and political sciences two German traditions had a particular strength. One emanated from the philosopher Friedrich Hegel (1770-1831), and the other statist influence came from the *Verein für Sozialpolitik*, founded in 1872. Both traditions strongly emphasized the primacy of the state and of the nation both in social theory and policy.

The ideas of the *Verein für Sozialpolitik* fell on fruitful soil in Finland. The *Verein* had been founded in 1872. As its Finnish counterpart, the *Kansantaloudellinen Yhdistys* was founded in 1884. In Finland there was a definite social need for the kind of research promoted both by the German Association for Social Policy and the Finnish Association of National Economics. During the second half of the 19th century a sharp fall in the mortality rates had led to a rapid increase of the landless rural population all over Europe, but for many reasons the problem became more grave in Finland than in other Nordic and most Western European countries. Its rapidly growing rural proletariat became one of the main topics for Finnish social research at the end of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century. The German emphasis on the "worker question" developed in Finland into an interest in the "agrarian question". The Finnish studies of the tenant farmers, scrapholders, farm workers and other landless rural people represented advanced research in social policy and it established a strong tradition in Finland for studying social conditions, social stratification and structural change.

Liberalism Introduced Through Sociology: Edward Westermarck's Reliance on Darwin and Adam Smith

The founder of Finnish academic sociology was Edward Westermarck. He was appointed *Docent* in sociology at the University of Helsinki in 1890, and later he held professorships both in Finland and at the London School of Economics. The methods and data he used were from social anthropology rather than from sociology, but his theoretical formulations has a substantial sociological content.

Westermarck's major study on the origin of moral ideas contained a theory about the basic foundations of social life. Despite his emphasis on customs and their binding character, his analyses were always based on data about individual reactions. In his reasoning Westermarck was not far from the marginal economists who constructed their view of society on how individuals choose between different options. In addition, his empirical research methodology was centered on human beings as individuals, not on societies, villages, tribes and other collective formations. Westermarck's evolutionary and cultural approach to moral development combined with the social policy research school for studies of social stratification and the rural proletariat gave a strong impetus to the development of sociology.

The Strength of Social and Sociological Research Compared to the Study of Economics

The study of the socio-economic conditions of the population played such a powerful role in Finnish academic life that for a long time the new currents in marginal and neoclassical economics remained almost unknown in Finland. On the other hand, Finnish social and sociological research received support through its double anchorage in the structural analyses of researchers working in the tradition of the *Verein für Sozialpolitik*, and in Edward Westermarck's ethnosociology, with its emphasis on culture, customs, and the moral reactions of individual beings.

It is instructive to compare the developments in Sweden and Finland. In Sweden a theoretically brilliant and internationally important school of economics emerged with scholars such as Knut Wiksell, David Davidsson, Gustav Cassell and Eli F. Heckscher. They laid the foundation for the later famous Stockholm school of economics. One important characteristic of the Swedish economists and the Stockholm school was that they succeeded in combining liberal and statist concerns.

In Finland the neglect of theoretical economics worked in favor of the other social sciences, notably of sociology and social policy studies. When the social sciences developed rapidly after the Second World War, a large body of studies of social stratification, social mobility and socioeconomic conditions already existed in Finland. Prior to World War II the Nordic countries had occasionally established professorial chairs in sociology specifically designated for outstanding individuals. However, in Finland ordinary chairs in sociology were already in existence at four universities and colleges during the second half of the 1940s when such chairs were just being established in the other Nordic countries. It is a revealing fact that when faculties of the social sciences began to be created in Finland in the second half the 1940s, professorial chairs in social policy were established and continued to be founded during the subsequent decades.

The Eurocentric Heritage

While the tensions and the paradigmatic clashes in the emerging Finnish sociology were international, it may be asked whether they also were universal. In the Gulbenkian Commission report Immanuel Wallerstein and his colleagues (1996, p. 55) posed the question, whether the sociological tradition was parochial in its eurocentrism.

In the face of this strong central European heritage one may ask whether other alternatives were available. It has been shown that an active and fertile sociological research community existed in Russia prior to the revolution from about 1870 onwards (Nowikow, 1988). However, Russia

also developed other and less European traditions of social thought. One strong such tradition has been summarized under the label of *sobornost* (Sergeyev and Biryukov, 1993, p. 32-39;112-115) which denotes a belief that there exists a true and given will of the common people. It had its origin in the *Sobors*, which were religious institutions of medieval Russia that were revived during the 19th century by populist and anti-European Russian philosophers. It was alien to modern science in its assumption that there is one, once and for all given truth. Yet, this world-view was not devoid of sociological content in emphasizing the importance of the traditional Russian *mir*, the village community in which the interests of villagers merged into a comprehensive whole.

Nevertheless, the *sobornost* tradition is alien to empirical research methods and in particular to the critical questioning of established truths. This is probably not an uncommon situation in reviewing alternative approaches to the prevailing eurocentric approaches to the social sciences. They may present relevant sociological observations, but they also contain elements which are problematic from the point of view of the methodology of science. They may be rich in content, but they represent what Michael Hechter (1997) has branded as the soft option.

Are there Remedies to the Predicament of Present-Day Sociology

It may be said that an academically and socially vital sociology has two characteristics: (1) it produces unique critical and constructive statements about social conditions, and (2) it contributes to the conceptualizing and theorizing of other social and human sciences and is not theoretically entirely dependent on what other sciences have produced.

Today it is doubtful whether sociology fulfills these conditions. Much of today's sociology tends to leave the social world as it is; this is a politically safe endeavor, which appears esoteric to many. It does not influence other fields and is basically a recipient of impulses from contemporary linguistics and philosophy. It is also not multiparadigmatic, as it was in 1940s, 1950s and 1960s.

The multiparadigmatic character of sociology probably contains the key for solving its crisis. Margareta Bertilsson (1997) has reviewed the contributions of some leading discussants, notably of Anthony Giddens, I.L. Horowitz, and William Julius Wilson in an interesting way. She also offers a remedy in a return to the multiparadigmatic approach. She speaks about a double hermeneutic which pays attention simultaneously to language, behavioral, and institutional practises. She uses the basic sociological concepts of action, structure, and system in a programmatic manner, implying that they all are necessary conditions for pursuing a fertile sociology.

The lessons to be learned from studying the heritage and development of sociology in a national setting speak in favor of a multiparadigmatic approach. Sociology has tended to be rich and fertile in situations in which it has been possible to combine different modes for analyzing social life.

Bibliography

- Allardt, E. (1997), *The History of the Social Sciences in Finland 1828-1918*, Ekenäs: Societas Scientiarum Fennica.
- Bertilsson, M. (1997), *What is Sociology*, University of Copenhagen: Department of Sociology.
- Hechter, M. (1997), "The Soft Option", *Times Literary Supplement* no. 4919, January 24, 1997.
- Nowikow, N. (1988), *Die Soziologie in Russland. Ihre institutionelle Entwicklung von den Anfängen bis zur Oktoberrevolution 1917*, Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz.
- Rodriguez-Ibañez, J.E. (1997), "On Sociological Difficulties and National Backgrounds - A Comment From Spain", *Theory*, The Newsletter of the Research Committee on Social Theory, Spring 1997.
- Sergeyev, V. & Biryukov, N. (1993), *Russia's Road to Democracy. Parliament, Communism, and Traditional Culture*, Aldershot: Edward Elgar.
- Wallerstein, I. et al. (1996), *Open the Social Sciences*, Stanford: Stanford University Press.

CHAPTER 2 STRUCTURAL TRADITION AND CULTURAL STUDIES IN FINNISH SOCIOLOGY

Risto Alapuro
University of Helsinki, Finland

In Finland the challenge of cultural analysis appears exceptionally vigorous, at least in comparison with the rest of Scandinavia. Its emergence and development opens an interesting perspective on the dynamics of sociology in Finland.

The Structural Tradition

Pertti Alasuutari, a Finnish sociologist and one of the three editors of the *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, maintains that cultural studies emerged in the 1980s in Finland against the backdrop of a specific structural paradigm then prevailing in Finnish sociology. This structural "model" portrayed society as consisting of a (causally) primary structural level, including the class division, economic processes, etc., which serves as the starting point for the analysis of other phenomena, like opinions, ideologies, etc. (Alasuutari 1996, pp. 12-22).

Alasuutari in fact parallels Erik Allardt, in whose judgment macrosociological analyses of social structure and change constitute the "master trend" in Finnish sociology. This tradition is strong, he concludes, because of a number of sudden structural transformations in Finland during this century due to the country's peripheral position and its location between East and West in Europe (Allardt 1984, p. 140-141; Allardt 1994, p. 92). It is indeed easy to identify structural themes that have flourished during the entire post-World War II period and continue to do so today (see Alapuro 1995, pp. 168-170).

According to Allardt (1984, p. 141), this interest was even more pronounced in Finland than in the rest of Scandinavia. Decisive for this post-World War II consolidation was Allardt's own work in the 1960s, crystallized in his theory of the degree of division of labor and the degree of pressure toward uniformity as preconditions for solidarity (Allardt 1971). Through his theory -- a *tour de force* in structural analysis -- Allardt powerfully formulated the "problem" of Communism in Finland as well as a solution to it. In the 1970s Allardt turned to welfare research (Allardt 1975), and a number of his students worked on the welfare state, classes, and stratification.

In the same decade, Marxist research emerged alongside this structural macrosociology and produced major works on capitalism and classes. In retrospect the two discourses appear to have had much in common: both approaches contributed to the sociological discourse of the Finnish welfare state, and both of them formulated structural explanations to social problems, poverty, and deviance and were concerned with the problem of inequality (Julkunen 1993, p. 258).

The resemblance between liberal and Marxist welfare studies can be described in terms of their commonly shared structure-culture framework. Both envisioned a causal relationship between (social) structure and culture that gave meaning and purpose to the historical process and a perspective on social criticism -- and thereby a role for sociologically oriented intellectuals in this process.

From a Structure-Culture Framework toward Culture

In the 1980s and the early 1990s a considerable number of active sociologists abandoned this framework, mostly some of its Marxist versions, and many of the younger ones never adopted it. This transition has followed two main paths, one of which has retained, in an altered form, an interest in the diagnosis of our time and our place in it. Most representatives of the *Zeitdiagnose* variant of the farewell to Marxism belong to the generation which began its academic career in the late 1960s.

The followers of the other path gradually eliminated the social-structural element of the framework. Their interests shifted away from the disintegrating Marxist camp and turned to cultural analysis. A clue of how this change took place is provided by the difference between Allardt's class analysis and the class analysis of the younger generation, be they Marxists or not. Allardt was interested in the integration of groups *into society*, but the subsequent class analysis put more emphasis on the class structuration aspect and integration *within classes* (Pöntinen 1989, p. 76). The problem of national integration underpinning Allardt's studies of solidarity and communism was no longer a major problem for the younger generation; in the 1970s and the 1980s class tensions in Finland were on decline. When the younger generation focused on the structuration of classes, its attention was increasingly directed toward different aspects of the life of one class at a time.

Put in this way, the within-class perspective was in no sharp disagreement with what soon became perhaps the dominant theme of cultural analysis in Finland, i.e., the search for *homologies* between different spheres of life of one social group. The shift in emphasis is traceable to the interest in the notion of the "way of life" in the late 1970s and early 1980s, prevalent among many of those who made efforts to find a way from

Marxism to empirical sociology. Ways of life were ways of life of different classes or strata. The dynamics present there were not between structural groups and cultural forms emerging from their encounter but between the structure and the culture in terms of one class, between its (material) conditions and the cultural forms characteristic of it.

Here lies an important reason for the fact that Pierre Bourdieu gained popularity very rapidly in Finland, already during the early 1980s. Bourdieu made it possible to stress culture without rejecting structure. Homology refers to the principle that makes various spheres of life a meaningful whole: there is a homological relation between work and leisure activities, for example. This idea provided a new, "cultural" way of seeing the relationship between social organization and cultural practices. A related source of inspiration was found in the so-called Birmingham approach or British culturalism and its sensitivity to interactions between structure and culture: cultural practices were not simply derived from the social order but they had an important part in its constitution.

"Cultural studies" (in Finnish, *kulttuurintutkimus*) became the catchword during the middle and the latter half of the 1980s, largely inspired by both British culturalism and Pierre Bourdieu. Studies that showed an interest in culture, or that conceptualized social phenomena as "culture" proliferated to an unprecedented extent in Finnish sociology. The homology perspective led to an increasing dilution or disappearance of the structure-culture causality even in its modified or "weak" forms. An example that became influential was an examination of local pubs in suburban Tampere and Helsinki (Sulkunen et al. 1997 [1985]). In this study the pub or tavern milieu, people's activities in them, as well as their way of life and the classifications and distinctions guiding their life outside pubs are seen in a homological relation to each other in a genuinely culturalist and/or Bourdieuan style.²

Social Constructionism

At the beginning of the 1990s "cultural studies" as a term began to lose its initial attractiveness. Today the field of "cultural studies" covers a number of varying perspectives, many of which can loosely be called social constructionism. This research does not dwell on a social totality, as is the case in the structure-culture conceptualizations; instead, it deals with various cultural micro-practices. Another aspect is its claim to self-reflexivity, inherent in its stress on the social reality as something constructed by actors.

A few examples of studies addressed to a wider audience than the Finnish only throw light on the variability of cultural analysis in contemporary Finnish sociology. Pertti Alasuutari's version of social constructionism, as it manifests itself in his "cultural theory of alcoholism" (1992) is so flexible that

it dilutes (or solves, if you prefer) a number of antinomies or oppositions which usually are thought to be profoundly problematic in social research but which also structure it (cf. Alasuutari 1995). Conceptions of sexual difference and culturally constructed gender meanings underpin Tuula Gordon's study (1994) of single women in three cultures. Pekka Sulkunen's *The European New Middle Class* (1992) is an analysis of social identities which cannot be analyzed in terms of traditional class theories. In a recent work, Anssi Peräkylä (1995) investigates discussions during AIDS counselling in a conversation analysis framework. Jukka Gronow (1997) argues, in his treatise on the aestheticization of social life, that the role of taste is central to the understanding of the dynamics of modern society. And in his *The Consuming Body*, Pasi Falk (1994) connects the construction of the modern self with the idea of consumption -- of unlimited consumption of food, signs and goods.

Finally, it should be noted that today no watertight walls separate the structural tradition from cultural analysis. An interesting example of the successful adoption of a combination of cultural and structural approaches is a large international project that investigates Alcoholics Anonymous as a prototype of modern mutual- and self-help movements (Mäkelä et al. 1996).

Conclusion

Why has cultural analysis become comparatively influential within Finnish sociology and what are its characteristics? I suggest that a part of the answer stems from the long-term prevalence of the structural tradition: cultural studies were shaped by the tradition they confronted. When the structure-culture framework was questioned, the repertoire of other possible transitions from it was extremely limited or non-existent -- because of the strength of the earlier structural dominance. It is no accident that neither the structural tradition, in both its Marxist and non-Marxist guise, nor the cultural turn in Finland provides an active place for the subject. For the structural tradition, the sources of human behavior are largely found outside acting subjects, but the same goes for the mainstream of Finnish cultural studies. Besides, curiously enough, the continuity of Marxism and cultural analysis seems to lie in the fact that both abhor the idea of transhistorical generalizations about human conduct, and stress, in their own ways, the malleability of culture. Study of the individual in a larger social context, both as a rational actor and as somebody not subject to a "civilizing" analysis, is still at best secondary in Finnish sociology.

Another partial answer to the importance of cultural studies suggests the continuing importance of the role of the intellectual for sociologists in Finland. This traditional role -- which harks back to the period of Finnish nation-building and the place of university intellectuals in this process -- has

not lost all of its significance, far from it. Legislators have not agreed to become sheer interpreters.

Notes

1. In Sweden Bourdieu was introduced first of all by pedagogues (see Ahrne 1997, p. 280). Two important proponents of Bourdieu in Finland were J.P. Roos who, among other things, translated Bourdieu's *Questions de sociologie* into Finnish, and Pekka Sulkunen, who published a well-informed essay on Bourdieu as early as 1982.

2. An original example of a both culturally and structurally sensitive work may be seen in Matti Kortteinen's studies (1984; 1992), which show the logic people follow in struggling for survival in their everyday life. Kortteinen's approach is close to British culturalism, but he is original in Finland in showing people really as *actors*.

Bibliography

Ahrne, G. (1997), "Vad hände på åttioalet?", in L. Hansen et al. (ed.), *Sociologi i tiden. Bakgrund, utveckling, framtid*, Göteborg: Daidalos, 269-282.

Alapuro, R. (1995), "Structure and Culture: Finnish Sociology, 1990-94", *Acta Sociologica*, XXXVIII, 2, 167-180.

Alasuutari, P. (1992), *Desire and Craving: A Cultural Theory of Alcoholism*, Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press.

Alasuutari, P. (1995), *Researching Culture: Qualitative Method and Cultural Studies*, London: Sage.

Alasuutari, P. (1996), *Toinen tasavalta. Suomi 1946-1994* [The Second Republic: Finland, 1946-1994], Tampere: Vastapaino.

Allardt, E. (1971), "The Radical Vote and the Social Context: Traditional and Emerging Radicalism", in S.N. Eisenstadt (ed.), *Political Sociology*, New York: Basic Books, 490-497.

Allardt, E. (1975), *Att ha, att älska, att vara. Om välfärd i Norden* [Having, Loving, Being: On Welfare in the Nordic Countries], Lund: Argos.

Allardt, E. (1984), "Uohtuiko suomalaisen sosiologian suuri linja?" [Was the Master Trend in Finnish Sociology Forgotten?], *Sociologia*, XXI, 2, 139-142.

Allardt, E. (1994), "The Development and Present State of Sociology in Finland", in R.P. Mohan & A.S. Wilke (ed.), *International Handbook of Contemporary Developments in Sociology*, Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 86-107.

- Falk, P. (1994), *The Consuming Body*, London: Sage.
- Gordon, T. (1994), *Single Women: On the Margins?*, London: Macmillan.
- Gronow, J. (1997), *The Sociology of Taste*, London: Routledge.
- Julkunen, R. (1993), "Hyvinvointivaltion ajatusmuoto ja sosiologiset kehykset" [Discourse on the Welfare State and Sociological Frames], in P. Korvajärvi, R. Nätkin & A. Saloniemi (ed.), *Tieteen huolet, arjen ihmeet* [The Concerns of Science, the Wonders of Everyday Life], Tampere: Vastapaino, 256-268.
- Korteinen, M. (1984), Lähiö. *Tutkimus elämäntapojen muutoksesta* [The Suburb: A Study of the Change in Ways of Life], Helsinki: Otava.
- Korteinen, M. (1992), Kunnian kenttä. *Suomalainen palkkatyö kulttuurisena muotona* [The Field of Honor: Finnish Wage Labor as a Cultural Form], Helsinki: Hanki ja Jää.
- Mäkelä, K. et al. (1996), *Alcoholics Anonymous as a Mutual-Help Movement: A Study in Eight Societies*, Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Peräkylä, A. (1995), *AIDS Counselling: Institutional Interaction and Clinical Practice*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pöntinen, S. (1989), "Social Stratification Research in Finland", in V. Stolte-Heiskanen (ed.), *Sociology in the Context of Social Change: Finland and Hungary*, Tampere: University of Tampere, Department of Sociology and Social Psychology, Research Reports, XV, 69-93.
- Sulkunen, P. (1982), "Society Made Visible - On the Cultural Sociology of Pierre Bourdieu", *Acta Sociologica*, XXV, 2, 103-115.
- Sulkunen, P. (1992), *The European New Middle Class: Individuality and Tribalism in Mass Society*, Aldershot: Avebury.
- Sulkunen, P. et al. (1997), *The Urban Pub* [originally in Finnish 1985], Helsinki: Stakes.

CHAPTER 3

NORWAY: SOCIOLOGY IN A WELFARE SOCIETY

Frederik Engelstad

University of Oslo, Norway

In most of the Western world the social sciences came under attack from political and academic circles alike during the 1980s. This was true for all the social sciences, but sociology was particularly hard hit. Skepticism toward sociology also emerged in Norway. Nevertheless, more than in most other Western countries, Norwegian sociology has kept its central position in the nation's political and academic life. Data show that the number of sociologists is very high (1), they are held in esteem in public opinion (2), and they have a marked effect on political planning and social reform. Thus, when discussing strong and weak sides of Norwegian sociology, we are talking about a relatively successful discipline within the context of a small social democratic country.

The Janus Face of Norwegian Sociology

The social sciences hold a central position all over Northern Europe. Two traits are specific for Norway, however:

First, the prominent place of sociology among the social sciences. The largest number of social scientists recruited for research come from sociology. Since 1980 more than 40 percent of all sociologists went into research after their MA degree (cand.sociol. or cand.polit.). The majority of the remainder take up positions as civil servants (Utretningsinstituttet, 1994). Quite a few top positions in ministries and directorates are occupied by sociologists. In the lower ranks they are found in abundance.

Second, the importance of the so-called institute sector. There are between 25 and 30 social science research institutes in Norway. Most of them specialize in one or a few social sectors (urban and regional research, social policy research, etc.) or concentrate on social questions in the region where they are localized. The main bulk of applied and contract research is done by these institutes. All of them are multidisciplinary, but sociologists are the dominating group in the majority of these institutes.

The institutes for applied social research emerged mainly during the 1960s, reflecting a growing demand for social planning. A part of their activity consists of useful fact-finding and reports, rather than research in

any strict sense. However, much work of good quality is produced. But as with all applied research, there is an imminent danger of the work being narrowly centered on matters of direct relevance. Provincialism is a close threat; only a small fraction of the work is comparative, and the historical dimension is generally weak. On the other hand, the dialogue with politics and the public bureaucracy also creates interesting intellectual problems that nourish basic research activity. At its best, the interaction of basic and applied research proves very fruitful.

The presence of the institute sector also sets its stamp on the academic side of the discipline, and thus gives Norwegian sociology a Janus face: one side looking toward social application and the other in a purely academic direction. This cleavage is one reason why sociology in Norwegian universities has been less driven by empirical research, compared to most industrialized countries.

To a greater extent than in most universities, Norwegian academic sociology emphasizes the tradition of sociological classics, be they classics of the discipline in general or those of national prominence. This is particularly true for the largest and oldest department, of the University of Oslo.

Specific to academic sociology is the early criticism of positivism, which was already present at the end of the 1950s. Hans Skjervheim (1957) and Dag Østerberg (1961; 1988) were the pioneers of this criticism, and they have had a significant impact ever since. This early development must be seen within the wider context of the influence of philosophy on Norwegian social science. The single most influential group in the establishment of the discipline rallied around the philosopher Arne Næss already in the early 1940s. Philosophical and metatheoretical questions have been a constant theme running through the discipline ever since.

Problems and Paradoxes

A key to understanding Norwegian sociology is its left-wing loyalties to ideals of equality within a welfare society. Four themes have predominated in research for the last three decades: analyses of welfare policies, level of living studies, feminist studies, and studies of labor markets and work environment.⁽³⁾ The most heated disciplinary debates have focused on the study of Power in 1970s and early 1980s (Hernes 1982), and on research in criminology and sociology of law.

Most analyses are not very different from those carried out in other industrialized countries. Instead of presenting them I shall reflect on some central paradoxes confronting a successful discipline in a well functioning society. There is every reason to believe that sociology has had a positive impact on society. Nevertheless, a certain uneasiness is felt in the discipline.

Could it be that Norwegian sociology has become a victim of its own success?

Theory and Research

One consequence of the discipline's facing two ways is a lack of theoretical sophistication in empirical research. Despite the high level of philosophical reflection in university education, very little research is driven by theoretical concerns. Instead, a rather crude empiricism is the dominant paradigm.

This is all the more astonishing since the profession is profoundly marked by its engagement in social policy matters. One would expect that this would result in works of social importance based on long term research efforts, on a par with, for example, the work of William Julius Wilson on poverty. With few exceptions, this is not so. One reason for this may be a weakness inherent in the theoretical reflection, namely a common unstated assumption that theory is sufficient for social insight. Thus, theory becomes a substitute for empirical facts, rather than a help to interpret factual knowledge.

This situation is reinforced by the division of theory and empirical research between university departments and applied institutes. It is also strengthened by the easy access of sociologists to the mass media. It is unnecessary to write substantial books to reach an interested audience. A display of professional authority is sufficient to gain the ear of the public. Paradoxically, the contributions of sociology to social change might have been more weighty if its access to the public debate had been more demanding.

Conservation or Change?

Sociology's commitment to the welfare state involves it in another curious paradox. On the one hand sociology is radical, advocating social equality and the strengthening of welfare arrangements. But its commitment to the welfare state also forces it to defend good results already achieved, and thus to adopt a conservative position. Politically, this makes it sound highly ambivalent. More importantly, this ambivalence too easily leads to a narrowing of interesting problem formulations. The welfare system is undergoing major changes, but sociologists are so eager to defend the traditional welfare state that they seldom bother to ask why these changes take place, and whether alternative modes of producing welfare services would yield services of comparable quality. A similar attitude is found in comparative research. Too often analyses of the Scandinavian model rest on the unstated assumption that this model is superior to others - and that other countries are in the happy position of being able to learn from it.

Problem formulations seldom reflect that Norwegian welfare policy could profit from experiences outside Scandinavia.

Analyses of Social Stratification

Since 1945 the Labor Party has been in power for altogether forty years. At the same time, Norway is probably one of the most egalitarian nations in the world. From these two facts one might extrapolate that social class would be a major theme in Norwegian sociology. However, this is far from being the case. Not that concerns about social class are completely absent. But they hold a surprisingly marginal position in the discipline. The void is so striking that it demands further explanation.

One reason may be sought in the class structure of Norwegian society. The agrarian elements in the labor movement have been so prominent that traditional Marxian class schemes have lacked credibility. Many of the social conflicts in Norwegian history have been fought under the banner of national identity rather than class interest, summarized by Stein Rokkan (1970) in the slogan "mobilization of the periphery". But if Marxism has been felt to be irrelevant, alternative models of social stratification have been easily available. However, support for them has also been weak.

Another reason for the resistance to analyses of stratification may be found in the dominant position of social democracy. The working class, along with farmers and fishermen, has had strong organizations to defend its interests at the core of the power structure. Researchers have directed their attention to "weak" groups lacking forceful representatives, such as prisoners, immigrants, single mothers. Thus, social *engagement* has led away from thorough examination of social stratification.

Normative Theory

The alternative to analysing society from the point of view of stratification is to focus on norms of social justice. In a world where the belief in a qualitatively different future has vanished, struggles in the present over the division of social goods are intensified. This should be assumed to lead not only to the perfection of strategic skills, but also to the enhancement of norms of distribution. Admittedly, egalitarian ideals have a high standing with the public. The government, for instance, appoints committees to elaborate principles of distribution of health care. But lively debates over normative problems in the distribution of social goods are quite unusual, both in politics and research.

One interpretation is that this stems from a general denial of the necessity to make the hard choices of allocation that are forced upon us by scarcity, even in a high level welfare society. A principled egalitarianism

cannot work in practice. Instead of discussing alternative norms of distribution, the majority of the public tends to opt for a vague norm of equalization. They are followed by the majority of sociologists. For the discipline this has two consequences: serious discussion of possible alternative normative positions is precluded, while at the same time normative commitments reappear as fairly one-dimensional political standpoints. As a result, the distance between political agitation and scientific discussion tends to disappear.

Sociology as Critical Theory?

For Norwegian sociology a balance between short-sighted empiricism and abstract theory (4) may be found in the idea of 'critical theory'. Critical thinking is dear to all of us, and rightly so. But what can it actually mean in sociology? Four central elements may be distinguished.

(i) *Truth*. In Norwegian sociology of the 1950s and 1960s, the critical potential of sociology was seen primarily in its commitment to empirical facts. In the 1970s this was overrun by a completely different concept of critical, inspired by the philosophy of history of the early Frankfurt School, denouncing empirical findings as positivist and normative theory as bourgeois ideology. However, in the meantime it has become clear that sociology cannot envisage social reform without rather strict truth claims.

(ii) *Scientific self-criticism*. Furthermore, science must be critical, in line with Merton's (1942) concept of 'institutionalized skepticism', of its own findings, hypotheses, and theories. This does not denounce the regulative idea of scientific truth, but on the contrary enhances it.

(iii) *Social standards*. When the object of research is society, criticism is extended to the object itself. Social structures are the results of a multitude of interlocked social actions, guided simultaneously by rational deliberations and norms. Understanding social processes presupposes interpretation of these aspects of actors' motivations. Thus, rationality and norms supply the social sciences with critical standards that are inapplicable to the natural sciences. The critical potential resides in the clear understanding that the social world might have looked different from what it does, and in the exposition and discussion of these alternatives.

(iv) *Knowledge interests*. Finally, when social scientists help to achieve social change, they should also be critical of the knowledge interests they are furthering. Sociology is inevitably drawn towards politicization, be it to the side of established powers through contract research, or to the side of protest movements and venerable social causes. It is my belief that we would gain in scholarly vigor by making our intellectual endeavor more independent of social interests. Sociology would then probably, show itself to be more useful as well.

Notes

(1) The Norwegian Sociological Association is the largest of such associations in the Scandinavian countries. With the same prevalence in the United States, the ASA would have had more than 50,000 members.

(2) Social scientists, including sociologists, are in the headlines virtually every day in one or more of the larger newspapers (Eide et al. 1992).

(3) This classification is basically in line with descriptions of Nordic sociology in general (Allard 1989) and Norwegian sociology more specifically (Martinussen 1993; Engelstad 1996).

(4) The dilemma was formulated already by Wright Mills (1959), but not the proposed solution (see Engelstad 1996).

Bibliography

Allardt, E. (1989), "Recent Developments in Scandinavian Sociology", *Annual Review of Sociology*, XV, 31-45.

Eide, M., Narve, S. and Svela, E. (1992), "Samfunnsforskning spaltelangs" in Martin Eide (ed.), *Til Oppslag. Samfunnsvitenskap, forskningsformidling og massekommunikasjon*, Oslo: NORAS.

Engelstad, F. (1996), "Norsk sosiologi siden 1969: Problemer og utfordringer", *Tidsskrift for samfunnsforskning*, XXXVII, 224-252.

Hernes, G. (1982), *Maktutredningen: sluttrapport*, NOU 1982:3. Oslo

Martinussen, W. (1993), "A Snapshot of Present-day Norwegian Sociology", *Acta Sociologica*, XXXVI, 385-391.

Merton, R. (1942 [1957]), "Science and Democratic Social Structure", In *Social Theory and Social Structure*, Glencore: The Free Press.

Østerberg, D. (1961), "Sosiologi, kausalitet og prediksjon", *Tidsskrift for samfunnsforskning*, II,(1988), *Metasociology*. Oslo: Scandinavian University Press, 264-278.

Rokkan, S. (1970), *Citizens, Elections, Parties*, Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Skjervheim, H. (1957), *Objectivity and the Study of Man*, Oslo: Department of Sociology.

Utredningsinstituttet for forskning og høyere utdanning, (1994), *Kandidatundersøkelsen 1993*. Report 11:94. Oslo.

CHAPTER 4

SOCIOLOGY IN SWEDEN: CHALLENGES, RENEWALS AND/OR RETREATS?

Johanna Esseveld
University of Lund, Sweden

The starting point for the following reflections on the current state of Swedish sociology is rooted in my own experience of sociology as it is practiced and taught in several different European countries and in North America. More directly, they are sparked by current debates of a more global nature concerning a 'crisis' in the contemporary field.

There are differences in the content and meaning in contemporary debates concerning a presumed crisis in sociology. Let me offer a sample. According to Randall Collins this crisis is rooted in the fact that:

"the field has grown repetitive, stagnant, fragmented; that it has lost its public impact or even its impulse to public action; that it lacks excitement; that it no longer gets good students or has good ideas." (Collins 1986, p. 1336).

Bo Isenberg (1997) presents another interpretation of sociology's crisis. From his perspective, sociology is about to come to terms with modernity, a period of history characterized by crises. Crises then should be taken as a source of strength and vitality of the discipline.

Pierre Bourdieu (1995) also indicates that a sense of 'crisis' may be a positive thing, stimulating self-reflection and renewal in a discipline like sociology. The problem, as he sees it, is that sociologists have withdrawn too deeply into their ivory towers. Bourdieu argues that sociology must be more relevant and that sociologists should be more like intellectuals, taking active part in the public debate.

The relation between scientific knowledge and politics is central to the Report 'Open the Social Sciences' (Wallerstein et al. 1996). According to the Report, the social sciences are today challenged by feminists, third-world social sciences and postmodernists in the first-world and an opening of the social sciences to include these new perspectives will contribute to their renewal. Joan Alway (1995) provides insight into some of the barriers to such an opening in her comparison of the recent inclusion of postmodern theorizing into sociological theory to the exclusion of feminist theorizing.

Where is Sociology in Sweden?

As in other parts of the world, the concept of 'crisis' was introduced into Swedish sociology in the late 1960s. Swedish debates concerned fundamental issues internal to the field itself rather than to societal changes affecting the discipline. One such 'crisis' concerned the methods which would characterize the discipline (Asplund 1966; Zetterberg 1966), while another referred to issues of value-neutrality (Therborn 1973).

Today, Swedish sociologists are more reluctant to use the term 'crisis'. However, there seems to be some agreement that sociology is being challenged from within - by a fragmentation stemming from an abundance of methodological and theoretical perspectives, and an over-specialisation of its practitioners. From without, it is also agreed, sociology is threatened by profound changes in Swedish society, particularly regarding the form and content of the welfare state. Historically, there has existed an intimate relationship between the development of Swedish sociology and the Swedish welfare state; thus, any major change in the latter will almost necessarily evoke a change in the former. Any notion of a 'crisis' of the welfare state will *ipso facto* create a sense of crisis amongst Swedish sociologists, especially those of an older generation.

While there may be general agreement concerning the threat to sociology in Sweden, there is less agreement about how such challenges are to be interpreted. In order to better understand this, it is necessary to offer a short history of sociology in Sweden. In this presentation I will refer to what others have written, but I will use these texts to present an account that differs from more established narratives on the history of sociology in Sweden. The aim of this account is to contextualize present debates in Sweden both in order to better understand them and to reveal what is missing in such debates.

Sociology in Sweden: One History or Different (Hi)stories?

In the abundance of histories of the development of Swedish sociology, the importance of social and historical contexts is emphasized at the same time as the authors adhere to the idea that there has been continuous development. From this evolutionary point of view, new perspectives and challenges are added to earlier ones - often after clearly defined breaking points. Furthermore, the history of Swedish sociology as an academic discipline is most often presented with the following periodization: 1947 through the mid-1960s, when the field was established, followed by a second period, covering the late 1960s through 1970s, when changes in direction took place through a number of crises. This is followed by a period where sociology has grown so diverse that it weakened internally - losing its

earlier unified identity or "center" as well as its collectively established direction.

Sociology as an independent academic discipline was established in Sweden immediately after the Second World War. As an academic field, it combined a base in moral philosophy with an emphasis on concrete, empirical knowledge and was more inspired by the empirical orientation in American sociology than by European sociology. Like its American counterpart, Swedish sociology was assumed to be useful and to focus on practical problems. "Speculation" about societal development or structural problems was left aside.

From the mid-1960s to the mid-1970s the view of sociology as an empirical social science with a basis in survey-research and statistical analysis was challenged in a number of ways. One such challenge occurred in the area of methodology with the so-called "soft data" debates and another in the debates about value-neutrality, mentioned above. Other challenges occurred in the area of theory and grew out of a societal context where new social movements were questioning basic societal power relations. Sweden was no different than most of the rest of the world. As elsewhere, societal challenges led to re-orientations in sociology. A new generation of sociologists came to focus more on macro-oriented issues, often with Marxist orientations drawn from European rather than American sources. After a short period of polarisation in the 1970s, different perspectives came to exist side-by-side within sociology in Sweden. For some commentators this offered a positive diversity, where sociology continued to be empirically oriented but with a more sophisticated theoretical discussion occurring at the same time (Ahrne 1997). Some have a more negative opinion (e.g. Abrahamsson 1987), while others suggest that the emphasis on diversity hid the fact that there existed a dominant discourse which was materialistic, comparative and macro-oriented. This dominant perspective was circumscribed by the triad, welfare, class and state and downplayed cultural and ideological factors (Israel 1987).

During this period the connection between sociology and the Swedish state was further strengthened. This occurred in part through the creation of research institutes and counsels which financed applied research in an effort to stimulate more policy-relevant research, as well as that concerned with the welfare state. In many empirical studies and in theorizing about the welfare state, Sweden with its institutional model, was taken as a positive example. Swedish sociology also received international attention on this basis and descriptions of it were couched in visions of its relative success: "Swedish sociology ... is today, at the end of the 1980s, internationally visible and interesting" (Allardt et al. 1988 p. 41).

A combined economic and political crisis at the end of the 1980s led to the emergence of a more liberal welfare model, something which helped

produce a sense of crisis amongst Swedish sociologists, especially those who shared in this dominant perspective. Together with processes of bureaucratisation, professionalisation and specialisation, the field became more diverse. Diversity and pluralism were now seen in a more negative light and (re)defined as a *fragmentation* of the discipline (Åberg 1987).

This representation of contemporary sociology as fragmented, while earlier periods are portrayed as unified may need to be amended. In the first place, sociology in Sweden included more varying opinions than such accounts allow. The accounts presented in the anthology *Om svensk sociologi* (Fridjónsdóttir 1987) by key actors in the period immediately after the Second World War, suggest that from its inception as an academic discipline Swedish sociology contained divergent perspectives concerning theory and methods. These articles also reveal generational differences, as well as a diversity in terms of the profiles of the five university-departments with doctoral educations in sociology: Gothenburg, Lund, Stockholm, Uppsala and Umeå.

In a recent overview article, Dahlström (1994) represents sociology in Sweden through an array of discursive fields and a number of controversies. While he presents an open picture of sociology in Sweden including many different viewpoints and debates, certain dichotomies still remain creating a narrowly defined discipline in which significant perspectives and actors disappear. Dahlström still writes as if sociology in Sweden has a common core (with a focus on general problems of equality) and which exists relatively isolated from developments in the rest of the world.

Where is Swedish Sociology Today?

There seems to be a certain amount of uneasiness concerning the nature of Swedish sociology and its disciplinary identity, despite this insularity. Almost in spite of itself, the field seems to have become broader. Sociological thinking has been absorbed by other academic fields and seeped out into society at large (Ahrne 1997). This, combined with internal challenges concerning content, aims and purposes, has led to what could be called a crisis of identity. Whether sociology is a science or an intellectual activity of another sort are questions currently being asked. The claim to 'science' after all, was one of the prime claims to legitimacy of Swedish sociology in its earlier phases, and was especially important in navigating the close relationship between sociology and the state. Part of this identity crisis stems from the fact that given the changes in the welfare state, sociology has lost some of its centrality for Swedish social policy.

There remains an amazing predominance of the modernist project to order and predict in Swedish sociology, and a continued silencing of "other" voices. The content of the book *Sociologi i tiden* (Hansen et al. 1997) can

serve as an example. This sampling of the work of sociologists and historians consists of a backward glance into a sociology, where postmodernist, cultural and feminist frameworks are obvious in their absence. There is an awareness of some of these absences, as Thomas Johansson indicates in his contribution "What happened to the postmodern?". However, most is left implicit rather than being explicitly addressed. While this does not mirror sociology in Sweden as a whole, the results from earlier evaluations of the departments of sociology in Sweden and a recent research project on un/equal institutional environments show that while a few new areas are included in sociology's curriculum, new generations of students at undergraduate and graduate levels are still being educated according to a fixed canon which, in the Swedish version, acknowledges a core of classics of international and Swedish sociology. Profound criticism of the discipline has left sociology in Sweden relatively unmoved - at least if we take recent publications and the literature used in teaching as indicators.

One explanation of why so little has changed in sociology in Sweden, despite a sense of decline and fragmentation, is that the relative success of the dominant mode of Swedish sociology has limited the solutions presented to resolve any crisis. Paradoxically then, the relative success of this mode of sociology - nationally and internationally - and its predominance amongst Swedish sociologists may have contributed to the present stagnation and crisis.

Bibliography

- Åberg, R. (1987), "Sociologi - en splittrad vetenskap utan kärna?", in K Fridjonsdóttir (ed.), *ibid*, 226-234.
- Abrahamsson, B. (1987), "Sociologins ansvar" in K. Fridjonsdóttir (ed.), *ibid*, 177-188.
- Ahrne, G. (1997), "Vad hände på Åttioalet?", in L. Hansen et al. (ed.) *ibid*, 269-282.
- Allardt, E. et al. (1988), *Sociologin i Sverige. Vetenskap, miljö och organisation*, Uppsala: HSNR.
- Alway, J. (1995), "The Trouble with Gender: Tales of the Still-Missing Feminist Revolution in Sociological Theory", *Sociological Theory*, XIII, 3, 209-228.
- Asplund, J. (1966), "Aubert och mjukdatasociologin", *Sociologisk forskning*, 2, 96-104.
- Bourdieu, P. (1995), "Et pourtant..." *Revue internationale des livres*, Dec., 1-2.

- Collins, R. (1986), "Is 1980s Sociology in the Doldrums?", *American Journal of Sociology*, vol. 1, no. 6, 1336-1355.
- Dahlström, E. (1994), "Contemporary Swedish Sociology. A Personal View", *Acta Sociologica*, vol. 37, 75-92.
- Fridjónsdóttir, K. (ed.), (1987), *Om svensk sociologi. Historia, problem och perspektiv*, Carlssons: Stockholm.
- Hansen, L. et al. (ed.), (1997), *Sociologi i tiden. Bakgrund, utveckling, framtid*, Göteborg: Daidalos.
- Isenberg, B. (1997), "Sociologi, programmatisk modern", in L. Hansen, et. al. (ed.) *ibid.* 283-310.
- Israel, J. (1987), "Från positivism till kritisk teori", in K. Fridjónsdóttir (ed.), *ibid.* 112-130.
- Johansson, T. (1997), "Vart tog det postmoderna vägen? Om sociologi, ironi och framtiden", in L. Hansen, et al. (ed.) *ibid.* 337-356.
- Therborn, G. (1973), *Vad är bra värderingar värda?*, Stockholm: Bo Cavefors bokförlag.
- Wallerstein, I. et al., (1996), *Open the Social Sciences*, Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Zetterberg, H. (1966), "Traditioner och möjligheter i nordisk sociologi", *Sociologisk forskning*, 1, 1-21.

CHAPTER 5

DANISH SOCIOLOGY: THE NEED FOR A NEW BEGINNING

Peter Gundelach
University of Copenhagen, Denmark

In spite of Denmark's strong international orientation Danish sociology has developed in a such peculiar way that it cannot be compared to any other sociology in Western society. Chairs in sociology came late in Denmark. In fact, two competing departments were established as late as around 1960 at The University of Copenhagen. After relatively few years, in 1986-87, the departments were closed down by the government. In 1994 a new department of sociology was set up. This peculiar history places special challenges on Danish sociology compared to sociology in other societies. This article will outline the history of Danish sociology¹ and the consequences of its unique and almost bizarre history. In order to do so it is important to distinguish between sociology's institutional history, its importance in social reforms and sociology's general development.

In Denmark as well as in other societies the 1968 student rebellion meant that sociology became an important discipline in the interpretation of society. A sociological understanding of society became part of common sense and sociological concepts entered everyday language. Sociology also became part of the curriculum in high schools, in schools for semi-professionals such as teachers and social workers and in many other disciplines, even in humanities, health and technical sciences. In this general sense Danish sociology can be considered a success - a success that it shares with sociology in other societies (Beck and Bonss 1984).

However, compared to other countries Danish sociology never came to play a role as mediator of social reforms and Danish sociology has experienced an institutional crisis (and what follows from this in terms of lack of professionalization and problems with applied sociology).

Background

There has been scattered Danish sociological literature since the middle of the 19th century. The most remarkable Danish contribution was Claudius Wilkens' (1844-1929) Spencer-inspired work. Wilkens wrote the first Danish textbook in sociology in 1875. Several later publications can be classified as

sociological, but neither the intellectual nor the public debate was strongly influenced by sociology before World War II. The University of Copenhagen was the only Danish university until the foundation of the University of Aarhus in 1929. In Copenhagen, the university was divided in its perception of sociology between a wing that mainly understood sociology as a philosophical subdiscipline and another wing that perceived sociology mainly as an empirical discipline somewhat related to economy. This conflict meant that for many years sociology in Denmark was at an impasse.

The philosophical wing was the stronger. Of course sociologically relevant empirical studies were done, but most of this work was not carried out by sociologists. In relation to social reforms the most important influence came from a government position as economic adviser to the ministry of social affairs. All of the incumbents of this position got important positions in Danish academia. The first Frederik Zeuthen (1888-1958) and probably the best internationally known Danish economist got a chair in social policy in 1930. Zeuthen (1939) defined social policy in a broad sense as: "measures or attempts to create measures in the relations between the classes" and social policy in its narrow meaning "concerns measures in relation to poorly off classes and their relations to society". In his position as advisor to the ministry as well as when he was professor, Zeuthen played an important role in creating social reforms in Denmark and before World War II the Danish social policy debate was dominated by "social-economists".

Sociology was mainly considered a subdiscipline of philosophy and there was no fertile ground for establishing a Danish sociology at that time. This may be the explanation of why Denmark was relatively uninfluenced by a major German sociologist Theodor Geiger (1891-1952) who came to Denmark in 1933 after being expelled from Germany. Geiger worked in Copenhagen from 1933-1938 partly on a scholarship from Rockefeller foundation, but he never got a position at the university. In 1938 he got a chair of sociology at the Department of Economics at Aarhus University. He was strongly engaged in intellectual debates and empirical and theoretical work. During the German occupation Geiger had to go to Sweden. He continued his work in Sweden and after his return to Denmark after the war. Geiger was co-founder of the International Sociological Association and the Scandinavian journal *Acta sociologica*.

Much of Geiger's work is still well regarded and he was very active in the Danish intellectual debate. However, he never succeeded in establishing a Department of Sociology. When he died in 1952 the Department of Economics decided not to appoint a new professor of sociology.

In Copenhagen, the debate between different fractions at the university finally ended when it was decided to establish a chair in sociology with an empirical orientation at the Faculty of Law and Economy, where sociology had been taught as a subdiscipline since 1913. After quite some turmoil the

Norwegian Kaare Svalastoga (1912-1997) was appointed professor in 1956. Svalastoga was mainly interested in social differentiation. He was strongly positivistic oriented and conducted a major survey of prestige in the Danish society in the late 1950s. However, the struggle over the orientation of sociology did not end. Rather, it was sharpened and Svalastoga was met with strong criticism from a number of more humanistically oriented, sociologically interested lecturers. In 1964 Werner Goldschmidt became professor of "Cultural Sociology" and so from then on the University of Copenhagen had two competing departments of sociology: The Department of Sociology at the Faculty of Law and Economics and the Department of Cultural Sociology at the Faculty of the Humanities. Cultural Sociology was defined in strong opposition to Svalastoga's positivistic orientation and purposely designed as an interdisciplinary study of sociology, anthropology and social psychology.

Thus, in the mid-1960s there were two departments of sociology in Copenhagen, each with its own distinct orientation. The only other Danish university, Aarhus University, had a very small sub-department of sociology focusing on political sociology and at the Copenhagen Business School there was a small Department of Organisation and the Sociology of Work. Outside the universities, the Ministry of Social Affairs founded an institute for applied social research. However, strong co-operation between this National Danish Institute for Social Research and the two departments of sociology was never established. The development of Danish sociology can best be described as strong diversification without a centre.

The two departments came under heavy pressure in the late 1960s and the early 1970s. Large enrollment of students and the student rebellion hit the two departments hard and they were unable to cope with these changes. Kaare Svalastoga isolated himself and Werner Goldschmidt went on leave. For shorter periods, there were other professors at the department, but they did not play an important role for Danish sociology, so for several years the departments were not headed by senior faculty members. This meant that the departments were quite unstable in their research orientation. A large number of researchers were very influenced by the so-called capital logic school of Marxism. The competition between different types of Marxism soon began to dominate the departments, especially the Department of Sociology and the two departments still refused to co-operate. The Department of Sociology was in reality headed by a number of strongly Marxist oriented younger scholars, several of them without tenure, and was not interested in mainstream sociology. As two of the most important persons in the alternative development of the Department of Sociology said in a recent book: "The rebels just about abjured the project of sociology to replace it with many different variations of critical science which had as its main purpose to transcend the capitalistic society. And this was, quite truly,

a different project than that of sociology (even in a reflexive classical variant)" (Hansson and Aagaard Nielsen 1996, p. 28).

The Department of Cultural Sociology transcended mainstream sociology in another way by insisting on a multidisciplinary approach to sociology. Thus what should have been centres of Danish sociology instead emerged as different types of deviations from the general trends in international sociology. The lack of a centre resulted in a strong periphery. Sociology was established as a subdiscipline at other universities. In the mid-1970s two new multidisciplinary universities were established and sociologists played an important role in defining new departments and curricula in social science. After a few years there were professors of sociology at the Department of Political Science at Aarhus University (traditional university) and at the newly established Universities of Roskilde and Aalborg (multidisciplinary social science) and at Department of Organisation and the Sociology of Work at The Copenhagen Business School. Sociologist also played an important role in organizations for applied research. In sum, Danish sociology consisted of relatively strong and internationally oriented, but also very specialised, sociological milieu outside of the University of Copenhagen and of relatively weak and inner-directed departments of sociology at the University of Copenhagen.

In 1986-87, after recommendation of civil servants from the Ministry of Education, the government closed down the two departments. The institutional crisis of Danish sociology had peaked. The two Copenhagen departments more or less collapsed, but in the periphery the period was rather productive. Several textbooks of sociology emerged and the Danish Sociological Association finally succeeded establishing a Danish Journal of Sociology.

So the situation for Danish sociology at the end of the 1980s can be characterised as follows:

- 1) Malfunctioning and final collapse of the departments of sociology.
- 2) A relatively strong periphery without obligation towards general, mainstream sociology.
- 3) With minor exceptions ² a weak policy orientation.

In several ways excellent sociological work was done in Denmark, but the lack of a centre meant at least three important things: a very small and fragile sociological milieu, a lack of professionalization and a lack of public recognition of sociology.

Challenges for Danish Sociology

This very bleak picture of Danish sociology means that the challenges for Danish sociology are greater than in most other countries. In Denmark there

is a need to tackle the institutional crisis of sociology as well as to tackle the challenges of sociology which exist in many other countries.

Should the institutional crisis be tackled by establishing a department of sociology? The recent report from the Gulbenkian Commission (Wallerstein 1996) argued for a broad understanding of sociology with no clear boundaries to other social sciences. The commission argued that the contemporary situation of the social sciences is different from the founding period about 100 hundred years ago and the report questions the present division of labour between the social sciences. The consequences of this argument could be that there is no need for departments of sociology but rather for departments of general social science. While the first part of the argument is correct, the second part cannot be applied to countries where no sociology departments exist. The future of a strong sociology can only be secured with a double strategy: to develop departments of sociology and to open for co-operation with other social sciences.

Thus, in Denmark, the first challenge was to re-establish a Department of Sociology in Denmark. In 1994 the new department was founded at the University of Copenhagen and important objectives of the department are to form a centre for Danish sociology, but also to promote sociology at other universities and to strengthen the co-operation with other departments as well as with institutes for applied research. In 1997 Aalborg University got the permission to train sociologists not in a specific department but at the Faculty of the Social Sciences.

What is needed in Denmark is a strategy of "walking on two legs": to create a strong centre that can inspire other sociological milieu and to co-operate with other social sciences in order to meet the general challenges of sociology from social trends such as globalization and from intellectual trends such as cultural studies.

Notes

1. The history of Danish sociology is described in an article in English (Andersen et al., 1994) and some books in Danish (Due and Madsen, 1986; Madsen et al., 1994; Hansson and Nielsen, 1996).

2. The National Danish Institute for Social Research has carried out a large number of descriptive social science studies. Other institutes of applied social science have also contributed to a general description of Danish society. A Professor of Sociology at the University of Aalborg, Tore Jacob Hegland, has played an important role in development of the measures for the Ministry of Social Affairs in relation to the marginalised groups.

Bibliography

- Andersen, H., Blegvad, B. and Blegvad, M. (1994), "Contemporary Sociology in Denmark", in Raj P. Mohan and Arthus S. Wilke (ed.), *International Handbook of Contemporary Developments in Sociology*, Westport: Greenwood Press, 64-85.
- Beck, U. and Bonss, W. (1984), "Soziologie und Modernisierung. Zur Ortsbestimmung der Verwendungsforschung", *Soziale Welt* XXXV, 4, 381-406.
- Due, J. and Madsen, J.S. (1983), *Slip sociologien løs*, København: Hans Reitzel.
- Hansson, F. and Aagaard Nielsen, K. (ed.), (1996), *Dansk sociologis historie*, København: Forlaget Sociologi.
- Madsen, A. Ejersbo, H. og Damkjær, S. (ed.), (1994), *Den kultursociologiske omtanke*, København: Akademisk Forlag.
- Zeuthen, F. (1939), *Socialpolitik I. Bind*. København: Nyt Nordisk Forlag.
- Wallerstein, I. et al. (1996), *Open the Social Sciences*, Stanford: Stanford University Press.

CHAPTER 6

YOUTH AND SOCIOLOGY: THE NORDIC CONTRIBUTION IN A GLOBAL PERSPECTIVE

Gestur Gudmundsson
University of Copenhagen, Denmark

Young people are sensitive, inventive and likely to form the society for decades to come. Therefore youth studies have a privileged access to the *Zeitgeist* and trends of society and should play a vanguard role in social science.

For more than fifty years youth research has been an integral part of several disciplines, but since the 1970s an interdisciplinary field has emerged in Europe, combining sociology, anthropology, psychology, pedagogic, media studies, musicology, literature, and sometimes even economics, political science or others.

The strongest single intellectual force shaping this new field in Europe was the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies (CCCS) in Birmingham UK. "The Birmingham School" combined radical constructionist sociology with advanced semiotic reading and the Marxism of Althusser and Gramsci, inspiring far-reaching theoretical and methodological search across discipline boundaries. At the same time American youth studies remained divided between disciplines, theoretically and methodologically underdeveloped and dominated by raw empiricism (Dornbusch 1989). "New" countries like China and Russia came into the youth research arena with studies drawing from samples of millions of young people, but with a striking lack of original theoretical perspectives.

The Birmingham school had a radical chic image in the 1970s, but its Marxist overtones made it an easy target of the 1980s. In the 1990s a reconstruction has been able to remove this 'superstructure' of its approach, leaving a combination of a sophisticated reading of cultural practices and an integrative perspective, inherited from functionalist sociology (Wyn and White, 1997). A new wave of British youth research has also found the late modernism theories of Giddens and Beck compatible with an integrative perspective (Furlong and Cartmel, 1997). Thus theories originally designed to capture social change and youth as the agent of change have been recycled to modernize the perspective of functional integration.

However, a change of perspective from the global hegemony to local and regional developments may alter this overall picture.

Youth Research in the Nordic Countries - A Short Overview

Youth research has been carried out in the Nordic countries from very early on in this century, but within different disciplines and sub-discourses, like psychology and pedagogy. In the late 1970s and the early 1980s the influences of the Birmingham School and Thomas Ziehe in West Germany swept the Nordic countries. They were sometimes copied, sometimes rejected but more often reworked in a critical manner. The reaction to these impulses became a major force creating a Nordic forum in the field, but other influences were thrown into the pool, e.g. the Chicago-school, Coleman, Erikson, Margaret Mead, Bourdieu, Foucault and the traditions handed down from mainstream sociology, pedagogy and psychology.

The new Nordic discourse was nurtured at first in smaller groups but has been gathered in the NYRI network for more than a decade that organizes biannual conferences, a research bibliography and a quarterly journal, YOUNG.

This cooperation has widened the horizon from habitual national limitations and opened windows to research communities, especially in Britain, Germany, France, and USA. Young researchers in the Nordic countries had honoured the principle of interdisciplinarity for more than a decade, and the field of youth research became a natural forum for such efforts. From the beginning the community of a few hundred of youth researchers made links with other small communities. Of particular importance were the links with women studies and the mass media field. The field of youth studies became a centre of gravity for search processes (Ziehe 1982) within various disciplines.

Slowly national institutionalization emerged and took different shapes. In Sweden youth research projects were given high priority by the research councils, and six youth research centres were formed, promoting the idea of networking interdisciplinarity. The Norwegians decided to concentrate their efforts on one research centre carrying out empirical analyses of living conditions and integration of Norwegian youth. Finland has seen a pluralistic development of youth research, situated at the traditional disciplines, but united within an association of Finnish youth researchers. Denmark and Iceland have given less priority to youth research.

The outcome has definitely not been a distinct Nordic school of youth research, but a polyphonic choir, whose performance will now be evaluated against the hegemonic British youth research in terms of good practice.

Good Practice, Sociology, and Nordic Youth Research

First, the Nordic community of researchers has practiced interdisciplinarity in a highly exemplary way. Through encounters on Nordic, national and local

levels, scholars and students from different disciplines have shed lights from different angles on complicated phenomena, and many insights have been produced in this way. However this always implies the eclectic danger that bits of different disciplines are patched together without respect for their epistemological foundations, theoretical heritage etc. The original disciplines carry a responsibility for their heritage, also when it is used outside the discipline, but in the Nordic countries established sociology has given only limited critical feedback to the widespread application of sociology in interdisciplinary youth research. There are neither professors nor lecturers in youth sociology at the larger Nordic universities. Even though sociologists are the largest professional group in interdisciplinary networks of youth studies, they have had to move away from their sociological base to new interdisciplinary institutions as a rule if they want to carry on with youth research.

Second, several Nordic projects have achieved the good practice of combining quantitative and qualitative approaches in their design. But there is also a tendency in all the Nordic countries except for Finland to draw an iron curtain between soft humanistic approaches and hard sociological ones. By this distinction anything from ethnographic research to interpretation of rock texts, from studies of life stories to analyses of media genres is labelled as soft approaches, which means that the bulk of Nordic youth research is exiled from sociology.

Third, the Nordic youth research community has set a good example by its networking practices across the boundaries of states and disciplines, initiated by the researchers themselves. On the other hand the autonomy of the field is decreasing. The governments have cleverly granted small amounts of support to the networks, accompanied by growing control over their activities. Most of the research funds are also controlled by policy-makers. This does not only mean control by politicians but also by the youth organizations, that according to Nordic institutional culture have great influence on youth policy. The decline of these organizations has led to a number of defensive reactions, i.e. intervening in the youth research policy, demanding that attention be turned away from the unorganised youth (subcultures etc.) to the prospects of mobilizing ordinary youth into the healthy activities of youth organisations.

The presence of governmental and organisational interests in the research field cannot be avoided, but it requires the strengthening of independent research communities. The diversity of youth research can be an asset of intellectual development, but the power imbalance in the field threatens to turn it into destructive competition for the goodwill of the policy makers.

Fourth, the most unambiguously strong aspect of Nordic youth research is its ability to combine various discourses from areas that were largely

closed to each other in a critical manner, notably the British, German and French traditions. The Nordic style has not been to develop its own theories, but to move the field a bit further through combinations, criticism, application to new fields and other small steps that may be more fruitful in the long run than putting all the effort into the creation of omnipotent approaches.

The notion of reflexivity could be taken as an example of the Nordic achievements. In the wake of Ulrich Beck's risk society from 1986 he and Anthony Giddens have made the concept reflexivity the keyword of sociology. Thus the British-centred discussion of changing transition to adulthood in the nineties has made reflexivity a key reference. This represents no news for Nordic youth research, as these issues were introduced in the region by Thomas Ziehe in the early eighties. His seminal book on *Unusual Learning* (Ziehe 1982) took the Nordic community beyond the postmodernist debate, and he introduced the term of reflexivity in a very sophisticated manner in youth research already in 1985. Since then Nordic youth researchers have been developing these ideas further, both theoretically and empirically (Bjerrum Nielsen/Rudberg 1994, Fornäs 1995). In the light of the critical and empirical applications of these ideas in Nordic research, the current English-centred usage of them seems undigested and often ornamental. The analyses of changed transitions usually start with a short introduction of the idea of reflexivity, but then the scope is narrowed to questions of changed career trajectories. These questions are of course interesting but examining them in an isolated way seems to run counter to the basic idea of reflexivity, implying fundamental changes of orientation, e.g. as regards the role of work for identity formation and in the relation between leisure and work.

A reconstruction of the reception of Bourdieu in the Nordic countries since the early eighties would show that also here Nordic scholars have been ahead of their British colleagues, and there is a similar story to the Nordic reception of the Birmingham school. In Britain it was largely written off in the 1980s and resurfaced as a part of new trends in the 1990s, but in the meantime many Nordic scholars have developed aspects of their approach further in a less trend-ridden way.

These, and other, achievements of Nordic youth research do not stand out clearly neither in the international debate nor in the identity of Nordic youth researchers. Thus new introductory books in English on youth include almost no references to the extensive Nordic production in the field - and very few to scholars outside the British Empire. Although Nordic scholars are also orientated towards the Nordic community, continental Europe and America, UK references often appear as their point of departure - not because it is really the case but because they do not want to look provincial. In both cases the chief explanation is the paradigm of centre and periphery that not only structures the discourse but also the habitus of the researchers.

However, sociological developments should make the outdatedness of this habitus obvious. The hegemony of the Anglo-Saxon discourses is still linked to the hegemony of the English language. It has the structural consequences that the work of Nordic scholars have limited access to the international community, as only a little part of it is published in English, often many years after the original publication. But in the long run, Nordic traditions of reading 5 or more languages and shifting between writing in two or more languages, must be considered as assets of reflexivity winners. These reflexivity winners have to ask "what do I really intend to say?" instead of repeating the habitual language of their own inbred community of researchers. Even though their phrasing may often appear clumsy, the words have been chosen in a much more careful manner and the formulations are less likely to be a reflex of ethnocentrism. Scholars who only master one language, at most capable of reflecting between different sociodialects and perhaps reading one foreign language, candidate to become reflexivity losers.

Youth Research and Sociology

Youth research has become a field of interdisciplinarity especially in the Nordic countries, but most of its theoretical and analytical approaches have their origins in sociology. Interdisciplinarity has meant as a rule that humanistic methods and theoretical pieces are added to a basically sociological framework, but sociology treats its child, youth research, in a stepmotherly fashion.

In the Nordic countries interdisciplinary networks have been excellent for stimulating youth research, but they need a counterweight in more academic, discipline-based research. Especially sociology has an obligation to protect the various sociological roots of youth research.

At present youth sociology is taking a far too narrow space within youth studies and certainly not realizing its possibilities to become a vanguard of sociology.

Notes

A more extensive version was presented as a paper to the ISA Nordic Sociological Meeting in Copenhagen 11-13 June 1997 and can be obtained from the author.

Bibliography

- Bjerrum Nielsen, H. and Rudberg, M. (1994), *Psychological Gender and Modernity*, Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Dornbusch, S.M. (1989), "The Sociology of Adolescence", *Annual Reviews of Sociology* 15,233-259.
- Fornäs, J. (1995), *Cultural Theory & Late Modernity*, London: Sage.
- Furlong, A. & Cartmel, F. (1997), *Young People and Social Change*, Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Wyn, J. & White, R. (1997), *Rethinking Youth*. London: Sage.
- Ziehe, T. & Stubenrauch, H. (1982), *Plädoyer für ungewöhnliches Lernen, Ideen zur Jugendsituation*, Reinbek bei Hamburg: Rowohlt Taschenbuch Verlag.

CHAPTER 7

NORDIC COMPARATIVE HISTORICAL MACROSOCIOLOGY

Lars Mjøset
University of Oslo, Norway

The study of history was one of the main roots of sociology. Defining the relationship between history and sociology has been a core question of most Methodenstreits in the history of social science. Although "grand theory" and "abstracted empiricism" dominated much of 1950s/60s social science, historical sociology was an alternative already then. To the first postwar generation of historical sociologists - Eisenstadt, Bendix, and Barrington Moore - we also count a Norwegian scholar: Stein Rokkan (1921-1979). He gave historical sociology a head start in the emerging Nordic community of sociologists.

This note discusses Rokkan's contribution in order to ask whether later Nordic scholarship in historical sociology has matched the standards of the former. It is restricted to works in Rokkan's field of comparative historical macrosociology, focused mainly on nation states. With few exceptions, I include neither his single historical case studies, nor large comparative, cross-national studies.

The Legacy of Stein Rokkan

Educated in language and philosophy, Rokkan soon became a leading figure in early Norwegian social science. From his chair in sociology (from 1966) at the University of Bergen, he founded a department of comparative politics. Since Rokkan's wide-ranging research interests required collective work, he engaged in ceaseless efforts to establish international networks, including Nordic ones.

Rokkan started in electoral survey research, but moved away from the focus on variables determining voters' choices, focusing instead on the framework within which choices were made. He looked into history in order to understand the roots of the differences between present Western European political party systems: the extension of voting rights since 1789, the emergence of mass politics, mobilisation and party formation. A given party system reflected preceding conflicts and alliances, deriving from

fundamental *cleavages*. Rokkan (1970) compared the cleavages and the timing of conflict sequences between countries.

These studies took place in existing post-war nation states. But Rokkan also found non-state "nations", where nationhood referred to regional identities, religion, or language. This led him to the topic of nationalism and the formation of political identities (Rokkan/Urwin 1983). Studying the territorial consolidation of states, he considered the interplay between states in the European state system. These extensions mark the second phase of his work: the search for the underlying variables behind the Western European process of political differentiation. His aim was to establish a "family of models" that could synthesize the history of state formation, nation building and mass politics. Since 1973 he published increasingly detailed *conceptual maps* of Europe. Understanding Rokkan's approach to theory and method in historical sociology requires an understanding of these maps.

The maps are attempts to balance "contextual totality against systematic parsimony" (Rokkan 1981a). Comparativists may use these maps for orientation, not so much in physical landscapes and topologies, but in social landscapes, which are traces of human actions: institutions, economic patterns, cultures. Their mapping of economic, social, political, cultural types help us establish the *context of action*.

Comparative analysis always starts from distinct problems related to various units such as nation states, regions, interest groups, political movements. Whatever units we select, Rokkan's maps direct our attention to contrasts and similarities that help explain turning points in the development processes of the cases. Rokkan established groups of maps for various historical periods, so comparison involves navigating according to different maps. Theory in Rokkan's work concerns the interaction between many factors derived from several maps. His approach yields middle range theories, not grand theory. By mapping processes, his maps have a time dimension. They help us understand the interacting sequences over time. They contain accumulated comparisons from which we can sketch alternative middle range theories about the interaction of these sequences.

A frequent objection is that Rokkan's maps contain little *action*. But Rokkan held that only by specifying as much context as possible, is it possible to provide an adequate perspective on (collective) actors. Rokkan's position fits *bounded rationality* approaches, not rational choice. While rational choice theory introduces action at the highest possible level of abstraction, Rokkan introduces actors in a specified context, which "binds" actors so that their rationality is exercised within a framework of routines and cleavage lines.

At this level, causal conjunctures can be analysed. Rokkan is a predecessor of the case-oriented approach in the present methodological

debate. This approach emphasizes "multiple, conjunctural causation" (Ragin), "complex conjunctures in which complex actors encounter complex structures" (Abbott) or how "widely-applicable causes concatenate into substantially different outcomes depending on initial conditions, subsequent sequences, and adjacent processes" (Tilly). This position offers a criticism of the variables-oriented, methodological-individualist, rational choice-based approaches (Hechter, Goldthorpe). Despite Rokkan's concessions to a rhetoric of variables, the most fruitful basis for his maps is provided by recent methodological "revisionism" in historical sociology. One reason for this may be his background in language and philosophy.

How have later historical sociologists in the Nordic area stood up to the standards set by Rokkan?

Nordic Historical Sociology After Rokkan

As for scope, nobody have expanded on Rokkan's maps. There have been both theoretical and methodological comments, but judged against the international debate surveyed above, none of these have broken any new ground.

A few broad studies cover Rokkan's range of cases: Therborn (1977) provides a neo-Marxist perspective on the spread of democracy. Therborn's later odyssey through European modernity (1995a) displays some influence from Rokkan, but does not try to weave his many empirical threads into Rokkan-type maps. However, his recent studies of four roads to/through modernity are world historic in scope and promise even broader typologization than Rokkan's (Therborn 1992; 1995b).

From Rokkan's own group of students in Bergen, there seems to be only a few studies (Kuhnle 1981), on the welfare state/emigration link, Aarebrot (1982) on regional variation) that cover Europe broadly.

Another founding father of Norwegian sociology, Johan Galtung, has an even broader scope than Rokkan. But Galtung's emphasis on cosmologies brings him dangerously close to speculative philosophy of history. However, among his more than 1000 published books and articles (see Galtung 1990), highly informed historical comparisons are to be found.

The main response of Nordic historical sociologists has been to work further on the Nordic module of Rokkan's maps (1981b). Some examples are Kuhnle (1975) on mobilisation; Kuhnle (1978), Esping-Andersen (1985), Therborn (1986) on welfare states; Kuhnle/Alestalo (1987) on socio-political development patterns; Mjøset ed. (1986) on socio-economic developments and economic policies; Korpi (1981) on industrial relations; Mikkelsen (1986; 1992) on industrial conflict; Østerud (1979; 1981) on agrarian structures and the absolutist state, Alapuro (1985) on the external context of social mobilisation. In all these cases, inspiration from Rokkan is blended with the

impact of other approaches: historical welfare state research (Kuhnle, Therborn), institutional economics (Korpi), economic history and the French regulation-school (Mjøset), neo-Marxist works on absolutism (Østerud), and Tilly's theories of social mobilisation (Mikkelsen, Alapuro).

Nordic sociology has had a strong orientation towards welfare state studies. Major contributions to comparative studies, especially by Korpi, Esping-Andersen and associates are historical in the sense that they cover developments over the postwar period (see bibliographical note). They are not further commented here for lack of space only. Note, however, that these cross-national studies have benefited from certain strategic longer term case-studies (see e.g. Korpi/Esping-Andersen 1984).

More common than comparative studies are comparatively informed single case studies. Alapuro (1988) and Gran (1994) reflect Rokkan's impact mediated through the influence of C. Tilly.

With few exceptions, the trend in Nordic historical sociology after Rokkan is its limitation to Nordic cases. This confirms our impression that no Nordic scholar has yet matched Rokkan's scope. Rokkan gave Nordic historical sociology such a spectacular start that his regional followers confined themselves to fill in the smaller parts of his maps.

Let us finally investigate the extent to which non-Nordic cases have been included in the work of Nordic historical comparativists.

Rokkan himself presented a few applications of his maps. Hagtvet/Rokkan (1980) employ the maps to explain fascist victories in interwar Europe. As a parallel, Aarebrot & Berglund (1995) compare democratic survival in the same period. Comparing Prussia, Russia and Austria-Hungary, Kommisrud (1985) combines influence from Rokkan with broader Weberian inspiration.

Other studies have merged inspiration from Rokkan with ideas drawn from the comparison of the 19th century European periphery with 20th century third world countries (Senghaas 1982, cf. Mjøset 1992a); Aubert (1989), on the socio-political developments of Greece and Norway; Nordhaug (1992) comparing the socio-economic development of the Balkans and Nordic countries; Kasa (1992), contrasting the socio-economic development of Argentine, Brazil and Chile; Mjøset (1992b), comparing seven small Western European countries through industrial capitalism. Studying democratization in Central America, Berntzen (1993) asks Rokkan-type questions, using modern qualitative comparative techniques. There seems to be no similar kinds of studies in Finland and Iceland. In Sweden, one single study of working class mobilisation (Papakostas 1995) includes a non-Nordic case. That same topic is treated in a broader, variable-oriented study by Mikkelsen (1997), the first comparative venture in Danish sociology to deal with non-Nordic cases. This picture may be somewhat moderated if we include comparative work by historians, most notably by Swedish

historian Thorstendal (see e.g. 1991), but also work on Eastern Europe by Finnish historian Engman (1995).

In terms of manpower, resources and technology, Nordic sociology has grown considerably since Rokkan's days. It is about time that Nordic scholars become conscious of the huge challenge that Rokkan's work represents.

Bibliography

These *selected* references are organised by country groups. Due to lack of space, there are no references to (i) the international methodological debate (see update in *Comparative Social Research*, Vol. 16, 1997), (ii) comparative welfare state research (Korpi, Esping-Andersen, etc.), which may easily be found in library databases.

Denmark :

Mikkelsen, F. (1986), "Workers and Industrialization in Scandinavia, 1750-1940", in Michael Hanagan & Charles Stephenson (ed.), *Proletarians and Protest*, New York: Greenwood.

Mikkelsen, F. (1992), *Arbejdskonflikter i Skandinavien 1848-1980*, Odense: Odense Universitetsforlag.

Mikkelsen, F. (1997), "Working-class formation in Europe and forms of integration", *ISA Conference on Social Movements*, Tel Aviv.

Finland:

Alapuro, R. (1985), "Interstate relationships and political mobilization in the Nordic countries", in R. Alapuro, et. al. (ed.), *Small States in Comparative Perspective*, Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Alapuro, R. (1988), *State and Revolution in Finland*, Berkeley: University of California Press.

Alestalo, M. & Kuhnle, S. (1987), "The Scandinavian Route", in R. Erikson, et al. (ed.), *The Scandinavian Model*, Armonk: Sharpe.

Allardt, E. et al. (ed.) (1981), *Nordic Democracy*, Copenhagen: Det Danske Selskab.

Engman, M. (ed.) (1994), *När imperiet faller*, Stockholm: Atlantis.

Norway:

- Aarebrot, F. (1982), "On the structural basis of regional variation in Europe", in DeMarochi & Boileau (ed.), *Boundaries and Minorities in Western Europe*, Milano: Angeli.
- Aarebrot, F. & Berglund, S. (1995), "Statehood, secularization, cooptation", *Historical Social Research*, xx, 2.
- Aubert, V. (1989), "Notes on Greece and Norway", *Sosiologi i dag*, xix, 1.
- Berntzen, E. (1993), "Democratic consolidation in Central America", *Third World Quarterly*, xiv, 3.
- Galtung, J. (1990), *Bibliography 1951-1990*, Oslo: PRIO.
- Gran, T. (1994), *The State in the Modernization Process*, Oslo: Ad Notam.
- Hagtvet, B. & Rokkan, S. (1980), "The Conditions of Fascist Victory", in Larsen, et. al. (ed.).
- Kasa, S. (1992), "A Comparative Approach to the Economic Development of Argentine, Chile and Brazil in the 19th and 20th Centuries", in Mjøset (ed.).
- Kommisrud, A. (1995), *Stat nasjon imperium*, Oslo: Spartakus.
- Kuhnle, S. (1975), *Patterns of Social and Political Mobilization*, London: Sage.
- Kuhnle, S. (1978), "The Beginnings of the Nordic Welfare States", *Acta Sociologica*, xxi, Suppl.
- Kuhnle, S. (1981), "Emigration, democratization and the rise of the European welfare states", in Torsvik (ed.).
- Larsen, S. U. et al. (ed.) (1980), *Who were the fascists*, Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Mjøset, L. (ed.) (1986), *Norden dagen derpå*, Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Mjøset, L. (ed.) (1992), *Contributions to the Comparative Study of Development*, Oslo: ISF, Report 92:2.
- Mjøset, L. (1992a), "Comparative Typologies of Development Patterns", in Mjøset (ed.).
- Mjøset, L. (1992b), *The Irish Economy in a Comparative Institutional Perspective*, Dublin: NESF.
- Nordhaug, K. (1992), "Political Regimes and Economic Transformation in Scandinavia and the Balkans Before 1940", in Mjøset (ed.).

Østerud, Ø. (1978), *Agrarian structure and peasant politics in Scandinavia*, Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Østerud, Ø. "Configurations of Scandinavian Absolutism", in Torsvik (ed).

Rokkan, S. (1970), *Citizens, elections, parties*, Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Rokkan, S. (1981a), "Territories, Nations, Parties", in R. L. Merritt & B. M. Russett (ed.), *From National Development to Global Community*, London: Allen & Unwin.

Rokkan, S. (1981b), "The Growth and Structuring of Mass Politics", in Allardt et al. (ed.).

Rokkan, S. & Urwin, D.W. (1983), *Economy, Territory, Identity*, London: Sage.

Torsvik, P. (ed.) (1981), *Mobilization, Center-Periphery Structures and Nation-Building*, Oslo: Universitetsforlaget. (Contains Rokkan's bibliography.)

Sweden:

Korpi, W. (1981), "Labor Movements and Industrial Relations", in Allardt, et. al. (ed.).

Korpi, W. & Esping-Andersen, G. (1984), "Social Policy as Class Politics in Post-War Capitalism", in J. Goldthorpe (ed.), *Order and Conflict in Contemporary Capitalism*, Oxford: OUP.

Papakostas, A. (1995), *Arbetarklassen i organisationernas värld*, Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.

Therborn, G. (1977), "The Rule of Capital and the Rise of Democracy", *New Left Review*, 103.

Therborn, G. (1986), "The Working Class and the Welfare State", in P. Kettunen (ed.), *Det nordiska i den nordiska arbetarrörelsen*, Helsinki: FSLHCT.

Therborn, G. (1992), "The Right to Vote and the Four World Routes to/through Modernity", in R. Thorstendal (ed.), *State Theory and State History*, London: Sage.

Therborn, G. (1995a), *European modernity and beyond*, London: Sage.

Therborn, G. (1995b), "Routes to/through Modernity", in M. Featherstone, et al. (ed.), *Global Modernities*, London: Sage.

Thorstendal, R. (1991), *Bureaucratisation in Northwestern Europe, 1880-1985*, London: Routledge.

CHAPTER 8

ORGANIC SOLIDARITY IN THE PHASE OF REFLEXIVE MODERNISATION

John Andersen
Roskilde University, Denmark

During the transition from premodernity to modernity Marx, Weber and Durkheim offered different frameworks for understanding its dilemmas. For Durkheim the problem was to prevent anomie in industrial society, and identify the normative conditions and institutions necessary to ensure organic solidarity. For Marx and his followers, the problem was one of identifying the opportunity structure for the necessary systemic transformation.

If we look towards the future of sociology, one of the central questions might spring from linking the new concept of reflexive modernity (Beck et al. 1994) to the old Durkheimian questions of organic solidarity and ask how to avoid new social divisions which might undermine social cohesion given reflexive modernisation. An answer to such a question needs to take a global perspective into consideration.

Sociology is indebted to Marx and Weber for their introduction of the issues surrounding conflicting interests and power structures. Our understanding of the present power matrix is one of the conditions for identifying the conditions for future social (and ecological) sustainability.

Two questions seem pertinent:

(i) What happens if increased reflexivity leads to an advanced culture of contentment of the affluent winners instead of an increase in understanding and engagement with others?

(ii) How can we promote institutional reforms and the empowerment of new actors to create sustainable models of social and economic development, taking the present power matrix into account?

In this perspective I will discuss the heritage of sociology, dealing with social stratification in order to examine the contemporary integration-exclusion discourse. The point of departure will be the changes in the forms of social stratification that have taken place in the transformation from advanced industrial society to post-industrial society.

Across the theoretical approaches we can perceive a change in focus from one on *class and inequality* to one on *exclusion and integration*. This is a change from a view that perceives the relations between classes or strata

in a *vertical perspective*, to one that reflects social divisions in a *horizontal perspective*.

Functionalist Traditions

The functionalist position starts from the view that in every developed society it is necessary to link unequal distribution of goods and symbolic rewards to the different positions in the social distribution of work to ensure the optimal use of human resources (Davis & Moore, 1945). The fundamental thesis was that the advanced industrial societies moved towards the ideal of the open society - a society which still displayed inequalities between positions, but where fair competition increasingly gave individuals an equal chance of reaching various positions within the hierarchy.

Ascriptive attributes such as ethnicity, gender and an individual's social background would be less important than in patterns of social mobility of the early industrial societies. That is, advanced industrial societies were reaching a situation where meritocratic selection became the dominant mechanism of social stratification.

In Lockwood's terminology the relationship between *system integration* and *social integration* was seen as unproblematic. System integration refers to the harmonic relationship between the dominant institutions in society, in particular the relationship between the economic and political system. Social integration refers to the relationship between actors. In short: the legitimacy of the rules of the game in the distribution of life chances.

The *meritocratic society* thus reproduced a norm of social justice: an open opportunity structure and distribution of rewards according to ability and achievement. Thus, the need for strong collective actors such as the working class with antagonistic interests in relation to the social order (the Marxist view) was undermined.

The optimistic scenario for the advanced industrial societies was that the dominance of meritocratic selection would ensure both system and social integration. First, because human resources would be used optimally from society's point of view and mobilise industrial societies' dynamic potential, securing a general increase in living standards. Second, because individuals are given a wide action realm so as to achieve their own goals. Inequalities in terms of outcome (symbolic and material rewards) between the different positions would be interpreted as legitimate by the individual actors, due to the decreasing importance of traditional, ascriptive stratification mechanisms and increasing possibilities of upward social mobility.

Politically, central agents involved in the welfare state reforms after the Second World War picked up on this optimistic diagnosis. In many areas post-war welfare policies, the labour movement, social liberal forces and

substantial parts of the professional complex argued (and in Scandinavia with a great deal of success) that the rationality of welfare reform was not only a more egalitarian society, but also a more efficient society. The new opportunity structures would mobilise the unused talents of the lower classes and increase economic growth. Rigid stratification systems, it was argued, were not only unjust but also dysfunctional because they tend to minimize the possibility of fully utilizing human resources. In post-war sociology this type of argument was summarised most powerfully by Tumin (1953) in his classic criticism of Davis and Moore. Tumin emphasised the dysfunctions of rigid stratification or *hard-liner meritocratism* and argued for *soft meritocratism* linked to social citizenship. Differential rewards to different groups could only be justified as functional for society if equal access to recruitment and training for all talented persons actually existed. This was in line with Marshall (1950) and Titmuss (1974) and other driving intellectual forces behind the advanced post-war welfare state.

Weberian and Marxist Critiques

Critics from the Weberian and Marxian camps emphasised those elements of the functionalist tradition that could be understood as a universal legitimization of inequality. The former maintained the relevance of the concept of power, which could explain why some groups were able to ensure symbolic and material goods for themselves at the expense of others. This could be achieved for instance through mechanisms of social closure. Marxists maintained that the institution of property was central in generating systematic inequalities and class divisions. Dahrendorf (1959) suggested that the concept of *authority* was central in an explanation of the new forms of social stratification, which could be observed in advanced industrial societies. Many social scientists like the early Giddens (1972) wanted to combine Weberian and Marxist approaches.

At the empirical level the thesis concerning "the open society" was also rejected by numerous sociologists - from Mills' (1956) studies of the power elite to neo-Weberians emphasizing the emergence of new types of effective closure mechanisms in the modern professional complex (Parkin 1979).

From Classes and Strata to Social Exclusion and Underclass

The new feature of the 1980s and 1990s *underclass and social exclusion* discourse is that the focus changes to an inclusion-exclusion problematic. On the American, and to a certain extent the British social science and political scene, the New Right has set the agenda for the discourse concerning the new forms of disintegration. A discourse that is captured in

the very concept underclass, which from the beginning had its explicit connotations. In short the diagnosis is the emergence of a dependency culture due to an overgenerous welfare state and the destruction of classic family and work ethic norms. The response to the emergence of an underclass is to restore the efficiency of meritocratic *reward mechanisms* (Murray 1984). Creating maximum incentives to work in a deregulated labour market should restore the work ethic according to these critics.

In continental Europe social exclusion has become the key concept. In particular the French discourse about "l'exclus", with its strong intellectual roots in Durkheimian and French republican thought, became influential in European rhetoric. This tradition approaches inclusion (insertion) as a problem that requires a *new social contract*.

As Silver (1994) notes, the multidimensional concept of exclusion in the French tradition is plastic and is used as a metaphor for post-modern society's social polyphony - in which a weakening of common values and the social fabric is emerging. In this situation, social justice and citizenship are not just a question of extension of universal institutionalised social and political rights. It is a question of rebuilding the social fabric and providing the possibility of empowerment of marginalised groups in a new post-industrial environment. This leads to the concept of the enabling welfare state or, as Giddens (1994) frames it, positive welfare. Partnership models and cross-sectional action programmes are examples of institutional innovations which can be used for this purpose (Andersen 1996).

Future Challenges

To conclude, I will emphasize three important issues for sociology concerned with future social sustainability:

(i) The challenge of *balancing family, care and community responsibilities versus working life and career commitments* - on the premises that the equality between men and women will improve.

As Daniel Bell (1973) forecasted, post-industrial society brought with it a new type of scarcity, which neither socialists nor liberals had foreseen - namely scarcity of time. Today it is clear that a career and life reflexivity are not always compatible.

Can the notion of life reflexivity be linked to a new type of solidarity, which creates new opportunity structures for the strata that tend to be marginalised? For example, the Danish leave and worksharing schemes (the right to extended parental and educational leave from the labour market), implemented since the beginning of the 1990s can be seen as an attempt at a new type of labour-supply regulation (Andersen 1997). These measures deal with the legitimate claim of an individual not to work and are equivalent to become a conditional and time limited citizens' wage. This type

of reform acknowledges that integration in the labour market in some cases means social disintegration due to a lack of time resources outside working life. This is an expression of a change in the paradigm of the *linear* unbroken working life career as the social norm. The *flexible life career* model can be seen as an adjustment to the advanced industrial society's norm of labour market performance, where in certain phases of the working life and family cycle, a legitimate space is created for individual risk-handling.

(ii) Strategies for *inclusion and empowerment of the potential losers* in the transition towards a postfordist economy, e.g. manual low skilled workers.

Can pilot projects in partnership and empowerment processes (such as the EU anti-poverty programmes and other experimental schemes), strengthen private sector co-responsibility for social citizenship and develop intermediary bodies - a middle level between citizens - and the welfare state? (Andersen 1996). Can such experimentation influence mainstream policies and point a way towards new forms of postfordist welfare models?

(iii) An important aspect of reflexive modernisation is the transformation of the *professional complex*. In Denmark there are many indications that the consumers of social and other services like health, schools, education etc. have become empowered. Powerful consumer demand for reflexive services represents a fundamental challenge to the professional complex, which is still to a great extent based on professional identities formed in industrial society. The response to this challenge will, among other things require transformation of the traditional Weberian values of bureaucratic organisation of professional bodies. A reflexive democratisation of the professional complex of the advanced welfare states is one of the obstacles for developing empowering multidimensional strategies of inclusion, where citizens are seen as potential contributors to society, instead of potential dependants. New strategies for inclusion can not (exclusively) be based on universal practices, but must take into account particularistic values and identities of the target groups. This requires that the relation between professionals (e.g. social workers) and citizens becomes a dialogic subject-subject rather than a subject-object relationship.

Bibliography

Andersen, J. (1995), "Experimentation et mobilisation au Danemark", Service Social dans le Monde. Issue on *Les Politiques Sociales. Des exclusions à l'integration*, Belgium.

- Andersen, J. (1996), "Solidarity and Social Citizenship in post-industrial Welfare Models", in *Re-conceptualising the Welfare State. The Danish Centre for Human Rights*.
- Andersen, J. (1998) (forthcoming), "From class society to exclusion from society", in Gough, I. & Olofsson, G. (ed.), *Integration and Marginalisation*, Macmillan.
- Beck Giddens, A. & Lash, S. (1994), *Reflexive Modernisation*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Dahrendorf, R. (1959), *Class and Class Conflict in Industrial Society*, Stanford University Press.
- Davis, K. & Moore, E. M. (1945), "Some principles of Stratification", *American Sociological Review* 10.
- Giddens, A. (1972), *The Class Structure of the Advanced Societies*, London: Hutchinson.
- Lockwood, D. (1964), "Social integration and system integration", in G.K. Zollschan & W.Hirsch (ed.), *Explorations in Social Change*, New York.
- Marshall, T.H. (1964), *Class, Citizenship and Social Development*, Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Mills, C. W. (1956), *The Power Elite*, London: Oxford University Press.
- Murray, C. (1984), *Losing Ground, American Social Policy 1950-1980*, New York: Basic Books.
- Parkin, F. (1979), *Marxism and Class Theory: A Bourgeois Critique*, New York: Columbia University Press.
- Silver, H. (1994), "Social exclusion and social solidarity: Three paradigms", *International Labour Review*, vol. 133, no.5-6.
- Titmuss, R. (1974), *Social Policy*. London: George Allen and Unwin.
- Tumin, M. (1953), "Some Principles of stratification: A Critical Analysis", *American Sociological Review*. 18.

CHAPTER 9

CAUSAL REALISM AND SWEDISH SOCIOLOGY BEFORE 1968

Thomas Brante
University of Lund, Sweden

The history of Swedish sociology of the last three decades is not easy to distinguish from general international trends: positivism and anti-positivism in the 70s followed by neo-positivism and various kinds of ultra-relativism, such as post-modernism and constructivism, up to the present time. Swedish sociology of the postwar period up to 1968 is, however, a somewhat different matter. Established as a new academic discipline in 1947, its practitioners were eager to demonstrate its practical usefulness to the authorities, resulting in large amounts of fieldwork, reports, descriptions and statistical analysis of social variables.

One of the major sources of legitimization for this hand-book version of science came indeed from the outside, namely the works of George Lundberg, on the surface implying that empirical sociology of this time employed a positivistic notion of natural science as its prime exemplar. However, from the start a clear uneasiness concerning this rather superficial kind of sociology seems to have been present, probably because of the fact that Swedish sociology emanated from (practical) philosophy. As Torgny Segerstedt, the first professor of sociology in Sweden, wrote in 1956, in an article called "The Uppsala School of Sociology": "The philosophical background of Swedish sociology is also reflected in a great interest in the methodological problems of sociology. We have been aware of the fact that sociology must be an empirical science, but we have also asked ourselves the question what such a definition of sociology implies *in addition* to certain statistical-technical questions of methods". (Segerstedt 1956, p. 85, my emphasis).

Apart from methodological stringency, Segerstedt strongly emphasized the vital importance of theoretical work as a *precondition* for making sociology a science. One of his most important contributions was the introduction of a number of distinct conceptual definitions, serving to bring clarity into the analysis of groups, norms, the social significance of language and more. In one of his research agendas, he maintains that sociologists should proceed in two steps. First, there is a phase of quantitative establishment of co-variation between entities like, e.g. living conditions and

attitudes of various groups. The second step is qualitative analysis of these connections, e.g. linking attitudes to group-specific norms, providing causal explanations of variations in group behavior. "In my opinion, research on causes is of special importance, since not until we have established the cause, i.e. the norms regulating behavior, can we with reasonable certainty say something about the endurance or depth of the attitude." (Segerstedt 1948, p. 118).

With some exceptions, other influential Swedish sociologists of this time seem to have harbored similar overall conceptions of the aim and methodology of their discipline. In his book *Social Mechanisms*, George Karlsson (1958) seeks to identify the basic factors explaining macro-events such as social diffusion and group choice. In his interesting article *Causal Explanation in Sociological Research*, Edmund Dahlström (1956) sets the task of explicating not the true meaning of explanation or the like, but what sociologists mean with "causal explanation" as implied by their applied research methods. In my opinion, these sociologists together with Gunnar Boalt, Gösta Carlsson, Ulf Himmelstrand, Carl-Gunnar Jansson, Bengt Rundblad, Harald Swedner, and others belonged to approximately the same camp.

Today, approaching a new century, sociology seems (again) to be facing a crisis; ever more frequently it is claimed that internally, it has become far too fragmented, and externally the demand for sociological knowledge is decreasing. To my mind, confronted with this dilemma sociology must, and should, again seek unification and consolidation under a simple but not unsophisticated meta-theory that encourages both theoretical sophistication and practical relevance. I call my suggestion "causal realism" (Brante 1997). To put it very simply, the term "realism" serves to delineate the sociological area of interest, to some extent leaving problems like the ontological status of society, or the foundations of sociological epistemology, to philosophers. The term "causal" serves to orient both basic and applied sociological research towards focusing upon causal explanations of social effects at various macro- and micro-levels. Ontologically, causal realism asserts that causal mechanisms exist.

Before I say a few words about causal realism, let me just note that there is a clear family resemblance between this perspective and the ambitions of the Swedish post-war sociologists. The main difference is their belief in theory-neutral observations. Despite several hints at discomfort, most Swedish sociologists of the 1950s seem to have embraced classical mechanism as their sole scientific ideal, and seen social reality, the object of sociological study, as something pre-given, a non-issue. So perhaps the main difference between their version of sociology and causal realism is the former's pre-Kuhnian conception of science. Let me now, by way of drawing

an analogy to natural science, indicate how the object of sociology may be refined and linked to a causal approach.

Levels in Natural Science

In previous centuries the object of study for the natural scientist was - Nature. He - it was a he - mastered most aspects of nature's mysteries, from chemical reactions and the life of insects to the dynamics of the universe. Gradually, encyclopedic competence was replaced by specialization and the division into disciplines. Today, nature is divided into a large amount of subject areas, corresponding to an equally large amount of academic specialties. This division is not arbitrary - it is not merely an effect of academic competition and political decisions - but there seems to be a historical or logical, or rather ontological order for the divisions.

The order indicates that nature is divided into levels. First comes mathematics, then physics, chemistry and biology. These broad categories can be divided into subcategories, providing us with an evolutionist stratification of nature into a subatomic level, an atomic level, a molecular level, a cellular level, an organic level and so forth upwards. The logic is, first, that each lower level is a precondition for the existence of the higher levels; no flowers without cells, no cells without molecules, and no molecules without atoms. Second, lower levels can offer partial explanations of higher levels. Third, the higher level has a certain relative autonomy in relation to the lower - laws and empirical phenomena at the higher level cannot be completely explained by reduction to the lower. Each level has an existence *sui generis*.

This view of the object of natural science can be called a level-ontology (Bunge 1973; Johansson 1989), or an irreductive ontology. It focuses upon the actual praxis of modern science, which is an extreme division of labor on the basis of different types of structures, causal mechanisms and observations. Thereby it differs drastically from the numerous attempts to reduce reality to one ultimate level, something that characterizes mechanic reductionists of the early 19th century and recurs in logical positivism's notion of a unitary scientific language. The reductionists tried to find *the* basic formula, the law by which all levels and aspects of reality could be explained.

The point of this reminder is that I want to claim that modern sociology is situated in a position resembling earlier phases of the natural sciences, i.e. in the break point between encyclopedic knowledge and reduction. At present, in most social sciences there is a widely held conviction that social reality can be reduced to one level or be synthesized by one basic formula. Reductionist attempts abound, comprising all from methodological individualism and rational choice theory to holism, structuralism and so forth.

The most well-known attempt to synthesize levels into one formula is probably Anthony Giddens' theory of structuration, which by the formula "Structures are both the medium and the result of social action" claims to strike a balance between actor and structure by including both sides of the dichotomy. As I have shown in another context, such a formula resolves nothing but rather conceals the problem by labeling it, drawing a tarpaulin over it. In place of analysis of a complicated problem we are offered a blind-fold (Brante 1989).

Causal Realism and Sociology

Just like the reductionists of the 19th century, current meta-sociologists seek to find the basic and all-encompassing formula by which all social phenomena can be accounted for. In my opinion these attempts to reduction or synthesis of everything remain unfruitful, probably impossible. They tie the sociologist since he or she becomes a juggler with too many balls in the air, too much that has to be fitted into the formula. I would suggest that we, analogous to natural science, attempt a level division of the object of knowledge of sociology.

The alternative strategy I propose combines the concepts of causality and society as a stratified reality. First, if we take the actual research performed by sociologists seriously and inductively separate the levels that seem to be presupposed in sociological research, we reach the conclusion that sociology actually does produce knowledge on several levels. Second, we have to formulate a general purpose of theoretical sociology, regardless of level. I suggest that the ultimate goal of sociology is *to identify social structures that involve causal mechanisms that generate empirically observable effects*. Combining these two steps, we arrive at the hypothesis that each level contain specific, relatively autonomous structures, and that the goal of sociological theory is to map out the specific mechanisms for each structure in order to explain social phenomena.

This definition of the task of sociology corresponds reasonably well with Roy Bhaskar's definition of the object and task of sociology. According to Bhaskar (1989, pp. 71,72) the object of sociology is *social relations*, and the task is to explain the reproduction and transformation of social relations. I agree with Bhaskar with the proviso that it is a too strong constraint to study *only* relations between entities. The content of the entities - the components that constitute the structure - are of relevance and should be included in research object.

To illustrate this program, let me here just suggest five levels, without discussing them: An *international* level that is concerned with relations between components such as nations, multi-national companies and organizations, often viewed in a global perspective. An *inter-institutional*

level (in practice often a *national* level) that treats relations between components such as institutions and organizations, often by employing theories of historical and social development in general. An *institutional* level that deals with relations between components such as formal and informal status positions, social roles, positions in networks, in everything from companies and public hierarchies to families. An *inter-individual* level that elaborates relations between individuals in direct interaction. Lastly an *individual* level that focuses upon relations between intra-individual components in order to explain the social self.

Each level consists of structures harboring level-specific mechanisms. While upper levels constitute the context, lower levels provide the components for the level under study. Thus, I propose that sociological research should seek to a) explicate level-specific causal mechanisms (study their autonomy) and thereafter b) investigate how levels are inter-related (study their relativity).

Conclusion

There are a number of interesting consequences of a level-ontology of the kind suggested here, which I cannot go into in this brief space. Let me just propose that conceivably, a level-ontology coupled with a causal approach might constitute a first step towards the epistemological break that is necessary if sociology wants to leave its present phase of *Naturphilosophie* and become a genuinely explanatory science. Or, in other words: if the social sciences are to be of social *and* disciplinary relevance they must proceed towards specialization; not, however, by a specialization that sets out from contemporary social problems but by carefully problematizing and elaborating its very object of study, just like the natural sciences.

Lastly, to reconnect to my Swedish fore-runners; the primary difference between my perspective and the perspective of the 1950s is that the latter, being caught in an empiricist ontology, took their object of research as given by sense-experience. In a post-Kuhnian, realist perspective, the object of research is problematized, implying a stratified reality and unobservable structures and mechanisms. These differences notwithstanding, the emphasis on general theory-building, the view that the Achillesheel of modern sociology is its weak explanatory power, constitutes a mutual conviction concerning the primary purpose and target of sociology.

Meta-theories can be progressive during one phase of the development of a science but subsequently turn to have a stagnating function. The type of sociology predominant in Sweden during the 1950s and part of the 1960s was knocked out by the general anti-positivist critique. Clearly, however, we here have an obvious case of throwing the baby out with the bath-water: Swedish sociology of this time espoused a clear ambition to develop

sociological theory in general and by deductive approximations apply theoretical findings to aspects of social reality. In this sense, the ambition was of both of social and disciplinary relevance - an ambition or goal that is probably necessary if sociology shall avoid losing its autonomy, turning into social statistics and/or ethnology.

Bibliography

- Bhaskar, R. (1989), *Reclaiming Reality*, London: Verso.
- Boalt, G. et al. (1951), *Sociologi*, Stockholm: Forum.
- Brante, T. (1989), *Anthony Giddens och samhällsvetenskapen*, Stehag: Symposion bokförlag.
- Brante, T. (1997), "Kausal realism och sociologi", *Sociologisk forskning*, nr 1/2.
- Bunge, M. (1973), *Method, Model and Matter*, Dordrecht: Reidel.
- Dahlström, E. (1957), "Causal Explanation in Sociological Research", *Acta Sociologica*, Vol. 2, fasc. 3.
- Dahlström, E. et al. (1968), *Svensk samhällstruktur i sociologisk belysning*, Stockholm: Svenska bokförlaget.
- Elster, J. (1989), *Nuts and Bolts for the Social Sciences*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fridjonsdottir, K. (1987), *Om svensk sociologi*, Stockholm Carlssons.
- Johansson, I. (1989), *Ontological Investigations*, London: Routledge.
- Karlsson, G. (1958), *Social Mechanisms*, Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Segerstedt, T. (1948), *Att vara sociolog*; Min vetenskap, Sveriges radio.
- Segerstedt, T. (1956), "The Uppsala School of Sociology", *Acta Sociologica*, Vol. 1, fasc. 1.
- Turner, J. (1988), *A Theory of Social Interaction*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

CHAPTER 10

ICELANDIC SOCIOLOGY AND THE SOCIAL PRODUCTION OF CRIMINOLOGICAL KNOWLEDGE

Helgi Gunnlaugsson
University of Iceland

Sociology is now well into its third decade as an independent academic discipline in Iceland. Gunnlaugsson and Bjarnason (1994) have argued that sociological research in Iceland has been strongly influenced by the rapid transformation of Icelandic society in this century in terms of both relevant objects of study and in how these studies have been conducted. Moreover, it was argued that the forces of modernization have led Icelandic sociology to emphasize the task of providing basic facts about past development, present status and emergent trends rather than elaborating extensively on sociological theory. In part, this tendency was explained in terms of the relatively short history of the discipline in Iceland and the lack of social data in the early years of the field.

In the aftermath of WWII, Iceland increasingly came into contact with both European and North American countries after centuries of almost total isolation. The present worldwide process of internationalization thus constitutes an even more radical break in Iceland than in most other western countries. This transformation has, therefore, preoccupied a large proportion of the Icelandic social science community, including a number of sociologists.

Eric Allardt (1989) argued that four fields of research had been characteristic of Nordic sociology: welfare research, stratification research, women's studies, and cultural studies. These themes can indeed be found within Icelandic sociology, but Gunnlaugsson and Bjarnason (1994) did not find that this classification captured the structure of the sociological discipline in Iceland. Two broad themes were believed to underlie the bulk of Icelandic sociological research. The first theme involved studies dealing with social conditions, in terms of both historic and emerging social tendencies. The second theme, which will be addressed in more detail here below, centered around the various social problems associated with the development of Icelandic society.

Crime in Iceland: A Comparative Perspective

As with other social data in Iceland, the status of records of crime violations has been relatively primitive compared to most other western societies. Many indicators show however that the Icelandic crime rate for serious offenses is almost trivial when compared to most other modern nations such as the rate for homicide, armed robberies and serious narcotics offenses (Gunnlaugsson 1997).

Clinard (1978) designated Switzerland as the best candidate of a modern nation with a low crime rate. Balvig (1988) argued that Clinard's focus was mistaken since Switzerland actually had a similar crime rate as other European nations. Perhaps Iceland could be a better candidate than Switzerland as a nation without a high rate of serious offenses although Iceland is far from being a crime free paradise. As Durkheim (1893) pointed out at the turn of this century such a paradise does not exist. Crime is not only inevitable in any society, but is also a necessary social behavior since it causes punishment, which in turn facilitates cohesion and maintains social boundaries. However, the precise nature of criminal behavior may vary according to the type of society and the type of collective sentiments. At a time of both internal and external changes, as in Iceland, crime and punishment have become essential.

Fear of the Influx of Drugs and Alcohol Abuse

Concern with crime has indeed increased considerably in Iceland in recent years, as can be detected in public attitude surveys. The crime that Icelanders appear to be most concerned with involves the influx of drugs into the country (Gunnlaugsson and Galliher, 1995). A separate drug police unit was established in the early 1970s under formal supervision of an independent drug court in sharp contrast to traditional legal procedures. This court was not disbanded until 1992 but the drug police still operates as a separate unit. Moreover, the drug police force has grown considerably in recent years, making the drug police the largest specialized police force in the nation. The Reykjavik police has also allocated relatively more of their funds to drug controls than the police in both Copenhagen and Oslo.

Despite the firm institutional response in Iceland to the drug problem, that Nils Christie (1996) described as being the hawks of the Nordic countries, cannabis use among the young has increased in the 1990s and has been found to be similar to the use in Scandinavia. Yet, usage of harder drugs such as heroin or cocaine/crack has been almost non-existent in Iceland.

The public concern for drug use parallels closely the concern for alcohol use which has a long history in Iceland. For most of this century beer was prohibited in Iceland while all other alcoholic beverages were allowed

(Gunnlaugsson and Galliher, 1986). Moreover, the Reykjavik Police arrested about 2200 people for drunkenness annually from 1990-94 in a city with only 100 thousand citizens. On the whole about half of the prison space has been devoted to incarcerating persons whose only offense has involved intoxication.

During 1974-1990 more than 2400 individuals were arrested each year for driving while intoxicated which translates to a staggering one percent of the total population being arrested each year. Not surprisingly this figure is significantly higher than found in other Scandinavian nations. The penalties are not lenient by any means; once arrested for the third time a person faces a mandatory prison sentence and in the 1990s the number of inmates serving time for DWI has routinely surpassed 20 percent of the entire prison population (Gunnlaugsson 1997).

This situation certainly seems to suggest that alcohol consumption must be substantial in Iceland. Therefore, it must come as a surprise to learn that according to official information on alcohol consumption, Icelanders consume significantly less alcohol than most other western nations. Still, this category of violations is noteworthy in Iceland and the same can be said about the public debate and continuous measurement of how much Icelanders drink, especially the young generation. Not surprisingly, sociologists have found their role in mapping out the extent and volume of this situation.

Beliefs Regarding the Genesis of Local Criminality

National attitude surveys have repeatedly shown that substance abuse, along with difficult home life, is believed to be central in explaining the genesis of local criminality. Interviews with key people in the criminal justice system and even among inmates themselves have also demonstrated the substance abuse and crime link. Moreover, in recent government sponsored research on domestic violence, most women victims also explained this violence by mentioning substance abuse as the leading cause of the violence inflicted on them by their spouses.

Thus, it appears that substance use is one of the largest offense categories within the criminal justice system and is also believed by most to be central in explaining local criminality. Even though the situation has changed and crime has increased in recent decades due to industrialization and urbanization, individual and social psychological explanations of its origin, such as substance abuse and difficult home life, continue to be dominant. Social factors such as the changing structure of modern society, social class divisions, and unemployment, have not yet seemed to enter the picture significantly as variables explaining the local crime situation.

Crime in Iceland: A Social Realist Perspective

It has been repeatedly demonstrated that in relatively small and homogenous nations we could expect low crime rates (Adler 1983). In societies with diverse ethnic and cultural groups social conflict and crime has often been found to be the consequence. Iceland's population is very small and homogenous with only a trace of minority ethnic or religious groups. Iceland, being a small nation also enables its members to maintain closely knit primary social bonds, which according to many noted criminologists such as Nils Christie (1993), is central in keeping the crime rate down.

Moreover, Iceland has possessed a relatively equalitarian and cohesive social structure, partly because it has never had a monarchy or aristocracy, which in turn intensified the likeness of its people. Slum areas have not become an integral part of Iceland's urbanization and education and health care have for the most part been free of charge further reducing social class disparities and most likely also crime.

Iceland became a fully independent nation in 1944 after a peaceful struggle with Denmark for almost a century. No blood was ever shed, no lives had to be sacrificed and no one ever had to serve time in prison. The path to independence was characterized by the use of dialogue: to reason with the Danes and gradually Iceland gained full independence through entirely legalistic means.

Finally, Iceland has never had a standing army of its own and gun controls have been extensive. The police and prison guards have not carried guns and social conflicts between classes or between the people and the government have been very peaceful for the most part.

Concern Over Substance Abuse: A Constructionist Perspective

It has to be pointed out that many countries, especially the Nordic, have a similar concern over alcohol use. In Iceland this concern has had many dimensions and can be shown among other things in the peculiar beer ban. It was argued for instance in Parliament that the drinking habits of Icelanders show that Icelanders are not able to use alcoholic beverages as civilized persons, and at times the Viking blood was given the blame. Tolerance for alcoholic consumption appears to be at a minimum, perhaps reflecting the Protestant ethic that Weber (1930) discussed in his famous book on the genesis of capitalism. Icelandic authorities have adopted many strict policies to control the availability of alcoholic beverages which have in part helped shaping the local drinking culture and the role of alcoholic beverages in society.

In the latter part of this century the influx of drugs has become an additional grave concern and an ideal boundary maintenance mechanism in a changing society with increased international air travel. Drugs are generally imported, and are therefore perceived as being a foreign threat to a nation that has for centuries been isolated and small. Consistent with Iceland's cultural aversion to mind-altering substances is that in the Icelandic language the common term for drugs is "eyturlyf" which translates literally as "poison medicine".

Moreover, drugs seem to have the tendency at times to serve as convenient scapegoats for various social and economic problems, i.e. blaming drugs or their alleged effects on users for a variety of pre-existing social ills that are typically only indirectly associated with them (Reinarman 1996). The possibility that drug abuse may be an expression of various social ills of a modern and changing society, an expression which certainly might intensify the problem, has seldom been seriously considered. The role of sociology becomes crucial here; in broadening and enlightening the public discourse on social problems. In the past few years we have seen some signs that sociology is meeting this challenge.

Conclusion

Iceland is in the midst of a radical transformation, both in terms of internal and external changes. On the heels of these changes Iceland has experienced an increase in the level of crime, associated with a deepening crime concern, and especially with substance abuse. Sociologists have a decisive role to play here to broaden the public and political debate on social problems by linking the crime situation to the changing social and economic order. Only an integrative approach, synthesizing different aspects of sociological theory, enables us to fully come to grasp with modern society, which in turn could serve as a basis for informed social policies.

Bibliography

- Allardt, E. (1989), "Recent Developments in Scandinavian Sociology", *Annual Review of Sociology*, 15, 31-45.
- Balvig, F. (1988), *The Snow-White Image: The Hidden Reality of Crime in Switzerland*, Oslo: Norwegian University Press.
- Christie, N. (1993), *Crime Control as Industry: Towards Gulags Western Style?*, London: Routledge.

- Christie, N. and Bruun, K. (1996), *Den Gode Fiende. Ny og revidert utgave*, Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Gunnlaugsson, H. (1997), "Kriminaliteten i Island: Internasjonalt perspektiv", *Nordisk Tidsskrift For Kriminalvidenskap*, 84, 1, 50-59.
- Gunnlaugsson, H. and Bjarnason, Th. (1994), "Establishing a Discipline: The Impact of Society on the Development of Icelandic Sociology", *Acta Sociologica*, 37, 303-312.
- Gunnlaugsson, H. and Galliher, J.F. (1986), "Prohibition of Beer in Iceland: An International Test of Symbolic Politics", *Law and Society Review* 20, 335-353.
- Gunnlaugsson, H. and Galliher, J.F. (1995), "The Secret Drug Police of Iceland", in C. Fijnaut and G. Marx (ed.), *Undercover: Police Surveillance in Comparative Perspective*, The Hague: Kluwer Law International, 235-247.
- Reinarman, C. (1996), "The Social Construction of Drug Scares", in E. Goode (ed.), *Social Deviance*, Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 224-234.

CHAPTER 11

GENDER AND HEALTH - THE HIDDEN ASSET IN FINNISH SOCIOLOGY

Elianne Riska
Abo University, Finland

Introduction

Research on the health of the population has a long tradition in Finland. Since 1832, district physicians have reported to public authorities on the health and living conditions in their districts. Official reporting of the figures began with the establishment of the Statistical Bureau in 1865. Late in the nineteenth century, when the public health movement swept over the Western world, it had its followers in Finland as well.

In the decades before and after the turn of the century there were a number of studies on the health of the rural population, and later of the working class. In today's sociological parlance, what was mapped, through both a qualitative and a quantitative approach, was the social inequality of health and its gendered aspects (Lahelma et al. 1996). This endeavor was paralleled by a general trend of social engineering research pursued by researchers in economics and the social sciences (Allardt 1998).

Social Science Research on Health from 1960 to 1985

Between World War I and World War II, health research was focused on mothers and children's health, and concern about occupational health began to gain ground (Lahelma & Riska, 1988). But it was not until the 1960s that an era of social science research on health began. The Social Insurance Act of 1964 and, a year before that, the establishment of the Research Institute for Social Security at the Social Insurance Institution gave the momentum to this era of research, the purpose of which was to evaluate enacted health reforms. The Institute has carried out a sequence of four surveys that have mapped the use of health services and self-reported illness of the population - in 1964, 1968, 1976, and 1987 (Kalimo et al., 1982; 1989). While the purpose was to evaluate the efficacy of the health reforms implemented, the research was conducted at a time when Finland was undergoing vast demographic and social change, moving from a predominantly agrarian to a service society. The data gathered, hence, might be more telling of the

effect of structural changes on people's health than the effects of health reforms. But, more important, the public effort to reduce inequalities in access to health and the related research to evaluate it generated a data base on regional, class, and gender differences in health covering a period of more than twenty years. The Finnish health surveys - national and repeated - are unique because studies conducted in the other Nordic countries are few and cover only a region or a district.

The final reports on this research reveal mainly privileged differences between urban and rural areas, in access and use of health services and self-reported health status. In the reports, unlike most research on health at that time, class and gender differences did appear, though they were left unproblematized. Two important findings emerged as early as the first survey of 1964. First, the lowest income category reported a chronic illness almost twice as often as the top income category. Second, there were almost no gender differences in self-reported illness. A division of labor between state research institutes on health might explain the silence about the findings on social class. Class differences in health were largely addressed by another state research institute - The Institute of Occupational Health. The basic assumption underlying occupational health research has been that major differences in health of different social classes are created by conditions at work and concomitant occupational hazards. The approach was largely toxological, with the purpose of setting occupational health standards and regulations and establishing occupational health services. A politically more controversial interpretation of causation would have addressed the question whether the distribution of economic resources was the primary cause of social inequalities in health.

The lack of marked gender differences in health was an anomaly, from a sociological point of view, since most research in the West has shown that women are more likely than men to report ill health and the use of health services (e.g. Verbrugge 1989). Although the Finnish figures differed from the international trend, the lack of interest in explaining them followed the general pattern at the time. In the international research literature, questions of gender differences in health were not raised until the mid-1970s. The issue was brought up by groups outside of the academic community - by the new women's movement and the emerging women's health movement in the U.S. and the UK. Until then, gender differences in reported illness - even a lack of such, as in Finland - were left unproblematized and largely "naturalized".

When the issue of social class and gender was raised in Finland in the mid-1980s, the data came from the Nordic Welfare Study conducted in 1972. Karisto (1984; also 1990) raised the issue of social class differences in health and Haavio-Mannila (1986) pointed to the level of Finnish men's and women's self-reported mental and physical symptoms - a higher level

than in the other Nordic countries, and without the traditional gender difference. A new era of sociological research on health had begun.

Sociological Research on Gender and Health Since the Mid-1980s

While both class and gender were being "discovered" in the data of the Nordic Welfare Study, the debate waged on these issues in the Anglo-Saxon world began to reach the Finnish academic community. In contrast to the countries of its origin, the research on social inequality and health in Finland has not been a political issue based, for example, in a women's health movement. Instead it has been an academic intellectual inquiry. This inquiry has been aided by the existence of a priority area of public health research in the Academy of Finland, the Finnish national science research funding agency since the early 1980s. In the mid-1980s, the social scientists doing research in medical and health sociology organized themselves as a section of the Society of Social Medicine to advance, nationally and internationally, a network of research. As in many other countries, medical sociologists constitute one of the largest sections of their national professional associations, but the Finnish members have also been one of the largest groups in the European Society for Health and Medical Sociology since its founding in 1984.

During the past decade, two approaches in the research on class and gender aspects of health and illness have been discernible in Finnish sociology: a structural approach and a social constructionist/phenomenological approach.

The structural approach characterizes the research done at University of Helsinki. It has examined class and gender differences in mortality and pointed to the high mortality rate of Finnish men (Valkonen 1985; Koskinen & Martelin 1994). It has also examined social class and gender differences in ill health in Finland and compared social inequality and health in Finland to that in Sweden and Norway and Britain (Rahkonen et al. 1995; Arber & Lahelma 1994). These studies confirm the picture of the wider gap in health status between educational and income groups in Finland than in the other Nordic countries.¹ Furthermore, Finnish women's high rate of full-time employment seems to provide support for the contention that their health is better than in those countries where women work mainly part time or are housewives, as in Britain. Nevertheless, class differences in health are greater for employed women in Finland than for employed women in Britain (Arber & Lahelma 1994).

The social constructionist approach is found in the research on gender and the body and on use of tranquilizing substances, such as alcohol and psychotropics. The construction and confirmation of the female body as a social category by the medical profession has been the focus of studies on

menopause and on young girls' views about menstruation (Kangas 1997; Oinas 1998). Other studies have used narratives to illuminate women's perceptions of pain and discover gender differences in accounts of mental health. These studies have anchored health accounts in the gendered context of society (Honkasalo 1988, Ettore & Riska 1995; Riska 1997). The same kind of studies on the construction of the male body and of masculinity seem still to be missing in Finnish sociology, although studies on Finnish men's drinking in taverns have unravelled the mechanisms of male bonding and affirmation of male identity in such settings (Alasuutari 1992). But do Finnish men self-medicate their symptoms of anxiety and depression through their high alcohol consumption, or does the high full-time labor-force participation of Finnish women imply that their mental health is better than those women who are at home or work half time in other countries? This would explain the lack of gender difference in psychotropic drug use found in Finland (Riska & Klaukka 1984). The other Nordic countries follow the international pattern: women are twice as likely as men to use such drugs (Riska et al. 1993). A question often posed is whether the fact that women currently constitute 47 percent of the physicians in Finland explains the lack of signs of an overmedication and overtreatment of women. The above questions are based on different interpretations of illness: is ill-health mainly based on socio-economic and work conditions or is it predominantly a social construction - an artifact - so that lay and professional definitions of gendered characteristics explain gender differentials in health and illness?

Conclusion

The heritage of Finnish sociology is characterized by its connection to the state and currently by an era of cultural sociology markedly detached from the previous social-engineering approach of Finnish social science research (see Allardt and Alapuro in this volume). Sociological research on health and illness has followed this general pattern.

In the 1990s, researchers in genetics and molecular biology have argued that the homogeneous population and the comprehensive health care coverage in Finland constitute unique assets for researchers to do frontier research in medicine. Few mention the asset that, from a sociological point of view, makes Finland unique: the common gender differential in ill health is missing. The challenge in research on gender and health is to examine how women's labor-force participation has influenced their health in the long run and whether the present trend will continue as the labor market changes. By the year 2000 the Finnish medical profession will be a female-dominated one. But will that have an impact on the priorities in health care and the research on women's health issues as envisioned by feminists in American

and British contexts? These questions constitute challenges for future sociological research and theorizing on gender and health.

Note

1. This is explained by the fact that there are more single men lacking in education in Finland than in the other Nordic countries.

Bibliography

- Alasuutari, P. (1992), *Desire and Craving: A Cultural Theory of Alcoholism*, New York: State University of New York Press.
- Allardt, E. (1998), "The Heritage of Sociology as Seen in the Development within one Single Country", in this volume.
- Arber, S. & Lahelma, E. (1993), "Women, Paid Employment and Ill-Health in Britain and Finland", *Acta Sociologica*, XXXVI, 121-138.
- Ettorre, E. & Riska, E. (1995), *Gendered Moods: Psychotropics and Society*, London: Routledge.
- Haavio-Mannila, E. (1986), "Inequalities in Health and Gender", *Social Science & Medicine*, XXII, 141-149.
- Honkasalo, M-L. (1988), *Oireiden ongelma*, Helsinki: Helsingin Yliopiston kansanterveystieteen laitoksen julkaisuja M: 101.
- Kalimo, E. Nyman, K. Klaukka T. Tuomikoski, H. & Savolainen, E. (1982), *Terveyspalvelujen käyttö ja kustannukset 1964-1976*, Helsinki: Publications of the Social Insurance Institution A:18.
- Kalimo, E. Klaukka, T. Lehtonen, R. & Nyman, K. (1989), *Tietoja suomalaisten terveysturvasta*, Helsinki: Kansaneläkelaitosten julkaisuja M:67.
- Kangas, I. (1997), *Vaiva, muutos, vanheneminen: Tutkimus lääketieteen, julkisuuden ja naisten vaihdevuositulkinnosta*, PhD thesis in Sociology: University of Helsinki.
- Karisto, A. (1984), *Hyvinvointi ja sairauden ongelma*, Helsinki: Publication of the Social Insurance Institution M: 46.
- Karisto, A. (1990), "Sosiaalihuolto ja sairastavuus", *Sosiaalilääketieteellinen Aikakauslehti*, XXVII, 43-54.

Koskinen, S. & Martelin, T. (1994), "Why are Socioeconomic Mortality Differentials Smaller among Women than among Men?", *Social Science & Medicine*, XXXVIII, 1385-1396.

Lahelma E., Karisto, A. & Rahkonen, O. (1996), "Analysing Inequalities: The Tradition of Socio-economic Public Health Research in Finland", *European Journal of Public Health*, VI, 87-93.

Lahelma, E. & Riska, E. (1988), "The Development of Medical Sociology in Finland", *Social Science & Medicine*, XXVII, 223-229.

Oinas, E. (1998), "What is a Normal Menstruation? Accounts conveyed by young Women and Medical Experts in Medical Advisory Columns", *Sociology of Health and Illness*. In print.

Rahkonen O., Manderbacka K. & Lahelma, E. & Karisto, A. (1995), "Social Class, Gender and Illness - a Nordic Experience", in C. Lundh (ed.) *Demography, Economy and Welfare*, Lund: Lund University Press.

Riska, E. (ed.) (1997), *Images of Women's Health*, Åbo: Åbo Akademi Tryckeri.

Riska, E. & Klaukka, T. (1984), "Use of psychotropic drugs in Finland", *Social Science & Medicine*, XIX, 183-189.

Riska E., Khhlhorn E., Nordlund S. & Skinhrj, K.T. (eds.) (1993), *Minor Tranquillizers in the Nordic Countries*, Helsinki: Nordic Council for Alcohol and Drug Research.

Valkonen, T. (1985), "The Mystery of the Premature Mortality of Finnish Men" in R. Alapuro et al. (ed.), *Small States in a Comparative Perspective*, Oslo: Norwegian University Press, 228-241.

Verbrugge, L. (1989), "The Twain Meet: Empirical Explanations of Sex Differences in Health and Mortality", *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, XXX, 282-304.

CHAPTER 12

THE CONTRADICTION LOGICS OF INSTITUTIONS

Søren Christensen and Ann Westenholz
Copenhagen Business School, Denmark

Empirical Questions and Theoretical Position

In 1973, the Danish Parliament unanimously passed a law granting employees of private companies the right to choose two representatives to their company board of directors¹, subject to the same rights and obligations as representatives elected by the general assembly. With respect to the passing of the legislation, we focus on two issues: (1) Why was this institution not created by the two sides of industry (the Danish Employers' Confederation and the Danish Federation of Trade Unions) but as a law passed by the Parliament, taking into consideration that since 1899 the formalised co-operation between employees and employers has been negotiated by the two sides of industry. And (2) Why was the law passed unanimously by the Parliament when the political parties, were very sceptical about it.

One approach is to search for answers by applying the rational actor model. This model sees political behaviour (in this case the genesis of the law) as a market or a power game in which the actors (individuals or political parties) pursue interests that are viewed as exogenous in relation to the analysis. We suggest an alternative *institutional actor model* which views behaviour as a dialectic process in which individuals and organizations are constructed by societal institutions while individuals and organizations simultaneously transform these institutions.

In this article, we argue for understanding the genesis of the law as a struggle between individuals and organizations over which institutional logics (symbolic constructions) are appropriate for understanding how industrial relations should be organised. We find that two fundamental contradictory logics have been active in this struggle, the institutional logic of capitalism, which is the accumulation and commodification of human activity (Friedland & Alford 1991, p. 248), and the institutional logic of democracy: participation and extension of popular control over human activity (op.cit., p.248). In the following, we will analyse the historical and social context of this process, but we will not address the practical impact of its results on working life. We have done this elsewhere (Christensen & Westenholz

1997a; 1997b), arguing that employee representatives infuse the law with meaning through a process of identity construction as "strategic company actors": the employee representatives come to share with their board colleagues, the representatives of capital, a market or company strategic perspective on board decision making, while simultaneously maintaining the perspective of employee interests.

Historical and Social Context

Since 1899, industrial relations in Denmark have been based on agreements between the labour market organizations, the Danish Employers' Confederation and the Danish Federation of Trade Unions. This model was based on the cognitive framework of *collective bargaining*, belonging to the institutional logic of capitalism. Shop stewards were not supposed to perform or take part in the management functions in companies. Their job was to negotiate wages and working conditions for the workers. Thus, workers in private companies could be constituted as actors through their membership of a union. (Westenholz 1994, pp. 22-36).

However, since the Second World War, most European countries, including Denmark, have developed industrial relations based on a framework of *co-determination*, also belonging to the institutional logic of capitalism. Within this framework, employees are constituted as actors through their membership of two organizational units, the union and the firm. Employees as well as employers are granted the right to discuss matters of mutual interest. This system was established by the two sides of industry and formalised in works councils (Westenholz 1994, pp. 56-63).

During the 1960s and the 1970s, the Danish society was characterised by a comprehensive and strongly ideological debate on democratisation of firms and organizations. Among other things, this debate resulted in the Statute for Institutions of Higher Education in 1970 (revised in 1973) which entitled teachers, students and administrative staff to one third of the votes each in decision making bodies (study committees and faculty councils) at the universities.

Settling the Issue of Democracy at the Work Place

1. In 1964, the government appointed a commission to revise the Corporation Law. In its report, this commission mentioned both the German and Norwegian systems of employee representation on boards in private firms. However, the commission refused to take a stand on such systems in relation to Danish legislation, claiming that such issues (democratisation of decision processes in firms) were either political (and hence fall outside the

competence of the commission) or fall within the framework of existing legislation and thus were negotiable in the individual firm.

2. In 1965, the Danish Federation of Trade Unions appointed a committee to consider democratisation in business life and employees' right to participate in general policy decisions within the existing system of co-determination (works councils). The committee recommended the establishment of a works committee along the model existing for German firms, but in keeping with Danish traditions, the issue should be negotiated by the two sides of industry. The status of this committee should be consultative. Another proposal, which solely aimed at granting employees representation on company boards, could not obtain a majority because such representation was not perceived to have any significant effect on employees' influence until a profit-sharing scheme was also implemented.

3. In 1967, the issue of democratisation of business life was taken up by the Social Democratic minority government. After having consulted the Danish Federation of Trade Unions, the government introduced a law on profit-sharing which was defeated at first reading in Parliament.

4. In 1971, the Danish Federation of Trade Unions introduced a new proposal for profit-sharing which was endorsed by the Social Democratic party.

5. In 1972, after Denmark had joined the EEC by referendum, the Danish Federation of Trade Unions, the Social Democratic Party, and the Social Democratic Government introduced a proposal for a system of employee representation on boards of directors along with a system of profit-sharing. The profit sharing system was based on central funds managed by the trade unions. Employers' associations and the right wing parties in Parliament were opposed to this plan, fearing a concentration of capital managed by the trade unions.

6. The plan was now separated into two proposals and introduced in Parliament in 1973. The bill on profit-sharing was put to a vote, but was defeated. The law on employee representatives on boards of directors was passed. This representation, which was included in the revised version of the Corporation Law, was solely based on employment in the firm (and not upon union membership), and the law was passed unanimously by Parliament and supported by both sides of industry.

Analysis and Conclusion

The legislation from 1973, granting employees the right to elect representatives to the board of directors, was in our opinion a step towards *co-management*. This framework supplemented the collective bargaining and co-determination regimes and resembles what Selznik (1969) calls

"organizational citizenship". Employees as organizational citizens are constituted as actors solely through their membership of the firm.

In order to understand the political construction of this institution, we begin by pointing to two central institutional logics: the logic of capitalism and the logic of democracy. We argue that the genesis of the law should be seen as a struggle between actors (individuals and organizations) embedded in the institutional understanding of the "appropriate" logic for working life. In our opinion, the key institutions and actors are shown in the following figure. The entire period was characterised by close relationships between organizations and individuals in the three institutions. The analysis focuses on the matching of extended employee influence and a suitable institutional framework.

INSTITUTION:

Government

Parliament

Two Sides of Industry

ORGANIZATION:

Social Democratic Government

Left wing parties

Right wing parties

Danish Federation
of Trade UnionsDanish Employers'
Confederation

We find that discussions of organizing working life were affected by the general debate about democratisation characterising the western world and especially Denmark in the sixties. It was the labour movement and the Social Democratic party that placed democratisation of working life on the agenda in the early sixties. The Danish Federation of Trade Unions reached agreement with their counterpart The Danish Employers' Confederation to extend the existing co-determination regime, but not exceed the logic of capitalism (the employer's right to manage work) which had been the basis of this regime since 1899. Furthermore, a majority within the labour movement recommended introduction of employee representatives on company boards if this was combined with the introduction of profit-sharing. However, combining profit-sharing and co-management was a frontal attack on the logic of capitalism which constituted the framework for the institution "two sides of industry". Since both parties were embedded in this institution and wanted to protect its central logic we find this to be the reason why trade unions and employers' associations wanted to use and maintain the institution of the two sides of industry for negotiations on wage and working

conditions and thus maintain management's right to manage work. However, via the labour movement the proposal was channeled into another institution, the Parliament, whose role in society as legislator is based on a logic of democracy. Therefore, the Parliament is an institution which can regulate such relationships through legislation.

Consequently, it was in the Parliament that the struggle over the regimes of working life took place. Should a logic of capitalism or a logic of democracy be the regime? The right wing found it "natural" to understand working life by applying the logic of capitalism, whereas the Social Democratic party and the left wing parties viewed working life from the perspective of the logic of democracy. None of the wings were particularly enthusiastic about a law on employee representatives on boards. The right wing argued that "this is against the natural order of things" that is, the idea was against the logic of capitalism, while the left wing found that the way to secure the employees a genuine influence the logic of democracy required joint ownership.

However, there are two reasons why the right wing finally consented to the law: (1) The Social Democratic minority government opted for separating the two laws. First the law on profit-sharing was introduced and defeated which the right wing parties and the employers' associations perceived as a victory. (2) A year earlier Denmark had joined the EEC (EU). The right wing parties had played a dominant role in the political debates prior to the referendum, and they were now strongly oriented towards EEC. Here, the system of employee representatives on company boards had functioned smoothly in for instance Germany. In our opinion, considerations of potential effects of the EEC-legislation on Denmark also played a role. Such considerations resembles what DiMaggio and Powell (1991) term coercive isomorphism. Thus, even though the right wing was not enthusiastic about the law, it was difficult to argue that it would make the companies unmanageable.

The left wing supported the law on employee representatives on company boards because it was difficult to go against something that granted employees the right to participate in decisions about their work place. Although they had argued for a more elaborate scheme of democracy, going again the proposal would not be legitimate: At this point, a system of representation (and thus a co-management institution) was the only attainable possibility in the Parliament.

Through legislation on employee representatives on company boards, the business life had been infused with a formal logic of democracy as an adjunct to the framework of co-determination and bargaining founded on the formal logic of capitalism.

Note

1. The Danish company legislation follows the European-Continental model, which views the board and the management as separate decision units as opposed to the Anglo-Saxon model which mixes board and management.

Bibliography

Christensen, S. & Westenholz, A. (1997a), "The Social/Behavioral Construction of Employees as Strategic Actors on Company Boards of directors", *American Behavioral Scientist*, vol. 40 no. 4, 490-501.

Christensen, S. & Westenholz, A. (1997b), "The Political Construction of Institutions. The dialectics between form and content in the creation of employee representation on boards of directors in Danish firms", paper presented at the *ISA Nordic Meetings* in Copenhagen, Denmark, June 12-13, 1997.

DiMaggio, P.J. & Powell, W.W. (1991), "Introduction", in Powell, Walter W. & Paul J. DiMaggio (ed.), *The New Institutionalism in Organization Theory*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Friedland, R. & Alford, R.R. (1991), "Bringing Society Back In: Symbols, Practices, and Institutional Contradictions", in Powell, Walter W. & Paul J. DiMaggio (ed.), *The New Institutionalism in Organization Theory*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Selznick, P. (1969), *Law, Society and Industrial Justice*, New York: Russell Sage.

Westenholz, A. (1994), "Modeller af arbejdspladsdemokrati efter 2. Verdenskrig. Fra et logik- til et paradoksperspektiv med fokus på det organisatoriske niveau", Post-doctoral thesis, The Copenhagen Business School.

**XIV^e CONGRÈS
MONDIAL
DE
SOCIOLOGIE**

14th World Congress of Sociology

XIV^o Congreso Mundial de Sociología