

The genesis of Norwegian sociology*

– a story of failures and success

Published in Sosiologisk Årbok 2006. 3-4

Gunn Elisabeth Birkelund, Universitetet i Oslo
g.e.birkelund@sosiologi.uio.no



**Department of Sociology & Human Geography
University of Oslo**

P. O. Box 1096 Blindern
N-0317 OSLO Norway
Telephone: + 47 22855257
Fax: + 47 22855253
Internet <http://www.iss.uio.no/>

The genesis of Norwegian sociology* – a story of failures and success

Gunn Elisabeth Birkelund

Summary

The institutionalisation of Norwegian sociology is an interesting history of failures and success, both personal and institutional. Given that we do not often take an interest in the history of our own discipline, busy as we usually are studying our contemporary society and developing our discipline, it might be of interest to take some time to reflect on our own past, on the forefathers and the legacy we inherited from them. By doing so we might get a better understanding of the present-day situation of Norwegian sociology.

This essay addresses the genesis of the Norwegian sociology, covering the period from the early beginning of Norwegian sociology up to the phase of successful institutionalization of sociology as a discipline. We will briefly look at the most important forefather of Norwegian sociology, Eilert Sundt, before we proceed to the first attempts to institutionalise sociology, unsuccessfully. The most important names during this phase are Sigurd Ibsen and Arvid Brodersen. Then we will discuss the Næss group, the *war-time network* and the mythical history of the parachute jumper, and the so-called sea change after WWII, emphasising the important role of Arne Næss, Vilhelm Aubert, Stein Rokkan, Erik Rinde and Sverre Holm in establishing two institutions

* This essay is an extended version of a talk I gave at the plenary session of the ISA's RC28 conference in Oslo, 5-8 May 2005. I wish to thank Tak Wing Chan, John Eriksen, A. H. Halsey, Jean Martin, Per Otnes and Fredrik Thue for valuable comments. They are, however, not to be held responsible for the interpretations, which are my own responsibility.

where sociology could flourish: the Institute for Social Research and the Department of Sociology at University of Oslo.

Since I write here with a specific focus on the early years of these processes, and since any attempt to cover the rest of the story, i.e. the further development of Norwegian sociology, would be beyond the scope of an essay, we will end our journey in 1950, when the Department of Sociology at the University of Oslo and the Institute for Social Research were established.¹ I cannot, however, resist the temptation of addressing present-day sociology, thus, I will try in the concluding part to discuss the present state of the art, with sociology as an established discipline, in relation to the strategic goals of the post-war group of young researchers. As the observant reader have already deduced, the topics are discussed in chronological order, with WWII as the main dividing line. The discipline of sociology in Norway was not established until after WWII, thus the period before WWII can be characterised as a period of unsuccessful institutionalization of sociology, whereas the period after WWII is the history of successful institutionalization.

I do not make any claim whatsoever that this brief introduction to the early years of Norwegian sociology will provide us with an in-depth understanding of the various schools of thought in sociology advocated by the actors involved. Nor can I have any hope of conveying the history of sociology in a way that would do justice to the complexities involved in establishing a new science. For this we need to appeal to professional historians of science (Thu 2005), philosophers of science and future chroniclers. I have been selective, since an attempt to cover the whole story would be too ambitious. However, the essay may perhaps serve as an appetizer, with the hope of stimulating students' interest in the history of our discipline.²

Pioneering forefather: Eilert Sundt (1817-75)

Most Norwegian students of sociology (and other social sciences) know of Eilert Sundt. A pioneer in a number of disciplines (demography, ethnology, sociology), he published a large number of articles and books on population studies and folk society.

Eilert Sundt graduated in theology in 1846 at the University of Kristiania (Oslo). He worked during his student years as a Sunday-school teacher at a prison in Kristiania. Here, he "had an experience of great importance for his later life: he came into contact with several gypsies among the inmates." (Vogt 1968:410). He became interested in these people and he received a government scholarship to

study their everyday living conditions, language and customs. Later, the scholarship was extended to include studies of other population groups, such as farmers and workers. For approximately 15 years he travelled extensively in Norway, gathering data. In this period he also published his findings in *Folkevennen* (The People's Friend), a magazine which he edited himself with the intention of educating the people. He covered a variety of topics, including the habits and customs of farmers and "the common people"; his intention was later to merge them into a large study of the whole population. This task, however, was never completed.

Sundt's interest in studying the lower strata of the society led him to undertake more general field studies of the poor. He was familiar with the existing literature of the social sciences; in particular he was influenced by the works of Quetelet³ and by the British *Reports of the Poor Law Commission* and the *Reports of the Register-General* (Vogt 1968:410). Nevertheless, like many other European and American pioneers, he started out with a moralistic inclination on the habits and behaviour of poor people, and a conviction that helping the poor would prevent revolutionary attitudes from growing among them. Thus, he represented a fairly paternalistic view that was typical for his time. After intensive studies of their living conditions and habits, he ended, often but not always, defending the poor people's ways of living as rational adaptations to dire surroundings. He concluded that it wasn't necessarily bad morals, but lack of material resources that could explain some behavioural outcomes that he was originally inclined to condemn, such as the peasant habit of having sex before marriage⁴ (nightly visits), which "morally outraged Norway's urban citizens" (Vogt 1968:410). Sundt, however, explained the habit as a functional adaptation, since it allowed men to ascertain before marriage that a woman could bear children and thus produce an heir. These explanations, and some other features, made him increasingly unpopular with some of the members of the Parliament, which resulted in the Parliament ending the funding for his scholarship in 1869.

Eilert Sundt collected large amounts of ethnographic as well as demographic data, and developed a surprisingly high level of analytic sophistication. By doing so, he was the first demographer to detect patterns in population growth that could be formulated into generalizations. His work on marriage (Om giftemaal I Norge. 1855b. English edition: On Marriage in Norway, 1980), based on an earlier study of mortality (Om dodeligheten I Norge. 1855a) documented that heavy mortality due to crop failures and famine in 1742-43 and 1808 and 1812 was causing fluctuations in population growth (which he called "wave movements"). "The consequent variation in cohort sizes, with peaks recurring at intervals of about thirty years, led in the late 1830s to an absolute decline in the actual number of births

and beginning with the 1840s to a very substantial increase in that number.” (Vogt 1968:410). These fluctuations in the growth of the population also had implications for the marriage patterns: “*The number of marriages for various age groups under normal circumstances will mainly be determined by the number of births the appropriate years before*” (Sundt 1855:10). The Swedish demographer Gustav Sundberg (1894) introduced the term “Eilert Sundt’s law” to designate the pattern Sundt discovered in population fluctuations. This law is still well known to social demographers and family sociologists (Eriksen and Wetlesen 1996).

Based on his detailed ethnologic studies of the Travellers [fantefolket], Eilert Sundt initially argued in favour of their voluntary settlement by offering them financial support and housing, and for some years in the mid-19th century he received grants from the Norwegian parliament for this purpose. His major concern was to ensure that the children of Travellers received a proper Christian upbringing and education, so that they would be able to read and write, and not least, be confirmed, and hopefully motivated to live according to Christian norms (Hvinden 2000). Sundt regarded settlement of Traveller families as essential to achieve this religious and cultural assimilation. In the early years Sundt seemed to make some progress in his efforts, but after a while many of the settled Traveller families left their houses and started travelling again. After this experience, Sundt began to argue in favour of forced settlement of Travellers, backed up by threats of putting the men in forced labour institutions [tvangsarbeidshus] if they did not comply. In the meantime Sundt’s efforts had been defined as a failure and the parliament stopped his grants. Sundt ended his life as a parson in a small country parish (Eidsvoll) as a bitter and disappointed man. The government sought to continue the work Sundt had started, but with even less success.⁵

Sundt had no followers. His work, written in gothic typeface, was more or less forgotten until the 1960s, when Christophersen (1962) published a commentary summary of Sundt’s work and later published a selection of Sundt’s work in 12 volumes, including his book on marriage patterns, which was published in English (Christophersen et al. 1974-1978). His work was important for Norwegian sociological research: from the 1970s and onwards his work has been a classic reference. Sundt himself did not, however, describe his own work as sociology, a discipline that was hardly established anywhere during the time he undertook his studies. The rediscovery of his work in the 1970s was embraced enthusiastically, regarding him as the forefather of the level of living studies, amongst other things, that were initiated in the 1970s. However, his ethical and political attitudes have also been discussed. He disliked the radical Thrane movement, yet supported workers’ and farmers’ struggle for decent working condi-

tions.⁶ These, and some other controversial topics, have resulted in a more balanced view of his work. Today, Sundt's work is emphasized as an important documentation of poor people's living conditions and customs, and as amazingly sophisticated analytically and as pioneering science, both in demographic and ethnographic methods.

Eilert Sundt deserves to be included here, although he was not related to any process of institutionalisation of sociology, nor was his work influential when these processes did commence. He belongs to the first pioneers gathering social statistics in Europe, and his work has become more important in modern times, from the 1970s onwards.

Unsuccessful institutionalisation: Cosmopolitans without a national foothold

We now proceed to the period when a number of people were involved – at several points in time – in trying to establish sociology as a discipline at the University of Oslo, the only university in Norway at the time. This period of unsuccessful institutionalisation begins in the 1890s and ends with WWII, thus covering about 50 years. Our knowledge of this period is insufficient.⁷ In this essay, I will only discuss the role of two people, Sigurd Ibsen and Arvid Brodersen, who are of obvious importance when discussing the period of unsuccessful institutionalisation of Norwegian sociology.

From Munich and Rome to Oslo: Sigurd Ibsen (1859-1930)

Whereas everyone knows of Henrik Ibsen, few have heard of his son, Sigurd Ibsen. This changed, however, with the publication of Lars Roar Langslet's biography of Sigurd Ibsen with the telling title *The Son* (Langslet 2004).

Sigurd Ibsen could have been the first Norwegian professor of sociology at the University of Kristiania (later University of Oslo). Ibsen's academic work, however, has not been of importance to Norwegian sociologists. But a story about the institutionalization of Norwegian sociology ought to include him. Sigurd Ibsen's life history is closely intertwined with his father's and the life and the upbringing he had as the only child of the famous dramatist, who had high aspirations for his talented son. Langslet also emphasise the role of his mother, who was ambitious on behalf of her son.

Sigurd was fluent in several languages (related to the fact that he lived with his parents in Italy and Germany for many years). He graduated in law from the

University of Munich (1880), and took a doctoral degree, also in law, at University of Rome (1882). The topic for his doctoral thesis was representative governance and the distribution of power. The thesis, which Arvid Brodersen classifies as political science (Brodersen 1994:31) was received by the University of Rome with *approvata a pieni voti* (standing applause) (Langslet 2004:55).

Sigurd Ibsen worked in various temporary, often unpaid, positions for the Swedish-Norwegian Foreign Department, but his main contribution would be related to his political role during the dissolution of the Swedish-Norwegian union in 1905. He was a candidate for the Liberal party (Venstre) to become the first foreign minister in Norway after the union with Sweden was dissolved. However, he was controversial politically, and in 1899 he was appointed as the first Head of the newly established Office for Foreign Affairs under the Ministry of Domestic Affairs. Thus he became a civil servant and the founding father of an independent Norwegian foreign policy (Langslet 2004:212), and, for about one year, he became the Norwegian Prime Minister in Stockholm. I refer interested readers to Langslet's book for a fascinating biography.

Before this, however, Sigurd Ibsen, disappointed with Norwegian politicians and their lack of action vis-à-vis the Swedish parliament, suggested establishing a professorship in sociology at the University, in order to get himself a proper job. Ibsen's idea of a professorship in sociology was embraced by many of his colleagues in the Liberal party (Venstre), who saw this as a chance for him to obtain a prestigious position in Norway. In 1895 Sigurd Ibsen wrote an article entitled "On the study of society as a discipline at our university" (om samfundslære som fag ved vort universitet). Here, he argues that although the University offered some courses of relevance to social science, they were given at different faculties, and not dealt with in a systematic manner. The lawyers, he writes, address the society's system of laws, but this can only be regarded as the skeleton of the society; the economists study protectionism and liberalism, but the economic laws are interconnected with social and political factors which one also needs to understand. The statisticians produce useful data, but they only measure what can be counted and weighed, not the invisible engines that together constitute the spirit and soul of a society. (Langslet 2004:144, my translation). Ibsen then turns to the Humanities. Ethics are related to the sphere of ideals, and therefore do not comply with the social scientists' requirements about empirical data and practical results. The historians study what has happened and not society as it is today and will be in the future. Thus, he argues, rather sarcastically, the university has nothing to say about present-day society, about the ideologies, national, political and social forces that impact present-day societies;

rather, by looking at the university, he argues, one might think that the world has not changed since the battle of Waterloo (Langslet 2004:144).

Thus Ibsen argues the University ought to establish a new discipline, which he calls 'samfundslære': the study of society.⁸ This discipline was already established at major European universities, including Munich, where he had attended lectures in sociology. Sociology, or the study of society, includes the study of the family, the role of religion, social differentiation related to caste, status, and class; social conflicts related to race, crime, prostitution; the administration/governmental sector, including the role of the state, political institutions and parties and finally international relations. (Brodersen 1994:35-36). Sociology is the most generalizing of the social sciences, and may become the new unifying science, thereby taking the role that philosophy has left open⁹. In the published version of his lecture he also included a list of US and European universities which taught sociology/'samfundslære': altogether 49 universities in 8 countries, where 217 professors and associate professors gave courses in the new social science.

After some discussion, where in particular the politicians of the Conservative party (Høyre) were opposed to establishing a new professorship, the Norwegian Parliament compromised by deciding to give Ibsen 2/3 of the full professorial wage for one year in order to give a series of lectures on sociology at the University of Oslo. These lectures would then be evaluated by a committee appointed by the University. Thus this compromise, which did not establish a permanent professorship in sociology, nevertheless gave Ibsen a chance to show that sociology was a discipline worthy of being included at the University, and that he had the qualifications needed to teach this subject. This was not a small task: the University had already been sceptical, not only for political reasons, but also for scientific reasons. Ibsen had already argued against criticism that sociology was not science ('it smells of politics'), by emphasising that social science is entirely different from politics; the new discipline is about the science of society (samfundets naturlære) (Langslet 2004:147).

Sigurd Ibsen's formal qualifications had been disputed earlier (his doctoral degree from University of Rome was not acknowledged when he wanted a permanent contract with the Swedish-Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs); now he had a chance to demonstrate his qualifications. Thus he took the task very seriously. He spent a long time reading, also on topics that he knew little about, since he wanted to show the complete range of topics included in the new social science. The committee formed to evaluate his lectures comprised two professors from the Faculty of Law and three from the Faculty of History and Philosophy.¹⁰ Two members had no qualifications whatsoever in sociology (one being a profes-

sor in Egyptology, another in Nordic history (norrøn historie), the three others (two professors of Law and one statistician) were sceptical towards 'new fangled discipline', as well as the radicalism of Ibsen. Also Ibsen's earlier sarcastic comments about the University's inability to educate lawyers with knowledge of more than judicial paragraphs were likely to be remembered.

The lecture series took place in the winter 1896-97, attracted a large audience (including Henrik Ibsen) and was reported in detail in the Oslo newspapers. Ibsen's lectures reflected his wide definition of the new discipline, starting with the family as a social institution. In addition to sociological topics, he also covered social history, political science and ethnographical research, with references to biological and zoological research as well. His reading had indeed been impressive! However, Brodersen argues, although his lectures would make modern sociologists shake their heads in disapproval, we should bear in mind that the lectures were written at a time when modern sociology was still emerging, when the main publications of Durkheim, Weber and Simmel were still to come, so it would be meaningless to expect Ibsen to know about their work. Given these limitations, Brodersen argues that Ibsen gave a clear and consistent summary of what was then the state of art within sociology, including references to Comte (France), Spencer (England) and Marx (Germany). His main perspective was influenced by theories of organisations and evolution. Only a few of the lectures were published.¹¹

The committee evaluating Ibsen's lectures decided (April 1897) to vote against appointing him at the University. In doing so they referred to a Belgium essay (called *La Sociologie*) which documented that at that time only two professorships in sociology existed in all of Europe, thus concluding that it was too early to decide whether sociology could be established as a new discipline.¹² The committee also concluded that although Ibsen had many good qualifications as a lecturer, they had not been convinced that "Dr. Sigurd Ibsen had a talent for original scientific research" (Brodersen 1994:37).

Langslet, writing about this process, argues that it is too easy to conclude that the committee was not qualified to do its job (Langslet 2004:157-8). This might have been the case, yet he argues we need to understand the difficult relations between the University and the Parliament, in particular the Liberal Party, which on several occasions had showed little reluctance with interfering in the University's internal affairs. As today, the University disliked being told by the politicians what to do.

The personality of Sigurd Ibsen should also be of interest here. A majority of the Parliament voted (July 1897) in favour of requesting the Government to con-

sider giving the University an associate professorship in Sociology but Sigurd Ibsen said he was not interested. Either a full professorship or nothing at all, was his statement, and even his beloved father (who on several occasions had tried, unsuccessfully, to influence the process) could not persuade him to be more flexible (Langslet 2004: 1964-68). As in politics, Sigurd Ibsen again proved himself to be a loner, with high self-esteem and a lack of understanding of the subtle deeds of compromise. It is also likely that his father's lobbying unintentionally might have made Sigurd Ibsen's case worse. However, the personality of Sigurd Ibsen (Langslet argues he had a 'superiority-complex') might have made him a difficult person at the University as well. Despite his obvious talents and knowledge, he felt he never really succeeded in anything he undertook. It might therefore be an open question whether appointing him as the first professor of sociology would have benefited the discipline in the long run.

This was the first attempt to institutionalise Norwegian sociology. It was not the first time (and surely not the last time) that politicians wanted to decide what universities ought to do. Sometimes universities find it in their interests to follow the wishes of politicians, in particular if their requests are accompanied by money (which was partly the case this time), but it also happens, at it did this time, that universities dislike outside requests on what they regard as their internal scientific life. I would guess the discussion inside the University would have been seriously preoccupied with the academic quality of the proposed professor as well as his discipline, but it also seems likely that rivalry and conflicting interests of other sorts had an impact. The story is fascinating and certainly calls for more research. If the University had accepted the professorship, and/or if Sigurd Ibsen had been more flexible, he would have been one of the first professors of sociology in Europe¹³ and the history of science, at least in Norway, would have been different.¹⁴

From Berlin via Oslo to New York: Arvid Brodersen (1904-97)

The biography of Arvid Brodersen is also a story of unsuccessful institutionalisation of Norwegian sociology. He had a prominent role outside Norway, as an expert working for several periods for UNESCO after WWII and at the New School for Social Research in New York, where he worked as a professor from 1948 until 1980, when he retired and returned to Norway, where he lived until he died at the age of 93. His auto biography (Brodersen 1982) gives the reader a fascinating story of a cosmopolitan sociologist.¹⁵

Brodersen studied first in Oslo (Kristiania), then at the Friedrich-Wilhelm's University in Berlin (also called the Humbolt University) where he received his

doctoral degree in sociology in 1931. In the late 1920s Berlin was a cosmopolitan metropolis and the social sciences were the new and interesting disciplines. He learned about Weber, but also about Alfred Schutz and the phenomenologists. However, being worried about the political situation in Germany (having attended two public meetings at which Adolf Hitler spoke), Brodersen travelled back to Norway, where for a short period he worked as a teacher at the Economic College (Handelsgymnasium) in Trondheim (his home city), not thinking that there would be any relevant work for him as a sociologist in Norway at that time.

However, the University of Oslo was now, about 38 years after Sigurd Ibsen's lecture series, considering appointing two people to teach sociology, one in the Faculty of Law and one in the Department of Economics.¹⁶ In 1936, the Faculty of Law hired Wilhelm Thagaard, a lawyer and economist, to teach sociology on the Introductory Course (1. avdeling) for students of law. The economists did not know whom to appoint, but learned, through informal conversation with a representative of the Rockefeller Foundation (whose representatives visited Oslo regularly), that there was already a Norwegian sociologist with a doctoral degree from Berlin living somewhere in Norway. Learning that there was a candidate, the economists found Arvid Brodersen and invited him to Oslo for an interview.¹⁷ They decided they were interesting in appointing him, but, as he was trained in the German tradition, for which Brodersen felt there was a certain scepticism (Brodersen 1994:46), he was first asked to accept a Rockefeller Scholarship in sociology for 1935 to go to USA and learn more about American sociology. The economists then would set up a fellowship in sociology for the period 1936-1940, during which time he would be responsible for teaching sociology to students of economics. Brodersen accepted and travelled (by boat) to New York.

Inspired by Thomas and Znaniecki's book *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America* Brodersen decided to study Norwegian immigrants in the USA. In New York Brodersen visited the New School for Social Research, "the immigration university" (flyktning-universitetet), where he learned about Torstein Veblen, one of the founders of New School for Social Research. Veblen, being born in Wisconsin of Norwegian immigrant parents (who emigrated from Valdres), attracted Brodersen's interest and he decided to learn more about American social science by following in Veblen's footsteps.¹⁸ Therefore he travelled across the USA (University of Chicago, University of Madison-Wisconsin, University of Minneapolis, University of Seattle, University of California at Berkeley and Stanford University), and developed a large network of contacts with social scientists at a number of prestigious American universities.

Back in Oslo, Brodersen published an extended article on Veblen in the

Norwegian Journal of Economics, classifying Veblen as a researcher with huge influence (The father of New Deal), arguing that his perspective was more influenced by European thinkers and philosophers than by American "...puritan common-sense-philosophy and yankee optimism" (Brodersen 1937/1994:86), perhaps also characterising himself intellectually. However, WWII interrupted intellectual work more or less everywhere, also at the University of Oslo. Brodersen, fluent in German and with many friends in Germany, now played a role as an interpreter at several meetings between representatives for the German Occupants and influential Norwegians.¹⁹

After WWII Brodersen left Norway and lived abroad until he retired. He worked for UNESCO in London and Paris from 1946-49, and for another period (1951-53) in Israel. From 1948 he worked as a professor at the New School for Social Research in New York, again following in Torstein Veblen's footsteps. He also worked in Mexico for some years. He published articles on Weber, Veblen and Schutz.²⁰ It seems highly possible that if Brodersen had remained in Norway after WWII, Norwegian sociology would have been institutionalised at the University of Oslo with him as the first professor of sociology, and with the possibility of developing a Norwegian sociology benefiting from his large network, both in Europe and the USA. It also seems obvious that he would have advocated a scientific programme that was more influenced by the continental schools of thought, in particular German, with an emphasis on *erkenniss* and reflection, rather than a clear commitment for empirically oriented research. I think it would be fair to say that – given the development in Norwegian sociology after WWII – Brodersen would have been much of a loner in the new, emerging research community. However, his delicate and communicative personality might have contributed to an interesting merger between the two schools of thought.

Thus ended the first attempts to institutionalise Norwegian sociology. Let us now move to the next phase, the phase of successful institutionalisation.

Successful institutionalisation: Strategic entrepreneurship

The war hampered intellectual interaction, both nationally and with the outside world. However, there was *some* contact, and the mythical history of the parachute jumper during WWII is intertwined with the early phase of institutionalisation. Let us therefore start with the history behind the myth of the origin of modern sociology in Norway.

The history of the parachute jumper

Norwegian sociology is lucky in the sense that it has its own myth of origin. Myths of origin are important since they contribute to a sense of community and the feeling of belonging to an in-group, both important elements for the successful building of an institution. The history of the parachute jumper has been told again and again, and although the history is a tragic one, the myth surrounding it does – as myths do – contain elements of heroism, bravery, commitment, determination and even romance.

One member of the Næss group (see below) Odd Wickstrom-Nielsen fled to England early on in WWII. There, he was recruited by the Secret Service and in 1943 was aboard a British airplane going to Norway with military supplies for the resistance movement. Knowing the intellectual isolation and thirst for new books of the Norwegian intellectuals, he had been able to get hold of four books that he included in the cargo.²¹ These were: George A. Lundberg: *Social Research*. Bertrand Russell: *An Inquiry Into Meaning and Truth*. Lynd and Lynd: *Middeltown*, and also Lynd and Lynd: *Middeltown in Transition*; thus a book on American positivistic sociology, of British epistemology, and of American empirically oriented sociology.²²

Together with the cargo Wickstrom-Nielsen was dropped in a parachute over the mountains near Telemark (Vegglifjellet) (Thue 1990: 231). He died as a result of this parachute jump. When four members of the underground organisation arrived later, including Vilhelm Aubert, a 21 year old student of law and member of the Næss seminar group, they found the four books, which were brought back to Oslo.²³ It seems fair to say that in particular Lundberg's naïve positivism has not had an important impact on Norwegian sociology, although it was part of the curriculum of sociology for some years after WWII.²⁴ Russell's book on epistemology was relevant for Arne Næss's work (see below)²⁵, and the Middletown studies were important sources of inspiration for sociological research into small towns (such as the project about Mo i Rana).

As a story of the origin of modern sociology this myth has for generations triggered our fantasy of those days when doing sociology was a matter of life and death, when the entrepreneurs literally risked their lives for two parallel purposes: fighting against the Nazi-regime occupying Norway and preparing for post-war intellectual work. Since I write here with a specific focus on individuals and their impact on processes of institutionalisation, the next person to consider is the founding father of the network: Arne Næss.

The entrepreneur of Norwegian sociology: Arne Næss (1912 -)

Arne Næss graduated from the University of Oslo in 1933, studied in Paris and Vienna and received his doctoral degree in philosophy at the University of Oslo in 1936. He became professor of philosophy at the University of Oslo in 1939, at only 27 years of age. He held this position until 1969, after which he has worked free-lance as a “philosopher and naturalist and from 1970 onwards as an environmental activist” (www.sum.uio.no/staff/arnena/). Today Arne Næss is well known as a philosopher and the founder of Deep Ecology (cf. the web address above). His role as an entrepreneur of Norwegian sociology – and social sciences in general – is of great importance.

Being trained in the Vienna school which had an emphasis on behaviouristic empirically oriented research, Arne Næss was critical towards his own discipline, which he called ‘arm chair philosophy’. He also disliked the traditional academic style of lecturing to passive students, and instead started a seminar in 1939 to discuss actively with the students and also to promote empirically oriented philosophy and social science research. Being a charismatic and intellectually inspiring person, Arne Næss attracted not only students interested in philosophy and the new social sciences, but also students of law and science.²⁶ During WWII intellectual work became more difficult. The network continued the seminar though, discussing social philosophical challenges related to the transition to peace, the truthfulness of normative statements, questions related to propaganda versus truth and the logic of methodology (Thue 1990:241-42).

Several members of Næss’s network also got involved in active resistance work as members of an illegal underground organisation called XU, thus connecting behaviour and knowledge, a classic topic addressed by Næss. “The dilemmas and value conflicts the students were confronted with because of the war, and which motivated their interest for Næss’ work, was related to conflicts of attitudes, such as pacifism and defence, propaganda and objectivity” (Thue 1990:242, my translation). Vilhelm Aubert, who later became the most important person to establish sociology in Oslo, published an interesting article in 1985 on the two networks, the Næss group of young, talented academics and the illegal group of underground resistance activists, called XU.²⁷ A special form of social relationship emerged when people were members of both groups: they were openly friends in one group, yet operating under cover in the other group, not supposed showing that they knew each other (Aubert 1985).

The end of WWII marked the beginning of a new period of active entrepreneurship to establish a cross-disciplinary research programme for the social sciences, which included in particular social psychology, sociology and political sci-

ence (Thue 2005, forthcoming). Gradually Arne Næss fades out of the picture; his time as an agent of change was over, yet his influential academic work continued to be important for the social sciences for several generations.

The network

After WWII, the possibilities of interaction with the outside world were dramatically improved. Thue (1990), having studied the correspondence between central people in the network, emphasizes the determination of this group. They were looking for a guest professor they could invite to Oslo. They had both strategic and intellectual motives. The goal was to achieve scientific input and research experience under an experienced advisor. Also, they wanted to be attached to a successful international research group. They wanted to start Norwegian research projects that could later contribute to the internationalisation of Norwegian sociology. And finally, they wanted access to the large American research foundations. The guest professor should be able to teach general sociology and also give practical guidance in research methodology. They wanted to avoid a typical abstract oriented academic in the European university tradition, since they feared that such a person would not stimulate research projects with close collaboration between researchers. Thus, writes Thue (1990:250-251), their idea was that through scientific experience such as collaborative research projects, the institutionalisation of sociology and other social sciences would emerge.

A variety of different strategies was now used. The group actively tried to influence the University, the students, various important interest organisations and public opinion in general (Thue 1990:233). At the University, sociology was gaining a foothold and in 1947 a grant from a private benefactor enabled the University to invite “a visiting professor, preferably from the USA, with the specific task of teaching empirically oriented sociology to the students of sociology, with prospects of doing field work in a modern society” (Open Letter to the Students of Sociology at home and abroad, University of Oslo Archive, referred from Thue 1990:233). They knew what they wanted; the period of active search for prominent international scholars started. Arne Næss, Sverre Holm, Vilhelm Aubert, Stein Rokkan, Erik Rinde and many more, travelled abroad to get contacts as well as to study. They searched American universities for the right person, and they considered – and talked to – Robert Merton, C. Wright Mills, Paul Lazarsfeld and others. Sverre Holm, a former fellow student in philosophy with Arne Næss and later to become the first professor of sociology (1949) at the University of Oslo, was on a one year visit in the USA in 1947-48. He wrote enthusiastic letters to the vice chancellor at the University of Oslo arguing that he had discovered

stimulating research groups at Columbia University where “the magician Paul Lazarsfeld” worked, a man who created new forms of research no matter where he went (referred in Thue 1997:160). Lazarsfeld had a sabbatical year in 1948-49 and was thus in a position to accept the offer from the Oslo group. He was also regarded as an ideal person for the task since he had a close connection to Robert Merton, whose work became of utmost importance to Norwegian sociology (Mjoset 1991, 2003) and also since Lazarsfeld was Director of the Bureau of Applied Social Research, affiliated to Columbia University.²⁸

Paul Lazarsfeld, an Austrian refugee to the USA, accepted the invitation to come to Oslo. As part of an American programme to rebuild Europe, he played a key role in the re-establishing of empirical sociology in Europe after WWII. Thus Oslo became one of the first European cities to benefit from the planned transformation of empirical social science from USA to Europe after WWII (Thue 1997). This leads us to the next phase: the sea change.

The sea change

The large-scale emigration of intellectuals from Central Europe to the USA before and during WWII created contacts between American and traditional European sociologists that were decisive for the international development of sociology after WWII (Thue 1990:239-40). These exchanges between the two continents of thought and influence, which H. Stuart Hughes has called ‘the sea change’, is still relatively unexplored, in particular the last part of the exchange: the return of a new form of sociology and social science to Europe.

About two-thirds of the intellectuals who fled Europe during the 1930s and 1940s were Germans and Austrians, many of Jewish heritage (Hughes 1975:2). American society was more receptive of foreign talent and open to individual merit, irrespective of birth or class or language/linguistic accents, than the Europeans were accustomed to. The social sciences were already established at many American universities and colleges, yet it would be a mistake to think that the resources were plentiful; the social sciences were rather on the bottom of the prestige hierarchy: “In a situation in which individual professors enjoyed little power or prestige, it was comparatively easy to add the foreign-born to their number” (Hughes 1975:3), so the Europeans was met with an open and inclusive atmosphere.

Thus the well-known American melting pot was in operation and a new form of social science, based on the merging of two different academic traditions, gradually took place. Some of the refugees thrived, married and had children who grew up to become Americans. Others decided to commute back and forth to their home-

lands once the war was over. And still others never enjoyed American society and culture and returned to Europe as soon as the war ended. Hughes also argues that the McCarthyism most likely had an impact on some of these decisions.²⁹

The Marshall programme to rebuild Europe had economic, political and humanitarian motives. The related program, more limited but nevertheless important, to rebuild European social science would not have not been possible without the American research foundations, such as the Fulbright Programme, the Rockefeller Foundation and the Ford Foundation, which supplied considerable resources for these purposes (Thue 1990:255).

Lazarsfeld's time in Oslo is thoroughly described in Mjoset (1991) and Thue (1997, 2005, forthcoming). There can be no doubt as to his importance. He helped Norwegian social scientists gain access to eminent international networks, American universities and research funding/scholarships, etc. In one aspect, however, his plans for Norwegian social science were not successful. He proposed a large policy project on the Norwegian public administration which would have established Norwegian sociology as a science of social engineering.³⁰ The project was, however, never launched, primarily for political reasons: the Norwegian social scientists were more philosophically and critically oriented and did not like the idea of being a useful tool for the Government.

Lazarsfeld, one of the world's leading experts on survey research, as the first American sociologist in Oslo made headlines in the newspapers. He argued that the new social sciences were able to predict the outcome of elections, so that it would be possible to eliminate expensive democratic procedures such as elections (Dagbladet 27.10.1948, see next page).

After the US election, he had to explain why he had been mistaken (VG 9.11.1948). He argued that there were two types of explanations, methodological explanations, and those related to substance. The methodological explanations were related to the fact that his data had not been a representative sample; especially they lacked lower working class in the sample. Second, only 50 percent of the population voted while the opinion polls had higher response rates. Third, the time lag between the latest opinion poll and the election was substantial (6 weeks). As to the substantive explanations, he argued that there seemed to have been changes in people's political preferences during these 6 weeks.³¹

In the following years, a visiting scholar program with the USA was established, financed by the Fulbright foundation.³² It seems that Oslo was the first city in Europe to be included and a number of American social scientists visited Oslo.³³

Thus in a few years at the end of the 1940s and beginning of the 1950s, the sea change was substantial in terms of a number of Norwegians who now had the

Unødvendig med Valg i AMERIKA
i år, hevder professor Lazarsfeld

Vi kan lese av kurver og
tabeller at republikanerne
vil seire

**Den kjente
sosiolog me-
ner at Wallace
får høyst 5
prosent av
stemmene**



Joe Louis ønsker
De forente staters
kommende presi-
dent Thomas De-
wey hell og lykke
på ferden. Tung-
vekstmesteren har
lovt ham sin fulle
tøtte, men selv
uten denne sterke
støtte er Deweys
seier sikker. — Vi
er inne i en repu-
blikansk periode og
det er et uinter-
essant valg. Flittige
sosiologer har fun-
net ut av kurver og
tabeller at repu-
blikanerne vil spre
seg fra maktsentrene i nordøst og i Midt-Vesten og gjøre innhogg i de demo-
kratiske distriktene. Selv ikke California, som pleier å være en vippestat,
byr på noen spenning i år. Republikanernes visepresident Austin Warren er
derfra, og det sikrer republikanerne et trygt flertall i statene.

possibility to study at foreign universities and the number of US academics who visited Oslo.³⁴ The Department of Sociology, University of Oslo was established in January 1950 (one year after Sverre Holm became the first professor of sociology), and the Institute for Social Research was established in February 1950. Also worth noting: the International Sociological Association was established in Paris in 1949 and Paul Lazarsfeld, still in Oslo, suggested Erik Rinde, Oslo, as the first secretary/treasurer of ISA. Thus the secretariat of ISA was located in Oslo, at the Institute for Social Research, in 1950-53.

The first generation of sociologists in Oslo had a strategic goal for their scientific work, they were trained in an international climate and they also published extensively abroad.³⁵ A few examples of their publications include: Vilhelm Aubert: *Hidden Society* (with a foreword by Howard Becker), 1965/1982; *In search of law: sociological approaches to law* (1983), "White-collar Crime and Social Justice" (Aubert 1952). Stein Rokkan wrote *Geography, Religion and Social Class: Crosscutting Cleavages in Norwegian Politics* (1967) and a number of studies on voting behaviour which he established as a research program at Institute for Social Research together with Henry Valen (Rokkan 1959, 1961).

nr. 4. 9/11.48.

Priskontrollen avgjørende for Trumans seir.

Andre faktorer: Sammenbruddet for Wallace, Taft - Hartley-loven og valgdeltakelsen.

Samtale med professor Lazarfeld, som mener vi ikke må dømme meningsmålerne strengere enn meteorologene.

Det som er skjedd er fantastisk, intet mindre enn fantastisk. Ingen tvilte på at Dewey ville vinne. A gi en fornuftig forklaring på hva som beveget amerikanerne til å velge Truman er ikke mulig idag. Det som kan sies nå blir bare gjetninger, selv om en naturligvis kan peke på enkelte faktorer som må ha vært avgjørende.

Det er den amerikanske sosiologen, professor Paul F. Lazarfeld, som sier dette i en samtale med Verdens Gang. Han har som kjent gjestefore-

lest i 3 måneder ved Universitetet i Oslo og har lagt grunnlaget for vårt nye sosiologiske institutt. Før valgene i Amerika uttalte han offentlig at det var uunødvendig å foreta valg, så sikker var han på at Dewey og republikanerne ville vinne. Men vi finner ham ikke i slett lune av den grunn. Han peker på at det var to tapere i dette spillet: Dewey og meningsmålerne. Også sosiologene, de som på vitenskapelig — og ikke på forretningsmessig — basis undersøker hva som beveger seg i folkedepet trakk gale slutninger av sine undersøkelser. Men professor Lazarfeld har et godt svar på rede hånd: Også me-

(Fortsett 6. side.)



Professor Lazarfeld.

Johan Galtung wrote on theories and methods of social research as well as a number of books on Peace and Conflict Studies (Galtung 1975). He was also the founder of the *Journal of International Peace Research*. Natalie Rogoff Ramsøy, who headed the “The occupational history study” in Norway published in addition to her study on *Sosial Mobilitet i Norge* (Rogoff Ramsøy 1977), also on cohabitation and marriage patterns. Harriet Holter wrote *Sex Roles and Social Structure*, 1970; in addition to a number of international publications (Holter 1965, 1966).

It seems fair to say that the first generation Norwegian sociologists were internationally oriented, in particular towards American social science.³⁶ However, as argued by Thue (2005), during the Cold War Norwegian academics’ relations with the USA were complicated and more pluralistic, with concurring interpretations of what American social science could offer Europe (and Norway) in political terms. This complicated the relations with the USA, contributing to a pattern of diversity and differentiation in Norwegian sociology today.



The Sea Change

Seen from left to right: Vilhelm Aubert, Christian Bay, Nancy Bay, Ingemund Gullvaag, Erna Ofstad, Harald Ofstad, Mrs. Herb Hyman (in front), Else Irenkel (?)-Brunowich, Harriet Bog (later Harriet Gullvaag/Holter). The picture is taken at Roa, in the forests north of Oslo, in the winter of 1950 or 1951. Picture provided by Sven Lindblad, Head of the library at Institute for Social Research and NOVA.

Where are we today?

A strong discipline, well integrated in international networks and research funding, with a visiting scholars programme and possibilities for organisational expansion at the University and research centres; this might be the predicted outcome of the strategy supported by the network around Erik Rinde, Arne Næss, Vilhelm Aubert, Stein Rokkan, and others. What have we achieved? Sociology will soon be evaluated by a committee appointed by the Norwegian Research Council in collaboration with the Council for the Faculties for the Social Sciences. It is thus premature to give a qualified opinion of the state of art within sociology today. Let me nevertheless, try to provide some personal comments.

Sociology today, more than 50 years after its institutionalisation, is an established discipline at universities, with colleges (*høgskoler*) and a large number of

research institutes for applied social research outside the universities.³⁷ It seems fair to say that despite differentiation, Norwegian sociology continues to have a strong link with American sociology, a commitment to empirically oriented research, and to the use of middle-range theories.

Compared with many other countries, the Norwegian research council has been generous to the social sciences, including sociology. Most of the funding has, however, been concentrated in research programs where applications are evaluated on dubious criteria of relevance in addition to scientific criteria of quality. Applied social research has grown to an industry that employs a large number of sociologists who undertake research and development projects from public and private agencies, as well as from various interest groups. This development has had some consequences. As argued by Engelstad (1996), sociology today comprises a large number of sub-disciplines, without an obvious core.

Since the 1970s there has been a considerable influx of students to the social sciences, including sociology. Norwegian sociology has therefore been successful at the national level: we enjoy a comparatively high academic status; there are a large number of sociologists working in various positions as researchers, in public administration, media, education as well as private business. Yet I think it might be expected that the planned evaluation of Norwegian sociology will point to low numbers of international publications. Despite our national success, we are not visible enough on the international stage. The policies of the Research Council, established in collaboration with the Government and supported by social scientists, have emphasized nationally oriented research goals, in particular within applied research programs, which is where the resources have flowed. Norwegian sociological research has therefore been domestically oriented, in stark contrast to the ambitions of the war-time network.

To conclude

The history of the genesis of Norwegian sociology is fascinating, and this brief essay can only give a sketchy overview. At a personal level we have seen tragedy and triumph. For sociology as a discipline, we could argue that the process has taken a long time and the situation could have been different if Sigurd Ibsen had been appointed, and/or Arvid Bordersen had remained in Norway. The importance of the Næss group and the war-time network cannot be overestimated; indeed they were the entrepreneurs of Norwegian sociology. Today, Norwegian sociology is strong, yet too domestically oriented.

Notes

1. This essay therefore supplements previous studies of the history of Norwegian sociology by Otnes 1977, Thue 1990, Mjøset 1991, Allardt 1994, Engelstad 1996 and Thue 2005.
2. The interest already exists in other countries. Chelly Halsey suggests the following references included in this essay: Soffer (1982), Bourdieu (1984), Bulmer (1985), Lepenies (1988), Abbott (1999); in addition to his own work: Halsey (2004) as well as Halsey and Runciman (2005).
3. The Belgian mathematician Lambert Adolphe Quetelet (1796-1874) was one of the most influential statisticians of the nineteenth century in Europe. His *Body Mass Index* is still used today. He was the first to use the normal curve as other than an error law. He collected and analyzed statistics on crime, mortality, etc. for the government in Belgium, and devised improvements in census taking.
(see www.famousbelgians.net/quetelet.htm)
4. The habit, called “natt-frieri” (nightly visits with the purpose of proposal), implied that a young man could visit a young women living with her parents at night. The two would have to be at an age when marriage was expected to be the outcome. Apparently, people (including her parents) knew about these visits and (more or less) accepted it (although the man would have to climb up outside the house to get access to the women he wanted to see). If she got pregnant and he did not marry her, she (and her family) would be disgraced, as would he; so the habit was not entirely without its complications, and indicated an understanding of balance from both sides.
5. This paragraph is attributed to Bjørn Hvinden.
6. In fact, in 1864 Eilert Sundt founded the Worker’s Association in Christiania.
7. We may deduce from Sigurd Ibsen’s arguments that the University did give some courses with insight into the new social science in the 1890s. Per Otnes, in his large overview article on Norwegian sociology (Otnes 1977: 57-100) mentions several persons involved with important reform issues of their days, affiliated with the University; such as Jacob Mohn (1838-82), a lawyer involved with Child Labour Act, Axel Holst (1860-1931), professor of medicine, involved with the housing conditions of the poor.
8. Brodersen (1994:35) suggests that Ibsen used the phrase ‘samfundslære’ instead of sociology in order to improve communication.
9. Sigurd Ibsen argues that sociology will use the method applied in of natural science, which is “positive, inductive and experimental; based on observations and experiments, and moves from the single case to the more general, from the known into the unknown” (Ibsen 1896, referred in Langslet 2004:147). This, says Ibsen, is the only true scientific method, and the reason why it is related to the natural sciences is simply that they were the first to utilize it.
10. None of the members of the committee was expected to be favourably disposed towards the ‘Liberal party’s action’ (Venstre-aksjonen) for Ibsen and sociology.
11. Hughes argues that the decade of the 1890s was the decade of revolt against positivism, including the tendency to discuss human behaviour in terms of analogies drawn from the natural sciences. This revolt, however, was the task for the frontiers, such as S. Freud, whereas influential thinkers of the period – such as Durkheim and Mosca – remained essentially in the positivist tradition. And even Freud, Hughes argues, continued to use mechanistic language drawn from the natural sciences long after their discov-

- eries had burst the framework of their inherited vocabulary. (Hughes 1958:37).
12. The essay was written with the explicit intention of discrediting sociology as an emerging science in order to hinder the establishment of a chair in sociology at the University of Brussels (Brodersen 1994:38). However, chairs of sociology already existed in the USA (Halsey, personal communication).
 13. According to Brodersen (1994:36) Durkheim was professor of sociology and education (pedagogics) (in Bordeaux) in the 1890s. In Germany, professors of other disciplines taught sociology (Weber was appointed a chair as a professor in state economy (Staats Oekonomi) in Freiburg in 1894, Simmel was a philosopher). The first British chair of sociology was established at London School of Economics and Political Science (LSE) in 1907. But a lectureship was held there from 1903 by the Finnish philosopher/anthropologist Westermarck (see Halsey 2004).
 14. It took 52 years before the first professorship in sociology at the University of Oslo was announced (1949).
 15. I was fortunate to know Arvid Brodersen when he lived in Oslo in the late 1980s and 1990s, thus some details here are based on personal communication. As usual, memories may corrugate; hence the need for more research by historians of science should be obvious.
 16. In 1935, Parliament, dominated by the social democratic party, decided to establish a personal professorial chair at the University in so-called Work Science (Arbeidslære) for Dr. Ewald Bosse. Again, the University disliked being instructed by politicians, yet a committee was appointed by the University to evaluate Bosse's qualifications (he had a doctoral degree from University of Kiel). The committee concluded that he was not qualified for a professorship and a professor in Work Science was never appointed at the University of Oslo (Bordersen 1994).
 17. One of the three professors of economy at University of Oslo who interviewed Brodersen was Ragnar Frisch, later Nobel Price laureate in economics.
 18. See Brodersen 1937/1994, footnote 3, for an overview of the relatives and colleagues of Veblen that he met during his trip across the US continent in 1935.
 19. Brodersen's contacts with the Germans *during* WWII might have been uncomfortable for a career at the University in post-war Norway, with strong anti-German attitudes. He was undertaking Intelligence Service tasks on behalf of some members of the underground resistance movement, called XU. Most Norwegians, including other members of the XU, were not informed about his role, yet they might have known that he had been in touch with high-level representatives of the German-Norwegian Regime throughout the whole war. I would guess this is one of the main reasons why Bordersen was offered the OECD job just after the war. The job offer came through a friend of Brodersen, professor Alf Sommerfelt at University of Oslo, who had stayed in London during WWII, and who was familiar with United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, an emerging organisation to promote international collaboration. In his auto-biography Brodersen deals extensively with this period of his life, perhaps related to a desire to tell the story from his point of view.
 20. After he returned to Norway, a selection of his articles was published in Brodersen (1994), and he collaborated with Sven Lindblad, librarian at the Institute for Social Research, who has published a bibliography of Brodersen's publications (Lindblad 1994). Brodersen also donated his entire collection of scientific books to the library at Institute for social research in Oslo.

21. Mia Berner writes in her auto biography that Wickstrom-Nielsen was her boyfriend, and that the books were intended as a gift to her, thus they are in her possession. She was also a member of the Næss seminar group.
22. The two books on Middletown are still fascinating reading. Based on available public statistical information, the researchers strategically selected Middletown, a town in the Mid West, as a typical American town and explored it in depth, using both ethnographic and survey data to get a full picture of the typical American town. The first book is based on data collected in the mid-1920s, whereas the second book is based on the researchers' return to Middletown 10 years later, i.e. mid 1930s, in order to study social change and potential conflicts related to the recession etc. The books cover a wide range of social institutions and people's attitudes towards these, such as labour market and income distribution, the family, child-rearing, consumption patterns, educational systems and training, leisure activities and organisation, religious activity and organisation, and community activities, including caring for the less able, health and group solidarity. The main conclusion in the 1939 book was that "Middletown is overwhelmingly living by the values by which it lived in 1925.....(however).... the conflicts under the surface in Middletown are not so much new as more insistent, more difficult to avoid, harder to smooth over." (Lynd and Lynd 1937:489-490). Certainly these books have inspired a number of local community studies within sociology. In Norway, they inspired Sverre Holm, who wanted to do a study of Sauda. However, for various reasons the study was undertaken in Mo i Rana (Thue, personal communication).
23. After the war, the members of the seminar group learned that the mysterious parachutist was not a British agent (as they thought in 1943), but rather had been a member of their own group before WWII (see Thue 1990 for more details).
24. Lundberg was invited to Oslo after Larzarsfeld, but he travelled to Stockholm, where he had more of an impact (Fredrik Thue, personal communication).
25. Russell argues that he "as regards methods, (is) more in sympathy with the logical positivists than with any other existing school", yet he also differs from them in his attempt "to combine a general outlook akin to Hume's with the methods that have grown out of modern logic." (Preface). From the Introduction of the book we can read the following: "When the behaviourist observes the doings of animals, and decides whether these show knowledge or error, he is not thinking of himself as an animal, but as an at least hypothetically inerrant recorder of what actually happens. He "knows" that animals are deceived by mirrors, and he believe himself to "know" that *he* – an organism like any other – is observing, he gives a false air of objectivity to the results of his observation. As soon as we remember the possible fallibility of the observer, we have introduced the serpent into the behaviourist's paradise. The serpent whispers doubts, and has no difficulty in quoting scientific scripture for the purpose. (...) These considerations induce doubt, and therefore lead us to a critical scrutiny of what passes for knowledge. This critical scrutiny is "theory of knowledge", ..., or "epistemology", as it is also called." (Russell 1940:15). Russell was also important politically, in particular for Stein Rokkan (Thue 2005, chapter 8).
26. The Næss group was therefore from the very beginning an interdisciplinary oriented group, comprising not only sociologists, but also political scientists (Rokkan, Bay, Tønnesson), psychologists (Rommetveit, Saugstad, Gullvaag Holter), and philosophers (Ofstad). See Thue (2005) for more information.
27. According to Brodersen (1982:186) XU was the Intelligence Arm of the underground

- resistance movement in Norway.
28. Lazarsfeld had already in 1925 started an applied research institute in Vienna. He emigrated to the USA in 1932 and within a short period of time he had established three new independent research centres there.
 29. In the first period after WWII, McCarthy headed public political prosecutions against citizens claimed to be communists, socialists and others undermining, as it was claimed, the American society.
 30. According to Thue (personal communication) Robert Lynd took an interest in Lazarsfeld's proposed project on the Norwegian economic planning system.
 31. I wish to thank Lars Mjøset for this information. The story, a bit bizarre for us today, is reported here since it reminds us about the state of knowledge within survey research at this time. It also reminds us about the rather naïve believe researchers seemed to hold on the power of social science. The thought that social science could substitute democratic traditions such as elections is horrendous to us today.
 32. In a letter to the Vice Chancellor at the University of Oslo, dated 10th of October 1949, Paul Lazarsfeld writes: "I think there is a huge demand for a Centre for Social Science Research in Europe. Oslo has a genuine opportunity to become such a Centre unless too much time gets wasted." (My translation from Thue, 1997:162, footnote 22). It seems obvious that Lazarsfeld wanted to help his Norwegian colleagues in establishing social science at the University, yet he also might have the impression that the Oslo group was amongst the first scientific groups in Europe where social science might proliferate. Given the connections Lazarsfeld had in the USA, it is not unlikely that he was the mover to include Oslo into the Visiting program.
 33. In addition to Paul Lazarsfeld, David Krech, Herbert Hyman, Daniel Katz, Talcot Parsons and others visited Oslo in the late 1940s and the beginning of 1950s (see Thue 2005, forthcoming).
 34. Stein Rokkan travelled abroad for four years, to Paris, where he worked with Arne Næss at UNESCO, then to University of Chicago, Columbia University and London School of Economics; Vilhelm Aubert went to University of California at Berkeley and Columbia University; etc.
 35. The Anglo-American reorientation of European universities was not a specific Norwegian feature; Europe culturally and intellectually went through a period of 'Americanisation' after WWII. It could, however, be the case that Norway was more inclined to be influenced by American social scientists since Norway had a weak tradition of social science before WWII. Also, Thue argues that Norwegians and Americans shared some general political world views, with similar liberal, universalistic values, associated with a vision of 'one united world'. This also could have contributed to a more receptive climate for American social science in Norway than other countries.
 36. Per Otnes points to two other schools of thought that could be briefly mentioned as less influential, but nevertheless part of Norwegian sociology: the phenomenological school (related to Husserl and Schutz (in which Arvid Bordersen was interested) and Sartre (in which Dag Østerberg is interested), and the structural school (which would include Levy-Strauss (in which Sverre Holm was interested). See Otnes, 2005, for a discussion of Østerberg's achievements.
 37. Sociologists have also been vital in establishing the Faculties of Social Science and Departments of Sociology at the new Universities. Ørjar Øyen at the University of Bergen, Tore Lindbekk at the University of Trondheim and Yngvar Løchen at the

University of Tromsø have been honored by the Norwegian Sociological Association for their entrepreneurship and contribution to Norwegian Sociology. See Birkelund 1998, Mjøset 1998 and Birkelund 2003.

References

- Abbott, A. 1999. *Department and Discipline: Chicago Sociology at One Hundred*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Allardt, Erik. 1994. "Scandinavian Sociology and its European Roots and Elements", in: B. Nedelmann and P. Sztompka (ed.): *Sociology in Europe. In Search of Identity*. New York: de Gruyter.
- Aubert, Vilhelm. 1952. "White-collar crime and social structure." *The American journal of sociology*. Vol.58 (1952):3.
- Aubert, Vilhelm. (1965) 1982. "Secrecy: the underground as a social system." In: *The Hidden Society*. New Brunswick and London: Transaction Books.
- Aubert, Vilhelm. 1983. *In search of law: sociological approaches to law*. Oxford: Martin Robertson.
- Birkelund, Gunn E. 1998. "Norsk sosiologforenings hederspris 1998: Ørjar Øyen." www.sosiologforeningen.no/hedersprisen.html
- Birkelund, Gunn E. 2003. "Norsk sosiologforenings hederspris 2003: Tore Lindbekk." www.sosiologforeningen.no/hedersprisen.html
- Bourdieu, P. 1984. *Homo Academicus*. Paris: Ed. De Minuit.
- Brodersen, Arvid. 1982. *Fra et nomadeliv. Erindringer*. Oslo: Gyldendal Forlag.
- Brodersen, Arvid. 1994. *Sosiologi som opplevelse*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Bulmer, M. 1985. *Essays on the History of British Sociological Research*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Christophersen, H. O. 1962. *Eilert Sundt: en dikter i kjensgjerninger*. Oslo: Gyldendal.
- Christophersen, H.O., N. Christie and K. Petersen. 1974-1978. *Eilert Sundt. Verker i Utvalg*. 11 Volumes. Oslo: Gyldendal.
- Engelstad, Fredrik. 1996. "Norsk sosiologi siden 1969: Problemer og utfordringer." *Tidsskrift for samfunnsforskning*, 37: 224-252.
- Eriksen, John and Tone Schou Wetlesen. 1996. "Family Theory and Research in Norway: A Review Essay of the 1980s." In: *Intercultural Variation in Family Research and Theory: Implications for Cross-National Studies*. Vol. II. New York/London: The Haworth Press, Inc.
- Galtung, Johan. 1967. *Theory and Methods of Social Research*. New York : Columbia University Press.

- Galtung, Johan. 1975. *Peace: research, education, action*. Copenhagen : Ejlers.
- Halsey, A. H. 2004. *A History of Sociology in Britain*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Halsey, A. H. and Runciman, W. G. (eds). 2005. *British Sociology Seen From Without and Within*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Holter, Harriet. 1965. "Attitudes towards employee participation in company decision-making processes." *Human Relations*, 18(1965)4.
- Holter, Harriet. 1966. "Women's occupational situation in Scandinavia." *International Labour Review*, vol. 93, no. 4, April 1966.
- Hughes, H. Stuart. 1975. *The Sea Change: The Migration of Social Thought, 1930-1965*. New York: Harper & Row Publ.
- Hughes, H. Stuart. 1958. *Consciousness and Society. The Reorientation of European Social Thought 1890-1930*. New York: Octagon Books.
- Hvinden, Bjørn (ed). 2000. *Romanifolket og det norske samfunnet*. Bergen: Fagbokforlaget.
- Langslet, Lars Roar. 2004. *Sønnen. En biografi om Sigurd Ibsen*. Oslo: Cappelen.
- Lepenies, W. 1988. *Between Literature and Science: The Rise of Sociology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lindblad, Svein. 1994. *Arvid Brodersen : en bibliografi*. Oslo : Institutt for samfunnsforskning.
- Lynd, Robert S. And Helen Merrell Lynd. 1929. *Middeltown. A Study in American Culture*. New York: Harcourt, Brace.
- Lynd, Robert S. And Helen Merrell Lynd. 1937. *Middeltown in Transition. A Study in Cultural Conflicts*. New York: Harcourt, Brace.
- McKeon and Stein Rokkan. (eds.) 1951. *Democracy in a world of tensions: a symposium prepared by UNESCO*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Mjøset, Lars. 1991. *Kontroverser I norsk sosiologi*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Mjøset, Lars. 1998. "Norsk sosiologforenings hederspris 1998: Yngvar Løchen". www.sosiologforeningen.no/hedersprisen.html
- Mjøset, Lars. 2003. "Et savnet brev fra Merton. Merton, Columbia-sosiologien og Norge." *Sosiologi I dag*, vol. 33: 108-118.
- Otnes, Per. 1977. "Social Change and Social Science in Norway." *Scandinavian Sociology*, vol. 25: 57-100.
- Otnes, Per. 2005. "Dag Osterberg: Determination through ruptures." *Acta Sociologica*, coming.
- Ramsøy, Natalie Rogoff. 1953. *Recent trends in occupational mobility / Natalie Rogoff ; with a foreword by Herbert Goldhammer*. New York : Arno Press.
- Ramsøy, Natalie Rogoff. 1977. *Sosial mobilitet i Norge*. Oslo: Tiden forlag.

- Rokkan, Stein. 1959. "Electoral activity, party membership and organizational influence : an initial analysis of data from the Norwegian election studies." *Acta sociologica*, vol. 4 - fasc. 1, Copenhagen 1959.
- Rokkan, Stein. 1961. "Mass suffrage, secret voting and political participation." *European journal of sociology* 2 (1961), 132-152.
- Rokkan, Stein. 1967. *Geography, Religion and Social Class: Crosscutting Cleavages in Norwegian Politics*. New York: The Free Press.
- Russell, Bertrand. 1940. *An Inquiry Into Meaning and Truth. The William James lectures for 1940. Delivered at Harvard University*. London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd.
- Soffer, R. N. 1982. "Why do Disciplines Fail? The Strange Case of British Sociology." *English Historical Review*, 97: 767-802.
- Sundt, Eilert. 1980/1855. *On Marriage in Norway*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press (translated and introduced by Michael Drake).
- Thue, Fredrik. 1990. "Fra seminar-nettverk til institusjonalisert forskningsprogram" I H. Grimen (red.): *Modernitet: Differensiering og rasjonalisering*. Bergen: Ariadne Forlag.
- Thue, Fredrik. 1997. *Empirisme og demokrati. Norsk samfunnsforskning som etterkrigsprosjekt*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Thue, Fredrik. 2005. *In Quest of a Democratic Social Order : The Americanization of Norwegian Social Scholarship 1918-1970*. Ph.d. thesis. University of Oslo.
- Vogt, Johan. 1968. "Sundt, Eilert Lund". In: *International Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences*. MacMillan.