

The intellectual space in Europe, 19th-21st Centuries

Introduction

Gisèle Sapiro

Translated by Richard Nice

The economic and administrative construction of Europe seems to have had no parallel in the intellectual space, in spite of the still vivid memory of a prestigious past and the strong incentives provided by the agencies of the Union. To understand the obstacles to the emergence of such a space, one has to set it in a long historical perspective, that of the formation of the nation states. This process contributed to the break-up of the European scientific community, which had communicated in a single language, Latin. Vernacularisation was closely bound up with the rise of the book market and the expansion of the readership to social groups not necessarily trained in the classical humanities – women, the urban middle classes, and then the working class. Whereas, in the 18th century, French was the language of culture of the European courts, the *Bildungsbürgertum* would soon set the austere rigour of German *Kultur* against the superficial charm of French *civilisation*,¹ starting the process of the nationalisation of literate culture. While English and German rose to ascendancy as the languages of science, from the mid-19th century translation became the main mode of transnational circulation of texts.

The proliferation of nation states in 19th-century Europe was accompanied by the development of the intellectual professions and their differentiation, which took varying forms depending on the political and administrative structures of the various countries and the relations of competition among them.² Because of the central role assigned to culture, the construction of national identities depended very strongly on intellectuals as producers of collective representations – men of letters, publicists and social thinkers. Whether announcing a radiant future or nostalgic for a lost past, these intellectuals assumed the role of prophets of the modern world. This construction took place in the framework of an ever more intense

¹ Norbert Elias, *The Civilizing Process* [1939], Oxford: Blackwell, 1984.

² Andrew Abbott, *The System of Professions: An Essay on the Division of Expert Labor*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1988; Gisèle Sapiro, 'Les Professions intellectuelles, entre l'État, l'entrepreneuriat et l'industrie', *Le Mouvement social*, 214, janvier-mars 2006, 3-24.

international competition, with Europe as its centre, and the model circulated from one country to another in a mimetic process. In the following century this new principle of cohesion, which supplanted religion to form abstract territorially-based entities, led to the murderous consequences with which we are all too familiar, from colonialism to the two World Wars, and then to the ethnic wars.

After the First World War, the intellectual relations that were starting to develop among the countries – academic exchanges, pooling of knowledge, organisation of education and research – were made a component of international relations, in the hope that they would favour the pacification of minds. In spite of the rivalries and tensions that persisted, notably between the three great powers, France, Germany and Great Britain, these relations were institutionalised with the creation in 1924 of the International Institute of Intellectual Cooperation, the forerunner of UNESCO, which encouraged the formation of international agencies (societies of authors, professional associations, federations for education and journalism) in areas where they did not exist. These played an important role in promoting the corporate interests of intellectuals, in diffusing the model of professional organisation and in harmonising regulation (copyright, intellectual property). In parallel with the official exchanges between states and with the international bodies, or in conjunction with them, philanthropic foundations fostered the internationalisation of exchanges in the human and social sciences. In addition to these institutional factors, some political factors of the time helped to transcend national boundaries: socialist internationalism, pacifist humanism, the determination to reconstruct after the two World Wars, migrations, whether voluntary or forced (exile), the mobilisation against fascism, and social movements such as May 1968.

The European states played a central part in the construction of this international intellectual space, which was not limited to Europe, particularly in the inter-war period the Wars. Indeed, the very idea and definition of Europe were then, as now, an object of struggle between opposing political camps, from the left to the right. In the face of a conception of Europe as a ‘crossroads’ of cultures which prevailed on the side of pacifist humanism, Nazi Germany aspired to establish a new European order under its own hegemony, based on the theory of the superiority of the ‘Aryan race’ and entailing the extermination of the Jewish and Romany peoples. This ‘project’ led to the near total destruction of the Old Continent. On its ruins were built two ideological systems, communism and (neo-)liberalism, creating a geopolitical division that lasted fifty years and strongly mobilised the intellectuals on both sides for or against the system that was dominant in their zone. While, under the reign of the USSR, the countries of Eastern Europe were converted to state socialism, the neoliberal

doctrine spread through the western world, whose centre had shifted from Europe to the United States. The new world order inaugurated by the GATT agreement of 1947 demanded the dismantling of the boundaries set by the nation states, with a view to the free exchange of goods. The European project promoted by a group of modernisers led by Jean Monnet saw the light of day in this context, in conjunction with the Marshall Plan, at a time when the Cold War was at its height and the wars of decolonization were beginning to rage.

But, as already noted, in contrast to the development of the nation states, the economic and administrative unification of this territorial entity has not been accompanied by a genuine cultural unification. Several hypotheses spring to mind to explain this phenomenon. First, economic and monetary logic tends towards homogenisation, whereas, in cultural terms, Europe is characterised by diversity. The advocates of a comprehensive process of unification tend to see this diversity as an obstacle rather than an asset, although it is strongly rooted in each national cultural habitus. Like religion, national identity has been constructed around symbols and rituals. But language has played a particular role in the formation of national communities. It has sometimes been imposed by force, but has become their cultural cement. Now, the question of languages is at stake in the struggles around the construction of Europe, even if English (or rather an impoverished and technical dialect of it) predominates. Language is also a barrier to the formation of a public space in Europe. The fragmentation of this space has no doubt been accentuated on the one hand by the development of national systems of higher education, on the other by the expansion of the social base from which intellectuals are recruited – multilingualism, a characteristic of social elites, is no longer the norm among them. And these intellectuals find their audience mainly at the national level.³ It is not simply a matter of a withdrawal of intellectuals into the national sphere: the process of autonomisation of the intellectual fields relative to the expectations of the economic and political powers, as well as the lesson drawn from the experience of a blood-stained past and the deconstruction of national ideologies, no doubt also explain why Europe has not found its army of prophets. Experts rather than intellectuals have involved themselves in the construction of Europe,⁴ intensifying among the populations the sense of dispossession and exclusion from a process carried out over their heads. The defection of the European intellectuals is also partly explained by the cultural hegemony exercised by the United States

³ Abram de Swaan, 'The European Void: the Democratic Deficit as a Cultural Deficiency', in John Fossman and Philip Schlesinger (eds.), *The European Union and the Public Sphere: A Communicative Space in the Making?* London & New York: Routledge, 2007, 135-53.

in several intellectual domains, from literature to the various disciplines of the human sciences, which has meant that relations with that country have been prioritised (evidence of this will be found in this volume). Thus the relationship with America is central to understanding the ‘construction of Europe’, not least in the intellectual domain. Faced with this hegemony, there are also those who fear, with some reason, a deepening of the North-South divide.⁵ However, beyond the burgeoning domain of ‘European studies’,⁶ more or less autonomous attempts to create a ‘collective imagination’ have proliferated, with anthologies, collections, multi-authored works⁷ and historical series.⁸ But their impact remains limited. Perhaps this is because, unlike national cultures, the ‘European’ identity is not inculcated in schools; and perhaps also because intellectuals have lost a large part of their charismatic power. This history could therefore also be that of the rise and fall of the figure of the intellectual as it emerged in Europe in the age of the Enlightenment.

Verifying these hypotheses would require a large-scale research project, breaking with the methodological nationalism that still prevails in intellectual history. This volume precisely undertakes to construct the object of such a project. It is the fruit of collective reflection carried out within the ESSE European network, based on a common theoretical approach and the comparison of empirical work; it seeks to offer both an overview of the field and perspectives for research with a view to the development of a social history of the intellectual space in Europe.⁹ At the same time it aims to set out methodological principles for a transnational intellectual history, a brief glimpse of which will be offered in this introduction.

⁴ As shown by several contributions to the issue of *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales* on ‘Constructions européennes: concurrences nationales et stratégies transnationales’, ed. Antonin Cohen, Yves Dezalay and Dominique Marchetti, 166-67, mars 2007.

⁵ The ‘European’ identity was, in the past, constructed in large part against the Ottoman Empire, as pointed out by Jean-Frédéric Schaub, *L’Europe a-t-elle une histoire?*, Paris: Albin Michel, 2008.

⁶ Craig Calhoun, ‘European Studies: Always Already There and Still in Formation’, *Comparative European Politics*, 1, 2003, 5-20; Ioana Popa, ‘La Structuration internationale des études européennes: un espace scientifique dissymétrique’, in Didier Georgakakis and Marine de Lassalle (eds.), *La ‘Nouvelle Gouvernance européenne’. Genèses et usages politiques d’un livre blanc*, Strasbourg: Presses Universitaires de Strasbourg, 2007, 117-48.

⁷ See for example Ursula Keller and Ilma Rakusa (eds.), *Writing Europe: What is European About the Literatures of Europe? Essays from 33 European Countries*, Budapest & New York: CEU Press, 2004.

⁸ Such as the ‘Making of Europe’ series coordinated by the historian Jacques Le Goff and launched in 1988 by five European publishers: Laterza (Italy), Seuil (France), Beck (Germany), Blackwell (UK) and Critica (Spain). See Hervé Serry, ‘Faire l’Europe’: enjeux intellectuels et enjeux éditoriaux d’une collection transnationale’, in Gisèle Sapiro (ed.), *Les Contradictions de la globalisation éditoriale*, Paris, Nouveau monde, 2009, 227-52.

⁹ This work was produced within the ESSE network (Pour un Espace des Sciences Sociales Européen), financed par the Sixth Framework Programme of the EU. I would like to thank Amotz Giladi for his assistance in preparing the French manuscript and Johan Heilbron for his help in the completion of this undertaking.

First, the approach developed here apprehends the intellectual world not as a disembodied space existing only in the heaven of ideas but as a social universe composed of agents – individuals and institutions – which constitute mediations amenable to socio-historical analysis. In the 18th century this universe acquired a relative autonomy with respect to the political, economic and religious spheres, which justifies a distinct methodological treatment of its mode of functioning, even if external logics continue to bear on it – in varying degrees, which need to be studied.¹⁰ In addition, the division of intellectual labour and the academic institutionalisation of the disciplines of the human sciences led to the differentiation of the fields of intellectual production,¹¹ which are battlegrounds for the imposition of the legitimate definition of the activity in question (literature, philosophy, history, sociology, etc.). This is why the study of the various fields benefits from being resituated in the space in which this struggle is fought out, a space that we shall limit here to literary and/or learned culture, to which the adjective ‘intellectual’ refers, a culture characterised by the central role of the written word and from which both the literary tradition and the human and social sciences have sprung, even if the former has moved towards the arts as the latter has turned towards the natural sciences.¹² At the very moment when this space was bifurcating, the ‘intellectuals’ emerged as a social category and asserted their symbolic power as a political force.¹³

This process of differentiation and autonomisation coincided with the rise of the nation states. While the relationship between the two phenomena remains to be studied, the nationalisation of intellectual life in the 19th century is an indisputable fact, which partly explains why this approach was first embedded in a national framework. However, the national delimitation of the fields of cultural production has rightly been questioned and challenged by a number of researchers.¹⁴ Moreover, some research has undertaken exploration of the transnational dimension, from various angles ranging from comparison of

¹⁰ Jürgen Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*, Cambridge (Mass.): The MIT Press, 1989; Lewis Coser, *Men of Ideas: A Sociologist's View*, New York: The Free Press, 1965, new edn. 1970; Roger Chartier, *The Cultural Origins of the French Revolution*, London: Duke U.P., 1991; Daniel Roche, *Les Républicains des lettres: gens de culture et Lumières au XVIIIe siècle*, Paris: Fayard, 1988; Didier Masseau, *L'Invention de l'intellectuel dans l'Europe du XVIIIe siècle*, Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1994.

¹¹ On the concept of the field, See Pierre Bourdieu, *The Rules of Art: Genesis and Structure of the Literary Field*, Cambridge: Polity Press, 1996, and *Homo Academicus*, Cambridge: Polity Press, 1988.

¹² Wolf Lepenies, *Between Literature and Science: The Rise of Sociology*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988; Johan Heilbron, *The Rise of Social Theory*, Cambridge: Polity, 1995.

¹³ Christophe Charle, *Naissance des 'intellectuels': 1880-1900*, Paris: Minuit, 1990, and *Les Intellectuels en Europe au XIXe siècle: Essai d'histoire comparée*, Paris: Seuil, 1996.

¹⁴ It was discussed, in particular with reference to the cases of Belgium, Quebec, Switzerland, East and West Germany, and Galicia, in the ESSE network, at the first conference organised by Joseph Jurt (ed.), *Champ littéraire et nation*, Freiburg im Breisgau: Frankreich-Zentrum der Universität Freiburg, 2007.

intellectual fields in Europe or the cultural construction of national identities to the ‘global republic of letters’.¹⁵

These explorations have raised a number of problems also encountered by specialists in cultural transfers.¹⁶ The limits of comparativism, especially the methodological nationalism it presupposes, have rightly been underscored.¹⁷ It raises problems of definition that require an effort to historicize the categories of classification of the social world, starting, for our purposes, with the very notion of ‘intellectuals’.¹⁸ In this regard, the experimental character of the comparative history of intellectuals and its reflexive dimension has been emphasized.¹⁹ Moreover, the question whether the comparable phenomena are the product of the same structures or of the circulation of cultural models has no answer *a priori*, but only *a posteriori*, on the basis of an empirical analysis, for each case.²⁰ Methods of cross-comparison have been put forward, under the name of ‘entangled history’ or ‘*histoire croisée*’, to find a way out of the false dilemma of comparativism and intercultural exchanges.²¹ The study of cultural transfers requires for its part not only a meticulous reconstruction of the spaces of reference – without which it is likely to miss what is essential, namely the forms of reappropriation and reinterpretation of the models or goods which are circulating, in accordance with the specific stakes of the space of reception – but also requires a structural analysis of the system of relations within which those spaces are more broadly set. Likewise, comparativism is only possible on condition that one also compares the social structures within which the phenomenon in question is located, whether it be the demarcation and hierarchy of the disciplines – in order to understand the position of any one of them – or the sociogenesis of the institutions of intellectual life.²²

¹⁵ Christophe Charle, *Les Intellectuels en Europe au XIXe siècle*, *op. cit.*; Anne-Marie Thiesse, *La Création des identités nationales. Europe XVIIe-XXe siècle*, Paris, Seuil, 1998; Pascale Casanova, *La République mondiale des lettres*, Paris: Seuil, 1999.

¹⁶ Michel Espagne and Michael Werner, *Philologiques*, Paris, Éditions de la Maison des Sciences de l’Homme, 1990-1994, 3 volumes.

¹⁷ Michel Espagne, ‘Au-delà du comparatisme’, in *Les Transferts culturels franco-allemands*, Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1999, 35-49.

¹⁸ Christophe Charle, ‘Intellectuels, *Bildungsbürgertum* et professions au XIXe siècle: Essai de bilan historiographique comparé (France, Allemagne)’, *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales*, no 106-107, mars 1995, 85-95; and ‘L’Histoire comparée des intellectuels en Europe. Quelques points de méthode et propositions de recherche’, in Michel Trebitsch and Marie-Christine Granjon (eds.), *Pour une histoire comparée des intellectuels*, Brussels: Complexe, 1998, 39-60.

¹⁹ Michel Trebitsch, ‘L’Histoire comparée des intellectuels comme histoire expérimentale’, in *ibid.*, 61-78.

²⁰ For a discussion of these problems and case studies, see Christophe Charle, Julien Vincent and Jay Winter, *Anglo-French Attitudes: Comparisons and Transfers between English and French Intellectuals since the Eighteenth Century*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007.

²¹ See the clarification by Michael Werner and Bénédicte Zimmermann, ‘Penser l’histoire croisée: entre empirie et réflexivité’, *Annales HSS*, no 1, 2003, 7-36.

²² Fabrice Clément, Marta Roca i Escoda, Franz Schultheis and Michel Berclaz, *L’Inconscient académique*, Zurich: Éditions Seismo, 2006.

The study of the social conditions of the circulation of ideas raises some specific problems, which Pierre Bourdieu addressed in a lecture he gave at the inauguration of the Frankreich Zentrum of the University of Freiburg (Germany), with which this volume opens.²³ Such a study requires both the reconstruction of the categories of classification specific to the spaces of origin and reception and the analysis of the modalities of the transfer. Intercultural exchanges involve the circulation of texts (we limit ourselves here to the written word, but this can also include other media) and/or of persons. The modalities are not the same in the two cases. As Bourdieu, following Marx, points out, texts circulate without their contexts, and this is a constant source of misunderstandings. Translation, which is, as has been said, one of the main modes of cultural transfer of the written word, implies in addition the substitution of one text for another, often giving rise to conflicts of interpretation which compound those arising from the polysemy of the works (one could give as an example the French translations of Max Weber). But comparison of the translation with the original becomes meaningful only in the light of the translation norms of the space of reception,²⁴ just as the various interpretations and uses made of the translated texts have to be related to the specific stakes in that space, as implied by prefaces, notes, commentaries, reviews and controversies. As well as providing a measure of the intensity of intercultural exchanges,²⁵ the circulation of texts, especially through translation, raises the question of the mediators – publishers, official cultural representatives, translators, critics – and the various logics (economic, political and cultural) of mediation.²⁶

The circulation of persons is the other modality of intellectual transfers. Being relatively internationalised, the intellectual life offers – albeit unequally, depending on the position occupied in the national and/or international space – many opportunities for travel: symposia,

²³ We are grateful to Jérôme Bourdieu for allowing us to reproduce this text, which was first published in the *Romanistische Zeitschrift für Literaturgeschichte/Cahiers d'histoire des littératures romanes*, 14e année, 1-2, 1990, 1-10 and subsequently in *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales*, 145, 2002, 3-8, and in Pierre Bourdieu, *Forschen und Handeln. Recherche et action. Conférences prononcées au Frankreich-Zentrum de l'Université de Fribourg en Brisgau*, ed. Joseph Jurt, Freiburg: Rombach, 2004, 21-33.

²⁴ See Gideon Toury, 'The Nature and Role of Norms in Translation', *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*, Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1995, 53-69. Translation practices also differ, however, according to the type of social constraint that bears on them; cf. Gisèle Sapiro, 'Normes de traduction et contraintes sociales', in Anthony Pym, Miriam Shlesinger and Daniel Simeoni (eds.), *Beyond Descriptive Translation Studies: Investigations in Homage to Gideon Toury*, Amsterdam & Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 2008, 199-208.

²⁵ Johan Heilbron, 'Towards a Sociology of Translation: Book Translations as a Cultural World System', *European Journal of Social Theory*, vol. 2, no. 4, 1999, 429-44.

²⁶ See Johan Heilbron and Gisèle Sapiro (eds.), 'Les Échanges littéraires internationaux', *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales*, no. 144, 2002; Gisèle Sapiro (ed.), *Translatio: Le Marché de la traduction en France à l'heure de la mondialisation*, Paris, CNRS Éditions, 2008; and the proceedings of the ESSE conference organised at the University of Lausanne by Jérôme Meizoz (ed.), 'La Circulation internationale de la littérature', *Études des lettres*, no. 1-2, 2006.

international conferences, visits and secondment for research and teaching, writers' residence – which are thought to favour the exchange of ideas and the confluence of intellectual traditions. Migratory trajectories, whether forced or chosen, can also be a powerful vector of cultural transfer and even innovation, as in the case of Claude Lévi-Strauss, exiled to the United States during the Second World War.²⁷

These transfers take place in a transnational space of symbolic goods, whose structure and principles of hierarchization need to be reconstituted.²⁸ They are torn between three logics, political, economic and cultural, the relative weight of each of which varies according to the historical situation. Political stakes may have a direct impact on exchanges, as is shown by the case of the importation of the literatures of the Eastern European countries during the communist period.²⁹ The internationalisation of intellectual life is also embedded, historically, in a competition between the nation states, in which culture and science are instruments of influence and hegemony. But nationalities, although they have some weight even in areas in which they are denied, such as the sciences, are only one aspect of the conflicts and competitive struggles within the transnational intellectual space. The literary and artistic avant-gardes have generally claimed to transcend frontiers – of countries and cultures as well as of genres or specialisms. They have readily allied themselves with radical – and internationalist – political movements: socialism, Trotskyism or Maoism. International political causes, such as the anti-fascist movement in the 1930s, tend more generally to mobilise the 'intellectuals' in the sense the term took on in the Dreyfus Affair.³⁰ In the interwar period, another form of intellectual internationalism also emerged, bringing the corporate demands of 'intellectual workers' onto the international stage and winning official recognition for them by the League of Nations and the International Labour Organisation.

The tension between regionalism, nationalism, internationalism and transnationalism (to which other principles of identity should be added, such as religion or ethnicity) is only one variant of the tug-of-war between particularism and universalism that shapes intellectual life. While the degree of internationality can be measured and varies according to the domain or

²⁷ Laurent Jeanpierre, 'Une opposition structurante pour l'anthropologie structurale: Lévi-Strauss contre Gurvitch, la guerre de deux exilés français aux États-Unis', *Revue d'histoire des sciences humaines*, no. 11, 2004, 13-43.

²⁸ See in particular the proceedings of the ESSE conference organised at the University of Venice by Anna Boschetti (ed.), *L'Espace culturel transnational*, Paris: Nouveau Monde Éditions, forthcoming.

²⁹ Ioana Popa, *La Politique extérieure de la littérature. Une sociologie de la traduction des littératures d'Europe de l'Est (1947-1989)*, doctoral thesis, EHESS 2004, (Paris: CNRS Éditions, forthcoming).

³⁰ The question of the political commitment of intellectuals in Europe was addressed in the EESE network conference organised at the University of Bielefeld by Ingrid Gilcher-Holtey (ed.), *Zwischen den Fronten: Positionskämpfe europäischer Intellektueller im 20. Jahrhundert*, Berlin: Akademie Verlag GmbH, 2006.

discipline in question,³¹ the meanings that these oppositions take on in different socio-historical configurations cannot be defined *a priori*. National identities were at first mainly constructed in a struggle against the hegemony of French culture, which laid claim to universality.³² Humanist universalism was able to serve as an intellectual justification for colonialism³³. While internationalism presupposes the existence and cooperation of nation states, we know that nationalisms do not systematically correspond to political and administrative divisions, and that the frontiers between regionalism and nationalism are sometimes tenuous (consider for example the case of Galicia³⁴). At the present time, the process of recomposition of collective identities passes not only through the notion of ‘globalisation’, which relates to the circulation of goods and models, but also, on the one hand, through the formation of supra-national regional entities such as the European Union,³⁵ and on the other through the valorisation of local, regional cultures and migratory trajectories.

In parallel to these stakes in the realms of politics and identity, intellectual and cultural production is partly dependent on market logics, which weigh on international cultural exchanges through the imposition of economic constraints (short-term profitability, rationalisation of costs, etc.) that are in contradiction with the specific requirements of intellectual production, which is costly in time and demands disinterested investment. As a consequence, the transnational market in cultural goods tends, like the national markets, to be structured according to the opposition between a pole of restricted production, where intellectual and/or political logics prevail, and a pole of large-scale production, governed by the logic of commerce.³⁶ In their conception, translation and distribution, the making of global best-sellers clearly follows this latter logic.

³¹ Yves Gingras, ‘Les Formes spécifiques de l’internationalité du champ scientifique’, *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales*, no. 141-42, 2002, 31-45.

³² Anne-Marie Thiesse, *La Création des identités nationales*, *op. cit.*; Pierre Bourdieu, ‘Deux impérialismes de l’universel’, in Christine Fauré and Tom Bishop (ed.), *L’Amérique des Français*, Paris, François Bourin, 1992, 149-55.

³³ Immanuel Wallerstein, *European Universalism: the Rhetoric of Power*, New York: New Press, 2006.

³⁴ Anton Figueroa and Xoán González Millán, *Communication littéraire et culture en Galice*, Paris, L’Harmattan, 1997.

³⁵ One could cite examples of other regional international organisations – intergovernmental, with political aims, such as the Pan-African Parliament (or, on a smaller scale, the Union for the Mediterranean), or non-governmental and with specifically scientific or cultural aims, such as the CLASCO (Latin American Council of Social Sciences).

³⁶ Pierre Bourdieu, ‘The Production of Belief’, in *The Field of Cultural Production: Essays on Art and Literature* (ed. Randall Johnson), New York: Columbia University Press & Cambridge: Polity Press, 1993, 74-111; ‘Une révolution conservatrice dans l’édition’, *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales*, no. 126-127, mars 1999, 3-28; Gisèle Sapiro, ‘Translation and the Field of Publishing. A Commentary on Pierre Bourdieu’s “A Conservative Revolution in Publishing” from a Translation Perspective’, *Translation Studies*, vol. 1, no. 2, 2008, 154-67.

The historical role that the nation states have played in organising this market – control, protection, regulation – explains, moreover, a number of its properties, even if it is tending to decline in favour of the economic actors (publishers, literary agents, large conglomerates).³⁷ In reaction to the growing weight of economic constraints on enterprises of cultural production and also to the pressures, in the name of globalisation, for the opening of frontiers to free trade and elimination of the ‘privileges’ granted by states in the form of protection or aid for certain categories of goods, policies of support for the pole of restricted production have developed in a number of countries such as France, on the basis of the shared belief that cultural goods are not ordinary commodities.

Although it does not remain entirely untouched by the logics of politics and economics, the pole of restricted production is the expression of the process of autonomisation of the intellectual fields, with the imposition of values that are specific to them and of an intellectual *ethos* – stringency, disinterestedness, cultural capital, self-referentiality, reflexivity – even if the notion of disinterestedness takes on meaning only in relation to the quest for symbolic profits, in particular peer recognition. It has its sites of sociability (discussion groups, research seminars, conferences) and its own institutions for diffusion and consecration (intellectual, literary or scientific journals, series, literary or academic prizes, other honours within their gift) and its agents (writers, critics, researchers, literary and academic publishers). While it should not be allowed to mask the individual competitive struggles and the specific interests that are invested, the notion of autonomy makes it possible to understand the forms of accumulation of specific capital, both at national and transnational level, by individuals and by collectives. Just as one can speak of the literary capital accumulated by a national literary field, especially in terms of the number of works that have entered the universal heritage,³⁸ so national intellectual traditions are endowed with a symbolic capital that varies according to the discipline (for example, German philosophy enjoys great prestige on the international stage) which can be measured according to similar criteria (the number of works translated, taught, commented upon, etc.).

The chapters that make up this work approach these questions from various angles. Bringing together historians of culture and literature, sociologists and political scientists, the approach that is advocated is resolutely multidisciplinary, synergizing the different methods

³⁷ See the proceedings of the ESSE network symposium held in Paris (EHESS and IRESCO), ed. Gisèle Sapiro, *Les Contradictions de la globalisation éditoriale*, Paris, Nouveau Monde Éditions, 2009.

³⁸ Pascale Casanova, *La République mondiale des lettres*, *op. cit.*

of the human and social sciences: quantitative and qualitative, synchronic and diachronic, structural and historical, comparative and monographic (event, configuration, trajectory, transfers), external and internal approaches to intellectual productions, explicatory and hermeneutic methods. The perspective and the scales vary from the *longue durée* of the formation of a European space of knowledge, to the study of medium-term processes, such as the transformation of the intellectual fields in Europe in the 19th and 20th centuries, their internationalisation or the evolution of cultural exchanges as measured through the books translated, to the short time of a conjuncture, an encounter of causal series from which there springs an event, in this case May 1968. Comparison, based on quantitative and/or qualitative data, is used both synchronically (between countries, national traditions, social groups, professions) and diachronically (evolution of the configuration of a space, such as European sociology, or the exchanges between spaces). Transfers are related to the asymmetrical structure of the exchanges in which they take place, with investigation of the social stakes and the actors, both individuals and institutions; and the position-takings of intellectuals are related to the positions they occupy in their space of reference and their individual trajectories.

The work is organised according to a twofold logic: chronological and thematic. The first part deals with the historical conditions of emergence of an intellectual space in Europe and its evolutions in the 19th and 20th centuries, particularly in its relations with the field of power; the second is more specifically devoted to the literary field, while the third focuses on the social and human sciences.

Setting up a historical perspective, Victor Karady retraces, in the first chapter, the demographic and institutional frameworks that allowed the emergence of a European space of knowledge about Man and society from the end of the Middle Ages to the 19th century. Until the Reformation, the unity of knowledge flowed mainly from the control that the Church exercised over the universities. Humanism would offer an alternative common culture, as the Enlightenment did later. But by then culture and science had become a stake that underwrote royal power and was the foundation of its prestige. The dominant position that the German and French universities occupied at the beginning of the 19th century helped to maintain a certain homogeneity of the European intellectual space in spite of the process of nationalisation of the institutions of teaching and research, which eventually brought about its fragmentation.

The conditions of emergence of the ‘intellectuals’ as a social category in the 19th century are analysed by Christophe Charle from three standpoints: the comparative social evolution of

the conditions of intellectual life under the effect of the development of education and the expansion of the supply of cultural products, with the growth of the book market and the printed press; the change in the status of intellectual activities, marked by the gap between those that are state-supported and those that are independent but increasingly subject to the constraints of the market; and the new relationship between the intellectual field and the political field that developed in the countries of Europe in the end of the 19th century. This analysis, which articulates structural comparison of the intellectual fields with the circulation of models – in particular that of the *Dreyfusard* intellectual – makes it possible to explain the different traditions of ‘commitment’ by intellectuals, from the Russian *intelligentsia*, through the British ‘public moralist’ to the French-style *intellectuel*; their limits (especially in Germany); and their renewal (with the phenomenon of radicalisation in Russia or the appearance of reformism in Britain).

The internationalisation of the intellectual field between the Wars, examined by Gisèle Sapiro, has two aspects, professional and political. The first is seen in the birth of an ‘intellectual trade-unionism’ (the French Confederation of Intellectual Workers was founded in 1919 and internationalised in 1923), which brought together the corporate demands of the intellectual professions, and in the institutionalisation of international intellectual relations with the creation of the International Institute of Intellectual Cooperation. The second is marked by the ideological stakes of European reconstruction after the Great War (retranslated into the debate of ideas by a struggle around the notions of culture and civilisation), and by the rise of political tensions in the 1930s, which led to the mobilisation of the intellectuals for or against fascism.

Anna Boschetti examines the stakes of the recomposition of the intellectual space in Europe in the aftermath of the Second World War, a period of hyper-politicisation on account of the material and symbolic effects of the war and the new order established by the victors, and the ensuing Cold War. Faced with the countries of Eastern Europe, where intellectuals were placed under close surveillance by the authorities, which did not exclude a degree of autonomy, varying according to the country and the period, the figure of the critical intellectual spread through the western parliamentary democracies, notably in Italy, with the journal *Il Politecnico*, and in West Germany with the *Gruppe 47*, but the problem of commitment takes different forms depending on the history of the relationships between the intellectual field and the field of power.

Investigating the international dimension of the movements of May 1968, Ingrid Gilcher-Holtey shows that they were preceded by a cognitive reorientation of the Left, characterised

by its specifically European roots. While the political and social conditions of the formation of the movements of May 1968 differ from one country to another, the process of mobilisation brought out some common elements, such as the structural crisis of the universities and the emergence of a student New Left, with the Vietnam War acting as an accelerator of internationalisation. Ingrid Gilcher-Holtey also connects the movements of 1968 to the Prague Spring through the mobilising ideas of ‘participatory democracy’ and ‘self-management’ or ‘co-management’.

The second part deals with the stakes specific to the literary field. Joseph Jurt explores the multiplicity of the relationships between literature and nation: literature played a founding role in the making of the modern nations, especially in the absence of national political structures; in other contexts, literature became an important attribute of a politically constituted nation. The national definition of literature is however called into question by the universalist claims of some writers, who – rightly or wrongly – deny the anchoring of their work in a particular cultural tradition. It is also challenged by regionalism on the one hand and the existence of linguistic areas on the other. The cases of the transnational French-speaking and German-speaking areas (the latter in the period of the two Germanies) are examined in more detail.

This national definition has been consolidated by literary history.³⁹ While the need to ‘denationalise’ is now well established,⁴⁰ Pascale Casanova points out the perils attendant on attempts to write a history of European literature, which are torn between the idea of cultural unity, imposed by the political authorities, and a heterogeneous reality. This is mainly because, in spite of its rich past and the current political voluntarism, this literary space is still a space in the making. As a consequence, its history can only be grasped through the competitive struggles and conflicts between national literatures, which offer the only cohesive principle that is methodologically acceptable. This is the approach that Pascale Casanova puts forward to lay the foundations for such an undertaking, paying particular attention to the specific struggles to modify the power relations that structure this space, especially by writers working within dominated literatures.

Intellectual production is not only subject to efforts to enrol it politically but also, as has been said, to economic stakes, which bear on it especially through the book market. On the

³⁹ See Michel Espagne, *Le Paradigme de l'étranger. Les chaires de littérature étrangère au XIXe siècle*, Paris, Éditions du Cerf, 1993.

⁴⁰ See for example Christie McDonald and Susan Suleiman (ed.), *French Global: a New Approach to Literary History*, Columbia University Press, forthcoming.

one hand this market has been bound up with the construction of the nation states;⁴¹ on the other hand, its expansionist logic has been a powerful factor in transcending national boundaries, whether in the framework of a linguistic area or through translation. Europe has played a historic role in the formation of an international translation market, as Gisèle Sapiro shows here. In the age of globalisation, this region remains the one in which the density and diversity of exchanges, measured by source language, are greatest. But this diversity varies according to the category of the works in question: it is strongest at the pole of restricted production, particularly on account of the historical link, already mentioned, between literature and the construction of national identities, and almost non-existent at the pole of large-scale production, governed by commercial logic. This finding is also valid for translations in the human and social sciences, in contrast to essays, biographies, tourist guides, etc.

Those sciences are the focus of the third part of the book. Johan Heilbron points out that, from the outset, they have been strongly marked by their national contexts. A significant part of the social sciences has been constituted since the Renaissance as ‘sciences of government’, i.e. as administrative and political knowledge and know-how in the service of the emerging national states. Reconsidering the notion of ‘national tradition’ in this light, he distinguishes several meanings to the term depending on whether it is a matter of ways of thinking and acting that are specific to a discipline or field of research, or those that stem from the particularities of disciplinary constellations and national intellectual hierarchies (for example, the hegemonic position of philosophy in France), or the more general postures and practices that help to define what are called national styles (‘British empiricism’ vs. ‘French rationalism’, for example), and which are anchored in the educational culture.

As Johan Heilbron, Nicolas Guilhot and Laurent Jeanpierre suggest, it is possible to conceive a transnational history of the social sciences in terms of three general mechanisms that have structured the circulation of individuals and ideas: first, the functioning of the international scientific institutions and transnational networks; secondly, the mobility of academics, the research visits organised by universities from the beginning of the 20th century, and voluntary or forced migrations, such as the exile of German academics to the United States in the Nazi period; thirdly, the exchange policies of non-university institutions, whether state-sponsored agencies or philanthropic foundations.

⁴¹ Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, London: Verso (1983, rev. ed. 1991)

Through the case of sociology, Johan Heilbron considers the problem of the Europeanisation of the social sciences. The multiplicity of meanings that the term 'European sociology' has taken on point to distinct historical phases. Johan Heilbron distinguishes four of them: the moment of the genesis of this new science in Europe, between 1830 and 1880; its first institutionalisation in universities, corresponding to its nationalisation, between 1880 and 1920; the decades between the inter-war years and the 1970s, which was a period of expansion of the discipline and the transfer of its centre to the United States, through the migrations due to Nazism and Fascism; and the most recent phase, from the 1970s to the end of the 20th century, which was a period of crisis, fragmentation and the search for new forms of synthesis but which also saw the emergence of major figures of the discipline in Europe (Bourdieu, Elias, Giddens, Habermas, Bauman, Beck).

This period of globalisation saw a significant growth in international and intra-European collaborations, as Yves Gingras and Johan Heilbron show (with supporting data) in a survey of the evolution of the proportion of scientific publications in the social and human sciences written in international collaboration by researchers from the main European countries. It becomes clear from this survey, which isolates a sub-set of European journals by comparing it with national and international journals, that while the trend towards internationalisation, which varies according to the disciplines, is rising, collaborations with the United States are dominant. The findings suggest, more generally, that a large proportion of scientific production in the social sciences will necessarily remain local and national.

This overview and construction of the object do not claim to be exhaustive. A number of important questions have been left to one side, because insufficient detailed work has been done on them to support even hypothetical generalisations. One of these is the ethnic dimension, without which one cannot understand the specificity of the formation of the elites in central-eastern Europe⁴². Methodological nationalism has tended to play down this type of variable, just as it tends to reify national entities while masking the heterogeneous realities they cover, from the phenomena of migration to geographic and cultural concentration. Hence one may question to what extent the nation state is the pertinent unit for apprehending the transnational intellectual space: while, as has been said, nationality is often the most significant property in this space, and while states contribute to the structuring of the market

⁴² This issue is the object of a research project led by Victor Karady under the EU's Seventh Framework Programme. The project is still in its early stages and it is premature to draw even provisional conclusions from it.

in cultural goods, the city is a more decisive territorial unit of reference for intellectual life, both through the places of socialisation and sociability that it offers and through the concentration of cultural activities.⁴³ As a preliminary to the understanding of the intellectual stakes, the study of the social and historical conditions has moreover been given more attention than the representations – categories of perception and evaluation, productions, ideas – which would require opening a vast area of research on the comparison of systems of classification,⁴⁴ the circulation of models, and the effects of two-way transfers on works,⁴⁵ integrating what has been learned from *Begriffsgeschichte* and also the approaches opened up by the Cambridge school (notably the work of Quentin Skinner) and the new sociology of ideas.⁴⁶ It would have to be accompanied by a social and cultural history of the intellectual ethos as initiated by Pierre Bourdieu with the notion of ‘scholastic bias’ and Wolf Lepenies with his reflection on melancholy, which he sees as characterising the European intellectual in contrast to the scientist.⁴⁷

The ESSE European network has drawn up a number of principles and recommendations to improve the conditions and quality of intellectual exchanges between European countries. They are presented in an appendix by Franz Schultheis. If European intellectuals have a role to play, it is that of defending the autonomy of critical thought that was historically won in this part of the world and is constantly threatened by the temporal forces.⁴⁸ From the

⁴³ In this regard, one can cite – as well, of course, as Carl Schorske's *Fin-de-Siècle Vienna*, New York: Vintage Books, 1981, and Michaël Pollak's *Vienne 1900: une identité blessée*, Paris: Julliard, 1984, repr. Gallimard, ‘Folio’, 1992 – Christophe Charle and Daniel Roche (eds.), *Capitales culturelles, capitales symboliques: Paris et les expériences européennes*, Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne, 2002; Christophe Charle (ed.), *Capitales européennes et rayonnement culturel. XVIIIe-XXe siècle*, Paris: Éditions Rue d’Ulm/Presses de l’École normale supérieure, 2004; Christophe Charle, *Théâtres en capitales, naissance de la société du spectacle à Paris, Berlin, Londres et Vienne (1860-1914)*, Paris: Albin Michel, 2008.

⁴⁴ Such an undertaking was launched, within the ESSE network, by Olivier Christin, ‘Anthropologie historique comparée des sociétés européennes’, seminar of 16-17 September 2005 at the Frankreich-Zentrum, Freiburg im Breisgau.

⁴⁵ Some case studies have been presented within the network and have been published (see the volumes cited above), but are at present too dispersed for a synthesis.

⁴⁶ Charles Camic and Neil Gross, ‘The New Sociology of Ideas’, in J. R. Blau, *The Blackwell Companion to Sociology*, Oxford, Blackwell, 2004. See also Mathieu Hauchecorne and Etienne Ollion, ‘What is the new Sociology of Ideas? A Discussion with Charles Camic and Neil Gross’, *TRANSEO*, no. 1, janvier 2009, <http://www.transeo-review.eu/What-is-the-new-sociology-of-Ideas.html>, published 9 December 2008, accessed 5 January 2009.

⁴⁷ Pierre Bourdieu, *Pascalian Meditations*, Cambridge (UK): Polity, 1999; Wolf Lepenies, *Melancholy and Society*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1992; *Qu’est-ce qu’un intellectuel européen? Les intellectuels et la politique de l’esprit dans l’histoire européenne*, Paris, Seuil, 2007.

⁴⁸ Pierre Bourdieu, ‘For a corporatism of the universal’, postscript to *The Rules of Art: Genesis and Structure of the Literary Field*, Cambridge: Polity Press, 1996.

introduction of managerial methods in teaching and research⁴⁹ to the various forms of censorship exercised by the major communication groups, this autonomy is now threatened. The European intellectual space could offer a site from which resistance to these threats could be organised. Some initiatives already exist.⁵⁰ But the defence of its autonomy does not dispense one from a critical review of its functioning and of the knowledges that it produces, the interests they may serve, the values they carry with them and the questions they exclude. Such a critical review necessarily takes a route through history, for which this work seeks to lay the foundations. The fact that, as Michel Foucault pointed out,⁵¹ this history relativises our understanding does not necessarily lead to epistemological relativism; on the contrary, as Pierre Bourdieu demonstrated, it can lead to a higher degree of reflexivity which should make it possible to avoid the errors of the past, from scientific universalism to colonial science, and including methodological nationalism.⁵²

⁴⁹ See Isabelle Bruno, *À vos marques, prêts... Cherchez. La stratégie européenne de Lisbonne, vers un marché de la recherche*, Paris: Éditions du croquant, 2008.

⁵⁰ Since 2003 the University of Manchester has organised a series of conferences on the theme 'Discourse, Power and Resistance'. The April 2009 conference was on 'Power and the Academy'.

⁵¹ Michel Foucault, *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences*, London: Tavistock, 1970.

⁵² Pierre Bourdieu, *Science of Science and Reflexivity*, Cambridge: Polity, 2004, and 'L'Objectivation du sujet de l'objectivation', in Johan Heilbron, Remi Lenoir and Gisèle Sapiro (eds.), *Pour une histoire des sciences sociales*, Paris, Fayard, 2004, 19-23.