

Nyhedsbrev

For Foreningen HEXIS

Nr. 27. Januar 2006

Nyhedsbrevet er foreningen HEXIS' forum for diskussion og faglig udveksling. HEXIS' formål er at videreføre den franske sociolog Pierre Bourdieus tænkemåde med særligt henblik på empirisk forskning i samfundsmæssige praksisformer. Deadline for indlæg til næste nummer: 1. marts 2006. Nr. 28 udkommer omkring 1. april.

Redaktør: Carsten Sestoft carsten@sestoft.dk

Redaktionel assistance: Anders Høg Hansen anders.hog-hansen@k3.mah.se

Hjemmeside og arkiv for nyhedsbreve, arbejdsrapporter m.v.: <http://www.hexis.dk>

Indhold

1. Redaktionelt (s1)
2. Meddelelser og arrangementer (s2-4)
3. Bourdieu-nummer af *Theory and Society* (s4)
4. Bourdieu i Val Fourré. Uddrag fra dokumentarfilmen *La Sociologie est un sport de combat* (s5-12)

1. Redaktionelt

Egentlig er der vist ikke noget at meddele under denne rubrik, men der skal jo stå noget (men hvorfor egentlig? ”Om det, man ikke har noget at sige om, om det bør man tie” for nu at parafasere Wittgenstein), så derfor står der nu dette. Næste nyhedsbrev har deadline 1. marts. (Så var der alligevel noget at meddele!) Budskabet kommer, mens man snakker! We make it up as we go along, som kollegaen sagde om sin undervisning.

/cs

Redaktørassistenten tilføjer, at vi i dette nummer kan præsentere en transkription af en debat i et kulturcenter i Val Fourré uden for Paris i år 2000. En række yngre mennesker, flere involveret i socialt arbejde, diskuterer med Bourdieu. Uddraget er fra dokumentarfilmen *Sociologi som kampsport*.

/ahh

2. Meddelelser og arrangementer

Ida Schultz' ph.d.-forsvar om det journalistiske felt i Danmark

Fredag den 27. januar forsvarede Ida Schultz sin Ph.d.-afhandling "Bag om nyhedskriterierne. En etnografisk feltanalyse af nyhedsværdier og journalistisk praksis". Afhandlingen er et Bourdieu-inspireret studie af nyhedsproduktionen i Danmark. Den er bygget op om et omfattende etnografisk studie af den nyhedsredaktionelle praksis på landets to største tv-stationer. Studiet går bag om det nyhedsbillede, som formidles til seerne, og synliggør de principper, der ligger til grund for udvælgelsen af, hvad der har nyhedsværdi. Det etnografiske studie sættes ydermere ind i en historiseret kontekst, hvor udviklingen i de journalistiske anerkendelsesprincipper synliggøres. Ud over denne spændende problemstilling er forsvaret specielt interessant for foreningens medlemmer, da Ida Schultz er en af de første på dansk grund, der har brugt Bourdieu til at studere det journalistiske felt. Det må derfor forventes, at diskussionen om, hvad Bourdieu kan bruges til i den journalistiske forskning vil blive et centralt tema. Forsvaret foregår på Roskilde Universitetscenter (Biografien i Hus 41) og starter kl. 13.

Jens A. Hansen

Politisk deltagelse og klasse. Reportage fra Gitte Sommer Harrits' ph.d.-forsvar

Som tidligere annonceret forsvarede Gitte Sommer Harrits sin ph.d.-afhandling "Hvad betyder klasse? En rekonstruktion af klassebegrebet med henblik på en analyse af sammenhængen mellem klasser og politisk deltagelse i Danmark" 30. november ved Aarhus Universitet. Både afhandlingen og forsvaret var meget spændende. Afhandlingen kan siges at være en empirisk test på nutidige danske forhold af den sammenhæng mellem sociale egenskaber og politisk deltagelse (bl.a. i form af evnen til at danne en "personlig mening" om politiske ting), som Bourdieu fremlægger i kapitlet "Culture and Politics" i *Distinction* (som Deres udsendte tilfældigvis havde undervist i to dage før), men afhandlingen er også mere end det. Referatet her er skrevet efter hukommelsen, så der kan være ting, jeg har misforstået eller fremstiller forkert: Så meget mere grund til at læse afhandlingen! Den udkommer snart på forlaget Politica.

Testen bestod for det første i at sammenholde en konstruktion af det sociale rum med distributionen af politiske opfattelser ud fra nogle forhåndenværende data, hvilket gav enkelte problemer, fordi bl.a. nuanceringen af kulturel kapital ikke var stor i disse data (men det havde selvfølgelig været helt uoverkommeligt at indsamle egne data til et i forvejen omfangsrigt projekt). For det andet havde Gitte Sommer Harrits også lavet et antal kvalitative interviews for at belyse det klassesdifferentierede forhold til politik. Nogle illustrative citater fra disse interviews, som hun tog frem i sin indledende

forelæsning, vakte en del moro, men illustrerede også effektivt, hvordan den kvantitativt konstruerede struktur gav en fortolkningsramme for de kvalitative udsagn, som på deres side bidrog til at forklare de statistiske konstateringer.

Konklusionen var stort set den samme, som Bourdieu kommer frem til, nemlig at der er en slags misforhold mellem demokratiets principielle lighed for alles deltagelse og den faktiske ulighed i muligheden for at deltage i politik, der som hos Bourdieu hænger sammen med kulturel og økonomisk kapital. Nemlig sådan at der kan opstilles dels en modsætning mellem de kapitalstærke (uden omsvøb kaldet overklassen) og de kapitalsvage, dels en modsætning inden for denne overklasse mellem dem med overvægt af økonomisk kapital (som lagde vægt på politik som management, magt og effektiv styring) og dem med overvægt af kulturel kapital (som lagde vægt på politik som ideer og legitimitet).

Dertil indeholdt afhandlingen også en diskussion af klassebegrebets relevans, hvor Gitte Sommer Harrits slog til lyd for et ”epistemologisk” klassebegreb, dvs. et teoretisk eller konstrueret begreb om klasse, som dels kan undgå det traditionelle spørgsmål om klassebevidsthed (og erstatte denne med klassehabitus), dels gøre spørgsmålet om klassernes virkelige eksistens irrelevant: Det vigtige er, at den epistemologiske klasse har objektiv (teoretisk) eksistens i den forstand, at den bliver til gennem et arbejde med variabler, som henviser til virkelige forskelle. Dermed kan man også undgå problemet med klassernes grænser i virkeligheden.

Ph.d.-forsvarets art – dvs. arten af spørgsmål, bedømmerne stillede – syntes at indicere en ekstremt gennemarbejdet afhandling, hvor der i de store linier ikke var meget at komme efter. Det slog den første opponenter, Annick Prieur, da også fast, men hun fandt alligevel nogle interessante diskussionspunkter i afhandlingen, ud over en kritik af konstruktionen af det sociale rum på basis af en variabel som avislæsning, som vel snarere hørte til konstruktionen af det politiske rum. For det første om muligheden af at forblive politisk neutral som forsker over for det konstaterede politikproblem; for det andet om det overhovedet var muligt at forene de økonomisk stærkes management-politik med de kapitalsvages populisme og de kulturstærkes ideer? Et godt spørgsmål, som Gitte Sommer Harrits gav et godt svar på, der næsten var en variation af den bekendte formulering: Der bliver regeret alligevel. Nemlig at der selv om man gerne vil diskutere ideer og legitimitet, skal der jo også træffes nogle beslutninger, og at det rene diskussionsdemokrati ofte lod en del tilbage at ønske i den henseende. (Enhver kan jo tænke på regeringsproblematikker in micro som hos gruppen af jævnaldrende, der på ferien skal vælge en restaurant, eller i familien, der skal blive enige om et feriemål.) Og populismen forstået som de kapitalsvages præference for politikere, som virker menneskeligt troværdige (som potentiel modsætning til den professionelt kompetente manager- eller idepolitiker), kunne jo også godt beskrives som en legitimitetsproblematik, dvs. som de kapitalsvages måde at foretage et legitimt politisk valg på. Måske i analogi til den ukyndige kundes præference for en håndværker, der i det mindste virker sympatisk, selv om det jo strengt taget er irrelevant for håndværkerens evne til at lægge et gulv eller skrue vandrør sammen – men når man nu ikke har andre kriterier at gå efter... Men her digter jeg vist; også det er imidlertid et vidnesbyrd om en stimulerende afhandling og ditto forsvar.

Næste opponenter var Martin Munk, der kom med nogle ret tekniske diskussioner af statistik, som i det omfang, jeg kunne følge dem, også var meget interessante. Sådanne teknikker er jo langt fra neutrale. F.eks. spurgte han, om en regressionsanalyse kunne have givet det samme som de fremlagte korrespondanceanalyser (svaret var vist nej), samt noget om – men nu er jeg virkelig på glatis –

hvorvidt den valgte valideringsmetode (?) i forbindelse med korrespondanceanalysen ikke risikerede at vægte nogle variabler for meget i forhold til andre og dermed give et bogstavelig talt skævt billede.

Sidste opponent var Gorm Harste, som stillede nogle mere teoretiske spørgsmål (jeg husker ikke længere klart, hvad de gik ud på), og dermed rundede en fin forsvarshandling af, hvor man – ganske i afhandlingens ånd – kom rundt om spørgsmål, der var både empiriske, politiske, statistisk-tekniske og mere alment sociologiteoretiske.

Kort sagt, Gitte Sommer Harrits' afhandling kunne godt gå hen og udløse en mindre revolution både på de politiske redaktioner på landets nyhedsmedier og i den politologiske forskning.

/cs

Konferencer

Nordisk sociologikongres

afholdes i Turko (Åbo) 18.-20. august 2006 under temaet "Dissolution of society?" Deadlines for indsendelse af abstracts, tilmeldinger osv. er i skrivende stund endnu ikke annonceret. Hold øje med <http://congress.utu.fi/nsf2006>

Nordisk pedagogiskhistorisk konferens

afholdes i Stockholm 28.-29. september 2006. Temaet er "Kultur, makt och utbildning", i sagens natur i et historisk og komparativt nordisk perspektiv. Karin Anna Petersen står for en session om "Yrkeskulturer och yrkesutbildning". Abstracts indsendes senest 31. maj, men konferencen synes endnu ikke at være annonceret på nettet. Spørg evt. Karin Anna: Karin.Anna.Petersen@ped.uu.se
/cs

3. Bourdieu-nummer af *Theory and Society*

The sociology of Symbolic Power: A Special Issue in Memory of Pierre Bourdieu, Theory and Society, vol. 32/5-6, december 2003

På en eller anden måde er det lykkedes mig at overse særnummeret af *Theory and Society* om Bourdieu fra 2003. Det er ellers vældigt interessant, og tidsskriftet er blandt de mest interessante sociologitidsskrifter (se f.eks. nyhedsbrevet nr. 26!) – et af dem, der i 70'erne blev startet for at give plads til de forskellige sociologiretninger, som de store amerikanske sociologitidsskrifter var for firkantede til at kunne rumme. Af samme grund har det ofte været temmelig blandet, men i reglen på højt niveau.

Blandt nummerets mange artikler er "On the wealth of nations: Bourdieueconomics and social capital", der sågar er skrevet af to danskere: Gunnar Lind Haase Svendsen, der er historiker og antropolog og

forsknings- og udviklingsmedarbejder ved SDU, og Gert Tinggaard Svendsen, der er professor i statskundskab ved Aarhus Universitet. De forsøger at føre Bourdieus udvidede kapitalbegreb sammen med økonomers og økonomiske sociologers begreb om social kapital med henblik på at forklare forskelle i nationers økonomiske succes – en variation over grundspørgsmålet i Adam Smiths *The Wealth of Nations*, som de skriver. I den sammenhæng har de kaldt Bourdieus generaliserede praksisøkonomi for Bourdieueconomics, som måske ikke er noget dårligt salgstrick. Selv om artiklen ikke er uden løse ender, finder jeg det uhyre interessant, at nogen tager Bourdieus økonomikritik alvorligt og fremfører den i ledende internationale tidsskrifter. (I mellemtiden har jeg også mødt den ene forfatter, som arbejder videre på projektet med at sammentænke Bourdieus kapitalbegreb og klassisk økonomisk teori.)

I nummeret er der også artikler af bl.a. Frédéric Lebaron (der har skrevet om økonomernes felt), Gisèle Sapiro, Annette Lareau og Elliot B. Weininger om ” Cultural capital in educational research”, de to redaktører David L. Swartz og Vera L. Zolberg m.fl.

Særnummeret er også (helt eller delvis) udgivet i bogform:

David L. Swartz & Vera L. Zolberg (red): *After Bourdieu: Influence, Critique, Elaboration*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2004 (prisen er beskedne 153 \$!).

/cs

5. Bourdieu i Val Fourré

Uddrag fra dokumentarfilmen *La Sociologie est un sport de combat*

*[Det transskriberede klip fra Pierre Carles' dokumentar *Sociology is a martial art/sociologi som kampsport* fra 2001 følger Howard Bonsors engelske oversættelse. Filmen varer ca. 2 timer og 20 minutter. I et af de længste klip, ca. 35 minutter, følger vi Bourdieu i et kulturcenter i Paris forstaden Val Fourré. Debatten har titlen "A debate with Pierre Bourdieu on inequalities in education and culture". Bourdieu svarer på kommentarer fra et tydeligt engageret publikum. Hallen er fyldt til bristepunktet, folk står på trappen. Transkriptionen følger Howard Bonsors engelske oversættelse. Da jeg kun kan en smule fransk, mest ukvemsord, og ingen franskyndige udtrykte interesse for opgaven, så gav jeg mig i kast med denne 'plan B'. Måske kan teksten inspirere folk til at se filmen? Jeg har ikke set nogen grund til at oversætte fra engelsk til dansk. Redaktøren, der er særdeles fransk-kyndig og bekendt med filmen, har kigget transkriptionen efter for de værste bommerter. Redaktionelle kommentarer er i klammer og kursiv, som her. En kort epilogs-kommentar følger. Gæster i salen er gengivet ved navn og ligeledes er Bourdieu.*

Anders Dec05/Jan06]

Mounir:

José [...henvendt til Bourdieu, tror han hedder José. Gæst bag ved ham retter ham]. Oh...

Bourdieu.... my generation has been encouraged since the 1970s to train for jobs which youth counsellors and teachers knew were going to become obsolete. That's why today there are people, 35

years old, qualified machine-operators who are on the scrap heap. It's the same with the younger generation. There is a talk about the year 2000, about the Y2K bug, about unemployment figures rising, about "incivility", all these words for us are like being on another planet, 20.000 leagues under the ground!

Bourdieu:

I don't really know how to answer [*publikum klapper*]. Please don't clap. Truth is not measured by clap-o-meters. Leave that to television.

Mounir:

... Not answering me?

Bourdieu:

I did not mean you.

Mounir:

What does media friendly mean? [*han henvender hovedet bag ud til en anden i salen, tolkende på Bourdieus bemærkning om TV...*].

Gæst i salen:

[*kvinde, navn ukendt, svarer*]: You know perfectly well. Look at all the people here tonight.

Bourdieu:

No let us be serious. Since I am the subject and object of what you're saying, it is hard for me to answer. But if being media-friendly means attracting lots of people to an evening in Val Fourré... that is not it. It means being in the media every day.... thank you. [*Bourdieu fik et stikord fra en gæst i salen*] It means being the instrument of the media, being pressed into service by the media, being someone who says for the media what the media ask their friendly intellectuals to say, which, more often than not, is nothing. To talk without saying anything, to give false explanations, to say "oh, another riot in Val Fourré". Oh, I don't know. It is spouting bullshit with authority and confidence, and being paid for it. That is what media-friendly is.

Mounir:

That is an intellectual argument.

Ordstyrer:

[*Længere kommentar/afbrydelse, hvor ordstyreren klargører, at dette er en intellektuel debat, at 'intellektuel' ikke er et skældsord, og at publikum ikke bør rakke ned på Bourdieu (?), men fortælle om deres egne erfaringer. Mounir råber tilbage "I came here to listen to a sociologist". Et par minutter efter fortsætter en mand, rastafyr, sidst i 30erne (Saïd):*].

Saïd:

It was hard growing up in the context we grew up in. The inequalities appeared when our environment started changing. Our generation - I was born in 1967 - has very clear memories, which today's

youngsters will not have, of open spaces, greenery, waste lands... Then people came along and started building without bothering that all our childhood was there. They put up buildings where you can go for your 100 francs or your food coupons. I think that everyone is insulted. Lots of people know this but they keep quiet. They're aware of it but their silence condones it. It's easier to say, "yes, I work in the free zone. It's really tough." - but they are nobody. The proof is, we get teachers who are 22 years old, already thinking, "If you want a transfer, you have to do your time. Then you can go back home to Toulouse..." Or Cantal or wherever. They are stressed when they arrive. And the kids can sense all that. We ask for cultural centres, they give us the police station and statues [*monumenter og kunstværker*] to show their involvement [*publikum griner og klapper*]. But take away the statues and know what you'll see? Just the police station and the violence it represents. There are people who wants to keep us down. What is the use? Bourdieu here, he talks about Seattle, then he is gone [*Saïd refererer nok til noget nævnt tidligere i debatten, men ikke med i filmen*]. What do we know about Seattle? People have trouble understanding the Euro. Now it is the year 2000. What is the year 2000 going to do for us? Really what? We get these markets where everything is ten francs. Sandwiches for ten francs. We are worth ten francs, we get cut-priced food, everything's cut-price [*publikum klugger af grin*]. They sell us eggs... Now get this: 60 eggs for 20 francs! Then they talk about salmonella... But we here don't catch on, and they know we don't catch on! I am talking about inequalities I have experienced locally, working as a social worker. I have done my part, right here where you are sitting. We built this place, but it's always empty because people are scared of Val Fourré. Tonight it is full because Bourdieu is here. So inequalities, it is no coincidence. We are here in the housing estates, we're a source of wealth. Well, you had or parents and our grandparents. And with us it is time it stopped [*Saïd gør pause... der er stille... ingen afbryder*]. We have had it all, police killings, state-assigned lawyers... Get one of them, and you're screwed. Straight up. This Papon [Maurice Papon, minister 1978-1981, som i 1998 blev dømt for at have været medvirkende til deportation af jøder under Vichy-regimet] fucked some people up – excuse my language – and we are supposed to let him off? How do you expect us to believe in anything? Our judicial system only keeps the peace for the police. It is true. How many murders? In Mantes, a bullet in the back of the neck. In St-Denis, in Trappes, back of the neck. And who stands up for us? No one! Any movement get swept up. To answer your question: there's a special branch cop every square metre. We're helpless. They even know our nicknames. They know everything about us. So here we are, enslaved, imprisoned by our own selves. If we want to make a film or use a camera, to show the truth, our own people are the ones who ask, "Why are you doing that?" On the other side anything goes. Everything is in the reverse. I think it is time everybody woke up. Give us real teachers who are not just here to bide their time and take from us. And once they are out of St-Denis, it's "Yeah, I worked in those areas. It is tough!" I have worked with lots like that. I have been an educator for ten years and I am sick of it. [*Saïd gør pause...*] Voila, I am finished. Now talk to Bourdieu, not Dieu! Don't be mistaken.

Abdellah:

A lot of that was true. But there is one thing I did not agree with, Saïd. This cultural centre... when you said, you came when Bourdieu is here, but it is empty otherwise. That is true. Two or three people come to see a film. It is a big room. But it is not up to them to come. It is up to us, the locals, to come. Mounir called Bourdieu "José" because he does not know him. That is okay. But, Mounir, let me tell you... I am answering your question, Saïd, about people coming here. It is up to us to come, to take action, to do things [*Vi begynder at kunne høre Saïd i baggrunden...*].

Said:

We can't wait for others to do it for us. We are the ones who always to make all the efforts and concessions. There is no other way. When we go into Paris, if we were not artists we would never get in some places. But when they come here they do as they like. I am sick of going to Paris and not being allowed in anywhere, and seeing the opposite here. We are being asked to make too many concessions, all the time. Our schools are in ZEPs. Why should we go to a ZEP? Zones of Educational Priority. Educational Poverty, more likely [*Abdellahs stemme bryder igennem...*].

Abdellah:

We expect too much of others. We have to take responsibility.

I would just like to say to Mounir... [*mumlen og ord-kampe blandt publikum... ordstyrer bryder ind*].

Ordstyrer:

Not between yourself.

Abdellah:

This isn't just conflicting ideas. I'll have a question at the end. This is a good image to give to Bourdieu. Mounir is one of the most active social workers around here, and yet he doesn't know you...

Mounir:

Can I tell you why I don't know him.

Abdellah:

But you could learn a lot from him, Mounir [*råben frem og tilbage i salen. Bourdieu lytter*]

Mounir:

I've seen hundreds of sociologists

Abdellah:

Read some of his books. He can help your thinking.

Mounir: My thoughts come from God!

[*ikke til at se om det er seriøst ment. Afløses af lidt indbyrdes ordkløvende pingpong blandt publikum og mikrofonen går rundt. Mikrofonen ender hos Mounir...*]

Mounir:

He said that there are bad and good sociologists, and he is one of the good ones. To some people we are scapegoats, to others we are just an excuse.

Ordstyrer:

[*ordstyrer forsøger at komme ind...*] We've got 15 minutes left... You have had time amongst yourselves [*han taler om at publikum havde tid for dem selv og at de kan fortsætte bagefter. Nu bør de stille spørgsmål til Bourdieu osv.*]

Aimé [sort fyr omkring 30]:
This is a debate among us too.

Ordstyrer: I understand [*Fint. Tak for det*].

Aimé:

We've been rolling out the same old prejudices that we learnt from the education system we suffered from. That creates the inequalities. We are here to qualify all that. It is alright to say, "We have experienced this and that", but not to lay blame. It is not his fault if...

Mounir:

Are you talking to me?

Aimé:

No, in general [*lidt mumlen, ryster på hovedet, giver mikrofonen væk...*].

Bourdieu:

All that has been said tonight – should I say this? – has been very interesting. I think that – maybe I am wrong – but if my presence has helped bring these things out, then that is something. I don't know if I was the reason, the catalyst... But I have been very pleased to hear certain things, some of which have been very contradictory, conflicting... But all interesting and important. That is how I heard it. Anyway, especially what Saïd said. There was a lot of truth in that... when he said that... How should I put it? "It is always one-sided, always us who have to make the concessions". He said something very important there. The problem is, though, the pessimistic conclusion, so now I say to him: why conclude so pessimistically? Why not listen to what was said here on my left? [*Bourdieu åbner armen ned mod Abdellah i salen*] It is up to us to take action, to get things moving all together, to get mobilised. And maybe we should make some concessions between ourselves. So as we have fewer concessions to make to those we're fighting. I am not preaching fraternity at any price. There are conflicts everywhere. Here! I think conflicts are, in part, the expression or the consequence of the oppression suffered by the people who have spoken here. The paradox is – and it's as old as the hills – is that the dominators divide the dominated. And they don't even have to try. Divide and rule. They do not even have to. Conflicting interests, antagonisms, prejudice... Someone mentioned prejudice. And I am sorry, but he was right. We are all full of prejudice. One reason a sociologist's work is so difficult is because he is also full of prejudice, and he has as much of a struggle against his own as against others... I have found this debate very moving and deep down I am glad that it took place. And maybe – but this is being optimistic – maybe it could be the beginning of... Someone made a sly illusion to my role in a recent conflict at *France Culture* [*statsligt radioprogram svarende til P1*] – they obviously meant me – that I had launched some *agitprop* experts at *France Culture*. For youngsters who don't know, that means professional agitators. They were people whose mission was to go amongst the people and preach revolution... Well, I have done a bit of *agitprop* myself... which, in all modesty, was my intention, and if it has had some success, then I am happy. One problem is how to continue *agitprop*? By founding associations, discussion groups? How to continue this debate? In some respect, it is too easy. Use me as your scapegoat. Kill the analyst. That's easy. Make fun of him and get yourself noticed. But when I have gone if the effect produced this evening could go on and the *agitprop* became self-perpetuating, and the agitated became agitators, agitating themselves first of all

then I would be really happy. I would have served a purpose. People slag off sociologists, and often with good reason. There are some... I don't recall who said social workers are part of the problem. But in the work that we do... well, I will not say it here because a social worker's work is not fun every day. But their relationship with the people they work with is very complicated, based on false grounds, in *La misère du monde* [*The Weight of the World*] there are some pathetic accounts by social workers who know they cannot help and who spend half their time kidding themselves they can as well as kidding the people they are employed to kid. Lots of teachers know they cannot help. These are some first-hand examples. But I was very moved by them and maybe this will not just be a flash in the pan. Maybe this room or another place will become the place where people start to take responsibility. That all sounds a bit like I am preaching. But we have to take responsibility, we have to get mobilised. I remember at the end of a debate similar to this one, in Strasbourg with German unions, that sort of thing. Four young men of Arab descent addressed me: "what is the use? My father, grandfather... exploitation..." etc. And I said to them, how about a movement uniting immigrants of all origins? Well, that is not the sort of thing you say in a university hall. I said, why not? Why not? The only thing I would disagree with in what Saïd said is the pessimism. I don't think there is any reason why...[*Saïd afbryder, hvor på Bourdieu fortsætter...*] But your conclusion was pessimistic you must admit. Yes okay...

Saïd:

[*Vi hører Saïd mens kameraet endnu peger på Bourdieu*] But the situation we are in...is a pessimistic one. When you go the problem remains.

Bourdieu:

I am not denying that. I am right to say it was pessimistic. To conclude, that is at least what I heard. "There is nothing we can do", I don't think that is true. It is not true and it is a classic, the most bogus structures, structures of manipulation, structures of supervision, can be diverted, turned around. Anyway, I am not here to preach revolution [*Bourdieu lægger mikrofonen...*].

Ordstyrer:

Two more questions and then a conclusion from Bourdieu.

Mounir:

Politics is keeping a low profile tonight. All commissions in general when they are set up by politicians always include a sociologist. Politicians take the essence of what you write in your reports. That is the first thing. As an inhabitant of the area, I think that a sociologist is a housing estate psychiatrist. Whenever there is a problem... sorry, that is what we call them.

Bourdieu:

"Housing estate psychiatrist?" That is just insulting. And it is not true. There may be some who...

Gæst:

[*råbende, har ikke fået mikrofonen...*] That is how we see it/you [*vanskeligt at høre...*], face the truth.

Bourdieu:

It is true that the term “sociologist” covers many different types. Maybe sociologists contribute by inspiring politicians... No, if only it is true. No, they provide politicians with their backing, which is worse. Some sociologists, I am sorry to say... And I don't consider them colleagues, they are scabs, they disgrace the profession... I have to say this. I can't feel sympathy for them. I could not care less for them. They don't bother me at all, except insofar as they legitimise a certain generalised revolt against sociological discourse and justify a certain anti-intellectualism. It pains me to hear all this anti-intellectualism. The French workers' movement died of anti-intellectualism. It was founded on a sort of workers-ism which allowed its leaders to be stupid and demand stupidity in the name of party discipline. That is why I keep my distance from those people. It is too easy to denounce people who are... yes, scabs. They are scabs. These are people who pretend to practise a profession. They are a sort of symbolic police force, frankly speaking. One factor which explains why the social movement cannot get organised is this anti-intellectualism. Someone said – just let me finish – that you might learn from my books. Well you would understand this, you would get tools for understanding this. That is not a plug. I don't give a damn. Don't let your righteous indignation, which is totally justified, blind you and deprive you of the tools of understanding. “Bourdieu could teach you something”, yes, I know a lot of things, I have been studying North Africa for many years. Lots of you were not even born. So I can tell you that the book by Abdelmalek Sayad, who I worked with in the 1960s and who died recently, who was a great sociologist in the field of immigration, and who wasn't a scab, and who worked with the people right to the end, who did great interviews, who knew how to listen to people... Well, there is a book by him called *The Double Absence*, in which he analyses the conditions of immigrants... Before he died he asked me to finish the book telling me it was meant for people like you. If you refuse that because he uses big words like assimilation and integration then you are stupid. Really, that is out of order! Sorry I had to say that. [publikum klapper] No, no applause. So that is Abdelmalek Sayad *The Double Absence*, it costs 140 francs. A bit pricey but I could not get it lower. He was a man of intelligence who understood things with his heart. And maybe his work can help people to regain possession of their own historical identities from their parents' suffering, from the suffering of language and naturalisation, from the suffering of those who cannot escape their origins. You have taught me nothing. I could teach you a few things about yourselves. If that sounds arrogant. What the hell! Because I believe it is the truth. I am not preaching for your good. I don't give a damn. But don't deprive yourselves of these intellectual resources. Intellectualism is not a disease [*Bourdieu lægger mikrofonen...*].

Ordstyrer:

I think we will have to end there.

[*Kameraet følger nu korridorsnak i halvmørke mellem to af de meget talende gæster, Saïd, og Bourdieu. Jeg fornemmer en gensidig ægte interesse*]

Saïd: Mr Bourdieu, I am sorry, I did not say it all, I wanted people to make people understand certain facts. That is why I made that quip about Bourdieu and Dieu.

Bourdieu: I agree, you did well to say that.

Saïd: But there comes a point when we have to make people like you listen to us, so you can pass it on. Or try at least. To keep you in touch. All we said must have been useful.

Bourdieu: It was all very good. I would have liked it to go on longer.

Saïd: where can we get in touch with you, or write to you?

[Bourdieu giver ham en adresse siger tak og kameraet følger ham nu på vej ud sammen med Saïd og en kollega]

Said: we are trying to be sociologists, gutter sociologists. Remember that gutter sociologists!

Bourdieu: I will use that.... "As my friend Saïd, the gutter sociologist, said...".

[Bourdieu og kollega spadserer i vinterkulden hen imod en bil mens de glædes over kommentarerne og aftenen]

Kort epiløg

Med transskriptionen her har jeg ønsket at skabe plads til nogle nye stemmer i nyhedsbrevet (foruden min redaktørs i øvrigt udmærkede indlæg og de få men interessante læserbidrag) og til at formidle en mere politisk side af Bourdieu, ikke som enetale, men som den kommer til udtryk i en dialogisk mundtlig kontekst. Debatten i Val Fourré fangede min interesse på grund af dens redelige hårdtslående stil, dens tema, og dramaturgi. Der er ikke tale om ekspert-tale afbrudt af kortere lytter-spørgsmål og kommentarer. Parterne diskuterer og den ene parts ord påvirker den næstes. Selvom der råbes i munden på hinanden ind i mellem er der, paradoksalt nok, tid til at folk kan tale ud. Edward Saïd (ikke at forveksle mellem Val Fourrés Saïd) introducerer i begyndelsen af dokumentarfilmen Bourdieu til en videokonference foran hvad formentlig har været Columbia University studerende (Edward Saïds arbejdsplads i New York). Et par år efter var disse to store akademikere og aktivister - som på forskellig vis skrev om 'symbolsk vold' - borte desværre. Den intensiverede uro i franske forstader og ikke mindst den danske mediedebat om udstødelse og indvandrere, gør temaerne højaktuelle: Hvem gives stemme og plads, og af hvem, og hvordan? Hvordan engagerer vi os mest ærligt og redeligt som demokrater? Hvordan kan man tale om social udstødelse på en facon, og i et sprog, der giver de forskellige aktører en fair chance? Kære læser. Kommentér gerne.

Anders Høg Hansen