



Culture, Civilization and the World – the Semantics of Globalization

University of Oslo, Norway, January 25-27 2010

Abstracts

Ahmed Ahsanuzzaman, Doctoral Research Fellow, Centre for Ibsen Studies, University of Oslo,
ahmed.ahsanuzzaman@ibsen.uio.no

Ibsen contextualized in Bengal: Sambhu Mitra's Adaption of *A Doll's House*

Ibsen's entry into the Indian playhouse nearly coincided with India's independence from her British colonial rulers in 1947, and his *A Doll's House* is one of the foreign plays which has been widely staged both in translation and adaptation in different parts of the Indian subcontinent. In my presentation I will focus upon an early Bengali adaptation of the play, *Putul Khela* (Playing with Dolls) which was premiered in the West Bengal capital Calcutta (today's Kolkata) in 1958 by a leading theatre group, Bohurupee. Adapted and directed by Sambhu Mitra, one of the doyens of Indian theatre, *Putul Khela* is considered a milestone in the field of adaptation. The aim of my paper is to discuss the challenges that Mitra had to negotiate with while adapting the European play for a people belonging to a different culture and tradition. I will concentrate on the episodes of Nora's dance of tarantella and her departure from the house in the adapted play to argue that Mitra's intimate knowledge of Bengali culture and tradition enabled him to create a Bengali play out of Ibsen. I will contend that Mitra explored Ibsen in his adaptation to reflect upon the Bengali society of 1950's.



Hassan Bashir, Ph.D., Visiting Assistant Professor, Liberal Arts Program - Political Science, Texas A&M University at Qatar, Doha, Qatar, hassan.bashir@qatar.tamu.edu

Doing Political Theory in a Globalized World: Some Theoretical and Methodological Concerns

This paper focuses on the implications of globalization for the study of political thought in English-speaking universities in the west. Political theorists in these universities have traditionally maintained an almost exclusive focus on typically occidental concepts such as

democracy, rights, individualism, freedom etc. In recent years, however, a number of prominent North American political theorists have stressed the need for adopting a more inclusive approach in political theory by arguing in favor of inclusion of non-western ideas into mainstream western political theorizing. Calls by these comparative theorists have resulted in the creation of a new subfield of political theory which is interchangeably referred to as Cosmopolitan or Comparative political theory (CPT). Comparative theorists give several reasons in support of their arguments for CPT but the most compelling of these arguments seems to be that “globalization in its current form is deterritorialization of politics and culture par excellence and is uniquely beyond the grasp of traditional political theory due to its parallel focus on canonical texts of western thought and preoccupation with the relations between sovereign and people and the state and society.” (Euben 1999)

In this paper I briefly summarize the main arguments presented in support of CPT and highlight the promise as well as the challenges that emerge from adopting a comparative or a cosmopolitan perspective. While I fully support the argument in favor of a more inclusive discipline of political theory, I also believe that such an approach could prove to be counter productive if it is justified and adopted only in context of the current wave of globalization. My central argument in this context is that even though globalization may have acted as a catalyst in exposing the limited nature and scope of traditional western political theory it cannot be prior to theorizing itself. I argue that CPT promises to virtually introduce a Khunian paradigm-shift in the practice of political theory in the west by necessitating, even forcing, political theorists to open themselves to the insights from other fields in the social sciences and humanities. To illustrate this point I conclude the paper by making the case for a close partnership between CPT and conceptual history in making fuller sense of the human condition especially in a globalized world.



Elif Daldeniz, Asist. Prof., Okan University, Department of Translation Studies, elif.daldeniz@okan.edu.tr

Travelling Concepts: The Transfer and Translation of ‘Culture’ into Ottoman and Modern Turkish Thinking

The aim of this paper will be to discuss the transfer of the concept ‘culture’ into Ottoman and Modern Turkish thinking and its reception in the target system. The paper will present findings of research focusing on important figures in Turkish intellectual and political life that played an important role in the transformation of the Ottoman Empire into the nation-state Turkey. The concept ‘culture’ is an important element in this transformation since it was employed in the construction of the new national identity. Based on the conception of translation in contemporary Translation Studies, the paper aims to discuss this process of transfer by comparing/contrasting the conceptions of ‘culture’ in the importing as well as exporting systems.



Re-Imagining ‘The World’: Reflections on a Concept of Totality from the Perspective of Peter Sloterdijk’s *Sphere-Philosophy*

If we think about what we call ‘the world’, most likely we imagine a round globe or an bluish looking planet amidst the black space of the universe. Now, whereas this world’s roundness is an empirical fact I most certainly shan’t be trying to dispute, the *concept* we have of what we call ‘the world’, a concept very closely linked to the way our round world looks, is something that most certainly *can* be disputed – and maybe even *should*.

In most cultures, roundness is something that indicates perfection, and if one reads Plato’s *Banquet*, round perfection turns out to be that which isn’t fragmented, that which is whole, not lacking anything, total, *one*. Given the influence this core text of western metaphysics has had on our culture, our conception of roundness cannot be dissociated from the associations mentioned above; but even more importantly, spherical perfection, always already lost to us, is something that, since Plato, is to be regained, thereby making up for our fragmented nature. In the first part of his *Sphere-Trilogy*, called *Bubbles*, German philosopher Peter Sloterdijk (1947) makes several allusions to Plato’s *Banquet* and if you look more closely, it turns out that what Sloterdijk describes as our subjective coming-into-this-world is a process not only marked by a fundamental loss, but also highly indebted to Plato’s thoughts on compensation. Being born into a world that is governed by logocentric principles, Sloterdijk describes how the new-born subject meets a wall of silence regarding everything that doesn’t fit the rules and regulations of logocentrism. Only that which is compatible to this logocentric regime is allowed to develop, and thus, according to Sloterdijk, we begin to build our subjective ‘Opus One’, as he calls it, a very *one-dimensional*, subjective world by which we exclude everything else in our fundamentally *multi-dimensional* humanity. Exactly how devastating this subjective process really is becomes clear when taking into account the effects these subjective processes of repression have had on an intersubjective level. Reading the second part of his *Sphere-trilogy*, *Globes*, in which Sloterdijk tells the story of European conquistadores violently conquering the world, a globalization process Sloterdijk calls ‘terrestrial’, one quickly gathers that there is a fundamental link: the repression of subjects other than ourselves in *Globes* is nothing else, in the end, than a repetition of the repressive processes we ourselves have been the victims of within the framework of our own intra-subjective ‘Opus One’. Read before the background of Plato’s *Banquet*, then, both processes turn out to be compensatory in the sense that both by adhering to the logocentric rule of Oneness and by trying to make the rest of the world do likewise, all we really have been doing is try to compensate the fact that we *aren’t one*, that we are fragmented and not whole.

Now, what is problematic about this compensatory thinking since Plato is not only the fact that the wholeness it tries to attain is conceived as oneness, but also, and even more importantly, that it tries to make fragmentation, *ergo*, difference, disappear. Clearly, a philosophical project like that is not only doomed to fail, but also highly unethical, something Sloterdijk knows all too well; therefore, in his *Sphere-trilogy*, he tries to conceive of a different human becoming. Reminding us of the fact that *we are two*, that we are human, first and foremost because of the fact that we, together with other humans, build intersubjective, round worlds (‘Rundwelten’), the concept of ‘sphere’ is compensatory in the sense that it’s constructive energy undeniably, as in Plato’s *Banquet*, derives from a sensation of lack and of being fragmented, but in contrast to Plato the ‘globalizing’ construction of these little spheres does not cancel fragmentation. On the contrary: constructing spheres, for Sloterdijk, implies, firstly, that there are other people to build spheres with, something by which the fact of

intersubjective difference is warranted; and secondly, we wouldn't be constructing these round little worlds had we not, on an intra-subjective level, from the onset on been marked by cracks and fissures, *ergo*, by difference. The concept of 'sphere', then, involves a conception of roundness that no longer automatically means oneness, since 'spheres' or 'Rundwelten' can only come into being as long as we remember that we, both intra- and intersubjectively, *are two*.

Taking Sloterdijk's *Sphere-Philosophy* as an inspiration in my paper, I would like to re-think the concept we have of 'the world'. From a European perspective, 'the world' is something we have discovered, subjected to our own will, 'made in our own image'; thanks to our very one-sided hailing of the logocentric principle, our technical inventions, born by a seemingly unbound rationality, have even made it possible for us to watch and control our globalized world from space. This however, is not something we necessarily should feel an undivided pride about: for as also Sloterdijk implicitly suggests in his philosophy, what the view of our planet from space really should be telling us is exactly how much we have lost, in other words, other than only looking at our flying satellites as indisputable human achievements, we should have a good look at exactly what price this attaining of extreme technological heights has come. From such a perspective, we might get reminded of the fact that we as humans are more fragile and more subject to boundaries than we maybe have been thinking since the dawn of Modernity. And isn't further Sloterdijk's history of 'terrestrial globalization' telling us something about how we shouldn't be thinking 'the world', namely as a uniformly built, homogeneous globe where only Western principles are allowed? Taking Sloterdijk's concept of 'sphere' as a starting point, I would like to argue that our concept of 'the world' needs re-imagining: in accordance with Irigaray's concept of wholeness in *The Way of Love*, we should perhaps, when thinking of 'the world', make an effort to try to imagine a 'moving whole', a 'moving whole' that continually could be exchanged, disputed, enlarged, enriched, transformed etc., a 'moving whole' that we, the many different people of this 'world', all marked by the traces of fragmentation, would be working on *together*.



Nora S. Eggen, PhD fellow, Department of Culture Studies and Oriental Languages, University of Oslo,
n.s.eggen@ikos.uio.no

Conceptualisations of the world in Islamic foundational texts and scholarly literature

In this paper I would like to explore conceptualisations of the world in some Islamic traditions starting with the Qur'ān and ending up in contemporary debates on globalisation.

In classical dictionaries the Arabic word '*ālam* "world" is considered as a derivation from the root '*-l-m* with the root meaning "knowing", the '*ālam* being "that by means of which one knows [a thing]".¹ Consequently in the Qur'ān the purpose of the world is to be a device for man to know God, and the world of the heavens and the earth is a unity with this purpose (*malakūti al-samawāti wal-arḍ*, al-Qur'ān 7:185).

Space and time is in the Qur'ān organized in the conceptual pair *al-dunyā* "the lowest" and *al-ākhirā* "the last", the first referring to this world and the last to the hereafter (2:201). Pertaining to this world is the manifest (*al-shahāda*) and pertaining to the next world is the

¹ al-Rāghib al-Iṣfahānī: *al-Mufradāt fī gharīb al-Qur'ān*. Beirut, Dār al-ma'rifah 1998, s. 349.

hidden (*al-ghayb*). The medieval scholar Abū Ḥāmid al-Ghazālī (d. 1111) developed on the Qur’ānic ground of a two-fold reality a theory of not sequential but parallel existences with the conceptual pair *‘ālam al-mulk wal-shahāda* – denoting the phenomenal world, and *‘ālam al-ghayb wal-malakūt* – what is usually referred to as the invisible world. In al-Ghazālī’s epistemology the two worlds give access to different dimensions, and in his hermeneutics these different dimensions of knowledge relate to each other.

Moving into socio-political conceptualisations, the world can be perceived as fields of activity: *diyār* (sing. *dār*) “dwellings”. In the classical theories developed by early Muslim scholars such as Abū Ḥanīfā (d. 767) the world was conceived as two fields of activity: *dār al-Islam*, in which the laws of Islam prevailed and *dār al-ḥarb* (war), in which they didn’t and therefore was an abode of potential war. Others (al-Shafī’ī, d. 820) maintained that *dār al-sulḥ* (truce) or *dār al-‘ahd* (pact) would be temporary fields of activity between these two.

Alternative perceptions of the world has in recent times been presented. In view of the present geopolitical state of the world modern Islamic thinkers such as Tariq Ramadan calls for a redefinition of *dār*; from a limited dwelling to an open space. Only in an open space can the Muslim of today strive for global justice, hence Ramadan defines the West as a *dār al-shahāda* or *‘ālam al-shahāda* – “area, or world, of testimony”. With this notion we have reached a globalisation discourse, and the last part of the paper will dwell on two new notions in Arabic that has been coined with the etymological framework of *‘-l-m*: *‘awlama* “globalisation” and *‘almāniya/ilmāniya* “secularism”.



Ingunn Eriksen, Center of Gender Research, University of Oslo, i.m.eriksen@stk.uio.no

Narratives of Noise in Multi-Ethnic Schooling

This paper is about ethnic identity markers and their imprint on the narratives people tell about themselves and others, how such narratives may develop and how they allocate people to certain subject positions. I will focus on an upper secondary school classroom with a majority of ethnic minority students. Here, noise and disruption form a narrative that is used to conceptualize ethnic difference. A dominant narrative was established by the collected student group which obscured dissenting stories and actions, where “the foreigners” (as they were called) were narrated as the noisy ones, while the ethnic Norwegians, who were in radical minority, were portrayed as silent, studious and disciplined.

I suggest that on the one side, “the Norwegians” were unable to discuss their experienced marginalisation other than through the narrative of “the foreigners” noise, reinforcing the binary of chaos in the classroom. On the other, “the foreigners” dis-identified from the perceived Norwegian and middle-class privilege in school marked through the strong requirement for self-discipline. I propose that their disruptive behaviour and the narrative of noise were the outcome of a double ambivalent positioning in the particular intersection between their personal expectations and their social positioning: they negotiated an ambivalence between their perception of their societal minority status and their statistical majority in class, as well as finding themselves in a contradictory position between the school’s requirements of self-discipline and their own expectations of being disciplined by the teachers. In this class, the narratives of “foreigners” noise and “Norwegian” self-discipline may potentially secure white privilege, encouraging middle-class qualities and competencies,

while inducing a future working-class position for the ethnic minority group.

The PhD study is based on ethnographic fieldwork in a school class in the first year of upper secondary school and on in-depth narrative interviews with the same students. The interdisciplinary theoretical framework is grounded in a Ricoeurian narrative approach and a psychosocial analysis, giving an insight into how subjective narratives are created and what happens with the meaning of categories and narratives when they enter a specific context.



Eva Fetscher, PhD candidate at the Forum for Contemporary History, Department of Archaeology, Conservation and History, University of Oslo, eva.fetscher@iakh.uio.no

The atom bomb as a prerequisite of conflict and peace research? An analysis of the concept of conflict and peace research during its institutionalization.

During the first postwar decade humankind had been enchained in a mix of fascination, fear and denial regarding the atom bomb and possible consequences of an escalating war between the superpowers. In the late 1950s the accelerated progress of nuclear weapon research, outrunning human morals as well as social sciences, challenged the postwar generation. "There is no problem more urgent for mankind than learning how to resolve conflicts without resort to violence,"² Erik Rinde, director of the Institute for Social Research (ISR) in Oslo, declared in March 1959. A few months later the young mathematician and sociologist Johan Galtung stepped in as first director of the newly established Department of Conflict and Peace Research at ISR.

The paper's overarching objective is to discuss possible coherences between the global phenomenon of nuclear fear and the novel concept of conflict and peace research in the late 1950s. I will open with introducing the new discipline as a concept, which will derive from Reinhard Koselleck's methodology *Begriffsgeschichte*. Secondly, by applying the categories *Erfahrungsraum* and *Erwartungshorizont*, influences of relevant national and international academic and socio-political settings on the discipline's originating process, as well as the meaning of their relation to one another, will be studied. The third research objective is to accentuate the relation of conflict and peace research specifically to the atom bomb, i.e. the effect of fearful expectations and images of nuclear annihilation on shaping conflict and peace research. A decisive question in this context is to what extent the rapid rise of conflict and peace research can be related to a possible accelerating effect emanating from the atom bomb?



Herdis Hølleland, Doctoral research fellow, KULTRANS, University of Oslo. herdis.holleland@gmail.com

Conceptual turnover for the past: UNESCO and 'World Heritage'

The concept of heritage is a fairly recent addition to the vocabulary concerning the past in general and the relationship between the past and the present in particular. However, before

² Erik Rinde: "Towards a center for international research on peaceful alternatives to violent conflict", Bilag 6B 1959: 1, ISF Arkivboks "K", Institutsaker, Styremøter, 1959, PRIO archive.

the concept of heritage became mainstream, within either academic or everyday vocabulary, it was connected to the concept of the world by UNESCO. With UNESCO's World Heritage a new conceptual framework for classifying both the past and world geography was created. In a sense one can argue that the roots of a new type of landscape were formed – a global and transnational heritage-scape. This paper examines how such concepts have the possibility to create new landscapes and questions whether they can move beyond being about idealised landscapes to experienced ones.



Marja Jalava, PhD, post-doctoral researcher, Department of History, University of Helsinki, Finland,
marja.jalava@helsinki.fi

The Concepts of “Development,” “Backwardness,” and “Bildning/sivistys” in the Early 20th Century Finnish Historiography: the Case of the Finnish Lamprechtians

My paper focuses on the reception of the German historian Karl Lamprecht's *Kulturgeschichte* in the early 20th century Finnish academic historiography. The main objective is to examine and analyze the ways by which the Finnish historians interested in the new paradigm of *Kulturgeschichte* and social history translated the past into their own time, characterized by the integration of the Nordic countries into the globalizing world economy sensitive to fluctuations, the proliferation of mass movements, and the experiences of accelerated transition and shortened temporal rhythms. In other words, I am interested in the formation of the historical self-conception of modern society, in which its historicity – consciously reflected history – became a defining feature of its identity.

Karl Lamprecht (1856–1915) is commonly considered a “founding father” of social history, representing a universal nomothetic approach, i.e. the priority of collective socio-economic structures, statistic analysis, and causal laws. Moreover, Lamprecht strove for a vast morphology of the peoples of Europe and, ultimately, of the entire world, based on the idea that peoples developed, although at different paces and times, through similar series of stages. Thus, Lamprecht's *Kulturgeschichte* encouraged a comparative history of the entire world's peoples, exemplifying the emerging interest in world history during the first globalization period of the modern capitalist world economy (c. 1870s–1910s).

Although the Lamprechtian classifications of the universal developmental stages of humankind were never straightforwardly accepted or applied by the Finnish Lamprechtians, nevertheless, they agreed the idea of the different developmental stages, present and effectual at the same time. In my paper, I will discuss the ways by which they operated with the concept of “development” and temporal metaphors such as “backwardness,” “overtaking,” and “delay,” based on a Western European canon of how a modern society should be.

The special emphasis is on the Finnish Lamprechtians' way of exploiting a double manoeuvre which allowed the co-existence of national and universal discourses. For instance, on the one hand, on the European level, they admitted that Finland was “the periphery of everything,” characterized by the geographical and mental distance from the European cultural (*bildning/sivistys*) centers, but, on the other hand, in the meso-region of the Finnic peoples, the Finns were claimed to be “the most cultured (*bildad/sivistynyt*) Western people,” which legitimized the interwar pan-Finnicism. The relation between “development” and

bildning/sivistys (in German, *Bildung*) exemplifies a particular worldview common to the Lutheran-dominated, German-influenced regions of Northern Europe. Only in the 1960s and the 1970s, mostly because of the Anglo-American influence, was the concept of *bildning/sivistys* replaced by *kultur/kulttuuri* in the Finnish historiography.



Pekka Korhonen & Paul-Erik Korvela, University of Jyväskylä, Finland,
pekka.a.korhonen@jyu.fi, paul-erik.korvela@jyu.fi

Conceptual Change and Contestation in International Relations

Although there are many notable exceptions, in general the field of IR is characterized by a-historical use of concepts and is largely bereft of any serious attempt at studying the origin, multiple meanings and contextual changes of its central concepts. Many studies tend to argue that whatever their historical compositions or transformations are, states and states systems exhibit certain regularities across time, and that it is therefore plausible to make analogies between historical states systems. Even those more historically oriented surveys that compare e.g. ancient Chinese states-system and the present Westphalian (or post-Westphalian) system easily use their central concepts as if they had the same meaning. Studies like K. J. Holsti's "Taming the Sovereigns" (Cambridge University Press, 2004) that focus especially on change in central institutions of IR like war, the state, diplomacy etc. seldom say anything of conceptual change, let alone differences produced by translations and dissemination of certain concepts to foreign cultures. The present states-system, for instance, is only apparently European in its origin. The historical European development forms one lineage, but in East Asia only the Philippines, Malaysia and Indonesia are European creations; the rest of the states in that region from Korea, Japan and China to Thailand and Cambodia are older national states than any of the present European ones. Consequently, culturally different normative conceptualizations of the state, territory, war, and the international system, are inherent in their historical and linguistic patterns and actual practices. As noted by for example J. Blommaert, only the forms of political discourses tend to disseminate. The contents of the concepts might actually not do that, and we would like to study instances where a discussion is apparently carried on in empty terms, so to say.

The fulcrum of the proposed paper is the acknowledgement of conceptual change and its usefulness for studying IR. We argue that the linguistic turn has not reached IR in full extent and that there would obviously be a call for a more thoroughgoing conceptual/linguistic research in the field of international relations. It is only recently that a variety of postmodernists and/or social constructivists have started to criticize the mainstream schools of IR of the obsolescence of the conceptual categories of the field. As usual, the critique is first and foremost targeted towards realism and its core assumptions. The critique has suggested that the traditional renderings of the field are no longer consistent with the perceived reality. Key concepts like war and sovereignty remain caught within the spatio-temporal horizons of another era and we continue to use the obsolete conceptual apparatus at our intellectual peril. The conceptual foundations of the field of international relations have not kept up with changes in the real world. This is especially evident in concepts like war: it has come to mean almost exclusively inter-state war, which is withering away in the modern world. Non-state actors are increasingly involved in wars that are no longer declared, but the juridical and conceptual apparatus is still based on a state-centred definition of war.

The pressing need for greater sensitivity is also evident in the different usage of some concepts in political theory and IR: anarchy in the international sphere does not have the same connotations as in political theory. Whereas in political theory anarchy means absence of rule, disorder and chaos, in international sphere only the first connotation is applicable. The absence of an authority greater than the state's has not created complete havoc in the international sphere. There are also concepts like democracy and human rights, which strangely have been elevated beyond politics: democracy is seen as unproblematic on/off condition and in the Western mindset there are only countries that are democratic and countries that are not yet democratic.

Although it is rather evident that the conceptual apparatus is not keeping up with the changes in the "real world", it could be claimed that this has never been the case: employing the Western conceptual apparatus and the elevation of Western cultural values as the telos of other societies has always been misleading and tended to exclude and marginalize non-conforming ambiguities and contingencies. This, what Hedley Bull called the "domestic analogy", has often inhibited the theorists of IR to grasp the global life as it really is: open-ended and hazardous contestation between plural possibilities and differing views.



Inkeri Koskinen, Helsinki, Finland, ikoskine@mappi.helsinki.fi

"Culture" as a contested concept in ethnographic research

It could be fruitful in philosophy of human sciences to treat some of the problematic but still common terms used in research not necessarily as theoretical terms that denote clear-cut objects or categories, but rather as thoroughly contested but irreplaceable elements of theoretical controversies. This approach enables the philosopher of science to discuss problematic terms not as failures to meet a fixed standard, but as examples of what theoretical terms sometimes actually are like.

Culture is an avowedly problematic concept which nonetheless is widely used in ethnographic research. It is entangled in several disputes that range from national politics to epistemology, and it is quite as contested as a term used in research as it is as a more general Koselleckian basic concept. Politics and philosophical problems are tightly intertwined in the academic discussions where it can be found. As James Clifford puts it, "Culture is a deeply compromised idea I cannot yet do without".

There are different possible ways for a philosopher of science to try to grasp the phenomenon in question: why do researchers use concepts that because of their vagueness and numerous conflicting definitions seem to be particularly unsuitable for research purposes? Why cannot Clifford do without culture? One can choose the normative path and try to define the concept in question. I however find this unsatisfactory, and believe a descriptive approach to be more fruitful. One possibility would then be to use the idea of boundary concepts, similar to boundary objects defined by Susan Leigh Star and James R. Griesemer: "They have different meanings in different social worlds but their structure is common enough to more than one world to make them recognizable, a means of translation." Thus such vague terms as "culture" would be useful because of their facilitating role in interdisciplinary discussions. However, the shortcoming of this approach is the too little attention given to the obvious controversies

surrounding terms like "culture". Koselleck's idea of contested concepts could be used to make this side of such terms clearer.

I find it possibly fruitful to assume that at least some terms used in research are necessary as bones of contention in theoretical disputes. As Koselleck puts it, they "become indispensable to any formulation of the most urgent issues of a given time". They are necessary because the debates can not be stated without them, and at the same time they are necessarily ambiguous and contested: the different sides in the debates materialise their differences in different ways of using the relevant analytical tools. The debates culminate in the keywords used in them. In order to tentatively test the usefulness of Koselleck's ideas in philosophical study of research terminology, I have gathered some recent Finnish folkloristic dissertations as text files. I use the program AntConc to study the ways in which the Finnish word "kulttuuri" is used in them, and try to see whether a Koselleckian viewpoint offers useful insights when attempting to understand the persistent use of the term in ethnographic research.



Pia Lane, post doctoral research fellow, Department of Linguistics and Scandinavian Studies, University of Oslo, p.m.j.lane@iln.uio.no

Categorizing Indigenous Peoples

ABSTRACT TO BE INSERTED



Claudia Lenz, The European Wergeland Centre, Oslo, Norway, C.Lenz@theewc.org

Citizenship – an ambigram in the context of national and global interpretations

The “global citizen” has become a trend-word. It is related to the idea of cosmopolitanism and of “inhabiting the world” instead of being tied to a nation as source of identity and belonging. It points to the limitation of national boundaries when it comes to our responsibilities and commitments to the social, political and environmental context we live in. Offering a perspective of peaceful coexistence without borders and the idea of civic participation in global political decision making that take up with the economical and cultural interdependences, it seems to be a desirable goal and a logic consequence of contemporary developments.

But is it as easy as that? Can the notion of citizenship, which traditionally is linked to the idea of rights and duties related to a state, be transcended to the notion of being the “citizen of the world”? Can the identities and the sense of belonging really be related to something like the “global village”? Critics highlight the need of existing formal structures and shared cultural symbols and rituals for the creation of “citizens”.

“Education for Democratic Citizenship” is a field gaining importance in European countries. The concept is promoted via large-scale programs by the Council of Europe, and it is related to an idea of an emerging European *culture of citizenship* – maybe even a *supra-national*, European *form of citizenship*. But citizenship education still has to be implemented within

national education systems and it has to build on experiences made in local contexts. Another approach being promoted is the concept of “global education” which explicitly aims at “global responsibility of the citizens of the world” (da Silva 2008). The paper will highlight some of the ambiguities of the citizenship-concept and argue that this very ambiguity should be an element of educational practice fostering critical and self-reflecting thinking.



Trond Nerland, Doctoral research fellow, Department of Literature, Area Studies and European Languages, University of Oslo, trond.nerland@ilos.uio.no

Neither Pacifism nor Bellicism: Selective Conscientious Objection, Lutheran Churches in America, and the Vietnam War.

This paper aims first at documenting historically the conception and development of selective conscientious objection in journals of religious thought; a new kind of principled moral rejection of war in America. The paper shows with reference to primary sources that the invention of this concept, as well as the more specific and intermediate terms ‘selective objector,’ ‘limited objector,’ and ‘just war objector’ early on were linked to the nature of the Vietnam War, a discriminating conscience, and the doctrine of moral enquiry known as Just War.

The problem of selective conscientious objection is then followed in one cross section of American religion. In so doing it deals with the treatment of selective conscientious objection by the rather liberal Lutheran Church in America, the moderate leaning American Lutheran Church, and the theologically more conservative Lutheran Church–Missouri Synod, the three largest Lutheran denominations in the United States.

Through research of primary sources in archives from biannual conventions, minutes from board meetings, letters, and official statements on the Vietnam War, military service, and conscience from these religious bodies, as well as the debate in a number of magazines and journals during the Vietnam War, I aim at explaining why the Lutheran Church–Missouri Synod ultimately rejected a proposal which would approve of conscientious objection to particular wars, while the two other and largest Lutheran churches approved of the principle of selective conscientious objection.



Hans Erik Næss, Doctoral research fellow, Kultrans, University of Oslo, h.e.nass@admin.uio.no

Methodological Cosmopolitanism: From Semantic Novelty to Empirical Innovation

A string of recently published books demonstrate that sociology is in need of a methodological framework more able than conventional ideas to deal with the complexities of today’s globalizing societies. Generally, this paper therefore seeks to review the current status of globalization methodology, including the introduction of one of the most prominent attempts to cope with the pluralism of the modern-day world: Ulrich Beck’ theory of methodological cosmopolitanism. Specifically, it aims to explore the validity of methodological cosmopolitanism by focusing on its novelty as a) theoretical concept and b) empirical tool-box. Assuming that both these elements must be well developed to be a

coherent methodological innovation, this paper investigates how Beck's theory may satisfy a), but not b). Consequently, it is argued that methodological cosmopolitanism has re-conceptualized the sociological outlook in a positive way, yet it still faces empirical challenges in order to be a complete alternative to existing methodologies. Conclusively, by reviewing the promises and pitfalls of multi-sited ethnography, some of these challenges are attempted solved.



Liliana Obregon, Associate Professor, Universidad de los Andes - Colombia (on leave), Postdoctoral Researcher, University of Helsinki, liliana.obregon@helsinki.fi

The Concept of Civilization in International Law

This presentation will look at the appropriation of the concept of civilization by the discipline of international law in the nineteenth century, in particular relation to the new American states. The concept of civilization is modern, only coming into use in the mid-eighteenth century and quickly popularized during the French Revolution. In its French meaning it expresses the idea of progress and the possibility of human perfection. By the end of the eighteenth century, Europe was said to have “an existing or finished civilization” that was in expansion. As Norbert Elias stated in 1939, the “concept of civilization expresses the [national] self-consciousness of the West.” Criollos (creoles or Spanish Americans) realized that if the civilization of Europe was unified and perfected, theirs was left half-way or lacking after the end of European (Spanish) presence in the region. Therefore, it was the Criollos utopia to “complete” and to achieve the civilization that they presumed Europe had. More than a result of colonization, the Criollos’ “will to civilization” was self-imposed, one of the factors they thought to be fundamental for their recognition as sovereign states and as members of the self denominated “community of civilized nations,” as well as for national and regional advancement. In addition, the United States declaration of independence in 1776 and the Haitian Revolution of 1791 as well as her declaration of independence in 1804 were two American events that shaped the initial direction of the will to civilize of the Criollos in the nineteenth century. The project of completing civilization in Latin America thus began early in the nineteenth century, and by the mid-nineteenth century the discourse of civilization (and its complement, “barbarism”) had been completely appropriated, it had been “creolized” adopted to local circumstances and mixed in with the popular culture. The dichotomy civilization/barbarism became the definitive axis through which the past and future of progress in Latin America would continue to be discussed for the entire nineteenth century.



Heli Rantala (MA), Department of Cultural History, University of Turku, Finland, hemara@utu.fi

”Culture” and ”Civilization” in Finnish 19th century discussion

My paper will discuss the notion of culture and civilization in Finnish scholarly discussion in the first half of the nineteenth century. I will give some examples on how these concepts were used in Finland, especially after the year 1809. In 1809 Finland became a Grand Duchy of Russia, losing official ties to its old motherland Sweden. This new political situation launched a public debate among the Swedish-speaking educated class. In focus were national issues (questions of Finnish national characteristics and the future of Finnish nation) but the discussion had many transnational aspects. One of these aspects is the use of concepts like “culture” and “civilization” in this discourse. In many respects these concepts were transferred into a Finnish discussion from European intellectual tradition, mostly from German philosophical and literary tradition. In my presentation I introduce a text from Johan Jakob Tengström (1787–1858), a university teacher who had a significant role in the education of Finnish future scholars in the first half of the 19th century. I introduce also his close student Johan Wilhelm Snellman (1806–1881). With these two intellectual examples I will bring forth

some aspects of "culture" and "civilization" in Finnish use. My view is on the transnational character of these concepts, together with the idea of change. One can see the change in the meaning of "culture" and "civilization" in some decades. In my presentation I will highlight this change by comparing these two concepts in the use of Tengström and Snellman.



Aino Rinhaug, Post-doctoral Research Fellow, Department of Literature, Area Studies and European Languages, University of Oslo, Visiting Fellow, IGRS School of Advanced Studies, University of London, aino.rinhaug@ilos.uio.no

Adopted Aesthetics: Art as Discourse of Migration, Exile and Transversality

In view of the seminar's focus on the semantics of globalisation, my presentation seeks to highlight a particular form of semantics of subjectivity. As the title suggests, I intend to examine more closely different works of art (in a broad sense) by artists that were once upon a time adopted from South Korea. The point of departure of my analysis is the notion that this large group of people constitutes a particular kind of diaspora and that several of their shared negotiations related to questions of identity, belonging and self can be processed and viewed in art. More specifically, I will take the following topics into consideration:

1. Globalisation today and different forms of migration
2. Exile and the urge to create a lost self
3. The adopted self: renegotiating genealogy and otherness in art
4. Transversality, identity and belonging in art as discourse of the self (Korean *segzehwa* policy vs. genealogy of the adoptee)



Chris Rowland, KULTRANS guest researcher, University of Oslo, c.j.rowland@ilos.uio.no

Homing In: What Ethnic Return Migration Can Tell Us about the Semantics of Globalisation

Modern globalisation as a concept and practice is most fascinating where our understandings of existing and often hackneyed phenomena are challenged. Migration is one such field, typically reducible only to (controversial) immigration on the one hand and (not so controversial) emigration on the other. Yet in the last twenty years, many millions of people have uprooted themselves from the lands of their birth to make new lives in an 'old-new' country: these 'ethnic return migrants' come from diasporas which, since 1990, have moved increasingly from unstable states (typically but not exclusively from the former Soviet Union) to eponymous 'homelands' abroad. There, however, whether they be ethnic German *Aussiedler* in Germany, Russian-speaking Pontic Greek in Greece, former Soviet Jew in Israel, or Hispanophone Italian-Argentine in Italy, their reception and integration has been uneasy, fraught with disputes over ideals of authenticity, belonging and nationalistic kinship on the one hand and the reality of alienation, contestation and sociological strangeness on the other. This paper investigates the distance between the concepts, ideals and practice of

diaspora, homeland and national identity as it applies to ethnic return migrants. Reports of the death of the nation-state, nationalism, and national identity are wildly exaggerated. Can the circle of diaspora needs, homeland pragmatism and the immigration debate be squared in our self-consciously ‘modern’ and ‘global’ era?



Mohammad Sajjad, sajjad@mpib-berlin.mpg.de

Allegiance to the Master: Conceptualizing Spiritual Authority in Indian Sufism

The hierarchic master-disciple relationship is a characteristic feature of mystical Islam. This relationship is sealed by Bai’ah (an oath of allegiance) in which the disciple promises to obey his master in all matters to show respect and love to him.

The paper will examine the Sufi concept of *Bai’ah* (allegiance), which is also a religious-legal concept, with a special reference to the master-disciple relationship in Indian Sufism. The paper will explore how the reformist Sufis and scholars conceptualized and appropriated *Bai’ah* (an Arabic-Islamic term) in the socio-political contexts of North India in the late 18th and early 19th century.

The paper will also delineate the emotional aspects (such as love and respect) of pledging allegiance to the spiritual master.



Johanne Kielland Servoll, Doctoral research fellow, Lillehammer University College, Norway,
johanne.servoll@hil.no

The track record of the auteur concept in Norwegian film history

The aim of this paper is to test the validity of the theoretical and methodical tools I have chosen to examine the main question of my dissertation: How can we understand the impact the auteur concept, which originated in French film culture in the 1950’s, has had on Norwegian film culture. I will argue the usefulness of two theoretical perspectives: (1) The history of the transfer and translation of the concept in the Norwegian film culture in the 1950ies/60ies. How, if at all, was the concept transferred into Norwegian film culture; what was preserved; what was changed; and what new content was generated? Insights will be drawn from Quentin Skinners article “Language and Political change” (1989) where he differs between three levels of meaning of concepts; its range of criteria; its range of reference; and the range of speech-acts it can be used to perform. (2) After more than two decades in disgrace, after its “heydays” in the 1970’s, the auteur concept has once again been thrown into the ongoing film debates in Norway. In what ways can the filmmakers from the 1970’s be said to have (mis)managed their roles as auteurs? And in a way that still colours the concept today. Again I will argue that Quentin Skinners theory and method, which stresses the text’s performative aspect, accompanied by theories on the “author function”, is well suited for my project. By analysing key films from this period as speech acts in the ongoing debate on the role of the film director and what film should be, I will examine in what ways the film directors were conceived at that time as auteurs, by themselves and by their critics. By tracing

their history of reception I hope to reveal why these films later were so heavily discredited, and how we can understand why it is so difficult to introduce the auteur concept in Norwegian film debates again



Ekaterina Smirnova, St. Petersburg, Russia, esmirnova@eu.spb.ru

Cultural semantics of the term “opyt”: historical analysis of the Russian discourse

The issue of the origin of particular national mentality is widely discussed in Russia nowadays. The viewpoint of the “pursuing” civilization³ is being quite widespread in socio-economic and political discourse. Indeed, various scientific tools (ideas, books, instruments and techniques) borrowed from the West played an important role in the history of natural sciences in Russia. The western influence can be easily seen in the Russian scientific terminology, mostly adopted from other European languages. Up to the mid of the XIX century Russian scientists corresponded with their colleagues (even in Russia) either in Latin, French or German. However, the problem of popularization of natural sciences (permanently grown along with the industrialization) urged the formation of national scientific terminology. This was most commonly done with the use of direct replication.

However there were some exceptions. One of the basic scientific term *experiment* was replaced by Russian word *opyt*. It should be emphasized that in Russian this word has many other meanings. Depending on context, it may denote not only *experiment*, but also *study*, *experience* or *essay*. It is rather astonishing that Russian scientists use in the field of exact sciences (mechanics, physics, chemistry) such a vague meaningful term.

Polysemy of the Russian term *opyt* even enlargers due to coexistence of cognate words with quite different senses: *pytka* (torture) and *ispytanie* (test, trial). The etymologically similar words, *opyt*, *pytka* and *ispytanie*, nowadays are used in completely different spheres – scientific, juridical and technical, respectively.⁴ This is a unique situation when comparing Russian to other European languages.

This study is devoted to the cultural history of the Russian term *opyt* with special emphasis on the etymological, historical and epistemological aspects. I believe that this kind of research (basing on the construction of social reality by means of the words) will shed some light on the origin of the distinctions between Russian and Western European mentalities thus contributing to better understanding of different cultures particularities. I hope the results of comparative analysis provide us with some arguments for the discussion on the perspective of their divergence-convergence.

I focus my attention on the two major questions:

- Why in the Russian language the two different notions - *experiment* and *experience* are

³ One of the main point of concern here is the fact that results obtained by fundamental science are not called for the economic development.

⁴ The link between the practices of juridical domain with the scientific ones is perceived through the procedure of «pytati» (questioning) and the practice of «lubopytstvo» (curiosity) appeared in the XVIII century in scientific contexts, meaning the questioning of the guilty and of the nature respectively. The significant examples are cabinet de curiosités established in the Russian Academy of Sciences by Peter the Great.

expressed by the same word *opyt*?

- Why, in spite of the wide usage of foreign terminology beginning from the XVIII century and up to date, Russian scientists (physicists, in particular) use equally well both – the Russian term *opyt* and the Latinism *experiment*?

The main idea is as follows. By the time of intensive penetration of natural sciences from the West to Russia (during the reign of Peter the Great) the practices similar to the *experiment* and denoted by the word *opyt* were already widely used in the indigenous cultural discourse. The propagandists of exact sciences (mainly imported from the West) could not ignore this fact. However, the frames of practices covered by Russian *opyt* were much larger than the procedures of scientific *experiment*. This may explain the parallel usage of both terms *opyt* and *experiment*.

Another explanation of persistence of rather vague concept *opyt* in the Russian lexicon of exact sciences can be drawn from epistemological analysis. Historically, one meaning of the Russian term *opyt* was equivalent to the final verdict of verity. This notion corresponded with basic idea of positivism shared by pioneers of natural sciences.

Trying to adjust the transnational (transcultural) meaning of *opyt* (as *experiment*) with wide polysemy of this concept in Russian, I have traced historical succession of different practices described by Russian words cognitive to *opyt*:

- the ancient practice of questioning and inquiry (particularly in juridical and clerical contexts) expressed in Russian by the verb *opytati* (derivative of *opyt*-examination);
- the term *opyt* (an expertise) which was used in the fields of agricultural and industrial examination of the quality of goods beginning from XVI century and transferred to the expertise of military equipment at the end of the XVII century;
- and scientific *opyt* (experiment) which appeared in the XVIII century due to the institutionalization of natural science in the Russian Empire modernized by Peter the Great.



Brit Solli, Professor, Museum of Cultural History, Department of Archaeology, University of Oslo,
brit.solli@khm.uio.no

Heritage trouble in the Anthropocene

In 2000 the Nobel winning chemist Paul J. Crutzen and his collaborator, marine science specialist Eugene F. Stoermer, suggested in a short statement that planet earth have entered a new geological “era” namely the *Anthropocene* (Crutzen & Stoermer 2000). Geologists and earth scientists now discuss whether there is a *need* for a new concept covering the last 300 years’ colossal human impact on the Earth. The last 8000 cal yr B.P has been a relatively stable climatic period and sea-level has also been relatively stable. These c. 8000 years “represents the longest interval of stability of climate and sea level in at least the past 400.000 years. This stability has been a significant factor in the development of human civilization” (Zalasiewicz et al. 2008). How we cope with this situation will be of outmost importance for how we are to consider the long term history and “the heritage” of man-kind. The questions I take up in this paper are: How do we define cultural and natural “heritage” in the epoch of the

Anthropocene? How are we going understand “heritage” in a rapidly changing global environment? The “linguistic turn” has had a huge impact on heritage studies since c. 1985, statements like “heritage is made, not found” dominate academic discussions on heritage, a cardinal questions is: What happens to the non-essentialist concept of heritage in the Anthropocene?



Audun Solli, Doctoral research fellow, Kultrans, University of Oslo, audunsolli@gmail.com

The Concept of the State in Popular Culture in Mexico and Venezuela - a Comparative Perspective

What kind of entities are states? How are they best conceptualized? This project aims to contribute to the debate on the state under the era of globalization by using a perspective from popular culture to analyze the cases of Venezuela and Mexico. To understand the nature of the changes that states undergo, a pertinent question is how people living under them experience these changes. How do they affect their views on the state’s legitimacy? This study partakes in a growing scholarship that calls for theoretical approaches to statehood that abandons the static analysis inherent in traditional ideal-typical approaches. The aim is to bring “the state back in without leaving the people out” (Scott 1994: 12). I propose that popular culture provides a privileged vantage point for people-centered state analysis, in particular in cases where the state’s legitimacy is challenged. Looking at the changes in the state forms in Venezuela and Mexico from 1980 to the present, I understand these changes as a result of the inability of state elites to control the (inherently contested) fields of meaning that constitute popular culture.

I use popular culture as a way to interrogate the boundary or relationship between state and society, and thus analyze what kind of power the state exercises. The focus is on what Bourdieu would call symbolic power, Gramsci hegemonic power, and Foucauldian inspired scholars term productive power or governmentality. Acknowledging the inherent difficulty in using popular culture as research material, I propose two forms of engagement. First, I use popularity as a criterion for what constitutes popular culture. Second, I treat popular culture as a social commentary, and see it a battleground for hegemony between dominant and marginalized groups. The purpose is to interrogate the relationship between popular cultural forces and the state, and specifically ask what ideas and values are cast as commonsensical with regards to the distribution of political and economic power. Here I posit that it is the usage of popular culture rather than its content per se that provides it with political force.



Ivo Spira, Doctoral Research Fellow, Department of Culture Studies and Oriental Languages, University of Oslo, ivo.spira@ikos.uio.no

ABSTRACT TO BE INSERTED



The people of a democracy. The case of the German people in 1919

The proposed paper will deal with the issue of the semantics concerning “the people”. If democracy implies that the people rule itself as its own sovereign, what is then “the people”? Who or what defines “the people” where and when? Who belongs to “the people”, and who does not? Where is the boundary between two distinct “peoples”, and how is such boundary set up? This complex of questions forms the baseline for the proposed paper.

The actual case to be discussed is the formation of the German people – *Deutsches Volk* – at the instigation of the first German republic in the immediate wake of the First World War and the collapse of the German Empire.

The Kaiserreich, the German Empire of Bismarck’s making, had been constructed to meet the so-called “German question” of the nineteenth century. At the centre of that “question” was the problem of identifying the German people, which was to create its own German nation state through a French-Revolution-style national revolution. In 1866 the tensions created by different attempts to answer “the German question” lead to a short but intense German civil war, in which, for example, the Kingdom of Prussia not only conquered the Kingdom of Hanover, but also annexed that country. The so-called “unification of Germany” in 1871 was to a large extent the creation of a Greater Prussia. Since then, the lasting impression of Germany has been closely connected with the notion of Prussia. Even though the West German state formally dissolved the Prussian state through a law of 1947, the notion of Berlin being the self-evident German capital, as well as that the unification of the two German states in 1990 was “the re-unification of Germany” underlines the impression of Prussia still being at the centre of Germany.

According to the constitution of the Kaiserreich, the German Kaiser had to be the King of Prussia, and the German people were defined as the sum of the subjects of the German Kaiser. In the German Empire of Bismarck’s making, Prussia was the centre of the German state, and it was that German state that defined the German nation, the German people.

In November 1918, the Kaiser fled Germany, the Kaiserreich collapsed, and its constitution became obsolete overnight. As a consequence, the defined and institutionalised German people cracked, the German nation (as it then had been known for about half-a-century) dissolved, and in its place appeared only dispersed people. At the time, the fallen German Empire appeared as something of a fifty-years parenthesis between two German civil wars.

The conceptual historian Reinhardt Koselleck has noted that few words were so often used in the early German republic as was the word *Volk*. Yet, in the republic there existed no consensus about the meaning of the word. Instead, the one word *Volk* created the base for numbers of different and even contrary concepts. How was a democracy based on the notion of the people being its own sovereign become conceived in an anarchic situation where the word “the people” constituted different and contrary concepts?

The first article of the German constitution that was taken by the German National Assembly in 1919 reads:

§1 Das deutsche Reich ist eine Republik. Die Staatsgewalt geht vom Volke aus.

What was here “the people” – *das Volk* – that was the original source of power in the republic? To find the answer to that question one has to read the constitution. “The German people” of 1919 was principally “the German people” as it had been defined in the Kaiserreich 1871. This time, however, Bismarck’s construction was turned on its head, so that it was the nation that defined the state – not the other way around – although it should be kept in mind that it was the previous state that had defined that nation. Furthermore, “the German people” of the republican constitution was dynamic, so that it could be re-negotiated. The constitution at one and the same time fixated “the people” to be identical with the definition used in the Kaiserreich, and opened up for a meaning of “the people” that would be identical with the definition used by the National Assembly of 1848-49. A re-negotiation of the notion of “the German people” would have provoked both conflicts within the republic – between defenders of Bismarck’s Germany and defenders of the notion of a Greater Germany, including former Habsburg lands – and conflicts between the young republic and its neighbouring states. When the constitution of the republic was being worked out, also the peace treaty after the Great War was negotiated in Paris. At stake in 1919 was not only the collective making of the German people and of a new German nation state, but also the problem of how to hinder the outbreak of escalating civil war and the permanent dissolution of Germany as an unified polity.

In short, the two sides of the one issue were both to conceive a German democracy and to avoid the outbreak of a German civil war. To achieve that, a notion of “the German people” had to be created and implemented among the dispersed people that lived in the institutional ruins of the fallen Kaiserreich.

The proposed paper aims at presenting the issue of the conceptualisation of “the German people” in the wake of the First World War and the collapsed German Empire. The claim made in the paper is that this case study can be seen as an example of a successful nation-building process and instigation of a democracy – it should be kept in mind that the first German republic, against all odds, really managed to form a functioning democracy that lasted for more than a decade – and as such the making of “the German people” is a case within a wider frame of modern nation creations, not a specifically “German” case that would deviate from other modern developments.

At the bottom line, the modern system of democracy is created around circular definition that is seldom brought forward in public debate: In any democracy, it is the constitution that defines the people, just as it is the people that define constitution. The delicate balance between the people and the constitution becomes clearly illuminated in the case of the instigation of the first German republic.



Einar Wigen, Student fellow, Norwegian Institute of International Affairs , Oslo, Einar.Wigen@nupi.no

A History of the Turkish Concept of Europe

In a Eurocentric world, few things are as important as what meaning is imbued in the concept ‘Europe’. This paper uses a Koselleckian *Begriffsgeschichte* approach to Turkish and Ottoman discourse as a case for examining how this concept is used in the *limes* between a

European and a non-European context over the past three hundred years. It is at once a study of how the meaning imbued in the concept 'Europe' differs fundamentally depending on context, even on Europe's border, and a study of how Turkish identity is constructed in text. Through the use of Turkish language texts, it analyses how the concept 'Europe' is defined in a relationship to its counter concepts, the Turkish, Muslim or Ottoman Self. The paper furthermore examines the semantic field that surrounds this concept in the Turkish language, and examines how it is linked to and differentiated from such concepts as culture (*kültür/hars*), civilisation (*medeniyet*) and modernity (*çağdaşlık/muasırlık*). Its fundamental argument is that for all the *secularisation*, *modernisation* and *Westernisation* that Turkey is said to be involved in, the concept 'Europe' has, in Turkish language text, been a fairly stable Other that the Turkish Self is defined vis-à-vis, and not something that the Turkish Self becomes part of.

