

Keijo Rahkonen

Bourdieu in Finland: An Account of Bourdieu's Influence on Finnish Sociology

(doi: 10.2383/27723)

Sociologica (ISSN 1971-8853)

Fascicolo 2, settembre-ottobre 2008

Ente di afferenza:

()

Copyright © by Società editrice il Mulino, Bologna. Tutti i diritti sono riservati.
Per altre informazioni si veda <https://www.rivisteweb.it>

Licenza d'uso

L'articolo è messo a disposizione dell'utente in licenza per uso esclusivamente privato e personale, senza scopo di lucro e senza fini direttamente o indirettamente commerciali. Salvo quanto espressamente previsto dalla licenza d'uso Rivisteweb, è fatto divieto di riprodurre, trasmettere, distribuire o altrimenti utilizzare l'articolo, per qualsiasi scopo o fine. Tutti i diritti sono riservati.

Bourdieu in Finland: An Account of Bourdieu's Influence on Finnish Sociology

by Keijo Rahkonen

doi: 10.2383/27723

Introduction

This paper is roughly divided into two parts. First, I outline the reception of Bourdieu's thought in Finland. It aims to be both a descriptive and analytical account on how Bourdieu's theories arrived in Finland. In person Bourdieu visited Finland only once, in 1995 [see the story of his visit to the University of Joensuu in Eastern Finland, Sabour 2005]. In the second part, I discuss briefly some Finnish applications of Bourdieu. In this connection, I also try to say something about the applicability and "Frenchness" of Bourdieu's theories.

Before going to the topic itself, a few words should be said about the historical background of Finnish intellectual life [cfr. Rabier *et al.* 1977; Rahkonen 1995]. As to the Finnish history of ideas, until World War II Finnish culture and academic life was more or less a backyard of Continental Europe, of German culture in particular, but even to some extent that of France. The founding father of Finnish sociology and the then professor of sociology – the very first one! – at the London School of Economics and Political Science (1907-1931), Edvard Westermarck (1862-1939) was anti-Durkheimian and represented the British evolutionary school of social anthropology [see Dahrendorf 1995]. Between the World Wars Finnish sociology was basically synonymous with social anthropology [Allardt 1994]. After the World War II there was a strong Anglo-American turn in the Western world, and this was also experienced in Finland. Since then North American influence has

been stronger than any other international trend in Finnish sociology. In the 1950s and 1960s it was so thorough that even the classics of sociology were read through their English translations, if there was no Finnish translation, which was usually the case. It was not until the late 1960s and early 1970s when – due to the rise of radical sociology in its various forms – the younger generation of Finnish sociologists restarted reading continental – that is above all German, but to some extent also French and Italian – philosophy and sociology, and a few read them in the original languages.

At this point, I would like to remind you of the fact that there are only about 5.3 million people in Finland, and we have two official languages, Finnish and Swedish (Swedish is spoken natively by ca. 5 percent of the population). However, nowadays English is an unofficial second language in Finland, as well as academic lingua franca. This implies that most German and French sociological books – if not translated into Finnish – are read through their English translations. The principal works of the classics, say, Durkheim, Marx and Weber are available in Finnish but the leading contemporary sociologists (besides Bourdieu, Beck, Giddens, Luhmann, etc.) have been translated quite sporadically. As a Finnish curiosity one can mention that almost the entire literary *Nachlass* of Ludwig Wittgenstein has been translated into Finnish thanks to the strong tradition of analytical philosophy in Finland, and the Finnish successor to Wittgenstein in Cambridge, G.H. von Wright (1916-2003), who was one of Wittgenstein's literary executors [cf. von Wright 1989].

All in all, apart from Durkheim, French sociology has had only a minor influence on the history of Finnish sociology [cfr. Allardt 1967]. However, Pierre Bourdieu's thought arrived in Finland relatively soon in the 1980s. Before that Bourdieu, e.g., *Outline of a Theory of Practice* (translated into English in 1977) and *The Reproduction* (translated into English in 1977), was known first of all among sociologists of education in Finland [e.g. Rinne and Kivinen 1984]. But Bourdieu's real breakthrough in Finnish sociology did not take place until the early 1980s. This was above all due to *La Distinction* [Bourdieu 1979], which was reviewed by J.P. Roos soon after its publication in France [Roos 1980; see also Sulkunen 1982; Roos *et al.* 1983]. After the English translation of 1984 it reached a larger sociological audience in Finland. Without doubt, it is now the best-known work by Bourdieu in Finland, although it has not been translated into Finnish. Later on when some of Bourdieu's books had been translated into Finnish – the major boom of the Finnish translations took place in the 1990s –, Bourdieu became one of the best-known contemporary sociologists, if not the best-known one in Finland. I am not able to deal here with the other Nordic countries [see Roos 2006a], but for instance, in Sweden Bourdieu was introduced primarily by pedagogues [Ahrne 1997, 280]. One Swedish Bourdieu scholar should

be mentioned above all, namely Donald Broady who also wrote a very impressive dissertation on Bourdieu's thought [Broady 1990], but unfortunately it is available only in Swedish [see also Broady 2005].

The arrival of Bourdieu's sociology in Finland took place at the time when there was also a post-Marxist turn in sociology. Bourdieu fitted into this situation perfectly. What made Bourdieu's theory so attractive for post-Marxists was that it was also a theory of (symbolic) power. Bourdieu was also both theoretical and critical. As Marxist sociology had seen classes determined simply by economic relations, Bourdieu offered a more sophisticated interpretation of culturally and socially determined classes (cultural capital and social capital, without ignoring economic capital). Simultaneously a cultural turn in social sciences was taking place. For some reason Bourdieu has never become very influential in Finnish sociology. Alongside structural-linguistic or semiotic, cultural studies (e.g., the so-called Birmingham school, Paul Willis, etc.) did become more popular than the Bourdieusian approach – probably due to its qualitative orientation, as Bourdieu combined statistical data with qualitative analysis. However, in Finnish universities – unlike in British and American universities – no chairs of cultural studies were established. Cultural studies have taken place in social science departments (including media studies and women's studies) as well as in faculties of arts. Bourdieu has not been a major figure in these studies, although his work has every now and then been referred to [cfr. Alasuutari 1997]. A Finnish curiosity has been cultural studies of alcohol and drug use [cfr. Sulkunen 2002], which however has lost its strong position since the shutdown of the Social Research Institute of Alcohol Studies in the 1990s. Later cultural studies has found their own forum, a Finnish journal *Kulttuuritutkimus* (founded in 1984) published by the Research Centre for Contemporary Culture at the University of Jyväskylä and the Finland-based *European Journal of Cultural Studies* (of which Pertti Alasuutari from University of Tampere is one of the founding and current editors). Additionally, there has been research tradition in the mainstream sociology of literature [Alestalo, Eskola and Eskola 1977], which has later been to some extent interested in Bourdieu's thought [Eskola and Linko 1986].

In addition to the cultural turn, in the Finnish post-Marxist tradition there was also an empirical turn, first to lifestyle studies (especially the German research tradition of *Lebensweise*) and sociology of everyday life (cf. Henri Lefebvre). For this, Bourdieu fitted in well. The strength of Bourdieu's theory was that it offered a fruitful theoretical research program that could be applied in several research frontiers, where it was empirically applicable, such as lifestyle studies (e.g. that of modern working class), sociology of education as well as sociology of consumption. In all of these research fields, Bourdieu's theories were at least in some ways incorporated.

Bourdieu in Finnish

In all Nordic countries, there are several translations of Bourdieu's work, but Sweden has been in the forefront of translations of his major works [Roos 2006a]. In Finland Bourdieu has not been much, nor very systematically, translated into Finnish, but that is not surprising considering the field of sociology in a small country like Finland. Neither have other internationally acclaimed sociologists – like Anthony Giddens, Niklas Luhmann, Richard Sennett or Ulrich Beck – been translated much into Finnish (I think Beck or Sennett is in second place as far as Finnish translations are concerned), i.e. less than Bourdieu's work (see the list of translations Appendix 1).

To avoid misunderstandings regarding Bourdieu's theoretical impact on Finnish sociology, I should immediately add that Bourdieu is not necessarily the only international contemporary sociologist who has influenced Finnish sociology. These days there is a pluralist state of theoretical affairs in Finland although one could say that mainstream Finnish sociology is still dominated by the ideal of American style statistically oriented research.

Since a Bourdieusian school of sociology has not been developed in Finland, and only some individual scholars being seriously inspired by Bourdieu, there has not been anything like a gatekeeper to represent Bourdieu's sociology. Perhaps M'hammed Sabour could have been one – whether he ever had the will? – being the closest Finnish liaison with Bourdieu, if he had had a more powerful chair than that at the University of Joensuu, in the North Eastern periphery of Finland. On the other hand, one could say that there has been a sort of gatekeeping on the mainstream side, i.e. to discard Bourdieu's theory. That was the case above all in Klaus Makela's early heavy critique [Makela 1985] – that was not really empirically grounded – against the applicability of Bourdieu's *Distinction* in Finnish society. Somehow Makela's intervention led Finnish sociologists to become convinced of the uselessness and inadequacy of Bourdieu. In this sense, Risto Alapuro [1988], who also questioned Bourdieu's importation into the Finnish context, was quite different in that he did not exclude the possible applicability of Bourdieu in Finland altogether, but with certain cultural-contextual reservations.

As for the Finnish translation of Bourdieu, one could say that there has never been any gatekeeper proper, as there has not been anything like a systematic publishing program of Bourdieu's translations. The main publisher of Bourdieu's books in Finland – although there have not been many – has been Vastapaino, an originally leftist cooperative founded in the early 1980s by Marxist oriented academics at the University of Tampere. Later it has become the leading publisher of sociological translations, e.g. Adorno, Bauman, Habermas, Sennett etc. Some of Bourdieu's texts

(cfr. Appendix 1) have also been published by Finnish art magazines of the Foundation for the Finnish Museum of Photography and the Artists' Association of Finland.

Bourdieu appeared little by little in Finnish textbooks. In the most influential textbook for years, the grand old man of Finnish sociology, Erik Allardt's *Sosiologia I* [Allardt 1983] Bourdieu was mentioned only once, but later the textbooks of the new generation [Sulkunen 1987; Heiskala 1994; Heiskala 2000; Jokinen and Saaristo 2004] have dealt with Bourdieu at length. Bourdieu's theories have also influenced many Finnish doctoral dissertations in different fields of sociology [e.g. Suopajarvi 2001; Bauvois 2007].

Applied Bourdieu

Now I turn to the question of the applicability of Bourdieu's theories. Nowadays, there are also some comparative studies or other applications based on or critically inspired by Bourdieu's theories in Finland.

Bourdieu's *Distinction* has been the object of lively discussion in Finland ever since it was introduced soon after its publication to Finnish sociologists. A broader theoretical discussion then emerged [e.g. Sulkunen 1982] about Bourdieu's concepts and ideas on habitus, taste, categories of taste (vulgar taste, cultural goodwill – "*bonne volonté culturelle*" – and legitimate taste) and the capitals which structure them, cultural capital in particular. A little later Roos and Keijo Rahkonen tested the applicability of Bourdieu's ideas (about taste, differences in tastes, attitude to culture etc.) in a small study of the so-called new middle class in Finland [Roos and Rahkonen 1985; Roos and Rahkonen 2000; cfr. also Rahkonen, Roos and Seppala 1989]. Simultaneously a broader discussion started about the "Frenchness" of Bourdieu's theories [Alapuro 1988; Alapuro 1997] and their overall applicability in Finland [Makela 1985]. In that discussion Bourdieu's theories were seen culturally conditioned to such a degree that it was problematic to transfer them from one cultural context to another [Alapuro 1988]. Bourdieu's applicability was also totally rejected by claiming that Finnish society and culture (particularly the usage of the Finnish language) is more homogenous than the French one and does not include such sophisticated distinctions like French culture [Makela 1985]. This became a more or less dominant opinion among Finnish mainstream sociologists as well as among the dogmatic Marxist sociologists, although in the case of the latter perhaps on other grounds. In general, it seemed that Bourdieu's *Distinction* was seen as irrelevant in a social-democratic welfare state like Finland, as it did not fit into the ideology of equality, i.e. emphasising homogenous characteristics rather than heterogeneous differences.

Bourdieu himself has also touched upon the question of the applicability of his theories. In his “Preface to the English-Language Edition” of *Distinction*, Bourdieu [1984, xi-xii] discusses this problem and admits that “by virtue of its empirical object” his theories are “very French.” But by the same token he suggests seeking “structural variants” and “equivalent institutions in another social universe,” such as American society. In general, it seems that Bourdieu is convinced of the universality of his theoretical models (*Homo Academicus*, *Distinction*), and considers that they could well be suitable as comparative models and thus be applicable to an analysis of widely different societies, such as the USA, Germany and Japan – Bourdieu deals with this question in his *Raisons pratiques* [Bourdieu 1994] and also in his “Vorwort zur deutschen Ausgabe” [Bourdieu 1983, 11-12]. Subsequently several studies have been carried out in Finland applying Bourdieu’s theories on some specific fields – sometimes critically. These studies have taken as their starting point not only *Distinction* – e.g. Sulkunen [1992] on the new middle classes and Eskola and Linko [1986] on reading preferences of Finns – but also *Homo Academicus* [e.g. Sabour 1988; Rahkonen and Roos 1993].

As for the Finnish applications – or “applied Bourdieu” as Derek Robbins put it nicely in his introduction to the *Pierre Bourdieu: 4 Volume Boxed Set* [Robbins 2000, xxix] – the above listing hopefully gives an idea about the many-sided Finnish discussion on Bourdieu. Most of the contributions are, however, more like commentaries – some of them quite critical ones – on Bourdieu than research based on Bourdieu’s theories proper. And quite soon some of the very first introducers of Bourdieu, like both Roos and Sulkunen distanced themselves from Bourdieu’s theories, Sulkunen to semiotics, Roos [2008] to life histories and then to evolutionary psychology.

Although there has never been anything like a Finnish school of Bourdieusian sociology, two Finnish scholars in particular should be mentioned in this connection: the Finnish-Moroccan sociologist M’hammed Sabour and the political scientist Niilo Kauppi. Sabour did his doctoral dissertation on Arab intellectuals [Sabour 1988; Sabour 2001] under the guidance of Bourdieu obtaining his doctoral degree from his home university, University of Joensuu, Finland. He has been also one of Bourdieu’s introducers in Finland and was member of the group at the University of Joensuu, which collectively translated *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology* into Finnish. Over the years Sabour was probably Bourdieu’s closest contact with Finland. He also succeeded finally in getting Bourdieu to visit Finland. Bourdieu was present at the launching of the Finnish translation of his book at the University of Joensuu in 1995. This occasion received nationwide coverage in the press and television [cfr. Sabour 2005].

Niilo Kauppi studied in Paris attending Bourdieu's seminars and wrote his doctoral dissertation on the *Tel Quel* group there in the late 1980s [Kauppi 1990]. After his *Tel Quel* dissertation Kauppi grew apart from Bourdieu [Kauppi 1991], although he dealt with Bourdieu later in his book *The Politics of Embodiment: Habits, Power, and Pierre Bourdieu's Theory* [Kauppi 2000]. He has also criticised what he calls Bourdieu's "political theory." Afterwards Kauppi has described his years of apprenticeship in the Bourdieusian circle with a rather self-ironic tone:

We were like a sect, a group of few, whom Bourdieu himself had chosen. Bourdieu was our leader. (...) We believed what he said and trusted him. Without doubt, following Bourdieu's teaching changed irreversibly our worldview. We collected and read all his texts. We tape-recorded his seminars and lectures. We started to despise his rivals in Paris and inside the EHESS. Many of us dreamed of becoming his right hand. In the eyes of others in the Parisian academic world we were seen as a group of our own; we gained ourselves some of his charisma [Kauppi 1999, 8-9].

It has been said that Bourdieu's attitude to foreign colleagues or visitors, who were interested in getting in touch with him, was totally different from his attitude to French colleagues (except his own circle). It seems that Bourdieu for some – personal? – reason appreciated particularly those in the margin (e.g., movement of unemployed in France etc.) and also those in the periphery of the cosmopolitan field of sociology, e.g., Finland [cf. his visit to the University of Joensuu in Eastern Finland: Sabour 2005]. My own experience at least was that he was very kind to me taking his time to discuss some of my texts, when I met him a couple of times in Paris. J.P. Roos has told about similar experiences of Bourdieu's generosity, although he got closer to Bourdieu than I [see Roos 2006]. Roos gives his own explanation based on Bourdieu's autoanalysis, why Bourdieu treated him as a "kindred soul:"

The answer was however obvious, and shows once again Bourdieu's francocentrism: the fact that I came from Finland, of which Bourdieu knew nothing (not even that Westermarck was Finnish), put me immediately in the same category as if I had come from Bearn and my father were a postman (probably I had even a lower status in Bourdieu's eyes). The fact that I belonged to the ruling class in Finland was totally irrelevant from the Parisian perspective. Moreover, I spoke absolutely lousy French, i.e. my cultural capital was about zero [Roos 2006, 84].

Applicability of Bourdieu's theories

Finally, as there is not space here to go into all of the Finnish texts and discussions mentioned above, I would like to take up here just a couple of illustrative examples, which have been true trials of applying Bourdieu in Finland – and which I myself know best.

In the 1980s, J.P. Roos and Keijo Rahkonen, attempted in two case studies to apply Bourdieu's theory of distinction, on the one hand, and his theory of the intellectual field (*homo academicus*), on the other, to Finnish society. The nature of these studies was basically tentative, i.e. to test and discuss the applicability of Bourdieu's ideas in another cultural terrain. Although our research report *Will to a Distinctive Life Style: In Search of the Finnish New Middle Class* [Roos and Rahkonen 1985a; abridged in Roos and Rahkonen 1985b] in particular, was based on rather modest and somewhat old data, these two small studies aimed to say something sociologically substantial about certain aspects of Finnish society and culture. It was this trial of Finnish application which was most heavily declined by the Finnish mainstream sociology, as mentioned above [cfr. Makela 1985].

In *Will to a Distinctive Life Style* the way of life and the essence of the Finnish new middle class were discussed. Within a theoretical framework that one might call Bourdieusian, our analysis was based on a questionnaire designed by Pierre Bourdieu in his book *La Distinction* [Bourdieu 1979] and interview material consisting of life stories of members from the Finnish new middle class. We had two problems: to offer a definition of the new middle class and to uncover its internal structure.

In our conclusions we maintained that it is reasonable to argue (on a more or less tentative basis) that taste is by no means as important a strategy of distinction for the new middle class in Finland as it is in France, if we are to believe Bourdieu or those who have been particularly concerned with the new middle class. In the Finnish new middle class emphasis is rather, on subjectivity, on personal relationships and their therapeutic nature, on life style in a broader sense. However, we felt it would be premature to abandon the strategies of distinction in the analysis of the new middle class in Finland. Finally, we noticed that our conclusions must be examined against material that focuses more on those areas of taste that presumably are more relevant in Finnish circumstances, e.g. literature, high-brow and popular aspects of television and theatre tastes (as is well known, popular culture was totally neglected in Bourdieu's analysis, e.g. in the *Distinction*); also, we would need a more profound analysis of the new middle class's life style as a whole.

In another study of ours, *The Field of Intellectuals: The Case of Finland* [Roos and Rahkonen 1992], the rudiments of a "field theory" of intellectuals (cfr.

Bourdieu's *Homo academicus*) were developed, with specific application to the problems of a marginal field. The theory was further discussed with data from a Finnish questionnaire given to a selected number of recognized intellectuals in Finland, asking them to name leading Finnish intellectuals and to give a definition of the concept of "intellectual." Towards the end, an outline of the Finnish intellectual field was presented. It was compared with the intellectual field, which was found in France by Bourdieu (cfr. *Lire* magazine). We also conducted a correspondence analysis based on the textual descriptions of intellectuals. In principle, it is an excellent method to analyze "open questions," but we had some problems in using the program SPAD.T (1989) – in those days it was still a pilot version – and therefore had to treat the results as very preliminary.

In the conclusions we argued that in a country like Finland, the field of intellectuals is often a subfield, the dominating centre of which is in France, Germany, etc. Finland is a periphery of the international field of intellectuals. Keeping that in mind, it is, of course, quite problematic to make comparisons between France – a country of intellectuals *par excellence* – and Finland. But as a comparison of centre and periphery it is an interesting configuration. And, as our analysis indicated, there were some surprisingly clear structural similarities – i.e. a certain homology – between the two very different countries. With hindsight, one could say that it applies to the field of the Finnish sociology, too.

Last, I would like to mention one new research project that is currently underway – and that is a great deal more systematic and extensive than the above-mentioned two examples. In fact it is the first really systematic application, although a critical one, of Bourdieu's *Distinction* in Finland – and in this sense unique. It is quite a large research project "Cultural Capital and Social Differentiation in Contemporary Finland: An International Comparison" [Rahkonen *et al.* 2006] that is funded by the Academy of Finland. In applying Bourdieu's *Distinction* and the later critical developments of the Bourdieusian approach [e.g. Lahire 2004; Schulze 1992 and discussion of the so-called cultural omnivorousness in the sociology of consumption, cf. Peterson, and Kern 1996], the main purpose of the project is to develop an understanding of cultural capital in Finland, to find out how it is distributed and what kind of forms of social differentiation currently exist, and to analyse the structuring factors shaping these differences in Finland. The research is being carried out in cooperation with a British research project [see Bennett *et al.* 2003; Bennett and Savage 2005], which will make possible international comparison. In 2006-2007, a nationally representative survey and a series of focus group interviews were conducted in Finland following the empirical strategy of the UK team. It will be interesting to see to what extent Finnish society differs from a traditional class society like the UK, and also from the other Nordic

welfare states, e.g. Denmark [for the preliminary results see Purhonen *et al.* 2008]. Finally, it is in the broad sense also a test of the applicability of Bourdieu in Finland.

To conclude, over the past twenty years, since the introduction of Bourdieu's thought in Finland, first having been rejected by the mainstream and then having gone through critical international discussion, Bourdieu's sociology has become part of the sociological canon – as a contemporary classic – in Finland also. Although Bourdieu's influence on Finnish sociological research itself has remained quite limited, it has, however, inspired many studies in Finland. Moreover, some of his texts are on obligatory reading lists at the universities; his sociology is referred to in sociological articles and presented in Finnish textbooks, etc. Some of his concepts – e.g., habitus, cultural capital etc. – have been popularised in the Finnish media. Also his political writings on anti-globalization are referred to every now and then in the public debate (e.g., that of Finnish Attac).

Appendix 1: Bourdieu in Finnish

The list of Bourdieu's major texts translated into Finnish is following:

1983 “Pierre Bourdieun haastattelu.” [Bourdieu's interview by J.P. Roos and J. Heilbron and B. Maso] in *Sosiologia* 20: 319-329. Revised version of “Interview met Pierre Bourdieu by J. Heilbron and B. Maso.” *Sociologisch Tijdschrift* 10: 307-334. In French: “Repères in P. Bourdieu.” Pp. 47-71 in P. Bourdieu, *Choses dites*. Paris: Minuit, 1987.

1985 *Sosiologian kysymyksiä*. Tampere: Vastapaino; Finnish translation of *Questions de sociologie*. Paris: Minuit, 1980.

1986 “Valokuvauksen sosiaalinen maaritelma.” Pp. 107-144 in *Kuvista sanoin*, vol. 3, edited by M. Lintunen. Helsinki: Foundation for the Finnish Museum of Photography; Finnish translation of one chapter of *Un art moyen: Essai sur les usages sociaux de la photographie*. Paris: Minuit, 1965.

1987 “Klassikot ja arvonsa menettäneet.” in *Taide* 28: 13-17; abridged Finnish translation of “La production de la croyance: contribution à une économie des bien symboliques.” *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales* 3: 3-43.

1995 *Refleksiiviseen sosiologiaan*. Joensuu, Joensuu University Press; Finnish translation of *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992. French original: *Réponses. Pour une anthropologie réflexive*. Paris: Seuil, 1992.

- 1997 *Ajatusten vapaakauppaa*. Helsinki: Taide; Finnish translation of *Libre-échange*, with H. Haacke. Paris: Seuil 1994.
- 1998 *Jarjen kaytannollisyys*. Tampere: Vastapaino; Finnish translation of *Raisons pratiques. Sur la théorie de l'action*. Paris: Seuil, 1994.
- 1999 *Televisiosta*. Helsinki: Otava; Finnish translation of *Sur la télévision*. Paris: Liber-Raisons d'agir, 1996.
- 1999 *Vastatulet*. Helsinki: Otava; Finnish translation of *Contre-feux*. Paris: Raisons d'agir, 1998.
- 2000 "Sosiologian tehtävä ja sosiologien kompetenssi." [The task of sociology and the competence of sociologists; Finnish translation of a Doctor Honoris Causa speech given *in absentia* at the University of Joensuu in 1999]. *Tiedepolitiikka* 25: 43-46.

References

- Ahrne, G.
1997 "Vad hände på åttioalet?" [What happened in the 1980s?]. Pp. 269-282 in *Sociologi i tiden: Bakgrund, utveckling, framtid* [Sociology in time: Background, development, future], edited by L. Hansen *et al.* Goteborg: Daidalos.
- Alestalo, M., Eskola, K., and Eskola, A.
1977 *Cultural Participation and Class Structure in Finland*. Department of Sociology and Social Psychology, University of Tampere, research reports 23.
- Allardt, E.
1967 "Émile Durkheim e la sociologia politica." *Rassegna italiana di sociologia* 8: 47-66.
1983 *Sosiologia vol. 1*. Porvoo: WSOY.
1994 "The Development and Present State of Sociology in Finland." Pp. 86-107 in *International Handbook of Contemporary Developments in Sociology*, edited by R.P. Mohan and A.S. Wilke. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Bauvois, G.
2007 *Le Pinceau et la Médaille: Les réseaux coopératifs d'Albert Edelfelt dans le champ artistique français 1874-1905*. Joensuu: Joensuu University Press.
- Bennett, T., Savage, M., Silva, E., and Warde, A.
2003 "Cultural Capital and Social Exclusion." Unpublished research plan.
- Bennett, T., and Savage, M. (eds.)
2005 "Special Issue: The Concept of Cultural Capital and Social Inequality." *British Journal of Sociology* 56.
- Bourdieu, P.
1977 *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
1979 *La Distinction: Critique sociale du jugement*. Paris: Minuit.

- 1983 "Vorwort zur deutschen Ausgabe." Pp. 11-15 in *Die feinen Unterschiede*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- 1984 *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. London-New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- 1994 *Raisons pratiques*. Paris: Seuil.
- Bourdieu, P., and Passeron, J.-C.
- 1977 *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture*. London: Sage.
- Broady, D.
- 1990 *Sociologi och epistemologi: Om Pierre Bourdieus författarskap och den historiska epistemologin* [Sociology and epistemology: on Bourdieu's literary production and the historical epistemology]. Stockholm: HLS.
- 2005 "L'art de l'autoréflexion: Un témoignage d'Ultima Thule." Pp. 435-440 in *Rencontres avec Pierre Bourdieu*, edited by G. Mauger. Broissieux: Croquant.
- Dahrendorf, R.
- 1995 *LSE: A History of the London School of Economics and Political Science, 1895-1995*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Heiskala, R.
- 2000 *Toiminta, tapa ja rakenne* [Action, habit and structure]. Helsinki: Gaudeamus.
- Heiskala, R. (ed.)
- 1994 *Sosiologisen teorian nykysuuntauksia* [Current trends in sociological theory]. Helsinki: Gaudeamus.
- Kauppi, N.
- 1990 *Tel Quel: La constitution sociale d'une avant-garde*. Helsinki: Societas Scientiarum Fennica.
- 1999 "Tapaus Bourdieu." [The case of Bourdieu]. Pp. 7-16 in P. Bourdieu, *Televisiosta*. Helsinki: Otava.
- 2000 *The Politics of Embodiment: Habits, Power, and Pierre Bourdieu's Theory*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Lahire, B.
- 2004 *La culture des individus: Dissonances culturelles et distinction de soi*. Paris: La Découverte.
- Mauger, G. (toim.)
- 2005 *Rencontres avec Pierre Bourdieu*. Paris: Croquant.
- Peterson, R.A., and Kern, R.M.
- 1996 "Changing Highbrow Taste: From Snob to Omnivore." *American Sociological Review* 61: 900-907.
- Purhonen, S., Gronow, J., and Rahkonen, K.
- 2008 "Cultural Capital and Social Differentiation in Contemporary Finland: Preliminary Results from a National Survey." Paper presented at the ESA Network of the Sociology of Consumption Interim Meeting "Materiality, meaning, power." Helsinki, Finland, 27-30 August 2008.
- Rabier, J.-C., avec la collaboration de R. Alapuro, R. Erasaari and K. Rahkonen
- 1977 "La Sociologie en Finlande." *Revue française de sociologie* 14: 109-131.

Rahkonen, K.

1995 "Américanisation et positivisme: Le cas de la Finlande." *L'Aventure Humaine*, 2: 49-51.

Rahkonen, K. *et al.*

2006 "Cultural Capital and Social Differentiation in Contemporary Finland: An International Comparison." Unpublished research plan.

Rinne, R., and Kivinen, O.

1984 "Kulttuuris-sosiologisia nakokulmia kasvatukseen." [Cultural and sociological viewpoints on education]. *Kasvatus* 15: 252-260.

Robbins, D. (ed.)

2000 *Pierre Bourdieu: 4 Volume Boxed Set*. London: Sage.

Roos, J.P.

1980 "Ranskalaista haarukkastrategiaa." [French fork strategy: A review of P. Bourdieu's *La Distinction*]. *Sosiologia* 17: 70.

2006a "The 'Arctic Bourdieu.' Four theses from the Nordic countries." *Sociologiskt Årsbok* 2006: 87-102.

2006b "Pierre ja mina." [Pierre and I]. Pp. 71-101 in *Bourdieu ja mina: Nakokulmia Pierre Bourdieun sosiologiaan* [Bourdieu and I: Perspectives to Pierre Bourdieu's sociology], edited by S. Purhonen and J.P. Roos. Helsinki: Gaudeamus.

Roos, J.P., and Rahkonen, K.

1985a *Att vilja leva annorlunda: På jakt efter den nya medelklassen*. [Will to a distinctive life style: In Search of the Finnish New Middle Class.] University of Helsinki, Department of Social Policy, Research Reports, 2.

1985b "In Search of the Finnish New Middle Class." *Acta Sociologica* 28: 257-274. Published also in D. Robbins (ed.): *Pierre Bourdieu: 4 Volume Boxed Set*. London: Sage, 2000.

Roos J.P., and Rahkonen, K.

1992 "The Field of Intellectuals: The Case of Finland." *International Journal of Contemporary Sociology* 30: 154-172.

Roos, J.P. *et al.*

1983 "Pierre Bourdieun haastattelu." [Bourdieu's interview with J.P. Roos and J. Heilbron and B. Maso]. *Sosiologia* 20: 319-329. Revised version of "Interview met Pierre Bourdieu" [by J. Heilbron and B. Maso]. *Sociologisch Tijdschrift* 10: 307-334.

Saaristo, K., and Jokinen, K.

2004 *Sosiologia*. Helsinki: WSOY.

Sabour, M.

1988 *Homo Academicus Arabicus*. Joensuu: Joensuu University Press.

2005 "Deux jours avec Pierre Bourdieu aux confins du pôle Nord." Pp. 427-433 in *Rencontres avec Pierre Bourdieu*, edited by G. Mauger. Broissieux: Croquant.

Schulze, G.

1992 *Die Erlebnisgesellschaft: Kultursoziologie der Gegenwart*. Frankfurt-New York: Campus.

Sulkunen, P.

1982 "Society Made Visible: On the Cultural Sociology of Pierre Bourdieu." *Acta Sociologica* 25: 103-115.

1987 *Sosiologian avaimet*. Helsinki: WSOY.

1992 *The European New Middle Class: Individuality and Tribalism in Mass Society*. Avebury: Aldershot.

2002 "Between culture and nature: intoxication in cultural studies of alcohol and drug use." *Contemporary Drug Problems* 29: 253-276.

Suopajärvi, L.

2001 *Vuotos- ja Ounasjoki-kamppailujen kentät ja merkitykset Lapissa* [Environmental Conflicts in Lapland]. Rovaniemi: Acta Universitatis Lapponiensis, 37.

Wright, G.H. von

1989 "Intellectual Autobiography." In *The Philosophy of Georg Henrik von Wright*, edited by P.A. Schilpp and L.E. Hahn. La Salle, IL: Open Court.

Bourdieu in Finland: An Account of Bourdieu's Influence on Finnish Sociology

Abstract: Apart from Durkheim, French sociology has had only a minor influence on the history of Finnish sociology. By contrast, Pierre Bourdieu's thought arrived in Finland relatively quickly in the 1980s. This was due to *La Distinction*, which was reviewed in Finland soon after its publication in France. However, it did not reach a larger sociological audience in Finland until the English translation came out in 1984. Later on when some of Bourdieu's books had been translated into Finnish (e.g., *Questions de sociologie* came out in Finnish 1985), Bourdieu became one of the best-known contemporary sociologists in Finland. Over the years there have been comparative Finnish studies or other applications based on or critically inspired by Bourdieu's theories, but in spite of this his impact on Finnish sociology has remained relatively small: no Finnish Bourdieusian school has developed. However, his sociology has become part of Finnish sociological canon, e.g., in Finnish textbooks etc. In this paper the applicability and the "Frenchness" of Bourdieu's theories are also discussed.

Keywords: Finland, sociological theory, Bourdieu, intellectual field, France.

Keijo Rahkonen is a Senior Research Fellow of the Academy of Finland and a director of the research project "Cultural Capital and Social Differentiation in Contemporary Finland: An International Comparison" funded by the Research Council for Culture and Society at the Academy of Finland. He is also head of the Department of Social Policy at the University of Helsinki. He has published widely on Pierre Bourdieu's sociology, social theory and the future of the welfare state. His recent publications include "In Search of the Finnish New Middle Class" (with J.P. Roos) in D. Robbins (ed.) *Pierre Bourdieu: 4 Volume Boxed Set* (Sage, 2000) and "Pierre Bourdieu – *L'homo academicus*: Etude de la pensée de Bourdieu dans une perspective bourdieusienne" in E. Suomela-Salmi and F. Dervin (éds.), *Intercultural Communication and Education. Communication et éducation interculturelles* (Peter Lang, 2006).