

IMMANUEL WALLERSTEIN: Like to welcome you here to the session on Speaking to Power, which I think is, in the end, the crucial question of public sociology or public, public intellectuals in general. How does one do it? Is it worth doing? Does it have any effect? Does it have any negative consequences, etc.? We have assembled a, a distinguished and international panel to discuss this issue. Let me start this discussion with an anecdote. Now, when I was a graduate student at Columbia University, Paul Lasofeld was invited by the graduate students to have an informal conversation with us, and he talked about his own career. As you may know, he started "Life," and one of his first things he did was he was the chairman of the Social Democratic Youth of Austria, and that's at the time when he was still going to the University, and when his first book, which he wrote with Maria Hoda and Hans Seitzel was the results of a inquiry poll on unemployment in Austria. This was in, at the time of the Great Depression. Now, Paul went on from that to a long and distinguished career, which involved what he considered to be public sociology in, in the fashion in which he practiced it. And when he recounted this and how important it was to do these things, I asked him the following question. I said, "Professor Lasofeld, I'm very interested in your idea of combining public sociology," I don't think he actually used that term, public sociology, "with a professional career, but how does one find the time to do it?" And he said, "By not coming to meetings like this." [laughter] So for all those who are still graduate students in the audience, should you be interested in engaging in public sociology, perhaps you shouldn't waste your time at this meeting.

What I will do now is first introduce to you the members of the panel. Then I have asked them each to respond initially to a question which I have posed to them. I will tell you when we come to it what that is, and they will each give you a five-minute or five- to seven-minute presentation responding to that question, and then after that we're going to have a conversation. I will ask some follow-up questions. They will ask each other questions or talk to each other, and we hope to have some greater clarity at the end of it about public sociology. We have three members of the panel. We should have four. I will come to that and explain to it. The first member of the panel, this is going in alphabetical order, is Johan Galtung. Johan Galtung was an assistant professor at Columbia when I was a graduate student. Indeed, he was on my doctoral defense committee. And he came to sociology bought by Paul Lasofeld, who had the illusion that he was a mathematical sociologist. This may seem strange to you who know his subsequent career. The first thing I remember about Johan Galtung was when he explained to me that he was going down to Sicily to work, to do something, and he may tell you about it with Danilo Dolci, who was at that time known as the Gandhi of Sicily. He went on to engage in many other activities. He had the temerity to go to the Soviet Union, I believe, in the early 60's and try to persuade them that it would be useful for them to engage in public opinion research. I don't think he succeeded at the time, but later on they, they caught onto his wisdom. He became one of the great founders of peace studies throughout the world. He claims he's from Norway, and he has some technical roots there. Perhaps some spiritual roots, but he lives all over the world, and has engaged in activities all over the world, and most recently he founded an organization, Transcend, which is a, which is by definition an exercise in public sociology. Our second speaker was supposed to be Pablo Gonzalez Casanova. Pablo Gonzalez Casanova from Mexico. You all know him by reputation. He was, he did many things in his career. The most recent and the most important one of recent years was he was a member of a commission called the Concejo NAI, which was established by the Bishop of Chiapas to try to mediate, unsuccessfully, between the Zapatistas and, and the government. Unfortunately, he's not here, and the cause of this is 9-11. It seems that today every Mexican who wishes to come to the United States needs a visa, and in order to get a visa, you have to be personally interviewed by a U.S. Consul. Doesn't matter that you've come over 40 years constantly. It doesn't matter that your wife is a U.S. citizen. You need to be personally interviewed, and they gave him an interview appointment early in July, but he was in Europe at the time, and he tried to reschedule it. Rescheduling it put him at the end of a queue, and despite the best efforts of the executive office of

ASA, who, and the National Academy of Sciences, all of whom along with the U.S. Consulate as late as three days ago, they did not deem his coming here an emergency, and so they could not give him an urgent appointment, and so he did not have a visa, and so he is not here with us, which is a great shame. Our next speaker is Paul Starr. Paul Starr and I go back to 1968, the Great Uprising at Columbia. I was on the executive committee of the faculty. He was the Bob Woodward of the "Columbia Spectator." He was a junior at the time covering the events with great acidity. As a result of this, he and I co-edited after the events the "University Crisis Reader" in which we've tried to put together the documents from throughout the United States relating to the 1968 events in many, many universities. He, too, went on to a, a distinguished career. He went to Harvard, became a junior fellow at Princeton as a professor. He's written important books, which I'm sure you have read, or if you haven't you should have read. He became the co-founder of the "American Prospect," which is a journal of political opinion. I guess it represents what we used to call the "L" word, liberalism, in, in, in the United States, but I, I don't want to impose that on him. He became a senior advisor to the Clinton Administration on their health policy in that ill-fated attempt in 1993, I guess, for to create some reforms, and he has continued in many roles thereafter. And Alain Touraine I met on a bus in Varna, Bulgaria. We were in [laughs] in an actual sociological meeting. We were going back to our hotel. I sat down on the bus. He happened to sit next to me, and we, this was 1970, and I told him about Columbia, and he told me about Paris, and we've been friends ever since. Early in his life, I, I, I think almost accidentally, he started as a someone interested in social movements. Wrote about social movements basically in France, the labor movement. Somehow got to Latin America. Almost accidentally became a great Latin American specialist, and continues to this day to be a great Latin American specialist. In later years, he invented the idea of sociological intervention, which I will leave to him to explain to you at some point, but it's a mode of public sociology which he practiced in Poland in the days of Solidarity and the various places in Latin America. And most recently, he has been a member of the, I think, it's 19 mem, Commission that the President of France appointed to advise him on L'Ecete [phonetic], which is very difficult to translate, but basically it's the relations of church and state, and basically it has to do with the problems the arose as a result of the wearing of the fla [phonetic] by young Muslim girls in schools and how the French state should react to that, the Commission, it's a remarkable report. Try to put this in a much wider context. He was one member of this Commission, but he was a member as a sociologist, and it's a very impressive activity. So having told you who these people are, not that you didn't know before, I will ask them each to start by responding to a, a simple question, which is each of them has chosen, at my request, one intervention in which they were involved. Johan is going to speak about Transcend and what it does, Paul Starr is going to speak about the advice, advising on health policy, Alain Touraine is going to speak about the Commission of which he was a part, and I'm, the first question I'm asking them to address to you briefly, five to seven minutes, is in what way did your intervention in public life, in what way was it useful? So, let's start with Johan.

JOHAN GALTUNG: Thank you, Diamante. Fellow sociologists. Although I am actually a former mathematician and a present peace researcher, but I had a past, and I'll not deny it. Here comes the story. The former president of Ecuador in 1995 [inaudible] in Guatemala went forward at the meeting we had during an excellent dinner, and said, "Professor Galtung, you live many years in Latin America. You seem to know something about conflict. You know about Ecuador, Peru. You know about the war that started in 1941. And" [inaudible] after that with thousands killed. Ecuadorians, Peruvians. About a 500 square kilometer zone up in the Andes Mountains, and the wars have been our efforts to draw a border. So Professor Galtung, in your view, how can we draw that border? We have tried everything. We are recent international lawyers who recommended a water shed, but [inaudible], the mountain range doesn't present us with any decent line. We have listened to them again. We found the river, and then we should that river as a border, the river had already disappeared. We have had three wars, and the idea being that a ceasefire line could be the border. So, Professor Galtung, what is your

advice?" You see, I have lived long in Latin America and knew the conflict quite well, and I had to pretend that I was thinking. Actually, I wasn't because if you [laughs] know the method, then the answer lies in the two words both and, or positive transcendence. So I said, "Mr. President, Your Excellency, I think the best solution is not to draw a border at all, but to have a binational zone with a natural park." Now, my experience with politicians is that if you have something to propose, never more than four words. [laughter] I had to be very economic. The same goes for journalists. So in Spanish, it would be [talking in foreign language]. His answer was immediate. It was, "Galtung, very creative, but too creative. I had been in these negotiations for 30 years. We started negotiating 54 years ago. Nobody has ever said that. It will take us at least 30 years to get used to the idea, and 30 more years to implement it." [laughter] "But otherwise, thank you so much. Nice to see you, and [talking in foreign language]." [laughter] I used it as a case study in workshops that we have around the world, and we had for ambassadors to United Nations in Geneva, one in English, one in French, one in Spanish, and in the Spanish one was the Ecuadorian and Peruvian ambassadors. And the Ecuadorian said, "Very interesting case. Very interesting. Could you come to Quito and talk with my superiors?" So I said, "Superiors. You mean foreign minister, prime minister, president?" "No, no, no. I said superiors. I mean generals and admirals." [laughter] "Politicians come and go, what do you think? Let's talk about power. Let's be realistic." The 5th of June 1998, I had 40 of them in front of me. They had enough gold here to take care of the national debt as far as I could estimate. The conversation was in 18th century Spanish. Extremely rich in the subjunctive mode. [laughter] Because when you do this, you never say anything. You always ask questions. And the English language, like the Norwegian, it's not very good at that because you raise a handful of maybes, but French, German, Spanish, Italian, Russian, Arabic, so much better. Now, having said that, we had a fantastic dialogue with all the details. They had already agreed that in September 1998, we are going to sign the agreement. And they had a whole text ready. Where it was to be signed, when it would be signed, who would sign it. The only thing missing was the content. [laughter] Now, this is not a bad method. So diplomats put a kind of constraint on themselves where time is concerned, and by that time it was 57 years ago that the zone had appeared. So when I in September sitting in my office in Japan opened "Japan Times" to read about the meetings, the report was the following. The Ecuadorian delegation to the meeting yesterday proposed a binational zone with a natural park. Peru has declared itself most interested, and it is expected that it will be signed on Monday. And so it was. Now, you see, [applause] [laughs]. I have a book about this kind of thing. So let me make a plug for that one immediately called "Transcend and Transform." Transcend. There are three points to the method. You identify the goals. You distinguish between legitimate and illegitimate goals, and to do that, you use law including international law, human rights, and basic needs. The trick, then, is to bridge the gap between legitimate goals. I'll give you an exercise. Washington wants democratic elections and free global market. They're both, on the surface, legitimate. When I talk with [inaudible] very close to Al-Queda, they want respect. Again, close to legitimate. Would you please be so kind and bridge those two? The world is waiting. But in the meantime, you can read the book "Transcend and Transform" by [laughter] [inaudible]. I would like to end by saying an important thing. When I was back in Ecuador last year, there was a newspaper headline that caught my eye. My eye, of course. It's the [talking in foreign language]. This peace between Ecuador and Peru is killing us. [laughs] It goes, of course, even if I had just made the suggestion that [inaudible] has some kind of proprietary feeling. The country belongs to them entirely, but having been the author of an idea, which they hadn't stumbled across, of course, they feel something. Written by a general, and he said the following wise words. "Before that peace with that natural park and all of that stuff, we knew who the enemy was. It was the Peruvians. Now, we are friendly to the Peruvians. So we start hating each other instead. The peace is killing us." Answer. There is no conflict transformation that opens Paradise on Earth. There is eternal. You try to make light at the end of the tunnel, and what is after that tunnel, a new tunnel, and in the meantime, hopefully, you have learned something. Thank you.

[Applause]

IMMANUEL WALLERSTEIN: And now Paul Starr will tell us something about his experience on health policy in the U.S.

PAUL E. STARR: Emmanuel, this is unfair. Johan Galtung gets to talk about settling a decades-old conflict, and I, I get to talk about how useful my intervention was in the Clinton health plan. [laughter] Now, in the beginning, in the early 1990's, I had an experience that most sociologists dream about. In writing and Congressional testimony, as co-editor of a political magazine, advising a group of Democratic senators. I helped to formulate a strategy for reforming a major institution, in this case health care, and saw those ideas become a top priority of the Democratic presidential nominee. And then through personal connections with his inner circle, I became involved in his campaign, and within a week of his inauguration, I moved from discussions in seminar rooms at Princeton to discussions in the Roosevelt Room in the White House. And from writing articles and books [inaudible] decision memos for the President. [inaudible] I was previously unacquainted with. It was a heady experience. Often exhausting. Sometimes exhilarating, but as they say, watch what you wish for, [laughs] because in the end, even with the support of the, the most powerful political leader in the country, things can go horribly wrong, and ideas you hope to advance can end up being set back for a long time. So at least for me serving as an advisor in the White House, it proved to be a humbling experience. The political logic of the strategy that I favored, some reasonable advance that I was able to sell a lot of people on it did not pan out in practice. So in a way that's an answer to your question was it useful, but perhaps I can also draw out something from that experience about whether the role of, of a sociologist or a social scientist at that level can be useful, especially in those circumstances when you have direct access to power at the top. In this case, to the man who is internally referred to by the awesome acronym POTUS, President of the United States. A, a great deal depends on the president's organizational style. Some presidents have strong chiefs of staff through whom virtually all communication and decisions are funneled. Other presidents keep open a variety of channels of communication and seek out conflicting opinions. Clinton, like FDR, followed this second less hierarchal style, and he created a pattern that provided far more opportunity for freewheeling discussion allowing advisors with different views to make their case directly to the president. A great deal, also, depends on the political leader's knowledge and appetite for detail. Compared to other politicians I've advised, Clinton has an exceptional grasp of the details of policy, in this case health policy. My friends on the Council of Economic Advisors, Alan Blinder and Joe Stiglitz, told me the same thing at the time. That Clinton was fully conversive with the language and the arguments of economic analysis and, and with the details of policy. Somehow, I [beep]. [laughter] The result of Clinton's openness to debate and analytical grasp was the substantive argument about policy was pursued at a very high level with the President himself. In that context, social scientists were fully accepted. Indeed, probably the majority of the people who were in [inaudible] talking about economic policy, health policy, [inaudible] other areas where I, I didn't get to participate where, people actually with advanced social science training. But, of course, the setting implies very different rules from the academy. In particular, being a player inside the White House means being a team player. At the end of the day, the decisions are the President's to make, as an, and as an advisor, you must defend them if you want to stay involved in the decision-making process. They're only as long as the President wants you. At the same time, if you enter the corridors of power as a tenured professor, and you only intend to stay briefly, and then go back to your university, you do have a certain autonomy that others in government may not have, and as a result, you can, with the words of this meeting, you can speak to power more freely, and when your time is up, you can go home and return to research, reflection, and writing for the public entirely in your own voice.

[Applause]

IMMANUEL WALLERSTEIN: And now I've asked Alain Touraine to tell us something about the L'Ecete Commission and their work. His work.

[Pause]

ALAIN TOURAINE: Thank you [inaudible]. I would say after Emmanuel how much I'm shocked by the absence of my old friend, Pablo Gonzalez Casanova, who is a major figure in Latin America sociology. It's hard to understand for me how such a figure, such a respected intellectual figure cannot be accepted in time to participate to such a meeting. I want to make clear from the beginning on that what I'm interested in and what I think we are all interested in is neither expertise nor ideology or just expression of values. We are trying. Our dream is [beep] to be able to present, to submit, to convey opinion to the government, to, to business and so on, analysis which are based on the specific purpose of knowledge exactly as economists on one side, psychologists on the other side [beep] and [inaudible] obviously can do that. If the firm is not just to be helpful technically speaking, it's not to oppose a perfect society, a utopia, as respectable as it is. To, down to politics. The firm is to look for a new definition of what we are, what sociology is, what kind of knowledge it represents, and which is so, so strong that decision makers have not to accept it but to take it into consideration. That's an insurrection then. Before, trying to give a first answer in two line. To this question I want to, to mention the stumble the cases I was involved in. And explain why I selected following Emmanuel's advice as the least rewarding and the most complex example. It's obviously easy to speak, to intervene in public debate just to help people, to understand the importance of a major movement. I'm not, let's say, mentioning too big to [inaudible], but let's just [inaudible]. In Poland, it's obviously something fundamental. It's what we had a series of different orientation, but not really could deny. It was nothing very, very difficult to recognize the importance of [inaudible]. The second case, which is much more complicated, much more interesting from that point of view is when historically speaking we have in front of us a mixture of various competence and various meanings, and it's extremely difficult but absolutely necessary make your choice to say yes, we have different and [inaudible] very opposed to each other, but I think the main meaning of this historical illustration is such and such. I think an example because this, the end of, of, of the discussion is, is a very recent one. The people have discussed during years and years about the Chilean [inaudible] and the military coup. And actually we're in the same sense have been able to, to make a choice and using the, the 30th anniversary of the coup. We, we decided to, to be clear, and we did that in Paris symbolically creating a square in front of the embassy, the Chilean embassy, which is the square. So that [inaudible]. And that meant, we think that above all the discussion, the main meaning of [inaudible] was to be a democrat. It's not obvious, but that's what we decided. Or I take two example I was deeply involved in further all, but, and was seen and court side exactly the same situation. Sixty-eight, May '68 or '64, '68 in the United States, we had a series of possible interpretation, and I personally, I was chairman of the programs of the [inaudible] university where everything began. I made the choice saying this is the most important meaning, which is to say the invasion of politics by culture. Another one which is a, a very recent one which is not over. Anyway, I met again Pablo Gonzalez Casanova his Zapatista case, and in Chiapas, and I visited, I, I had the opportunity to speak several times [inaudible] in Mexico with Marcos, and I decided to express myself like other people did [inaudible] to explain that this small thing of Chiapas is a first attempt against the [inaudible] of guerillas, the first attempt to put together a community action and national process of democratization. We are risk, maybe I'm wrong, but we, we were wrong with some people like me. But I sleep with it. Now, the third case, the third type of [inaudible] is much more difficult to, so I would sum up in very few words this problem of what has been called the and which is something different. A commission was made. It [inaudible] like it's common in England, in France, and so on. And a very intelligent [inaudible] told us. Your job is to combine two things. The first one is to extend,

respect and extend cultural right, cultural diversity. So second is to maintain the concept of citizenship involve all kinds of [inaudible]. So we discuss, we were very far from each other and a great diversity. We try to redefine the, the [inaudible] lay city, which is a very respectable notion, very far from British, American one, but as respectable as others, and we try to eliminate the entire religious aspect of, as the fight of the 19th century, and to transform this concept into a positive support of liberty of conscious. But at the same time, that's insensible. With [inaudible], we were divided [inaudible]. At the same time, we observed a rapid transformation of society. The formation of ghetto, which did not exist. The formation of communitarian [phonetic] authorities as the political, as the religious at the local level. The multiplication of incidents in high schools, not just the [inaudible] but girls who refused to go to gym, to biology class, to history class. A growing number of people, of women in terms of they husband, who refuse their wife to be in [inaudible] without touch by a nurse or by a, a doctor who is not, who is not a, a woman. I say a series of deep crisis of a kind of enlightenment which has triumphed in our society for the rest of two centuries. So the problem is what should come first. Should we give a priority to saying we think the most important decision to make today is to, to extend cultural-wise and to be less rigid and to permit people to express their religious, their religious creeds. Some people say they're, they're political, but very few people are interested in expressing political creeds today. And other people, and here we weren't divided, and so we decided unanimously in a way which can be deeply discussed or rejected, but it was necessary to give a priority to a statement saying we are not going to abandon our system of separation of religion and states. We are going to defend the idea of universally realistic individual rights, the idea of citizenship, and we are going to condemn all measures, all acts, types of action which were taken against equality between men and women or against mixed city and so and so on. That's what we did, but we did that very prudently. We proposed 21 measures of which the government selected one, which was the young lady, restricted, for example, we propose that people could choose as holidays not only Easter or Christmas but [inaudible] is the one too, but all of that was rejected as manner. Now the firm is, I have no answer that were you, were, were we right or wrong, we know that in the two or three weeks from now when the, the schools open again. Mind you is that in spite of the fact that the measure which was taken, the [inaudible] keeping out forbidden, my view is that the fact that the public debate has been open, the people have spoken but is more during all the, the, the rich years, make that probably, probably. Oh, it's, it's not impossible to have a better knowledge and, and to have people, public opinion and authority recognizing extreme diversity of these girls, some of them the one I know most for long time. We made a first study 15 years ago. We are modern girls who want just to maintain their [inaudible] and some of it which are more or less [inaudible] of community authorities or who can be even anti-Muslim, but I defend the idea that the main current, the mainstream is a pro-modern life and that it's necessary for all of us to give up more than before our capacity to, to create a new world with all elements of culture and our own process of transformation. So that's, that's why I selected this example because it's obscure. It has been criticized by many people. I was in the parliament has accepted that at 80 or 90 percent, and all polls show that public opinion is in a great, not great [inaudible]. So my wall of confusion is not about that, but about what I said at the beginning and I hope I have an opportunity to, to explain that a bit more. What is important is not to discuss what happens when we enter into a public debate and since, since then we, we all of us intervene as citizens [inaudible]. The prime is do we have recent surges, the capacity to speak in the name of a type of knowledge which gives us influence. We are not interested, I mean, I am not for, for, but then most people are not interested in speaking to the government with, to speaking to public opinion in a way which is important and relevant for the government. So that's why I consider, we are not discussing a marginal case today, and in this Con, Congress, but we are discussing the very essential problem of in what kind, in, in the name of what kind of knowledge do we speak to them.

[Applause]

IMMANUEL WALLERSTEIN: Alain Touraine's last question leads me exactly into my next one. The way we will proceed now is we will all sit at the table. This microphone will end its role, and I will pose follow-up questions and the three of them will respond as they wish, and they can ask questions of each other, and this will be a long conversation. So my first follow-up question, and, and it seems relevant in terms of what all three have described was as you talk to people who are political figures and politicians by, by choice, and by role, does the fact that you are a social scientist speaking about this question give you any credibility?

JOHAN GALTUNG: Wait. I'll just grab the microphone because my answer is definitely no. [laughter] They're not the slightest impressed with that. And I'll try to say what my experience is, and experience can be different. I have had face-to-face dialogues with eight of the world's presidents, a number of prime ministers, very many foreign ministers, a number of leaders of revolt against the three categories mentioned above, and jail leaders, common people, uncommon people, all kinds of things. And I think I can say that what they're looking for is actually just one thing, and that's the light at the end of the tunnel. The light at the end of the tunnel. Does this guy have something that could untie the knot? Just coming from a country in Europe, not my own, led an extra track for the Sri Lanka problem. Our organization, Transcend, has managed to change it from a conflict of two parties to down with one with three parties. The Muslims. Now, what you do in that situation is to try questioning, we're always questioning to indicate possibilities. In this particular case, what we call a non-territorial federation. I'll not go into all of this. The point is only that you put things on the table with question marks, and they bite into it. And they bite into it, and if they are interested in the premises for you saying so, they will ask you, but they are not interested in your learned discourse or how the conflict started in 1956 and what happened after that. First of all, they know it much better than you do. And if you ask them, they will be your teachers in the conflict, but you can see possibilities they can't see. Did I learn that in sociology? I don't think so. I think I was raised in positivistic sociology, that the future will be more or less like the past provided we can have access to data about the parameters and make good extrapolations. Is that the key to this is the creativity that provides you with a jump into a new reality. Now, non-territorial federalism presupposes a two-chamber solution. One is territorial and one is with the nationalities or the peoples. There is something like that some places, but it's by and large new. In other words, you don't have the empirical crutches to lean on. It's exploring together with the parties creatively, and I would like to end that by saying [clearing throat] that the most imaginative thing I found in sociology was "The Sociological Imagination" by C. Wright Mills, but only the title. I didn't find the book very [laughter] imaginative. I found the title fantastic, and I was reading until the very end desperately hoping that he would somehow, you know, come to the point. Now, he was [inaudible] and my colleague, beloved colleague, I loved him not only for his motorbike but for his orientation in general, which to me was an orientation of equality and equity. So where do I identify creativity? Well, about that, I can say something, and I'll stop at that point. We mean more than men, but if those women get university education, and at the time they have become professors. They come down to May 11ths, and the process is astonishingly quick. That means they become experts. That means with a certified discourse and very deep knowledge within that discourse. Again, I've said it's the capacity to jump out of a discourse. [beep] Jewish rabbis, Buddhist beakers, artists, engineers, architects, and, surprisingly, quite a lot of politicians. Now, if you have a woman who is a Jewish rabbi, a Buddhist beaker, an artist, an engineer, and an architect, and at the same time a politician, then we don't need more, but she would be absolutely intolerable. [laughter] So I would not advise that that creature is brought into being by some cloning experience. But I have indicated factors. It's also my experience that diplomats are remarkably non-creative, just remarkably. They are good at process, but not at the imaging new realities. They are not trained that way. Nobody will reward them for it either. Sometimes in secret, they may dare come up with something, but they usually make a basic mistake, and that is to have the

parties around the table. How you can be creative with a guy who ordered bombing the village in which you were born, exterminating your family 40 centimeters away from you, I don't understand. I see absolutely not the slightest indication of any psychology that could lead to that. So our method is to have dialogue with each party one at a time. And using the excellent American expression, trying to prepare them for the table. And we've had some successes, and they [beep] are not successes, then they come forward of themselves by saying it becomes successes in the longer run. Thank you.

[Applause]

PAUL E. STARR: Sociology did not have a lot to do with my particular role in, in health policy. My knowledge of health policy, specifically, was much more relevant, but I think that a background in, in almost of the social sciences can, can be a basis for a different frame of understanding from the ones that people who are immersed in the, in the daily business of policy and politics have. And so that what we can bring, we speaking very generally now about people from, from an academic background can bring, is a different frame of understanding often. And then, then I'd add just one other thing. I'd like, I like Johan Galtung's emphasis on creativity, and part of that is conceptual. But there's also a further step, which is really entrepreneurial, and which involves assembling groups of people from the academic world, from policy world and the political world, in trying to put together the, the kinds of ideas and, and power that can actually make something happen. And so working in that interface in the interest [inaudible] between the academy and the public world I think is, it's, it's, a, sparkling an entrepreneurial activity, and it's one there where, where a background on one side, the academic side, can be extremely useful.

IMMANUEL WALLERSTEIN: Paul. Part of my question was do you have credibility because you're a social science, with the other group.

PAUL E. STARR: Well, as I was, as I was saying, in drawing that distinction between Clinton and Bush, this will have a lot to do with the outlook of the, of the, of the, of the political people you're dealing with. I mean, some of them, some of them are, are, are much more substantive or much more interested in the kind of knowledge that the, the social sciences can offer, and others are obviously not. [laughter]

IMMANUEL WALLERSTEIN: Alain. [laughter]

ALAIN TOURAINE: If, if I had to answer by yes or no, for practical reason and not for intellectual reason, as such, I would say no, and I will explain why. I, I, I come back to what I said a moment ago. We are, have some influence, we are respected and so and so on, if people think and know that we speak in the name of a certain type of knowledge. It's not our role, the fact to be [inaudible]. Now, what is our situation? The situation is during a long period of time, yes, we have the specificity. We were explaining social fact by social facts. That disappeared because society is no longer exist because change is everywhere, because of global division. And so. So, during the last 30 years, we had a different type of, of answer, which was a purely negative. There are no actors because it's submitted to a system of external domination. And the explanation of, of behavior should not be found in active but in economic system and so on. That was very powerful, but sociologists had nothing to say. So the problem is are we able to define positive actions. In here, I observe that's a place where I would like to come very concretely to what Johan said because we are at a similar experiences. I would use the most simple word. What do we speak about? We speak about people who want to be respected, none humiliated, and have some rights recognized in some text or in some agreements. So I would say that after long period of time in which we were dreaming of a Paradise of a classless society, of a nation, of

a, a pure [inaudible], we are confronted today, maybe from the 60's on, from the women's movement on, to a certain extent from some national movement too, we are, we have to understand what it means to, as to or to claim human rights. Society no longer exists as it war [inaudible]. Violence. The institution unable to resist this impersonal forces. Only this kind of, to speak the English way, the reflective attitude to speak in this way, the, the reflective, I think is at the situation in which we are, our situation. We are directly, personally, and collectively involved. That's why the, the, the, the [inaudible] moment ago, how can we isolate, identify these basic demons for life, for not for justice. See for respect, which is much more personal. How can we isolate them [inaudible] in a series of situation which have different aspect, and we ask for different type of answers. And that means that we should never expected the [inaudible]. I'm not speaking that. We should never address ourselves to a government, especially in a secret way. We must always express our opinions publicly. We should not accept, participate to a final report which is not published. We should at the same time make [inaudible] that the government can be, is trying to answer some question which are of some interest for the government, but what we do is to tell the truth to a public that is best to the tell the truth. Remind me of Brazil during the, the [inaudible], and [inaudible]. We gave conference, and I attended one, and, and we [inaudible] so, so I asked my neighbor with why do, do you come, why are you [inaudible]? [inaudible] And she told me because it says the truth. [inaudible] That's not too bad. So, that exactly. So it's not the problem to be democratic or, and so, no. Not at all. The problem is to be able to, to tell people, [inaudible] you speak about power. You speak about economy or money or profit. We speak about actors. People are responsible for themself and in front of the threat of themselves by their consciousness, all these words which have [inaudible]. And that is error. As long as we keep our role, as we say what we are able to say, what does that mean to be an actor. What has the limitation? What has the compromises? What other force of destruction of action? We can be believed. We can have an influence even if, generally, governments do not agree with what we say. I finish giving a quotation of the President of, of France. At the end of the whole process, we, we, we gave him and the, the report which was the same thing, published. And I told him last time I was member of the Council about ten years ago. You know, big Commission about national, redefinition of nationality and citizenship, and the government, he, he was already President. The government did not accept any one of our proposals. And he told me, "That's absolutely true. We rejected everything, but the results were extremely positive because the level of the public debate has been deeply transformed because people are more conscious, not of administrative solution, but be, because at that time we were proposing nationality not only by, by, by then, by brought this out of our tradition, but by free, a free decision, but it was the, during the [inaudible] during the French Revolution. So they refused, which was strange because after all it's common sense. But I think, I think that is our real, and I think we are extremely useful and efficient when we help public opinion through media, with all the difficulties and limitation, you can imagine. When we reintroduce this point of view of ourselves as actors of our situation.

[Applause]

IMMANUEL WALLERSTEIN: I'm sure that each of you has, at some point in the process of doing the kinds of things you've been doing, been taxed probably by colleagues with having overstepped your bounds as a impartial scholar. Has this been a big issue, and if so, how have you responded to them about this?

JOHAN GALTUNG: My experience with colleagues is more that they are agreeing with envy. So that's why I put on a green jacket in order to [laughter] some of anticipated. No, not really, because first of all, I do have values, but I put them on the table from the beginning, and they are creativity, non-violence, and empathy. In other words, try to handle the conflict without violence, empathy with all parties, [clearing throat] and creativity in bridging legitimate goals. It's very hard to argue against it,

and that's the point. But I've had some interesting opposition from diplomats. And in a sense, since this is a kind of non-governmental diplomacy, remember when last year I was invited to Nepal to mediate between monocysts [phonetic] and Maoists, which was not very easy. Two embassies had protested my presence in the kingdom. I'll not give the names, but it was not they were afraid of. They were afraid that we might be successful. You see, this is a kind of a field where there is also competition in the sense that if a conflict gets away from the violent path and into something acceptable and sustainable, well, then something has been achieved. However, we have one more goal on top of that in Transcend, and that goal is that if you can find something that pushes your mantel a little bit forward by being transcending, a positive transcendence, like a binational zone that can be copied other places. Or what we are, and that's not very new at all. Oh, there must be about 1,000 dialogues in Israel-Palestine for the last 40 years, at least 1,000, we have come to the conclusion that neither the one-state solution nor the two-state solutions carry peace, but that a six-state solution may. Namely a Middle East community. And that will be Syria, Lebanon, recognize Palestine according to 242338194, Jordan, and Egypt. And Israel, of course. So the model will be the European community as it emerged first of January 1958. Now, obviously, this is not what's happening now. So here comes exactly our last point. You make an input, which does not necessarily have any kind of immediate result, but it has already enriched the debate. We have very elaborate courses in peace journalism where we don't ask journalists to take a stand. We ask them just to include two questions. Mr. President, what's the underlying conflict? Mr. President, do you see any solution to that conflict? Well, one answer is it's the conflict between good and evil. And there is a solution, crush evil. Well, there's a limited number of times he can say that, you seem, if he's exposed to that question consistently, and that's important. So by moving the discourse, you do something. I'd like to add I've found it impossible to receive any kind of honorarium from any one party in a conflict. We don't accept anything. If they should happen to come together and pay a joint per diem, that's OK, but if they manage to do that, probably the conflict is already solved. [laughter] So generally not. Point two. Absolutely no copyright. Whatever you say, exactly as Alain said, belongs to public space. Science is public; it's not private. Public sociology, I love it, and that means sociology going public as a property of public space. Now, today it's easier than before it because you can download it. www.transcend.org. There you have some perspectives on about 50 conflicts, and thieves are most welcome. There's no need for quotation. I'm not going to apply for any professorship any longer, and those of us, the 250 of us, they have enough professorships to [inaudible]. So that's not the point. The point is to try to enrich the debate. This is on behalf of the public. And there is, of course, then the underlying theory by not a two-step flow of communication, [inaudible] too modest, but by a 265-step flow of communication that sooner or later it will have some input. In the meantime, we try not to be dramatic, but come up with new perspectives. So my short answer is, politicians ask us how did you do it? Colleagues, by and large envious, is catching on. Not the envy but the tricks.

[Silence]

[Applause]

ALAIN TOURAINE: Short answer to Emmanuel's question. I think it's, it's rather easy to answer this question because very few people believe any beliefs in this type of, of objectivity. That you understand better a situation if you don't introduce any value judgment, if you don't speak about conflict, power, and so on. Under country, my experience has been repeatedly that people who speak in this type of language, the defense of objectivity are people who either don't understand anything [laughter] or chose to defend the status quo. The first situation is the most common, and I, I, I give you one example which impress with, with two names. One day I was in our university with a professor of geography. And in front of us there were hundreds, thousands, I don't know, of students of French and

German because there was a time that a Deutsch, Deutsch cathedral had visited our university. And this excellent professor of geography [inaudible] dozen of excited people. He had 2,000 people in front of his eyes, and he was negating their reactions. That is absolute faith constant. A very respectable sociologist and crazy good scientist like [inaudible] for example. I had a long difficult debate with him. Said repeatedly, "That is just a psychodrama." His only excuse that he had absolutely no idea what the word meant. But he, he was saying that does not exist. And this denial of facts that I would say is exactly as the negative force against [beep] [inaudible] from the first days in London in the 19th century has fought again. Sociology is, furthermore, uncovering what has been concealed and recognizing fact, but to recognize facts, you have to, to accept the idea that these facts are human facts which are defined by presence or absence of human dignity.

IMMANUEL WALLERSTEIN: Paul.

PAUL E. STARR: It's, it's really never been an issue. I, I, I, in, in my own career, I've straddled the academy, journalism, and politics. Probably it is a, a, a problem for some people, but I've never, I've never experienced it directly.

IMMANUEL WALLERSTEIN: I have. [laughter] But, but you should answer the question. Would you care to comment on what, if anything, is the role of associations of scholars like the American Sociological Association or any other association, vis-à-vis the concept of public sociology? Should they, should they be engaged collectively in, in public sociology? Should they be encouraging it? Obviously, at the moment the ASA at this meeting is in some ways encouraging it because they've convened a whole meeting around the theme, but I'm not sure everyone in the association thinks that's a marvelous idea. But in any case, would you, we are constantly faced in ASA and in other, in the International Sociological Association and all the other national associations, are faced with the issues of whether they should, as an association, take positions on public issues, and, therefore, play the role of public sociology. Could you speak to this issue?

PAUL E. STARR: Can, can I say something? This is a question I would like to respond to because I, I do think it's very productive to have a meeting where this is the subject and where people can engage in discussions about matters of great public moment. On, on the other hand, I, I don't really see much useful, much real effect from the association as such taking positions on all kinds of issues. It's simply not going to have much impact. If the association wants to have an effect, it ought to reserve such interventions for extremely unusual circumstances where the, the, the, the sheer rareness of the, of the, of, of the action, will, will, will call attention to itself, but by regularly taking positions, association and others will simply spend their influence and waste them.

ALAIN TOURAINE: Hello.

No, no, Alain.

ALAIN TOURAINE: Well, I certainly agree that the association as such as much to take public position in term of political problem and so on. Or even in term of you mean humanitarian problem. It's not the job of these associations, but, and I think that is what is happening right now. An association like the International, the American and so on and so on, [inaudible] association must be preoccupied with the existent or not existence of its specific field of knowledge. And it's a, you have to be blind not to see that in bookstores, sociology disappearing. There are many more books everywhere, in London, in New York, anywhere you like about cultural studies, about gay and lesbian, about women than about sociology as such. And I speak seriously. I think there is a lack of definition of the field, and that's why

so many bright, young people prefer to go, for example, to political science, which has a kind of a pride aspect. So I think what ASA is doing right now is absolutely vital. It's not, it's a side ac [beep] [inaudible], it's absolutely fundamental [applause]. What do we do? What are we speaking about? What are the criterion of truth or not truth? What can be described, what can be discussed, and so on. That had been made at, at, at the end of the 19th century. Like when, not only [inaudible] but let's say after, after [inaudible] and so many people. A new field was created, and it has progressively [beep] disappeared, and I would, I, I can't say really, I mean, I say that in this countries, my country. There's, it's urgent for us to break with the, the rest of the wounds of this classical sociology, extremely respectable, extremely that, and [laughter] that we should redefine, and redefine our field, and what impresses me is that in practically all countries, actually in Europe, North America, South America, I'm, I'm, I'm impressed by the fact that most people, most students, most research, and most professor spontaneously agree with this idea, and if you look at the program of various Congresses in various parts of the world, you'd say that this all sociology has almost disappeared, and the kind of program we are discussing in an apparently marginal way are right in the middle of our activities, our preoccupation, and our desire to create knowledge. So the Americans will [inaudible] association like that. Most country as [inaudible] of their own existence and should [inaudible] to call for new study, new definition of our field.

IMMANUEL WALLERSTEIN: Yes.

JOHAN GALTUNG: Alain's via a case study, I was mediating in an Italian medical dispute. And she said, and had been saying, in fact, for ten years, "If I'm ten years younger than you, I don't have a job. You're going to die before me. We have proved the pension is insufficient, insufficient. Where is my security?" And he says, "Well, you always demand me that I should ask, I should work overtime. I've worked enough overtime in my life. I'm to having a regular job. Why don't you start working? In addition to that, I like sitting in the bar together with my friends and have a good time. I'm entitled to a good life." "Ha, you good life. You even are suffering from," and then she said the technical term for erectile dysfunction. [laughter] Now, [clearing throat] then he said, "Did you say," and then he used the other word for erectile dysfunction. Bang. [laughter] So then came the physical violence. The police was called, and I'm not by telling this story saying that the verbal violence legitimizes the physical, but in the course of chain it had something to do with it. Now, searching dialogues, we each [inaudible] one at a time when my opening question usually is, "How do you, what do you think a good marriage looks like?" "Not with that one." "OK. Could you put that aside just for the time being?" [grumbling] Usually, very interesting things come out. And the key enough is stimulated creativity. I didn't have any preconceived idea, but I could help them along. And the end of it was, and many of you have probably, I hope, I hope, I hope already seen one solution. They open a bar together. [laughter] It's a fairly good proposition in the Italian climate. [laughter] Her security's guaranteed. He can be in the bar as much as he wants. He can have his buddies on both sides of the counter, and they lived happily ever after [laughter] until the next conflict came up. In the meantime, hopefully, they learned something. So what is my morale of this story? I think it will be useful to stimulate creativity and imagination. To simply have that as a major concern. To see the word "knowledge" that Alain is using, and I also use, as knowledge about empirical reality and about potential reality. Now, there are limits to what potential reality is bring about. This one was simple. [inaudible], Peru was not that simple, and I salute the two presidents who could embrace such a thing. And there are many others along that line. Now, where does one get this from? Well, as Emmanuel indicated, my background is actually originally mathematics. Very poor mathematician, but I learned one thing. That when mathematicians cannot get, get satisfactory answers from a mathematic [inaudible], they make a jump and create a new mathematics from positive numbers to introduce negative numbers. Then suddenly fractions, then suddenly rational numbers, imaginative numbers and

so on. They extremely good at those jumps. That's where the creativity comes in, and as long as they're inside a system, it is discipline. Now, as a mathematician, you're actually rewarded more for creativity than for discipline, and it may be good to learn from that. And the [inaudible] is, of course, called dialectics. It is called dialectics, and the richest source of it is not Marx. Marx was just leaning on here because he had stolen it from life, and it's [inaudible] had stolen it from this book from essentially a very famous Italian monk who went to convert, a Jesuit, to convert a Chinese and became converted himself. Now, Taoism an enormous source of richness. It's not the slightest reason to see [inaudible] to see some more Orient. It's just a part of the human experience that the potential reality is as important as the empirical one. Take a little look backward in history, use Emmanuel as a guide, and ask yourself, haven't there been a couple of changes? Isn't it the case that the couple of potential realities have come about, clear our minds for it. And that, I think, would be an enormous contribution by the American Sociological Association. There is need for the empirical positive sociology. There's need for the critical, and there's need for the constructive. So that would be my answer, Emmanuel.

IMMANUEL WALLERSTEIN: Alain.

ALAIN TOURAINE: Yes. Wanted to use -

[Applause]

ALAIN TOURAINE: The fact that Johan has used several times the word "creativity" I use different word like humanwise, like respect, You know what I mean? It's more or less the same thing. And that help us to define the difficulty we are meeting. So here [beep] I've spoken in the name of society. The difficulty, the real difficulty is that now we have to speak against society. I think definitely the concept of society is of no use. I say that at the Congress of [inaudible] 70 something, how to get rid of the concept of society. And it's something which is new and not new, but which is absolutely present in today's intellectual and moral world, though, in a situation of domination of matching [inaudible] and so on, we must accept the idea that social institutions, social forms of organization are acceptable only if they are based on none social factors. When you say creativity, it's not a social factor. When I say human rights, it's not a social factor. You can put that in a religious, non-religious, but I don't care, but the great transformation we have to do is that after the long period in which the state and then society where [inaudible] the basis for [inaudible] for morality, now we are actually most of us convinced that when we speak about society, we speak about something dangerous for which does not really exist, and that in a certain sense, when we speak about trust, [laughs] [inaudible] but in a different sense, when we speak about the rights that, for me, the central notion for sociologists the rights. How is it possible to invent new rights to combine old and new rights to a world that's rights [inaudible] against the rights as we have seen so many times in our history. When we concentrate our [inaudible] about the reconstruction, active reconstruction of institutions from [inaudible] school system, types of family, in term of giving more space to creativity, to respect, to individualism and at the same time a feeling of the other, otherness as a value. All of that, I mean, that is our task, which is to reconstruct a new, a new universe of analysis which is not, which is no longer based on concepts like functions or, or needs of society and so on and so on.

IMMANUEL WALLERSTEIN: This whole conversation has so far centered on ways that people who are trained as social scientists can involve themselves in talking to people whose role are political roles, and we've had various suggestions as to what is fruitful and what is not fruitful, what is desirable and not desirable. There's another long-standing discussion within the social sciences of the ways in which social scientists ought to keep more distance from rather than more involvement with. For example, let's take the case of Chile with, which at least two of had intimate connections. In the 1960's, [beep]

the rather fam, nor now famous or infamous [beep] I forget his name. What was his name?

ALAIN TOURAINE: Camelot.

IMMANUEL WALLERSTEIN: Camelot. Operation Camelot or the Camelot project, which was funded by a U.S. governmental agency, and my friend on the right here is the one who launched an international discussion of whether or not this was the CIA, which was behind it, and whether social scientists who were involved in it were not performing tasks which were illegitimate tasks because they were, in fact, promoting objectives which were, in themselves, illegitimate, but in any case, objectives of the government. Now, the anthropologists have been having an interesting discussion in the last few years over a particular anthropologist who was studying in Venezuela and what he did or did not do in terms of proactive introduction of changes within in the structure which he did for purposes of study which may have, may or may not have been harmful to the people who were being studied, and, again, there was a sense by a large number of anthropologists that this was illegitimate. That he was serving the interests, in effect, perhaps not of a government but of some outside interest. So the question of distance rather than closeness has also been a matter of debate, and I would like all of you to react to that issue.

JOHAN GALTUNG: The word were Camelot. I was invited to be a participant in the project. Now, a secretary had made a mistake, and put into the invitation letter a slip that was destined only for two levels higher than me. On that slip it was written, "The real purpose of this project is to find out how the U.S. Army can help the armies of friendly governments against insurrection." So that was fairly clear. It was not CIA. It was, if you will, higher up. So I decided since the [beep] [inaudible] professor who's task it was in Latin America to train sociologists. That one of my tasks was to stop this. They did outside working hours was my argument when [inaudible] a little bit unhappy about what I had done, and it didn't carry much water with them. But the point is that what I did was actually not so much to raise the public debate money as to mobilize friends in Chilean sociology. The Marx system among them unanimously said, "Let us participate. Take the money, and give them lies." [laughter] I didn't like that answer. You see, like Alain, I find human rights and under that basic needs where the word "dignity" summarizes very much what I find in basic needs. A very good basis on which to stand. So I found a middle wing Catholic sociologist, and he was the one who was my key, let us say, companion in this, and a photocopy of the relevant documents ended at the table of the President of Chile, who immediately informed the President of the U.S., Lyndon Johnson, and Lyndon Johnson cancelled the project immediately. But you see, this is, I think it's important, and I'm in a sense happy about it, but I'm much more interested in the constructive thing I can do than trying to stop one more international crime. But I would like to tell two very small anecdotes because I had met Lyndon Johnson before it. As a younger man, when my task was to accompany the Norwegian minister of development, who was [inaudible] Aves, a rare species in Norway. She didn't know one word of English. So I was appointed to be an interpreter with Vice President Lyndon Johnson. So Lyndon Johnson enters the room, sees the minister of development, also [inaudible], and says, "Hi, [inaudible], and what a pleasure to meet you. I'm so happy to see you." So I translated this to [inaudible]. She looked at me and said in Norwegian, "I don't like him." [laughter] Now, how do you translate that, you see. [laughter] So I said, "Her Excellently, Excellency says that she's equally delighted to see you." [laughter] Now, that shows you how easily corruptible I am. [Laughter] And also how good it was that I stopped that kind of career, but there is a second point to the anecdote, and that was in 1969 at a party in Paris. It was a [inaudible] party, and the American ambassador drove into the city, and the Italian hostess and a very nice party at [talking in foreign language], which is a rather sort of plush kind of place to have a party. And it was Vietnam, and the ambassador and I, we got into it very quickly, and the decibel got quite high, so did the temperature, and the only thing that did not heat up was the food

that was kind of cooling down. The hostess was desperate, and at the end, the ambassador solved the problem, and I sort of admire him, I must say. "What did you say your name was? Johan Galtung?" "Yes." "Are you the same Johan Galtung who gave us so much trouble down in Chile some years ago?" "That's me, sir." "Thank God there is only one of you." [laughter] The whole thing resolved, and the party could proceed. The hostess embraced him, we parted as friends, and it shows you the significance of a good remark at a good place.

[Applause]

ALAIN TOURAINE: I feel a bit uneasy about your question because too far, too distance. I don't think that's exactly the, the problem. You mentioned not only Camelot, which is an extreme case, but after all, so many sociologists who were caught in the Columbian situation and then were asked rightly or wrongly but a very violent thing. What is the real problem, especially if you look at, if you study, I don't know, African or Latin America, is that very many people, [laughs] I'm thinking of [inaudible] as a good example. When they go abroad in a different country, judge this country with their own norms and measures, and very often with good faith and good intention, Peace Corps and this kind of things, can do very negative deeds. So the problem is relatively simple in, but, but, but complicated to do, which is to know as completely as possible the conditions in which you were 20 years ago, which was customary to say where are you speaking from in [inaudible] sense. And this is part of exaggeration, this question must be maintained where who pays you, what is a possible use, what is the status, and the, yes, I mean, the processes for which you are working. So we, we, we can, we must ask social scientists to be as conscious as possible of the conditions in which they work and which do not depend on them financially, [inaudible], speaking so that it seems to be a sane attitude to be, first of all, in a position of opposition. In a critical position because that is a good way of discussing or eliminating parts of the, the role you have to weave out knowing it.

[Pause]

PAUL E. STARR: Well, it, the answer to your question is it all depends. Closeness, distance, it, it depends on the substantive values that the work involves. I, I find it very hard to generalize about this. In many cases, the issue can be dealt with through transparency. That is if, if everything's out in the open, if everything's public, what you're doing is clear, people will judge. They will, they, it, it, it's all very straightforward. That, but that wouldn't necessarily apply to every possible, useful, legitimate work that, that a social scientist could do. And, and I just, I, again, I find it very hard to generalize. I mean, I think, I think there are questions today about terrorism, for example, that might legitimately involve people and work that, you know, that wouldn't be fully public.

IMMANUEL WALLERSTEIN: We have very little time left so I'd like to ask you the question what do you think is the role of departments of sociology training graduate students in terms of talking to them about, training them in, teaching about public sociology?

[Siren]

[Pause]

ALAIN TOURAINE: This question is simple. Department of sociology must give a central importance to what we call here public sociology. First of all, because it's the best of way of training people to become aware of their own conscious, not to be naïve, not to be ingenuous. And second, because it's the only good way to avoid the negative role of the so-called organic intellectuals of the

past. And so in, in here, I, I, I don't think that Johan would descend from my opinion to belong to parties, to belong to big organization is always dangerous for the production of knowledge. And sociologists is only work. And we, students, after all, students, I don't know what they are, how they are here in this place today, but I know some in this country or especially in the [inaudible] UCLA. I think students are quite eager to follow this way. I would even say that I met very many people in different countries which feel frustrated to listen to a sociology which is made for sociologists. Which is a kind of discourse about yourself. Like a kind of a history of, of philosophy, it's better to make some philosophy. And, and so, sociology, I, I repeat always the same thing that sociology should have a much more important role, and indeed more important [laughs] more jobs, and the students are interested in that, and I observe that very often people will receive the training in sociology can be met everywhere in the world in with one hat or another one, and are really looking spontaneously for the type of thing we're discussing about. My view is that we are following a demand which already exists. We are not trying to create a new demand. This demand exists.

[Pause]

PAUL E. STARR: I guess I, I would like to see students encouraged to take risks. To take risks in their work, that, that push them beyond some of the, the [inaudible] boundaries. Johan Galtung was talking before about imaging potential realities as well as studying empirical realities. I think, I think this, this also involves crossing from the positive into the normative. One of, one of the misfortunes in sociology is that we, we don't have what political science has, which is a field within it of political theory, which is explicitly normative. There is no field within sociology that has normative theory as its, as its, as its objective, and so there is very little training. It's mostly a matter of what your intuitive beliefs are, or your, or your, or your, or your opinions happen to be. There's no, there's no systematic introduction of normative discussion into the curriculum. And so if there's one sort of issue, I think, hanging out there, for me, it's that there, there, there needs to be more of that as part of training in sociology, and sociologists ought to be encouraged to go from the, the positive to the normative but with some understanding of, of some of the systematic kinds of arguments that are made.

[Pause]

JOHAN GALTUNG: Where do we go? In "Les Miserables" has a remarkable statement written in the middle of last century about sociology where it says that the basic purpose must be to explore conflict and peace. Now, that was the beginning and the end of French peace studies. [laughter] Let me just say 30 more seconds on that. [clearing throat] If you go into this, I find the basis for other study, which transcends the distinction between the positive and the normative, and that's basic needs. I try to approach it empirically identifying survival, well being, freedom, and identity as four at the same level. And I have a feeling that encourage your students to explore what people want, what they cannot do without, and then encourage your students in a responsible way to release the creativity in everybody. Thank you.

IMMANUEL WALLERSTEIN: Alright. We have one minute left. So I have a last question, and I want a one-word answer from each of the three. As you look back on 200 years of public social science, all over the world, what grade would you give it? A, in terms of success and utility, A, B, C, or F?

JOHAN GALTUNG: Let me give it Bush's grade when he finished college, C. [laughter] But not Clinton, A plus.

IMMANUEL WALLERSTEIN: Paul.

PAUL E. STARR: Well, well, I'd give it an incomplete. That's what we -

[Laughter]

[Applause]

IMMANUEL WALLERSTEIN: Alain.

ALAIN TOURAINE: Strange question because you ask sociologists to give an A, B, C, to sociology itself.

IMMANUEL WALLERSTEIN: That's right.

ALAIN TOURAINE: What would you say for the mathematicians?

IMMANUEL WALLERSTEIN: I have no idea. [laughter]

ALAIN TOURAINE: So it's certain, that could be my answer, but I would be provocative in saying that I would, my answer would be A. Would be A in the sense that actually in spite of [beep] and [inaudible]. What we call sociology, what we call the human science has basically been linked more than, for example, political science, to understanding deep movement, be transformation, be a historical type of, a cultural type and so on, and so we are the worst possible A's, but we are A. [laughter]

[Laughter]

[Applause]

IMMANUEL WALLERSTEIN: I, I thank you all for coming, and I hope that this whole meeting illustrates Alain Touraine's point that the practical results of the activity are less important than putting the issues on the table.

[Applause]