11 Mobilising the outsider

Crises and histories of the humanities in the 1970s Scandinavian welfare states

Hampus Östh Gustafsson

The humanities in crisis? In Sweden? This is what we have been told. The crisis is even mapped and identified with the accuracy of numbers in a report published by the Research Council for the Humanities. Among other things, the report shows that the humanities have a weaker position in Sweden than in other comparable countries in Northern and North-Western Europe.¹

In the 1970s, the idea of a crisis of the humanities in Scandinavia started to circulate with new intensity. The quotation above introduced a famous essay by Swedish intellectual historian Sven-Eric Liedman (1939–), included in the anthology *Humaniora på undantag? Humanistiska forskningstraditioner i Sverige* (1978). The connotations of this Swedish title are difficult to translate. Literally, “*på undantag*” refers to something being set aside or excluded, thus constituting an impoverished exception (by referring to an archaic agrarian term) – in this case from an international perspective. For three years, a group of relatively young scholars from the University of Gothenburg had conducted a project on Swedish research traditions in the humanities, funded by the Research Council for the Humanities (HFR). The 1978 collection of their results was recently described as a “legendary” publication that shaped the self-understanding of Swedish scholars in the humanities for decades, not least by inspiring them to engage more actively – and critically – in the legitimisation of their field.² The expression “*humaniora på undantag*” has become an entrenched trope, resurfacing as soon as the state of knowledge in the humanities is discussed. This trope, however, was not new but had been used in previous decades when there were also attempts to revitalise the humanities. Preparatory works and parallel initiatives – not just in Sweden but in a wider Scandinavian context – run the risk of becoming invisible in the shadow of this book. By perceiving the debates on, and mobilisation of, the humanities in these years as part of a long renegotiation of their intellectual as well as societal legitimacy, I hope to generate new perspectives on the role of knowledge in postwar Scandinavian society.³

Scandinavian perspectives on the history and crisis of the humanities

In a newspaper review of *Humaniora på undantag?*, it was noted that: “When a branch of science is in crisis, it is time to write its history, because if science

refuses to see its past, it has no future.”⁴ This historiographic strategy is still used for responding to perceived academic crises. One example is the recent call for comparative contributions to the history of the humanities (promoted as part of a broader history of knowledge) as a response to ongoing concerns regarding the so-called “crisis of the humanities”.⁵ The Swedish book from 1978 may be regarded as an early example of this strategy, as it provided historical narratives aimed at bringing about change. The project was a prompt reaction to a 1973 HFR report that presented findings from a transnational survey of the state of the humanities (and theology).⁶ In retrospect, Sven-Eric Liedman stated that the report was shocking, demonstrating that many scholars in the humanities had never truly reflected upon their own value.⁷ Previous attempts to mobilise the humanities in Sweden lacked the theoretical awareness demanded in this new generational charge by Liedman and his colleagues, advocating perspectives such as Marxism, structuralism, and semiotics (and hermeneutics). Furthermore, the report concluded that the humanities were defunded and had fewer academic positions than could be expected compared to other Scandinavian and Western European countries. This paved the way for the emergence of a narrative of national exceptionalism. It was questioned whether Sweden would be the only country in the world to have “discovered that research in the humanities and theology no longer had any real value for cultural and societal developments”.⁸ Or, as a journalist sarcastically commented on the report, “We know that we are the very best, but at the same time we are aware that there are some peripheral civilisational activities in which Sweden, out of all countries in the West, is definitely the worst.”⁹ The marginalisation of the humanities was thus contrasted to Sweden’s leading position as a welfare state.

The challenges facing the humanities were obviously not only identified in Sweden. Transnational comparisons, alongside cross-references and joint Scandinavian arenas for debate and exchange of ideas, played a vital part in shifting the thinking of the postwar historical actors themselves. For instance, *Humaniora på undantag?* was preceded by a theme issue of the journal *Nordisk forum*, published in 1977 by the Nordic Summer University (a research network funded through the Nordic Council of Ministers), with the explicit title “Crisis in the humanities?” Instead of simply reproducing the Swedish narrative of exceptionalism, the problems raised could thus be interpreted as characteristic of Scandinavian welfare states in general, at the time regarded as social democratic havens. These crisis narratives challenged the political knowledge priorities of these countries, which held social science, technology, and medicine in high esteem as satisfying ideals of rational planning and social engineering – ideals that, on the other hand, probably peaked in 1960s Sweden.¹⁰ The mobilisation of the humanities thus went hand in hand with a general critique of the postwar system of the welfare state, in many cases seen as an expression of unchecked capitalism, bureaucracy, or even technocracy.

The role of the humanities in the context of an increasing critique of the welfare state was further explored in literary fiction at this time, for example in Carl-Henning Wijkmark’s satirical novel *Den moderna döden* [The modern death] (1978), depicting a symposium held at the Öresund strait separating

Sweden and Denmark. In the novel, cold-hearted Swedish administrators and scientific experts meet to discuss how to address death in the most rational and economically effective way in order to be held accountable to “society”, while an invited Danish intellectual historian, a “learned humanist”, desperately tries to defend traditional humanistic values.¹¹ A contemporary picture of the Swedish welfare state as particularly hostile to humanistic values thus flourished. The question is: when conceptions of the welfare state apparently changed in these years and the previous picture of Sweden as an idyllic exception began to crack,¹² could the humanities themselves define a more relevant role in a context of societal change?

Critique and crisis

The seminal status of *Humaniora på undantag?* generates a risk that any marginalisation of the humanities is simply equated with the emergence of an explicit discourse of crisis during the period when this book was published.¹³ It has, for example, been said that critical theory and the post-1968 academic left brought about their marginalisation.¹⁴ I rather claim that the humanities were already seen as marginalised at this point, no longer a priority of the future-oriented welfare politics, as indicated by the HFR report.¹⁵ The mobilisation of the humanities in the 1970s should be seen as an active response to this political marginalisation relative to other fields (the irony being that, in absolute terms, the humanities saw a great institutional expansion during the postwar period). A new generation of scholars in the humanities embraced their peripheral positions, but in order to accomplish this mobilisation and generate change, they were helped by the circulation of the notion of a crisis and by narratives that made their attacks on previous scholarly traditions meaningful. Accordingly, during these years, the notion of a “crisis of the humanities” had a breakthrough in Swedish parlance. The expression was used strategically in struggles over the legitimacy of knowledge. Implying a comparative state of affairs in geographical terms, but also chronologically, “crisis” served as a tool for bringing about a different future.¹⁶

“Crisis” was indeed a general buzzword of the 1970s, marked by political radicalisation in the wake of the 1968 movements. Established traditions were widely criticised, as well as the consensus-seeking welfare politics, whose national myths and optimistic narratives regarding the future were questioned.¹⁷ The Frankfurt School played an important part in raising awareness of the latent conflicts of modern capitalist societies by reformulating Marxist and critical theory for new audiences. The young Gothenburg scholars contributed to the introduction of such theories. Sven-Eric Liedman, today an international authority on the history of Marxism, and literary historian Kurt Aspelin, who served as an intellectual mentor to many scholars who became part of the new theoretical turn, were particularly important in this respect, not least by editing the book series “Kontrakurs”, in which *Humaniora på undantag?* was published. Important introductory work was also conducted through articles

in the influential journal *Häften för kritiska studier* [Journal of Critical Studies], where Liedman presented parts of his famous essay already in 1977 next to a brief presentation of their research project.¹⁸ A common target of all their publications was empiricism and positivism, whose expanded influence was described as a pan-European phenomenon. These ideals were criticised for not having acknowledged that research is carried out and acquires its legitimacy within the context of social structures.¹⁹ This social dimension of science was exactly what the Swedish group of critical Marxist scholars wished to highlight, arguing for theoretically advanced research in the humanities driven by socio-political problems.²⁰

Sven-Eric Liedman, who has been one of Sweden's most prolific public intellectuals for more than half a century, was originally trained as a philosopher. Feeling alienated by the direction taken by the increasingly ahistorical Swedish 20th-century field of academic philosophy, he soon departed for a career in history of science and ideas at the University of Gothenburg, defending his doctoral thesis in 1966. Ever since, he has shown a profound interest in the relationship between knowledge and society, not being afraid to participate in public debates. In 1977, he presented a model for the societal applications of science in a two-volume monograph on Friedrich Engels, *Motsatsernas spel*, and also in a brief report, *Den vetenskapliga specialiseringen*. Here, and later also in *Humaniora på undantag?*, he argued that 20th-century discussions on the use and value of science had focused too narrowly on material utility, thus overlooking the constantly present theoretical and ideological dimensions. This caused a depreciation of the humanities. In short, he claimed that science could have three types of societal applications: material, administrative, or ideological, as represented by the natural sciences, the social sciences, and the humanities, respectively. This tripartite division was obviously influenced by Jürgen Habermas' model on the instrumental/technical, emancipatory, and practical (or hermeneutic) knowledge constitutive interests.²¹ In Liedman's version, the ideological use of the humanities referred to their significance in terms of shaping worldviews in general. On this point, he often seemed to invite misunderstandings, as critics interpreted "ideology" in a limited, political sense. Liedman claimed that the wider ideological significance of science had been overshadowed by its material and administrative applications in discussions on the utility of science for modern welfare states. The societal contributions of the humanities thus went unacknowledged; their ideological function needed recognition and redirection.²²

Introductions to critical and Marxist theory sometimes took the form of joint Scandinavian ventures. For instance, two articles by Liedman were included in a Scandinavian anthology with translations of international articles on Marxist theory in the humanities.²³ Another parallel research project offers further evidence of this broad Scandinavian horizon. In 1977, literary historian Jan Thavenius presented findings from this project in the aforementioned theme issue of *Nordisk forum*. Previously, his research group had published an anthology on the crisis in the subject of Swedish, drawing inspiration from some Danish

volumes that, in the wake of the 1968 protests, presented a critique of existing pedagogical traditions in higher education in an attempt to renegotiate the social contract of the humanities and emancipate them from bourgeois ideology. Through an ambitious historical overview, the school teaching of Swedish was likewise depicted as stuck in a tradition reproducing capitalist social formations instead of acknowledging conflicts and stimulating change, thus failing to adapt to the demands of democracy and equality.²⁴ This attempt to write politically motivated historical syntheses, paralleled in *Humaniora på undantag?*, was characteristic. The critical authors needed a history of the humanities they could react against. As Thavenius put it: “Change can be achieved through the conflicts and ruptures in history. One must find the root in order to pull it up.”²⁵

Thavenius’ group worked in an activist way, encouraging readers to form politically engaged groups at their workplace and to take contact if they wished to participate in future work.²⁶ Through such institutional practices and publishing strategies, these new attempts at mobilising the humanities were integrated into the political struggle of the left movement. These projects were far from the first attempts to revitalise the humanities, although *Humaniora på undantag?* and *Nordisk forum* tended to frame them as novel and original. Previous attempts, however, had not to the same extent articulated lines of conflict within the field of the humanities. Now, such lines emerged clearly, leading to an open confrontation.

An exceptional publication?

Humaniora på undantag? was published by Norstedts in the “Kontrakurs” series, aimed at a new audience generated by the student expansion.²⁷ The publishing of original, low-cost paperback editions exploded in the mid-1960s and represented one of the most important forms of media for the New Left movement and consequently also for the mobilisation of critical humanities and social science.²⁸ In the 1970s, Swedish publishers faced challenges as the market shrunk and prices declined. Still, however, they continued to publish original paperback books, regarding the category as having strategic importance for the public debate and theoretical introductions.²⁹ Norstedts evidently had faith in *Humaniora på undantag?* While eventually achieving the status of a “legendary” milestone, the initial circulation of the book should not be exaggerated.³⁰ Its reputation gradually accumulated over the years. That said, the book also received immediate attention, and by the mid-1980s, it was already described as an “underground” classic.³¹

Several factors enabled the influence of the book. Material factors should not be neglected, such as Leif Zetterling’s cover art (he regularly illustrated the “Kontrakurs” series), satirically depicting a man in a suit, representing technocracy and capitalism, attempting to swat away a little angel (presumably the marginalised humanities) sitting on his shoulder.³² The catchy title *Humaniora på undantag?* was effective, even if not an original coinage. As early as the 1950s, it was being noted that the humanities ran the risk of being “set aside” in the

expected expansion of universities.³³ The anthology was thus not as original as it may appear at first sight but achieved an unprecedented discursive impact in debates on the humanities.

The project set out to investigate whether any specific characteristics of Swedish research in the humanities had contributed to their “isolation” and whether the external, political neglect of the humanities, identified by HFR, corresponded to an internal crisis.³⁴ After a press conference, the HFR report received wider and more immediate attention in the media compared to *Humaniora på undantag?* While this contributed to establishing the marginalisation of the humanities as a fact, *Humaniora på undantag?* managed to circulate the interpretation of this marginalisation as a crisis by contextualising it within wide-ranging historical narratives regarding the development of Swedish humanities and society, gaining a far more lasting influence.

Together with Kurt Aspelin and musicologist Jan Ling, Liedman gathered a group of researchers and applied for money from HFR. Their proposal received an excellent review, but due to its comprehensiveness and interdisciplinary character, the Research Council required some additional information, and an extended process of assessment followed before a grant was approved in early 1974.³⁵ Literary historian Tomas Forser, eventually the editor of *Humaniora på undantag?*, was now given the position of secretary, and he organised a seminar series in Gothenburg attended by enthusiastic students (who were encouraged to write theses in connection with the project) as well as influential humanities scholars, such as historian Erik Lönnroth (1910–2002), professor at the University of Gothenburg until 1977.³⁶ Since some proceedings from the group’s activities circulated before the final publication, the project gained traction at an early stage. For example, Liedman attempted to draw attention to the implicit theoretical perspectives of the dominant, empirically oriented 20th-century paradigm of Swedish history in the influential journal *Scandia*, where Lönnroth was a regular contributor.³⁷ The group soon realised that Lönnroth was not at ease with their project – despite having granted it money as chair of HFR.

The 276-page anthology included seven essays on Swedish history, philosophy, intellectual history, Nordic studies, literary history, and archaeology, some results of which had previously been published in the HFR journal *Humanistisk forskning*.³⁸ Liedman’s introductory essay received the most attention. He noted that an increasing number of scholars in the field of humanities felt that they were caught in a deep crisis. Since they did not (allegedly) acknowledge the ideological function of the humanities, Liedman found previous attempts at demonstrating public usefulness to be unconvincing. By writing a synthesis of the history of the humanities, he sought to generate conditions for a new type of discussion, where their proper ideological function could be acknowledged as a viable alternative. While it has been noted that crisis narratives have resurfaced again and again in the modern era, and frequently without a historical perspective, the crisis narrative presented here was far from ahistorical.³⁹

Liedman claimed that since the 19th century, the perceived function of the humanities in Sweden had too often been confined to the administrative sector,

particularly among civil servants. In recent decades, this administrative ambition had been thoroughly embraced by older, leading humanities scholars who, according to Liedman, exercised substantial power in small and homogeneous countries such as Sweden. This favoured the influence of individual professors, who had tended to focus narrowly on detailed empirical or even positivistic studies. Liedman claimed that these individuals then blocked novel forms of research from having an impact and left no room for theoretical considerations, only generating highly specialised research without any clear direction and of no real value for society.⁴⁰

Other contributors agreed with Liedman's harsh analysis. Existing research in the humanities was too fragmented due to its exaggerated empirical focus and positivistic methods in its attempt to follow the path of the successful social sciences.⁴¹ According to Forser, the previous generation of scholars had been so obsessed with their battle against 19th-century traditions of nationalism and idealism that they had lost all of their own theoretical ambitions.⁴² Even if the direct influence of the Frankfurt School should not be exaggerated,⁴³ the import of Marxist and critical theory was of strategic importance to this volume, seen as providing the humanities with new ideas on how to serve a meaningful function in a society marked by conflicts. Liedman concluded his essay by presenting a remedy for the internal problems of the humanities: they must reach out in an interdisciplinary spirit and reopen their links to the social sciences (the faculties of the humanities and social sciences had been separated in 1964) and take on general and, above all, controversial problems: "Scholars in the humanities need to take a stand."⁴⁴

Two cultures: critical mobilisation against tradition

Humaniora på undantag? played an important role in establishing the notion of a crisis of the humanities in Sweden. What may have remained a local dispute between different generations of scholars at the University of Gothenburg expanded not just onto the national but also on the Scandinavian stage – a subject to which I return in the next section. At the national level, at a conference organised by the student union at Lund University in 1980, it was, for example, claimed that: "Five years ago the humanities were *på undantag*. Today this research area is in crisis", indicating the prompt influence of the key ideas and formulations of the anthology.⁴⁵ However, the original book title included a question mark, which disappeared in many following discussions. Apparently, the crisis trope was now closely attached to the humanities and increasingly asserted as a fact. Interpretations of the crisis varied, but the term became – and remains – a standard point of departure for attempts to mobilise scholars in the humanities into engaging in societal problems.

Several reviews of the book were published. For example, it was pointed out that the authors were amply critical but did not provide enough constructive suggestions for how the humanities could be renewed. The authors were described as "the new Gothenburg philosophers", looking to conquer the

humanities from the inside and striving for a *coup d'état*.⁴⁶ It would, however, be an oversimplification to describe this situation as if a homogenous group of young researchers was trying to replace an older generation. In some cases, there was a clear affinity between young Marxists and older, well-established scholars. One example is archaeologist Carl-Axel Moberg (1915–1987), who contributed to *Humaniora på undantag*? Nevertheless, strong tensions emerged between the leftist, Gothenburg group and representatives of the “traditional” humanities they criticised, eventually leading up to a clash between these different cultures of knowledge. Soon, Liedman’s essay was the target of a frontal attack by the “Godfather” of the humanities, Erik Lönnroth. There had been an early encounter already after the publication of the HFR report at a Gothenburg panel discussion in 1973, tape-recorded by Tomas Forser and published in the cultural magazine *Ord&Bild*. As the person responsible for the report, Lönnroth had the last word and defended the research council against accusations of too leniently yielding to technocratic pressure from the government. He claimed that the council’s aim was to bring the battle to the enemy.⁴⁷ From Lönnroth’s point of view, these problems were outside the domains of the humanities, in sharp contrast to the internal critique of *Humaniora på undantag*? At this early stage, Lönnroth seemed to raise a resonant tone, but his concluding remarks were far from the last words uttered on this topic.

When the Royal Society of Arts and Sciences in Gothenburg held its annual meeting in 1979, Lönnroth lashed out against Liedman in public, accusing him of being dogmatic and attempting to start a Marxist revolution within the Swedish humanities.⁴⁸ This attack was reported by the local Gothenburg media, where it was even questioned whether Liedman, appointed professor that very year, would be able to continue teaching.⁴⁹ Lönnroth reformulated his criticism in the journal *Artes*, published by the Swedish Academy (he was a member). In his view, *Humaniora på undantag*? appeared like dishonest polemics by academic dissidents. He described the book as a heterogeneous “pamphlet” – in other words, not a proper publication for a research project. Insisting that Liedman’s essay should not be taken seriously, Lönnroth nevertheless argued that the essay was a symptom of a wider phenomenon: the emergence of an orthodox form of Marxism that did not respect the distinction between truth and lie.⁵⁰

Here, it should be remembered that Lönnroth’s generation had experienced the rise of totalitarianism and the Second World War. To him, the primary social function of historians was to combat myths and propaganda and to ensure that conditions never again arose for a totalitarian state – which explains why the new ideological (or theoretical) ambitions of Liedman’s group appeared so controversial. Lönnroth cited further examples of the Marxist trend by referring to the journal *Scandia*, where the HFR report received criticism. With reference to Thomas Kuhn, one author asked whether Lönnroth’s paradigm of Swedish history was approaching its end.⁵¹ Interestingly, Tomas Forser used a similar strategy in *Humaniora på undantag*? By assuming the rise and fall of paradigms, the interpretation of an internal crisis made the prospects of profound change seem realistic.⁵² Historical syntheses opened up for change and

legitimised the mobilisation of a reformed kind of research in the humanities. In this struggle of narratives, Lönnroth criticised the talk of paradigms. To him, the problems of the humanities remained external. Just as in the 1973 report, he pointed to the problem of resource allocations and the general postwar political priorities of the welfare state. Swedish scholars in the humanities were not weak, but any ideological orientation in their research would not improve their situation. What they needed to continue to strive for was objectivity, even if it was never fully achieved.⁵³

The 1960s had seen some self-critique among Swedish humanities scholars and attempts to make them useful for society. At a history conference in Denmark in 1969, for example, Lönnroth underlined the importance of striving for social utility when funding research in the humanities.⁵⁴ He deemed this previous mobilisation, together with actions by HFR, already successful in improving the standard of research, not least since many new projects had been funded. Now, one of them had turned against him, criticising him for being too lenient in relation to state authorities and technocracy. The fate of the Swedish humanities was clearly at stake in this confrontation, which, however, did not only have national implications.

Scandinavian debates intertwined

During the postwar period, an awareness of international conditions, stimulated by organisations such as the OECD, was essential for research and educational policy in Sweden. The Cold War created an atmosphere of competition that made reforms seem urgent. In this context, transnationally comparative reports, such as that by HFR, played a distinct role in Swedish debates on knowledge politics, which were far from provincial. Interestingly, *Humaniora på undantag?* appeared just in time for a Scandinavian conference on the humanities in Bergen, Norway, in May 1978 (where Liedman participated).⁵⁵ This may have contributed to the circulation of the book and the firmer conception of a crisis within the Scandinavian context, where it was soon pointed out that Sweden hardly constituted a unique exception.⁵⁶

In line with the theme issue of *Nordisk forum* in 1977, several Scandinavian initiatives were taken in order to address the dire state of the humanities. In 1978, the Danish journal *Kritik* published a theme issue on the humanities that included an almost full translation of Liedman's essay.⁵⁷ Another interesting example is the anthology *Humanioras egenart* [The Particularity of the Humanities], published in Norway in 1983 and edited by Swedish historian of science Tore Frängsmyr following a 1980 conference in Finnish Jyväskylä organised by the Nordic Research Councils for the Humanities. Frängsmyr claimed that the conference should be seen as a starting point for gathering around a mutual problem – a “crisis” that “was perceived in similar ways in several countries in one cultural region”.⁵⁸ His statement is interesting as it points towards a different view compared to the contributions to *Nordisk forum*, where the state of the humanities was described in more nationally diverse terms.⁵⁹ Now, the crisis

was rather discussed as a general Scandinavian phenomenon. It was also questioned whether these countries together represented an international exception, caused by their relatively small and specialised research environments tied to individual professorships.⁶⁰

Another work that contributed to the formation of a crisis narrative was the Danish *Til glæden. Om humanisme og humaniora* [To joy. On Humanism and the Humanities], published by literary historian Thomas Bredsdorff, intellectual historian Mihail Larsen, and philosopher Ole Thyssen in 1979. The book got a positive reception and was quickly translated into Swedish – a welcome weapon in the ongoing national rebellion. On the cover, it said that the humanities were “set aside” and a preface by Liedman was also included. Although he found the situation of the Swedish humanities specific in relation to its national context, he noted that a similar debate was indeed taking place in Denmark.⁶¹ Though there were occasional notes of optimism, the Danish authors confirmed the negative picture:

One must be blind on more than one eye if one cannot see that the humanities are marginalised today. The humanists are not useful for business, they are dealing with indifferences – and, on top of it all, they are demanding to be funded by the government. What shall society do with these scroungers?⁶²

Countering these caricatures, the Danish authors too advocated an ideological deployment of the humanities, explicitly referring to Liedman. They claimed that the humanities had to retain their ideological roots in Renaissance humanism and remarked that Marxism too contained a humanistic core, thus being the most viable foundation for the construction of a new kind of modern and useful humanities.⁶³

The political radicalisation of the 1960s, together with the propaganda and psychological warfare of the Vietnam War, had fuelled a new awareness of the ideological function of science. Bredsdorff, Larsen, and Thyssen claimed that these experiences, together with the 1970s crises of the welfare states, caused a general crisis for science that opened up a potential space for the humanities. If they were active in the ongoing negotiations of knowledge politics and switching allies from positivism and empirical historicism to critical theory, scholars in the humanities could take part in the creation of a progressive future – a renaissance of the humanities. If passive, however, their endeavours ran the risk of getting hijacked by technocracy. Just as in *Humaniora på undantag?*, a historical narrative played a key part in *Til glæden* (looking back 2,000 years): the humanities had lost their emancipatory function, once held through humanistic ideology, and turned reactionary, hiding like mandarins in their “ivory towers”. This narrative of decay after a distant golden age motivated a shift in the present.⁶⁴

Mobilisation of the past through grand syntheses was a characteristic strategy for achieving legitimacy in the 1970s debates. The Danish authors explicitly advocated efforts in the “history of the humanities” beyond traditional history of science or history of universities.⁶⁵ Historical narratives also played an

important part in Frängsmyr's aforementioned anthology, although his interpretation was different: Marxism perplexed scholars in the humanities and made them subject to external suspicion. Hence, it was no solution to their marginalisation.⁶⁶ Consequently, *Humanioras egenart* lacked the critical tone of *Humaniora på undantag?* and *Til glæden*, which reminds us of the complexity of these debates: several different Scandinavian projects were underway in order to save the humanities, and Frängsmyr's project can be regarded as a counter-project to the one in Gothenburg. But even if the critical role was downplayed, Frängsmyr confirmed the discourse of crisis. He also claimed that humanities scholars had to become more engaged and participate in the public debate, although displaying some caution: "Let us be a little pathetic and say that we need a fighting humanism and fighting humanities!"⁶⁷ Frängsmyr had used this phrase already in a previous article, where he commented on the Jyväskylä conference, stating that it reflected a new atmosphere among the scholars present: they were prepared for battle, ready to defend the humanities on their own ground.⁶⁸ In this way, a new kind of mobilisation of the Scandinavian humanities was indeed accomplished during the 1970s.

The formation of mobilising narratives of crisis

Ever since the 1970s, *Humaniora på undantag?* has inspired an engaged mode in the seemingly never-ending debates on the value of humanistic knowledge. Intertextual references and allusions have been common. Through such practices, Forser and Liedman themselves actively participated in securing the legacy of the book.⁶⁹ Such personal, almost entrepreneurial, efforts by the historical actors involved should not be underestimated. They not only presented new ideas but also made an effort to ensure their survival. Already in 1979, Forser claimed that no single text in the humanities in recent years had received as much attention in the national debate on research as Liedman's essay, which he pointed out was used as course literature, "circulated" as offprint, and discussed in seminars all over Scandinavia.⁷⁰ This individual chapter from this particular book, however, should not lead us to forget how much other publications, conferences, and panel discussions contributed to the formation of a Swedish and Scandinavian discourse of crisis throughout a range of years and how these served as arenas for negotiation and/or battle over the legitimacy and social value of the humanities. The exceptional generational influence of the anthology, successfully launched in the original paperback format within the important book series "Kontrakurs", may even have limited the perspective of later inquiries into the history of the Swedish humanities, as several of the mechanisms that contributed to the postwar undermining of their legitimacy have been difficult to detect in the shadow of the story told already in 1978.

Possibly, the greatest impact of *Humaniora på undantag?* stemmed from its narrative structure. Accounts – although pluralistic and contested – of the history of the humanities were decisive for establishing the notion of a crisis. They opened up a space for future change in the struggle between different strands

or generations of scholars, potentially enabling a revolution or paradigm shift. While not denying that the Swedish humanities had become marginalised due to external factors, the Gothenburg group embraced the already peripheral position of the humanities and turned their attack inwards, rejecting prevalent strategies of legitimisation in an attempt to mobilise a new kind of defence, for which recently imported perspectives, such as Marxism and critical theory, represented the perfect allies. The Swedish narrative of national exceptionalism, constructed through recurring transnational outlooks, is particularly interesting here, as the postwar social democratic welfare state was typically described as an international exception in positive terms. When a wave of critique hit societal institutions and consensus-seeking political practices in the 1970s, the affirmation of a critical outsider position seemed more attractive. The exceptionalism narrative raised an awareness of the marginalisation of the humanities. Eventually, however, the discourse of crisis expanded beyond national limitations as different discourses intermingled.

The critical mobilisation of the humanities concerned a new interpretation of their purpose and identity. This was part of a contest over what should be counted as legitimate knowledge in the humanities, whether this could include theoretical dimensions and social engagement in addition to the exploration of original empirical findings. In the context of progressive welfare state politics in previous decades, the established humanities were criticised for not being able to demonstrate how they could contribute to social change. Now, young scholars in the humanities developed distinct strategies for how to serve a progressive or even subversive function. As illustrated earlier, a wide range of Scandinavian arenas and personal contacts was essential for this mobilisation. By enabling a broad circulation of the notion of crisis and a national and international historical narrative (in itself a product of new inquiry in the humanities and an example of new knowledge claims), these arenas and networks paved the way for intellectual change.

Whether all of this actually secured greater legitimacy for the humanities, even temporarily, and whether the humanities really have contributed to social change is open to investigation through future research. The new mobilisation could easily be accused of being too abstract and limited to a theoretical level and an elite (its Marxist influences notwithstanding). At one point, Erik Lönroth claimed that the only achievement of his antagonists was a rearmament of the ivory tower, “which is not easily camouflaged in red”.⁷¹ While the humanities have often remained an institutional outsider in Scandinavian societies and treated as “an exception” in educational and research policy, the question remains open whether or not this marginalisation may truly be turned into an advantage.

Notes

- 1 Sven-Eric Liedman, “Humanistiska forskningstraditioner i Sverige: Kritiska och historiska perspektiv”, in *Humaniora på undantag? Humanistiska forskningstraditioner i Sverige*, ed. Tomas Forser (Stockholm: PAN/Norstedts, 1978), 9.

- 2 Anders Burman, *Kultiverandet av det mänskliga: Essäer om liberal education, bildning och tänkande* (Gothenburg: Daidalos, 2018), 13.
- 3 For critical comments on this text, I would like to thank Johan Östling, David Larsson Heidenblad, Niklas Olsen, and all the other participants in the workshop series “Knowledge and Society in 1960s and 1970s Scandinavia” in Lund and Copenhagen, but also Anders Ekström, Thomas Karlsohn, and Helen Small. Special thanks to Tomas Forser and Sven-Eric Liedman, who also read and commented on the manuscript.
- 4 Carl Fehrman, “Humanismens kris – och marxismens”, *Svenska Dagbladet*, 25 June 1978, 8. The Swedish term for science, *vetenskap*, is derived from the German *Wissenschaft* and refers to a wider spectrum of academic disciplines.
- 5 See Rens Bod et al., “A New Field: *History of Humanities*”, *History of Humanities* 1, no. 1 (2016): 1–8, <https://doi.org/10.1086/685056>.
- 6 I have previously analysed this report in Hampus Östh Gustafsson, “Planlös forskning? Svensk humaniora som undantag mot 1960-talets internationaliserings- och planeringskrav”, *Lychnos* (2018): 255–275. For examples of studies demonstrating the importance of transnational comparisons, see Jesper Eckhardt Larsen, “*ikke af brød alene . . .*”: *Argumenter for humaniora og universitet i Norge, Danmark, Tyskland og USA 1945–2005* (Copenhagen: Danmarks Pædagogiske Universitetsforlag, 2007); Paul Holm, Arne Jarrić, and Dominic Scott, *Humanities World Report 2015* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015); Paul Bennenworth, Magnus Gulbrandsen, and Ellen Hazelkorn, *The Impact and Future of Arts and Humanities Research* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016).
- 7 Sven-Eric Liedman, *Surdeg: En personlig bok om idéer och ideologier* (Stockholm: Författarförlaget, 1980), 44, 50. See also Kurt Aspelin, “Väckarklocka från forskningsråd”, *Dagens Nyheter*, 5 May 1973, 5.
- 8 *Humanistisk och teologisk forskning i Sverige: Nuläge och framtidsperspektiv* (Statens Humanistiska Forskningsråd, 1973), 15–18.
- 9 Allan Fagerström, “Ibland är Sverige allra sämst”, *Aftonbladet*, 11 April 1973, 15.
- 10 These welfare states have often been described as more universalist in nature than the liberal or conservative versions found in other parts of the world. See Mary Hilson, *The Nordic Model: Scandinavia Since 1945* (London: Reaktion Books, 2008), 26, 89–91; Carly Elizabeth Schall, *The Rise and Fall of the Miraculous Welfare Machine: Immigration and Social Democracy in Twentieth-Century Sweden* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2016), but also Neil Elder, Alastair H. Thomas, and David Arter, *The Consensual Democracies? The Government and Politics of the Scandinavian States* (Oxford: Martin Robertson, 1982); Francis Sejersted, *The Age of Social Democracy: Norway and Sweden in the Twentieth Century*, trans. Richard Daly (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2011), 1–12.
- 11 Carl-Henning Wijkmark, *Den moderna döden* (Lund: Bo Cavefors Bokförlag, 1978).
- 12 Marie Cronqvist and Lina Sturfelt, “En träff med tidsandan”, in 1973: *En träff med tidsandan*, eds. Marie Cronqvist, Lina Sturfelt, and Martin Wiklund (Lund: Nordic Academic Press, 2008), 11.
- 13 A similar problem has been identified in the international literature. See Paul Jay, *The Humanities “Crisis” and the Future of Literary Studies* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014), 1.
- 14 See, for instance, Svante Nordin, *Humaniora i Sverige: Framväxt–Guldålder–Kris* (Stockholm: Atlantis, 2008), 272–282; cf. Paul Jay, “Critique and Theory in the History of the Modern Humanities”, in *The Making of the Humanities: The Modern Humanities*, Vol. III, eds. Rens Bod, Jaap Maat, and Thijs Weststeijn (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2014), 655–665.
- 15 See Hampus Östh Gustafsson, “The Discursive Marginalisation of the Humanities: Debates on the Humanist Problem in the Early 1960s Swedish Welfare State”, *History of Humanities* 3, no. 2 (2018): 351–376, <https://doi.org/10.1086/699299>, but also Anders Ekström, “A Failed Response? The Humanities in Transition”, *Akademisk kvarter* 13 (2016): 20; Sverker Sörlin, “Humanities of Transformation: From Crisis and Critique Toward the Emerging Integrative Humanities”, *Research Evaluation* 27, no. 4 (2018): 287–297, <https://doi.org/10.1093/reseval/rvx030>.

- 16 See Janet Roitman, *Anti-Crisis* (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2014), 4, 15, 39, 70, who, following Koselleck, identifies crisis and critique as cognates and describes crisis as “a blind spot that enables the production of knowledge” rather than being an object of first-order knowledge available for observation in itself. As Koselleck further points out, the metaphorically flexible, ambivalent, and inflationary concept of “crisis” has served as a diagnostic criterion for (political) action, demanding decision or settlement. See Reinhart Koselleck, “Crisis”, trans. Michaela W. Richter, *Journal of the History of Ideas* 67, no. 2 (2006): 358, 369, 399; cf. Helge Jordheim, “Krisetid: Introduksjon til en begrepshistorisk forståelse av krisebegrepet”, *Arr – idéhistorisk tidsskrift* 2 (2017).
- 17 See, for instance, Thomas Ekman Jørgensen, “Scandinavia”, in *1968 in Europe: A History of Protest and Activism, 1956–1977*, eds. Martin Klimke and Joachim Scharloth (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008), 239; Thomas Ekman Jørgensen and Steven C.B. Jensen, *1968 – og det der fulgte: Studenteroprørets forudsætninger og konsekvenser* (Copenhagen: Gyldendal, 2008), 9; Thomas Ekman Jørgensen, *Transformation and Crises: The Left and the Nation in Denmark and Sweden, 1956–1980* (New York and Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2008), 112–113; Andrus Ers, “Kris, terror, besvikelse: 1970-talet efter utopierna”, in *Tillsammans: Politik, filosofi och estetik på 1960- och 1970-talen*, eds. Anders Burman and Lena Lennerhed (Stockholm: Atlas, 2014), 563–590; Sven-Olof Josefsson, *Året var 1968: Universitetskris och studentrevolt i Stockholm och Lund* (Gothenburg: Historiska institutionen, Göteborgs universitet, 1996), 12; Göran Rosenberg, “The Crisis of Consensus in Postwar Sweden”, in *Culture and Crisis: The Case of Germany and Sweden*, eds. Nina Witoszek and Lars Trägårdh (New York and Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2002), 180; Elke Seefried, “Reconfiguring the Future? Politics and Time From the 1960s to the 1980s: Introduction”, *Journal of Modern European History* 13, no. 2 (2015): 315.
- 18 Sven-Eric Liedman, “Humanistiska forskningstraditioner i Sverige”, *Häftan för kritiska studier* 10, no. 6 (1977): 36–56; Tomas Forser, “Svensk humaniora”, *Häftan för kritiska studier* 10, no. 6 (1977): 57. Liedman published another text in *Nordisk forum*, which can also be seen as a draft for his extended essay one year later. See Sven-Eric Liedman, “Humanister och ideologier”, *Nordisk Forum* 12, no. 1 (1977): 21–25.
- 19 Cf. Carl-Göran Heidegren, *Positivismstrider* (Gothenburg: Daidalos, 2016).
- 20 Sven-Eric Liedman, “Marxism och vetenskapsteori”, in *Positivism, marxism, kritisk teori: Riktningar inom modern vetenskapsfilosofi*, eds. Kurt Aspelin and Tomas Gerholm (Stockholm: PAN/Norstedts, 1972), 93.
- 21 Jürgen Habermas, *Knowledge and Human Interest* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2007 [1972]).
- 22 Sven-Eric Liedman, *Motsatsernas spel: Friedrich Engels filosofi och 1800-talets vetenskaper*, vol. 1 (Lund: Bo Cavefors Bokförlag, 1977), 6; Sven-Eric Liedman, *Motsatsernas spel: Friedrich Engels filosofi och 1800-talets vetenskaper*, vol. 2 (Lund: Bo Cavefors Bokförlag, 1977), 195; Sven-Eric Liedman, *Den vetenskapliga specialiseringen: Begrepp, aktuella problem och tillämpningar* (Gothenburg: Avdelningen för vetenskapsteori, Göteborgs universitet, 1977), 7, 25, 34–36.
- 23 Kjerstin Norén, ed., *Människans samhälleliga vara: Marxistisk forskningsteori i humanistisk forskning* (Staffanstorps: Bo Cavefors Bokförlag, 1973). See also Ragnvald Kalleberg, “En introduktion till Frankfurtskolans vetenskapsteori”, in *Riktningar inom modern vetenskapsfilosofi*, eds. Kurt Aspelin and Tomas Gerholm, trans. Ann Lilljeqvist (Stockholm: PAN/Norstedts, 1972), 113–139; Kurt Aspelin and Tomas Gerholm, eds., *Vetenskap som kritik. En introduktion till Frankfurtskolans aktuella positioner* (Stockholm: PAN/Norstedts, 1974), 8.
- 24 Bengt Brodow et al., “Förord”, in *Svenskännets kris*, eds. Bengt Brodow et al. (Lund: LiberLäromedel, 1976), 8; Sven Nilsson and Jan Thavenius, “Svenskännets kris – från borgerlig bildning till abstrakt färdighetsträning”, in *Svenskännets kris*, eds. Bengt Brodow et al. (Lund: LiberLäromedel, 1976), 11–12, 17, 22–28; Jan Thavenius, “Anteckningar om ett krisarbete”, *Nordisk Forum* 12, no. 1 (1977): 10–20. See also Peter Madsen, “Krise i humaniora”, in *Humaniora – pensioneret af kapitalen?* ed. Henning Salling Olesen (Copenhagen: Danske Studerendes Fællesråd, 1972), 16–20; *Danskstudiet i samfundet: En debatbog om humanioras krise* (Copenhagen: Dansk fagråd, 1973).

- 25 Jan Thavenius, *Modermmål och fadersarv: Svenskämnets traditioner i historien och nuet* (Stockholm: Symposion Bokförlag, 1981), 245.
- 26 Brodow et al., "Förord", 9; "Bör fortsättas!" in *Svenskämnets kris*, eds. Bengt Brodow et al. (Lund: LiberLäromedel, 1976), 164; cf. Tomas Forser, "Att återerövra den stora visionen: Marxister, institutioner, humanism", *Ord&Bild* 89, no. 5 (1980): 40, 42.
- 27 The book was also published in PAN, a paperback series launched in 1967 by Norstedts (today the oldest publishing house in Sweden). See Gunnel Furuland, "Billigbokens förändringar 1940–2017 från folkböcker till pocketserier: Definitioner, förlagskulturer och spridningsvägar", in *Böckernas tid: Svenska förläggareföreningen och svensk bokmarknad sedan 1943*, ed. Johan Svedjedal (Stockholm: Svenska förläggareföreningen, 2018), 308–309.
- 28 Ben Mercer, "The Paperback Revolution: Mass-Circulation Books and the Cultural Origins of 1968 in Western Europe", *Journal of the History of Ideas* 72, no. 4 (2011): 613–636, doi:10.1353/jhi.2011.0032; Ragni Svensson, "Bo Cavefors BOC-serie, den nya vänstern och pocketrevolutionen", *Biblis* 68 (2014): 36–49; Ragni Svensson, *Cavefors: Förlagsprofil och mediala mytbilder i det svenska litteratursamhället 1959–1982* (Lund: Ellerströms, 2018), 104; Kjell Östberg, *1968 när allting var i rörelse: Sextiotalsradikaliseringen och de sociala rörelserna* (Stockholm: Prisma, 2002), 80–85. See also Peter Mandler, "Good Reading for the Million: The 'Paperback Revolution' and the Co-Production of Academic Knowledge in Mid Twentieth-Century Britain and America", *Past & Present* 244, no. 1 (2019): 235–269, <https://doi.org/10.1093/pastj/gtz005>.
- 29 Ann Steiner, *I litteraturens mittfåra: Månadens bok och svensk bokmarknad under 1970-talet* (Gothenburg: Makadam, 2006), 44–45.
- 30 The influence of the book might have been regionally divided between Gothenburg and Stockholm/Uppsala.
- 31 Lars Lönnroth, "Men vi har fortfarande långt kvar till målet", *Expressen*, 31 May 1985, 5.
- 32 The importance of cover art for the paperback revolution has been highlighted by Mercer, "The Paperback Revolution", 615.
- 33 "Akademisk upprustningsoffensiv", *Svenska Dagbladet*, 10 July 1955, 4.
- 34 Liedman, "Humanister och ideologier", 21; Sven-Eric Liedman, *Blickar tillbaka* (Stockholm: Albert Bonniers, 2008), 195–196.
- 35 Project proposal by Kurt Aspelin, Sven-Eric Liedman, and Jan Ling, 1973, Statens humanistiska forskningsråds arkiv, E I A:53, Riksarkivet, Stockholm.
- 36 Alexander Ekelund, *Kampen om vetenskapen: Politisk och vetenskaplig formering under den svenska vänsterradikaliseringens era* (Gothenburg: Daidalos, 2017), 364; Liedman, *Surdeg*, 46–48; Liedman, *Blickar tillbaka*, 198–215.
- 37 Sven-Eric Liedman, "Den historisk-kritiska skolan i idéhistorisk belysning", *Scandia* 41, no. 2 (1975): 251.
- 38 Jan Ling was also preparing a study on musicology but was not able to finish in time.
- 39 See Poul F. Kjaer and Niklas Olsen, "Introduction: European Crises of Public Power from Weimar until Today", in *Critical Theories of Crisis in Europe: From Weimar to the Euro*, eds. Poul F. Kjaer and Niklas Olsen (London: Rowman & Littlefield International, 2016), xi.
- 40 Liedman, "Humanistiska forskningstraditioner" (1978): 9, 11, 34–42, 54, 60–62, 73–78.
- 41 See, for instance, Ingela Josefson, "Traditionen svensk nordistik", in *Humaniora på undantag? Humanistiska forskningstraditioner i Sverige*, ed. Tomas Forser (Stockholm: PAN/Norstedts, 1978), 124; Tomas Forser, "En helig och allmänlig kyrka", in *Humaniora på undantag? Humanistiska forskningstraditioner i Sverige*, ed. Tomas Forser (Stockholm: PAN/Norstedts, 1978), 154–156.
- 42 Forser, "Svensk humaniora", 57.
- 43 Cf. Sten Dahlstedt, "Kulturell kritik och komplexitet: Adornoreceptionen i Sverige", *Lychnos* (2008): 114.
- 44 Liedman, "Humanistiska forskningstraditioner" (1978): 78.
- 45 JFM [John F. Monhardt], "Behövs humaniora?" *Lundagård* 16 (1980): 3.
- 46 Fehrman, "Humanismens kris"; Arne Melberg, "De ämnena som vårdar 'icke säljbara' värden", *Dagens Nyheter*, 31 July 1978, 4.

- 47 Erik Lönnroth, "Att slåss på motståndarens mark", *Ord&Bild* 82, no. 5 (1973): 300–301. However, Lönnroth criticised the printed text in this magazine for not reflecting the complexity of the real discussion. See Erik Lönnroth, "Utredningens mottagande", *Humanistisk forskning* 2 (1973): 2.
- 48 See Erik Lönnroth, "Humaniora i framtiden – vetenskap eller dogmatik?" *Årsbok. Kungl. Vetenskaps- och vitterhets-samhället i Göteborg* (1979): 83–94. According to one article, Lönnroth was "close to burst his sky-blue order ribbon in pure anger". See Lennart Bromander, "Den uppkäftige professorn", *Aftonbladet*, 5 May 1980, 4. Erik Lönnroth's son, literary historian Lars Lönnroth, then holding a position at Aalborg University, Denmark, described his father's reaction as "furious". Lars Lönnroth agreed with Liedman that the Scandinavian humanities needed a theoretical renaissance but did not consider Marxism the only viable alternative. See Lars Lönnroth, *Dörrar till främmande rum: Minnesfragment* (Stockholm: Atlantis, 2009), 299–302.
- 49 Rolf Anderberg, "Nedgjord professor", *Göteborgs-Posten*, 8 June 1979, 2.
- 50 Erik Lönnroth, "Marxism och historieforskning", *Artes* 5, no. 3 (1979): 115–119, 124. Lönnroth received a reply in *Artes* from Liedman's fellow project leader, Jan Ling, who indicated that it was time for Lönnroth to step down from his research political commitments. See Jan Ling, "Kommentar till Erik Lönnroth", *Artes* 5, no. 5 (1979): 116–118.
- 51 Ingemar Norrlied, "Utveckling eller utarmning: Den historiska forskningen i Sverige vid skiljevägen", *Scandia* 44 (1978): 5–12, 18.
- 52 Forser, "En helig och allmänlig kyrka", 155, 157. See also Tomas Forser, "Till frågan om den goda metodiska träten", *Tidskrift för litteraturvetenskap* 5, no. 1 (1976): 5, 27, 29. Kuhn served as inspiration to other similar book projects in this era of political radicalisation, such as Ronny Ambjörnsson, Aant Elzinga, and Anna Törngren's seminal paperback *Tradition och revolution: Huvuddrag i det europeiska tänkandet* (Staffanstorps: Cavefors, 1968).
- 53 Lönnroth, "Marxism och historieforskning", 119–120, 125.
- 54 Erik Lönnroth, "Prioriteringsfrågor: Synpunkter från arbetet inom ett forskningsråd", *Historisk tidskrift* 89, no. 4 (1969): 413–423.
- 55 Fehrman, "Humanismens kris".
- 56 Sven Willner, "Humaniora på undantag", *Nya Argus* 72, no. 7 (1979): 105. Liedman's essay was indeed important for this wider debate, also in Finland and Iceland. See Liedman, *Surdeg*, 58; Larsen, "ikke af brød alene . . .", 136.
- 57 Sven-Eric Liedman, "Humanistiske forskningstraditioner: Kritiske og historiske perspektiver", trans. Anne Marie Bjerg, *Kritik* 46, no. 2 (1978): 25–71. See also Aage Henriksen, "Humaniora i støbeskeen: Om de humane fags fortid, nutid og mulige fremtid", *Kritik* 46, no. 2 (1978): 7–24, as it represented another attempt to write a history of the humanities and claimed that Liedman's essay was relevant for the humanities in the entire West.
- 58 Tore Frängsmyr, "Inledning", in *Humanioras egenart: En rapport*, ed. Tore Frängsmyr (Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1983), 9.
- 59 The editorial stated that the crisis of the humanities was "extremely" deep in Sweden. See "Ledare", *Nordisk Forum* 12, no. 1 (1977): 5.
- 60 Veikko Anttila, "De humanistiska vetenskaperna och samhället", in *Humanioras egenart: En rapport*, ed. Tore Frängsmyr (Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1983), 95. On the book cover, however, it was simultaneously stated that the humanities faced a crisis all across the West, indicating how readily the idea of a crisis expanded from the national context. This can be compared to present discussions. See, for instance, Robert A. Schneider, "The Humanities in Historical and Global Perspectives: Introduction", *American Historical Review* 120, no. 4 (2015): 1247–1252, <https://doi.org/10.1093/ahr/120.4.1247>; Dennis A. Ahlburg, ed., *The Changing Face of Higher Education: Is There an International Crisis in the Humanities* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2019).
- 61 Sven-Eric Liedman, "Förord till den svenska upplagan", in *Till glädjen: En stridsskrift om humanism och humaniora*, eds. Thomas Bredsdorff, Mihail Larsen, and Ole Thyssen, trans. Maj Frisch and Sven Vahlne (Stockholm: Gidlunds, 1981), 5–6.

- 62 Thomas Bredsdorff, Mihail Larsen, and Ole Thyssen, *Til glæden: Om humanisme og humaniora* (Copenhagen: Gyldendal, 1980 [1979]), 26.
- 63 For another example of a Nordic reflection on “Marxist humanism”, see Georg Henrik von Wright, *Humanismen som livshållning och andra essayer* (Stockholm: Rabén & Sjögren, 1978), 157–184.
- 64 Bredsdorff, Larsen, and Thyssen, *Til glæden*, 9–14, 21–25, 52–53, 58, 88, 128–130, 155.
- 65 Ibid., 27–29.
- 66 Frängsmyr, “Inledning”, 7–8.
- 67 Tore Frängsmyr, “Humaniora, bildning och allmänbildning”, in *Humanioras egenart: En rapport*, ed. Tore Frängsmyr (Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1983), 67.
- 68 Tore Frängsmyr, “Nyttig forskning eller ren hobby?” *Tvärsnitt* 1 (1980): 1.
- 69 See, for instance, Sven-Eric Liedman, “Humaniora – det ständiga undantaget: Några minnesanteckningar”, in *Kritikens dimensioner: Festskrift till Tomas Forser*, eds. Åsa Arping and Mats Jansson (Stehag, Stockholm: Brutus Östlings Bokförlag Symposion, 2008), 372–387, but also the intertextual volume Tomas Forser and Thomas Karlsohn, eds., *Till vilken nytta? En bok om humanioras möjligheter* (Gothenburg: Daidalos, 2013).
- 70 Tomas Forser, “Forskningen behöver Liedman”, *Göteborgs-Posten*, 14 June 1979, 2.
- 71 Lönnroth, “Utredningens mottagande”, 3.