This year it is fifty years since George Sarton died, in 1956. He was the pioneer, the discipline-builder, of the new field History of Science. Today he would have been surprised to see the growth of his discipline, spread out to so many countries and universities.

Sweden was one of the very first. When Johan Nordström was appointed to the first chair in 1932, he declared openly that Sarton was one of the most important sources of inspiration. We can easily see many links between the two, but also some differences.

The Progress of Science

From the beginning, George Sarton viewed the history of science from the science side. He had written his dissertation about Newton, and he continued to seek the roots of scientific thinking. He found a starting point in Auguste Comte’s positivistic philosophy, and he both built upon and tried to develop this system of thought.

According to Comte, science was characterized by progress. It led all the time to higher and more complicated structures; it led forward and upward. One reason was that science was cumulative in nature. You had literally to build upon earlier results, like you build a house stone by stone, brick by brick. Compared with science, humanistic scholarly works were not cumulative; they had their own values but they did not build upon some kind of earlier results.

Comte also stressed the importance of usefulness of science. By strict logic and use of scientific results, it would be possible to construct a world view, without theology or metaphysics. Humanity had now reached “the positive stage”, which meant the scientific stage. By this step-by-step process, man should use the cumulative scientific results to go further onto higher and higher levels to meet the future.

However, Comte thought it possible also to construct a similar system for the social sciences. The new sociology discipline should be seen as physics for society; the sociologists lay the ground of basic facts and upon these construct a system of knowledge. In this way, it would be possible to foresee the problems of society and make a better world.

George Sarton accepted Comte’s philosophy and further developed his system of thought. He believed in the unity of sciences, a very popular attitude during the 1920s and 1930s. He believed also in the idea of progress and gave a famous definition of this in a textbook from 1936:

“Definition. Science is systematized positive knowledge, or what has been taken as such at different ages and at different places.

Theorem. The acquisition and systematization of positive knowledge are the only human activities which are truly cumulative and progressive.

Corollary. The history of science is the only history which can illustrate the progress of mankind. In fact, progress has no definite and unquestionable meaning in other fields than the field of science.”

Peace and Human Progress

As we can see, Sarton was convinced of the superiority of science among all human activities. It directed his view of the world, his view of humanity and his view of the future. Already in 1916, the year he went to USA to become a scholar and a teacher at Harvard University, he wrote:

“Science makes for peace more than anything else in the world; it is the cement that holds together the highest and most comprehensive minds of all countries, of all races, of all creeds. Every nation derives benefit from the discoveries that have been made by others. Just as scientific methods are the basis of well-nigh all our knowledge, just so science appears more and more as the bedrock on which every organization has to be built up to be strong and fertile. It is the most powerful factor of human progress.”

The New Humanism

In his Colyer Lectures in 1930, Sarton explained the next step. Science is a superior human activity but it has to be balanced by a historical perspective: “Without history, scientific knowledge may become culturally dangerous; combined with history, tempered with reverence, it will nourish the highest culture.” The most fateful conflict in our times, he writes, consists in the difference in viewpoint that exists between men of science and humanists, and this gap will only increase so long as both groups behave with intolerance to each other. And then comes the solution, what he calls “the new humanism”: “Between the old humanist and scientist, there is but one bridge, the history
of science, and the construction of that bridge is the main cultural need of our time. An immense task to be sure, but one worth every pain it may cost. I do not know who is the poorer: the old humanist without understanding of science, or the scientist without appreciation of beauty, without urbanity, without reverence. I do not know which is worse: idealism without knowledge, or knowledge without idealism. We need both equally in order to go forward and prepare the dawn of a new age—the age of a New Humanism.”

For Sarton, history of science was more than a discipline, it was nearly a religious revelation. Some of his followers might not have seen the discipline in the same way, but the positivist influence is obvious with some of them. The same attitude could be seen with those who advocated an internalistic history of science in the lengthy debate going on between the internalists and externalists.

Even the present debate about social constructivism can be reduced to the polemics about internalism or externalism. Sarton and his tradition stressed that science used a simple cause-and-effect opposite of the scientific method. While Dilthey, whose historical method was the historical process, and by understanding he did not share his total view of history of science, in Sweden and through-out the world.

Johan Nordström

The conflict was no problem for Sarton’s Swedish colleague, Johan Nordström. He was taught history of literature in a broad sense, where the influence of the society was a natural explanation. When he was appointed to a personal chair in 1932, he called his subject “the history of ideas and learning” (idé- och lärdomshistoria) to mark this broad perspective. In English, however, he always called it “history of science” in accordance with its international equivalent.

Johan Nordström admired George Sarton’s work and wanted to follow in his footsteps when he founded the discipline in Sweden. Sarton visited him in Uppsala in the summer of 1934, and the two started a correspondence that lasted up to 1956, when Sarton died. Nordström was very active. He founded the Swedish History of Science Society in 1934, and three years later, the number of subscribers reached over 3,000, which made it the largest of its kind in the world. Sarton admired Nordström for that, and when he reviewed the yearbook Lychnos, he wrote the following, emphasized with italics: Long live learned Lychnos!

Although Nordström admired Sarton, he did not share his total view of history of science. Building upon Comte, Sarton had emphasized the understanding of science, using history as an instrument for this purpose. Nordström was first of all a historian, using science as one way of understanding the intellectual history of humanity. Based on Comte’s view of human progress, he pleaded for a new view of cultural perspective instead of history focused on wars, “the bloody parentheses” in the history of mankind. But Nordström combined Comte with Wilhelm Dilthey, whose historical method was the opposite of the scientific method. While science used a simple cause-and-effect view, history had to take a lot of factors in account. The historian had to understand the historical process, and by understanding he could explain, “verstehen” was to be “erklären”. He tried to explain not only “how” but also “why”.

Nordström in other words, saw history of science as history of culture in a broad sense. He was an externalist in its best meaning, and so were his followers. They were absolutely not Marxists, but they were not hostile to Marxism, as they saw this view more as an extreme kind of externalism, not to mention social constructivism.

Remembering Sarton fifty years after his death, it should be time soon for a re-evaluation of his influence in the field of history of science, in Sweden and throughout the world. —Tore Frängsmyr

Select bibliography:

The correspondences between Sarton and Nordström in Uppsala University Library, Nordström collection, G. 194 h:40, Nordström to Sarton, a total of 38 letters (transcripts) but obviously some missing; G. 194 h:35, Sarton to Nordström, a total of 51 letters, 5 appendices, and 12 Sarton bulletins.

Johan Nordström (1891–1967), professor in 1932, was inspired by Sarton when he founded the new discipline History of Ideas and Learning in Sweden.
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Sarton’s thesis was that history of science should be a bridge between science and the humanities: he called this the New Humanism (here the titlepage from his book from 1931).
THE LINNAEUS TERCENTENARY IN 2007

In 2007 it will be 300 years since Carolus Linnaeus was born. Throughout 2007 Uppsala University will be celebrating the 300th anniversary of its most famous professor of all time. What impact did Linnaeus have on his contemporaries? What is his impact today? What impact will he have in the future? With lectures, concerts, exhibits, conferences, and much more, the legacy of Carolus Linnaeus in Uppsala, in Sweden, and around the world, will be noticed.

The anniversary year will be launched on the name-day for Karl (Carl) in Sweden, January 28, and will culminate in May with a one-week festival around Linnaeus’ birthday, May 23. Linnaeus 2007 will be celebrated by many in a joint project at local, national, and international levels.

A History of Science symposium will be arranged May 25, entitled “Linnaeus and His Time”. The speakers will be Professor Tatiana Artemieva, St Petersburg, Dr Lisbet Rausing, London, Professor Marco Beretta, Bologna, Professor Gunnar Broberg, Lund, and Professor Tore Frängsmyr, Uppsala, who is also the organizer of the symposium. The doctoral conferment ceremony (promotion) will take place Saturday May 26 with invited scholars from all over the world.

The article below on Linnaeus and his life and achievements is written by Professor Gunnar Broberg, Lund University.

LINNAEUS’ LIFE AND ACHIEVEMENTS

Linnaeus is probably best known as a botanist, and for his sexual system. His scientific achievements, however, also extend into the mineral world and zoology, in addition to botany. He was curious about the complete natural world, and wanted to map the whole of nature. This mapping has given us the naming convention known as the “binary nomenclature”, that Linnaeus introduced.

Linnaeus published a number of rule-books on which the system was based, and the system, after some initial resistance, has come not only to dominate natural history, but also to influence other scientific fields. Linnaeus clarifies language, he bases his science on a rigid terminology, formulates the concept of species and sets the broad dimensions of natural history. Humans in his system, for example, are known as Homo sapiens and they are primaries in the class of mammals, Mammalia,—all of these are names and concepts that Linnaeus coined.

Their deaths in far-flung places carry a hint of heroism; they died for the sake of science. The continued influence of Linnaeus has stimulated scientific journeys, cataloguing and strange destinies, but it has also had a more calm interaction with nature at many places across the globe, with its placid nature of collection and systematic thought. Linnaeus creativity and sense of curiosity has left traces not only in science but also in literature and in other fields of culture.

Historical Documents

Linnaeus’ papers show a Sweden of long ago, and enable one to understand how the country has changed. The locations that are closely associated with Linnaeus place a special care on preserving his memory—his birthplace in Smalånd, the school in Växjö, and the universities, initially in Lund, later in Uppsala—to which he was faithful throughout his life.

We can approach Linnaeus very closely by reading the many letters, documents and objects that have been preserved, and by visiting the places where he lived. We can feel his charm, and we can sense that this complex man had other sides to his nature.

The Spirit of Linnaeus lives on

Linnaeus left a rich heritage, and a living one. It grows and changes continuously. For example, it is pertinent today to draw attention to his interest in economics, known at the time as “housekeeping”, and how economics will always be associated with what we now call “ecology”, which Linnaeus knew as “the economics of nature”. Our current understanding of Linnaeus is not only that of a successful scientific innovator, but also a person who had to come to terms with success, and who brooded over the meaning of life.

It is important during the anniversary not only to raise monuments, but also to create understanding for a way of thinking that remains relevant today. The anniversary is to draw attention to the fascinating person that was Carl Linnaeus, and inspire to creativity, curiosity and science in Linnaeus’ spirit.

Gunnar Broberg
The theme of the summer school this year in Uppsala was “The Two Cultures in the Republic of Letters: Intellectual History in the 17th and 18th Centuries”. For a week, more than thirty historians of science from sixteen different countries listened to lectures by Francoise Waquet (Paris), Mary Terrall (Los Angeles), Tatiana Artemieva (St. Petersburg), John Heilbron (Oxford), Roger Hahn (Berkeley), Hans Helander (Uppsala) and Tore Frängsmyr (Uppsala).


Topics

Some of the general topics discussed during the week were: – How did natural science become a part of the intellectual and academic programme? – What did travelling, scientific communication, and intellectual centres look like during this period? – How can the tensions between the two cultures, i.e. science and the humanities, be described?

Francoise Waquet (CNRS, Paris) opened the summer school with an investigation as to “What is the Republic of Letters?” In between this opening talk and the closing talk of Roger Hahn on “The Republic of Letters and the Republic of Science” the summer school included specific as well as general perspectives, covering ideas and attitudes, change and tradition in the learned Europe of the 17th and 18th centuries.

For instance, Hans Helander (Uppsala) pointed to the changing roles of the Latin language in the sciences and the humanities at this time. The main vehicle of communication in the learned world had of course for a long time been Latin, and also during the course of these centuries the Latin language served the learned world as a lingua franca, effectively connecting learned men of different nationalities.

However, the vernacular languages were on a steady rise, despite some resistance in the world of academia. An interesting point made by Prof. Helander was that the men who resisted academic use of the vernacular the longest were usually not humanists, but men of the natural sciences.

Several of the talks offered local contexts and flavours of the Republic of Letters: John Heilbron (Oxford) spoke about travels through the Italian provinces of the Republic of Letters around 1700, Mary Terrall (UCLA) focused on practices of natural history in the Francophone Republic of Science, while northern Europe was covered by Tatiana Artemieva (St. Petersburg) who discussed the “St. Petersburg Academy of Sciences as an International Network”, and Tore Frängsmyr (Uppsala) who spoke about Sweden in the Republic of Letters and the importance of travelling for scholars and scientists during the 17th and 18th centuries.
Excursions

Included in the programme were excursions to research institutions and historical milieus, e.g. The Carolina Rediviva University Library, the Linnaeus garden, and the Linnaeus summer house Hammarby, 15 kilometres outside Uppsala. Tore Frängsmyr served as a guide and cicerone at Hammarby.

The excursion to Stockholm on June 14th included a visit to The Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences, where Karl Grandin, Director of the Center for the History of Science at RSAS, welcomed the summer school and showed some extraordinary scientific instruments from the collection.

At the Nobel Museum the summer school was welcomed by Michael Sohlman (Managing Director of the Nobel Foundation), and Eva Åhrén Snickare (Head of the Research Department), who introduced the participants to the research library of the Nobel Museum, situated in the beautiful old cellars of Börshuset.

As can be seen in the photographs, the weather was picture-perfect throughout the week. The presence of Linnaeus, the Prince of Botany, whose tercentenary will be celebrated next year in Sweden and elsewhere, could almost be felt at his old summer house outside Uppsala.

Organizers

The 10th International Summer School in History of Science at Uppsala 2006 was organized by Tore Frängsmyr, Uppsala University. Co-organizers were Giuliano Pancaldi, Bologna, Dominique Pestre, Paris, and Cathryn Carson, Berkeley. In the organizing committee were also John Heilbron, Oxford, and Roger Hahn, Berkeley. The administrators and assistants of the Uppsala 2006 summer school were Ulla-Britt Jansson, Frans Lundgren, Jenny Alwall and Mathias Persson, all from the Office for History of Science at Uppsala University.

The next International Summer School in History of Science will take place at Berkeley in 2008, and will be organized by Cathryn Carson, Director of the Office for History of Science and Technology at Berkeley.

Jenny Alwall
Photographs by Alexei Kouprianov and Jenny Alwall.

Francois Waquet (Paris), Mary Terrall (UCLA) and Tatiana Artemieva (St. Petersburg).

Roger Hahn (Berkeley) and Tore Frängsmyr (Uppsala).

The participants depart on June 17th and go home.
GERMAN–SWEDISH NETWORKS IN RACE BIOLOGY:
Hans F. K. Günther and the Swedish Race Biology Institute

The authors of this article, Lennart Olsson, Uwe Hoßfeld and George S. Levit, are scholars at the Friedrich-Schiller-Universität in Jena, Germany. Their new research on German–Swedish networks in race biology is based on archival sources at Uppsala University Library Carolina Rediviva.

Hans Friedrich Karl Günther, a.k.a. “Rasse-Günther”, became a full professor of social anthropology at Jena University on May 14th, 1930. He was appointed by the Thuringian minister of education, Wilhelm Frick, from the NSDAP, the national socialist (or nazi) party. This happened despite the fact that some of the reviewers had been very critical, and both the Rektor (vice-chancellor) and the Senate (board) of the University had been against hiring Günther. Normally, it was impossible to become a full professor at German universities without the proper formal credentials, but Günther had no Habilitation and Dozent degree (normally an absolute requirement) and had been active in publishing rather than scientific work.

The reviews, which were written by scientists from a wide variety of disciplines (biology, anthropology, ethnography, medicine, theology and eugenics), show clearly the differences in opinion around 1930 as to what the goals and contents of subjects like race biology, race hygiene and anthropology should be. The fact that Günther got his professorship did not only hurt anthropology as a subject, it was also a blow to the traditional autonomy given to universities to appoint their professors.

Linguistics, anthropology and eugenics

As shown by our recent work in archives in Sweden, an important source for H. F. K. Günther’s knowledge of race biology was his close contacts, over many years, with the Race Biology Institute in Uppsala and its first director Hermann Lundborg. Günther also lectured at the institute and lived for long periods in Scandinavia with his Norwegian wife. Scandinavia had a special position in German race biology, and Günther’s colleagues Eugen Fischer and Alfred Ploetz had called this region the “Motherland of the Germans” (Mut-terland der Germanen) or the “German north” (Germanennorden).

H. F. K. Günther was a linguist by training and obtained his Ph.D. degree in 1914, before the start of WWI. After the war, Günther went to Dresden and became a teacher. In Dresden he also published his first book in 1920, Ritter, Tod und Teufel (“Knight, Death and Devil”).

In the summer of 1920 he met a publisher from Munich, Julius Friedrich Lehmann (1864-1935), who asked him to write a book about the German people from a race biology point of view. When back in Dresden, Günther worked with enthusiasm on this project in the Anthropology department for the remainder of 1920. From this time and onwards, Günther’s main interests were anthropology and eugenics, with a focus on linguistic problems.


In the fall of 1922 Günther moved to Breslau (now Wroclaw in Poland), and in the spring of 1923 to Skien in Telemark, Norway, where he married the Norwegian Maggen Blom in the summer of 1923. In the fall he worked for a while in the Museum für Vorgeschichte (Museum of Prehistory) in Danzig (now Gdańsk in Poland), where he studied a collection of human skulls.

The Institute of Race Biology

Early in 1924 Günther held a series of lectures at Uppsala University, arranged by the newly founded (in 1922) Race Biology Institute. Later he also gave a course on Anthropometry in the medical school (Anatomy department) and in the fall of 1925 he moved to Uppsala with his family. The first director of the Swedish “Institute of Race Biology”, Hermann Lundborg (1868-1943), had invited Günther to this stay in Uppsala, and Günther writes: “The contact with the well known researcher on heredity and race, Prof. Lundborg, the well equipped university library and also the library in the race biology institute with the latest journals were very good for innovative work” (University Archive Jena, Vol. N, No. 46/1, p. 168).

In the fall of 1926, Günther and his family moved to Lidingö in Stockholm. Günther’s book Rassenkunde Europas was translated into Swedish rather swiftly and published in the fall of 1926 by Almqvist & Wicksell, Stockholm, a well known publisher of academic books. In
this book, Günther described Sweden (as opposed to Norway) as the “relatively purest Nordic country”, in which the “purest Nordic race” was found mostly in central Sweden, around the Lake Vättern, and in the regions Härjedalen, Jämtland and Dalarna (Dalecarlia). He also writes that there are only 15% “short-headed” (brachycephalic) inhabitants and that the “blood” is more than 80% Nordic.

The close contact between Günther and Lundborg is shown by the correspondence kept in the Uppsala University Library Carolina Rediviva. Günther and Lundborg also exchanged portraits of Swedes, which Günther used for the new editions of his books. In a letter from Günther to Lundborg from March 23, 1923, he writes: “I was particularly happy about the seven Swedish sisters, which you sent to me. They are delightful also from a non-antropollogical view [...] Unfortunately I have too many educated faces, too few common average faces”. The picture of the seven sisters is reproduced here.

Social Anthropology in Jena

Because of financial problems, the family had to leave Sweden in the summer of 1928 for Germany. The income from his books was not enough to sustain a family, so Günther had to work in Germany, and travel back and forth between the countries. Despite these problems, Günther kept on writing. His Die Rassengeschichte des hellenischen und römischen Volkes (“The race history of the hellenic and roman people”), appeared in the fall of 1928, and in the next year Die Rassenkunde des jüdischen Volkes (“The race biology of the Jewish people”) was published.

In order to obtain a regular income for his family (the daughter Ingrid had been born in Uppsala in 1926), Günther started to work in the Gymnasium (High school) in Blasewitz (close to Dresden) as an extra teacher, receiving only half a normal salary. In this economically difficult situation, he was called to the chair of Social Anthropology in Jena. He started to work on October 1, 1930, and on November 15 Günther held his inaugural lecture before a large audience in the Main Lecture Hall at Jena University. The title of his lecture was “Über die Ursachen des Rassenwandels der Bevölkerung Deutschlands seit der Völkerwanderungszeit” (“On the causes of racial changes in the German population since the era of the Great Migration”), and Wilhelm Frick, Adolf Hitler, Rudolf Hess and other prominent nazi politicians were present.

Günther stayed in Jena until he was called to a professorship at his Alma Mater Freiburg University in 1939, where he taught until 1944. After the end of WWII Günther was caught by the French, who controlled this zone, and imprisoned for three years. After de-nazification he was removed from his professorship, but allowed to continue as a writer and journalist. In the last two decades of his life, Günther published new editions of some of his books, and was occupied by religious questions. He died on September 25, 1968 in Freiburg. His last book, an autobiography with the title “My impression of Adolf Hitler”, published posthumously in 1969, is a good example of repression and selective perception.

Science, politics and ideology

The race biology books by Hans F. K. Günther often sold well, and were translated into several languages. They contributed to strengthening the ideological control of science that the national socialists tried to achieve in the 1930s. Although Günther’s success as a writer declined in the 1930s and 1940s, the circulation of his books, which had first been printed in large numbers in the 1920s, continued to have an effect also during his Freiburg years.

Günther’s lectures and seminars on social anthropology in Jena (1930-1935), were small parts of the plans of leading national socialists to tie certain areas of science, politics and ideology together. To achieve this, subjects such as race biology and race hygiene were introduced early on at German universities and research institutes (e.g. the Kaiser-Wilhelm-Institutes) and relatively well funded. Many questions regarding how important a role this really played still remain to be investigated.

Lennart Olsson
Uwe Hoffeld
George S. Levit
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**NEW BOOKS AND DISSERTATIONS**

**Muses and Patrons**

In his thesis, Danneskiold-Samsøe analyses the development of natural philosophy in Scandinavia in the 16th and 17th centuries. Rather than dealing with individual natural philosophers and ideas, he focuses on groups of natural philosophers, primarily the Bartholin family and the former assistants of Tycho Brahe in Denmark, and the Rudbeck family in Sweden.

Danneskiold-Samsøe puts the study of nature into a cultural, religious, social, and political context, and especially gives attention to the phenomenon of patronage. General developments in the two countries, particularly political, are drawn upon to explain the different context, national style, and development of natural philosophy in Denmark and Sweden.


**The Two Cultures**

Emma Eldelin’s dissertation deals with how the concept of “the two cultures”, originally minted by the British writer, administrator and former scientist C.P. Snow, was interpreted and made use of in public debate in Sweden between 1959 and 2005. Eldelin’s major concern is to create an improved understanding of the Swedish interpretative framework that was developed around “the two cultures”, and to explain the differences between Snow’s conception and various Swedish interpretations.

The Swedish interpretative framework that developed around “the two cultures” connected the concept with notions of Bildung, culture and science as well as with broader discussions around these concepts. Snow’s metaphor served as a rhetorical point of departure in debates concerning Bildung and the relationship between general education and specialization. It appeared in discussions regarding the place of science and technology in culture and cultural debate, as well as in epistemological and historical analyses of the relations between the sciences and the humanities.

Eldelin shows how a specific Swedish understanding developed around Snow’s concept, which slightly differed from the view of the originator. This national re-contextualization often drew from historical perspectives and was affected by a cultural context somewhat different from the British one, mainly due to influences from the cultural traditions of Germany in the 19th century.


**New books from Finland**

Dr Rainer Knapas has been active at the Department of History at Helsinki University, as well as in the Swedish Literature Society in Finland. Together with Professor Matti Klinge, he has widened the perspective of cultural history relative to the old political and social history. Now at his sixtieth birthday, Knapas has received a very beautiful and handsome Festskrift in Swedish, called I trädgården, i biblioteket, i världen (“In the Garden, in the Library, in the World”), symbolizing three of Knapas’ favourite places. He has himself written about the garden as a place for escapism and recreation. He has written about libraries and the history of books. Finally he has written about many places in the world; St. Petersburg, Rome, Paris, Berlin and the Orient.

In the book, seventeen friends of Knapas have published articles about the three themes. They form a very interesting and delightful book. Also in the book is a bibliography of Knapas’ published works.

Dr Charlotta Wolff (Helsinki University) has published a book about the Swedish political elite and France during the Enlightenment, called Vänskap och makt (“Friendship and Power”). The Swedish politicians during the 18th century developed close contact with French intellectuals, such as diplomats, travelling aristocrats and officers in the French army. Cultural cosmopolites like Carl Gustaf Tessin, Carl Fredrik Scheffler, and Gustaf Philip Creutz, participated in the French salons and met writers of the day and many of the philosophes.


Uppsala Newsletter is an occasional publication, usually published twice a year by the Office for History of Science at Uppsala University. Its aim is to give surveys and information about our field in Scandinavia. Although there is no Scandinavian society for history of science, we have correspondents in most university towns, and through them we hope to reflect ongoing research.
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