

Foreword

The contributions to this volume go back to the conference “Mainstream and Dissident Scientific Networks between the Balkans and Germany” which took place at the Humboldt University in Berlin in September 2011, organized by Sevasti Trubeta and Christian Voss and sponsored by the German Research Foundation (DFG) and the Humboldt University. The initial aim of the organizers was to provide a common forum for scholars who may have different disciplinary backgrounds, yet are involved in some way in Southeast European Studies; this would connect together interdisciplinary approaches to the topic of scientific contacts between Southeast European countries and Germany. In conceptual terms, the intention was to emphasize both the complexity of the interconnections between scientific actors from the two regions as well as the dynamics of the field within which they interacted. This suggested frame of reference challenges any simple contextualization of scholarly interaction and, instead, creates space for raising questions such as how the field of their interaction was organized and which driving forces mobilized the scholars in both regions in their interaction with one another. Moreover, considering that modern science is characterized by its being interlaced with politics and society, then those involved in the production and transfer of scientific knowledge are liable to have multiple affiliations based on their professions, activities in political organizations, and such. This complexity motivated us to orient the focus of the conference towards the social action (rather than the narratives) of those who either conformed to the prevailing power relations, or who were dissidents or critics of the dominant power relations.

The conceptual issues addressed at the conference looked at the scientific networks between Southeastern Europe and Germany as fields of intercommunication involving the transfer of ideas and the mobilization of actors. This was rather than considering Southeast European scholarly elites as simply recipients of Western ideas, or rather than taking for granted a ‘national component’ as a premise in the actions of both sides. A simplifying dichotomy along the lines of the production of scientific knowledge in Western centers vs. the reception of knowledge on the periphery (or indeed the semi-periphery) actually only obscures the complex processes and dynamics of possible transformation. Where do the limits lie in approaching scientific networks between Southeastern Europe and Germany according to the model of center-periphery/semi-periphery, and again, what is the specific manifestation of Balkanism in this model?

The decision to approach scientific contacts between Southeastern Europe and Germany through the concept of *networks* paved the way to the currently flourishing network research, yet it lead inevitably to the quite different ways in which “network” is used. Indeed, the term network is being applied more and more in the social and historical sciences either as a metaphor with reference to diverse relational structures, or as a methodological and theoretical tool in social and historical network research. The latter reflects the implementation of sociological methods (quasi quantitatively oriented) originating in the theory of social systems and of primary sources (historical sources) looking for appropriate theoretical models.

The contributors to this volume use “networks” in different ways; most of them apply a formal notion of network for depicting multifold interconnections between

collective or individual scientific actors. *Sevasti Trubeta* and *Georgeta Nazarska* deal explicitly with approaches to networks from either a theoretical or a methodological perspective. *Sevasti Trubeta* addresses the multiplex scholarly paths leading through opportunity and choice. Starting from the idea of “rhizomatic networks”, she suggests contextualizing the scientific networks between Germany and Southeastern Europe in the broader settings in which modern scientific knowledge was being produced and transferred, rather than treating them from an exclusively bilateral perspective. Situated in these wider settings, researching scientific networks between Southeastern Europe and Germany means examining a series of phenomena related to the rise of modern science which involved the production and transfer of universal knowledge in a transnational space of interaction, while also attending to the specific regional characteristics. Trubeta argues that if historical and political circumstances provide the scholars with the opportunity to benefit from a networking drawing on symbolic and material capital, nevertheless, subjective choice is also crucial to utilizing the given opportunity. She addresses especially the contribution coming from the social history of medicine for the research of scientific networks between Germany and Southeastern Europe. Using the methodological tools provided by the prosopographical and social network analysis *Georgeta Nazarska* traces the career trajectories of female scientists from Bulgaria who were affiliated with German academia between 1920s and 1950s. In her analysis (which draws on unpublished archival documents from personal collections and the collections of academic institutions, memoirs, and biographies), Nazarska examines how power relations, once based on gendered hierarchies, influenced the networking of Bulgarian female scientists by either supporting or impeding their professional careers. The fragility and conditionality of intellectual and scientific networks is the subject of *Nenad Stefanov’s* article which addresses the case of historians and sociologists from socialist Yugoslavia and their contacts with West German colleagues. Stefanov illustrates how political commitment by Yugoslavian intellectuals, who were critical of the political system, influenced their affinities with Western German intellectuals, and how changing political loyalties, in the course of a rising Serbian nationalism in the 1990s, counteracted former contacts, shifting affinities and trajectories. Stefanov elaborates this argument in the case of the Journal *Praxis* and the *Praxis* summer school in the former Yugoslavia. An underexposed subject is addressed by *Stratos Georgoulas* in his article on the “father of the Greek criminology”, namely, Konstantinos Gardikas, the most prominent figure in Greek criminology and a well known liberal politician during the interwar period and after, up to 1968. Georgoulas reconstructs the affiliation of Gardikas with German scientific forums and circles, and his involvement in leading German criminological journals and societies during the interwar period. He poses questions as to how Gardikas’s contacts to leading Greek scholars who were well-established in Germany, (namely Constantin Carathéodory and George Joachimoglu), influenced and supported his affiliations; and how it was possible that Gardikas maintained his positions in the Greek university and state institutions (as the person in charge of the forensic department for the Greek police for over 40 years), although he continued to maintain his eugenic views (especially the sterilization of criminals) up to the 1960s. The influence of both the German version of eugenics, racial hygiene, as well as German racial anthropology in Bulgaria are the subject of *Christian*

Promitzer's contribution covering a half a century (1878–1941). Promitzer examines the scientific contacts between Bulgarian and German racial anthropologists and racial hygienists and argues that these contacts were facilitated by the development of certain features of a “culture of defeat” in both societies, which in turn promoted the respective standing of racial anthropology, racial theories, and racial hygiene. He argues that, despite this similarity, it was mainly the different role of fascism in these two countries which led German and Bulgarian racial anthropology and racial hygiene to take different pathways. The last contribution to this volume is from *Maria Zarifi* and deals with the rise of Greek medicine in the 19th century and its close linkage to German medicine. Zarifi argues that the establishment of medical science and institutions in the first decades after the building of the Greek state and the founding of the University in Athens (in 1837), played a decisive role in transferring scientific knowledge, influencing the creation of the medical community in Greece, creating strong knowledge networks between Greece and Germany, and professionalizing and finally controlling the medical practice in Greece. The paper highlights the interconnections between the rule of the Bavarian King Otto in Greece, the imperative of modernization of society, and the emergence of Greek nationalism.

Acknowledgement: This publication has been made possible first of all with the generous support of DFG and the Humboldt University, both of which sponsored the conference and the latter additionally provided the funding for the copy editing of the contributions to this volume. We would like to express our gratitude to them and also to Professor Gabriella Schubert for accepting the contributions for publication in the Journal *Zeitschrift für Balkanologie*. We also thank Ms Petra Himstedt-Vaid for her valuable support during the process of the publication and Dr. Philip Jacobs for the copy editing of the contributions.

Mytilene, Berlin, May 2014

SEVASTI TRUBETA
CHRISTIAN VOSS