1 Engelsk og dansk resumé

1.1 Engelsk resumé

The work hereby presented in an article-based dissertation is: 1) a combined empirical study of Danish sports sciences two phases of establishment (as natural science in the beginning - and as humanities and social sciences in the late - twentieth century), 2) a science study investigation of alleged dysfunctions in academic disciplinariness and the driving force of science respectively and 3) finally a speculative quest for a sustainable foundation for our societies and the institution of science. These different ambitions is linked to one another in the following way: The analysis of the second phase of establishment in Danish sports sciences lacked a theoretical basis to be analyzed from, and this challenge was met by means of a critical model (called EVHSEN) for modern science (Existential search-, Virtues of reason philosophy of History - and Secular Eschatology-Nexus model), which arose out of a reflection on whether modern science is a sustainable institution. The EVHSEN-model is presented in the second article of this dissertation.

In the first empirical study it is examined whether a number of hypotheses presented by different critical scholars of academic disciplinariness are supported by events and developments in the early phase of Danish sports science. The philosopher and sociologist of science Steve Fuller (Fuller 2000) has put forth the hypothesis that the formation of academic disciplines are inversions of social movements into disciplinary consensus cultures, and sociologist Joseph Ben-David has presented the theory of theory and role hybridization which explains how the alleged conservatism of academic disciplines can be overcome (Ben-David 1960). These hypotheses could not be confirmed. The Swedish gymnastics movement that promoted theoretical gymnastics as a subject at the University
of Copenhagen was founded on the natural romantic poet Pehr Henrik Ling’s gymnastic system. However, the dogmas of this movement were discarded at the national micro discipline that developed at the University of Copenhagen with Johannes Lindhard as the central figure. He, however, was focused on making theoretical gymnastics winning academic foothold among established academic disciplines. Here Thomas Gieryn’s thesis (Gieryn 1983), that the establishment of knowledge authority must be actively fought for and fiercely defended in social processes, termed boundary work, is confirmed. Furthermore, the case study left no reason to assert, that Lindhard had to overcome an internal resistance in the discipline of physiology in order to make his contribution to the development of exercise physiology.

Critic of academic disciplinarity V. Spike Peterson has pointed out that academic disciplines often contain basic assumptions that can be criticized for being oppressive to certain groups. Here it is supposedly a problem that such dogmas, because of the function they serve in an academic discipline, are protected by the consensus culture that often prevail here. This hypothesis was confirmed, however, in the studio, where J. Lindhard smuggled certain gender and class stereotypes into the gymnastic system he developed. All in all, some of the hypotheses considered are confirmed while others do not find support in this case.

Speculations concerning a theoretical foundation for a sustainable society and sustainable institution of science as presented in the introductory sections of the dissertation start to enumerate fundamental sustainability problems in existing modern university science. One of the key problems is that the output of science has been constantly growing since the second half of the sixteenth century. This growth has been followed by a corresponding increase in state funding of the activities. As a consequence of this development the organization and ideals of science in some areas have been changed in order to adapt the institution to new neoliberal demands from the state and more
funding from private industry. This transition connects science to the two central subsystems of modern progress and growth that are the primary causes of unsustainable interactions with our environment. The idea of unlimited growth however, is becoming increasingly obsolete. Earth is not infinitely great, and offers only limited room for expansion of human activities. Production wastes build up; depletion of resources begins to constrain production and greenhouse gas interference with climate set limits that need to be respected. The question now is how it can be, that so obvious needs for change are so hard to put into action at a political level. This question must be answered in order to clarify what challenges sustainable transition are facing.

This intricacy is analyzed by the site-anchoring thesis, which claims that different positions of thought are based on different assumptions of what (wo)man is and where he/she belongs. The relationship between assumptions in this regard largely determines thought on: 1) what humans should strive for, 2) how we fit into societies and 3) what aspects of human life count as meaningful. The thesis outlines three basic categories. Man can belong to this world (*siteness*), somewhere else (*offsiteness*) or nowhere (*nowhereness*). Modern thought resides in the off-siteness position which is very hard to reconcile with major sustainability transitions of society. We think of ourselves as world independent *res cogitantes* that reside in an Archimedean point position outside the world from which we can intervene in the world. Thus, Modern thought put us in an alienated external relationship to the world, which hence is primarily conceptualized as a force to be conquered and raw materials for manipulation. In other words, the advances of modern societies rest on mental and structural detachment from the world that we originate from. Hence, modern thinking does not view the world as a source of meaning in human life. Accordingly, modern thoughts on sustainability are anthropocentric: We only need to save the world for the sake of our own survival. This dogma has the consequence that moderns tend to view sustainability as a technical issue, which is completely decoupled from the individual's own life.
Contrarily, in siteness based thinking man must anchor himself in this world, as a condition for a meaningful life. Humans must be conceptualized in continuity with the life forms of this world, and in the version of siteness presented in this dissertation it is argued that human nature is active. These premises constitute a foundation for thought on society and its relation to the world in which it rests. Within the area of meta scientific reflection and theory, the siteness perspective has given rise to the descriptive EVHSEN- model, which analyses modern science as a scientific core activity that is superimposed by modern philosophy of history and modern protestant secular eschatology: enlightenment humanism and Protestant materialism. The model is presented in the second article (“Site Anchoring of Man in Modern Science”) of this dissertation. Normatively the model recommends that this overlaying is replaced by a vision for the historical future based on the siteness perspective. Following the assumption that human nature is active it is argued that humans possess inclinations toward different forms of activity. It is argued that the primary inclination for science is a search for site anchoring of man, which appears as impressionist and expressionist existential quests respectively. On a normative level the EVHSEN model promotes an organization of science that allows impressionist existential search to unfold. This effort will set free the specific drive of science, and make the activity more meaningful for the researchers involved and be likely to contribute to a new direction for science towards anchoring of man in this world. Such a transition will in itself anchor humans in this world since human nature is of this world. Combined with other similar siteness based sustainability initiatives in the community, this move will hypothetically lead to increased sensitivity in humans toward this world and make sustainability matters become a crucial existential issue for those affected by the efforts. It is reasonable to expect that such a development will lead to political pressure for radical adjustment of society. This is the vision which, however, is yet only a sketch.
The third article on the initial phase of Danish sports science within the humanities and social sciences investigates the EVHSEN model’s prediction that science has an inner drive (existential search), and seeks to clarify whether this drive can be indirectly identified in articles, which were printed in Danish journals in the period 1980-1997. Secondly, different trends and ambitions in Danish sports science of the period are analyzed according to their implicit site anchorings. This aspect of the article concerns the efforts made to formulate theoretical approaches pointing forward to the establishment of sports science as a scientific discipline in its own right. There were different kinds of drafts and theories which focused on the moving human body and they all challenged the humanist *res cogitans* assumption in different ways. The article argues that these different approaches can be categorized into three main categories: 1) research on the emancipation of the culture of the body, 2) siteness based emancipation oriented research and 3) research on anchoring to the body, and these three kinds of research predominantly rank within the nowhereness, siteness and off-siteness perspectives respectively. The analysis thus indicates that there existed very different views on how sport research should unfold, fundamental disagreements on what role sports sciences should play in society and even major difficulties among the different parties understanding what scientists of the other categories aimed to accomplish. The source material is not in conflict with the assumption that impressionist existential search is a driving force in science, but it must also be admitted that the issue cannot be determined only empirically, as the studied material can also be explained as manifestations of a passive human nature. This difficulty illustrates that science rests on basic metaphysical assumptions that serve as grounds for interpretations and explanations of empirical observations.