

THE SOCIOLOGY OF NON-WESTERN SOCIETIES AT THE AMSTERDAM  
UNIVERSITY<sup>1</sup>

Jan Breman

When I started my studies at the University of Amsterdam, the social sciences had agreed on a clear-cut division of the world. Anthropology, still split between ethnology and ethnography, was entrusted with the study of 'primitive peoples'. It was a label dating back to the 19th century which had already gone out of fashion to be replaced by tribal cultures or similar more polished terms such as non-literate, small-scale or non-complex societies. Sociology was supposed to concern itself with investigating the structure, culture and institutions of our own sort of mankind living in the West. The Netherlands was said to exemplify the type of society to be found on either side of the Atlantic ocean (North America and West Europe), or elsewhere but arguably sharing the same heritage. Whether Central, East and Southern Europe should be included in this 'western' classification was a matter of debate. But even if they were incorporated of these lands, *terra bene* the cradle of Greco-Roman civilization, that did not change the fact that the majority of mankind fell outside the anthropological-sociological watershed. These were peoples belonging to large-

---

<sup>1</sup> Dedicated to the memory of Wim Wertheim (1907-1998), a scholar of the 20th century.

scale, literate and highly stratified state formations, distinguished from western society by their distinctly non-urban and pre-industrial patterns of life and work. The completion of the process of decolonization in the mid-twentieth century marked the beginning of an era in which western social sciences in The Netherlands turned their back on the newly-emerged nation-states in the non-western world. These extra-European societies became the study object of the sociology of non-western peoples (societies or regions).

This new discipline, represented by W.F. Wertheim at the University of Amsterdam since 1947, was unique to the social science agenda in the Netherlands. Its inception was due to the unexpected eclipse of indology, a study programme providing academic training for entry into the colonial civil service. As the process of decolonization started to accelerate at the end of World War II, that profession became obsolete. Prior to their definition as non-western, it had been considered launching them under the title of Oriental social studies. Professor J.H. Boeke of the University of Leiden played a prominent role in these deliberations. Boeke was the well-known founder of the economic dualism theory, according to which there was a fundamental difference between the institutional frameworks of West and East. His colleague at Leiden, G. W. Locher, amplified that the term 'Oriental' should be understood as meaning broadly the world outside Europe. The two scholars, together with their colleagues at the University of Utrecht, where training in indology had also been based, agreed to

set up an oriental social studies programme, only deciding at the last moment to change the name to non-western. That alteration was inspired by the realization in Leiden that it might not be a good idea to focus almost exclusively on Indonesia while Utrecht, on the other hand, wanted to express the on-going academic interest in the Caribbean region, site of the remainder of the Dutch colonial empire.

Non-western was the mutually-agreed solution. In 1952 the Minister of Education agreed to the insertion into the Academic Statute of a non-western programme of social studies that would concentrate on the problems of countries undergoing a process of accelerated development. The ministerial decision was motivated by

the vast expertise of the Netherlands in dealing with the life-styles and capabilities for development of Oriental peoples, and the firm belief that scientific knowledge gained over the course of centuries should not allowed to go to waste. (Policy statement cited in Kloos 1988: 137)

The orientalist bias which had formed the basis of the colonialist civilising mission, also became the starting point for a second round, equally guised ethically based, which came to be known development policies. Within that framework, the continuing study of societal progress under western leadership made by former 'natives', was launched early in the post-colonial era.

This was not the manner, however, in which Wertheim fulfilled his task at the University of Amsterdam. His programme of teaching and research revolved around the idea that the freedom struggles

that had led to national independence were primarily the result of internally determined dynamics and expressed the craving for further social emancipation which had been ruthlessly suppressed under colonial rule. Wertheim reached this dissenting conclusion in the course of his professional career in the Netherlands Indies (1931-46). His critical appraisal of the colonial situation evolved after his appointment, at the youthful age of 28, as Professor at the Law College in erstwhile Batavia, but matured introspectively during his imprisonment under Japanese occupation (1942-45). The former colony in Southeast Asia figured prominently in the Amsterdam's academic study programme until the 1960s. In addition to sociology and modern history taught by Wertheim, his students had to attend classes given by C.Tj. Bertling on "the sense of reality among primitives, the ethnography of the social life of peoples in the Malayan archipelago and acculturation problems" - extremely boring and thoroughly outdated by student standards of those days. In contrast, Wertheim had a fascinating and contemporaneous repertoire, for example on Asian urban sociology, and his animated presentation made him popular among his students. He resolutely distanced himself from any nostalgia on colonialism, and his pro-Indonesian stance in the 1950s did not endear him to Dutch policy makers and the jingoist press. The Netherlands Intelligence Agency (BVD) kept close and careful watch on Wertheim after he became chairman of the left-oriented Netherlands-Indonesia Association. The antipathy that his name aroused among the political right increased when, together with

other leading intellectuals including the prominent historian Jan Romein, he started to champion the cause of the emerging Third World and of socialist regimes both in and out of Europe more especially. He attested to his radicalism as leading editor of the monthly De nieuwe stem (The New Voice.) His leftist opinions on social issues, however, did not prevent him from maintaining cordial relations and collaboration with his former colleagues in the colonial service and the prison camp, who remained faithful to familiar beliefs and sentiments.

Thanks to this old-boy network, it was possible to publish an English language series: Selected Studies on Indonesia, representing a careful selection amongst earlier and reputable works by Dutch scholars. This excellent and timely initiative, of which Wertheim was the founding father, was intended to attract foreign scholars who so far had shown little interest in Indonesian studies. The series helped to terminate the isolation suffered by research into the Indonesian society while still under colonial rule. Wertheim paved the way by continuing to publish his scholarly work in English, thus achieving wider exposure which brought him international renown - a distinction that was not shared, and often justly so, by most of his colleagues.

Wertheim based his teaching commitment in the School of Modern History and Sociology of South and Southeast-Asia, accommodated in a wing of what until recently had been until the Colonial Museum in Amsterdam, now renamed the Royal Tropical Institute. His centre consisted of two stately rooms in one of

which he resided alone whilst the other was occupied by one staff member, a part-time secretary and a few student-assistants. I became one of the latter in 1959 at an annual salary of 600 guilders. At the time my boss was starting to expand his interest in Asian affairs to areas far distant from Indonesia. On his way to that country, having accepted an invitation to become Visiting Professor at the Agricultural University of Bogor for the academic year 1956-57, Wertheim spent some time in South Asia where he had never been before. His first trip to India in particular, a few years later facilitated the fieldwork by some of the graduate students whom he supervised. That option was attractive in view of the deteriorating relationship between The Netherlands and its former colony. Sukarno's Indonesia was no longer keen to host Dutch scholars, even when they belonged to a younger generation untainted by what had happened in the past.

During his only post-colonial stay in Indonesia in 1956-57, Wertheim made several field trips accompanied by students of the Agricultural University of Bogor, going to villages in various parts of Java in order to study the condition in which the peasantry worked and lived. His investigative method formed a major break with the way in which colonial officials formerly carried out their rural surveys (Wertheim 1992: 57).<sup>2</sup> This personal experience convinced him of the importance of anthropological fieldwork and this became the type of empirical

---

<sup>2</sup> For a review of colonial research practices, see Geertz 1995.

research which he imposed on his students.

When I departed for India for the first time in 1961 to carry out rural research it was not even a matter of debate that I should base myself in a peasant locality. These years were the high tide of village studies conducted in all parts of the non-western world. Wertheim grasped the opportunity to visit me 'in the field' together with his wife, a scholar in her own right who was his devoted companion at home and abroad. I had just started my research and arranged to receive the elderly couple in a village close to my fieldwork locality in South Gujarat. This was instinctively the right choice: the Wertheims' open-hearted behaviour, partly due to lack of familiarity with accepted dos and donts in their interaction with members of high and low castes, deeply impressed or rather shocked my village hosts. Whenever I later submitted a new chapter of my thesis, the Wertheims never got tired of telling me what had struck them during their short stay in the remote hinterlands of Gujarat. That was a great deal and some effort was needed to ensure that these impressions did not harden into rigid stereotypes.

While Wertheim became a strong advocate of anthropological fieldwork, practitioners of that discipline signalled that they wanted to cover a broader terrain. The University of Amsterdam again set the trend in this respect as became clear when A.J.F. Köbben succeeded J.J. Fahrenfort. The latter had been a hard-core

ethnologist who rarely left his study to venture into the real world, and had never visited the abodes of his 'primitives'. Köbben, appointed at a young age, distinguished himself from his predecessor by actually conducting fieldwork and also by doing it in a peasant village of West Africa rather than in a tribal society. Köbben erased the term primitive from the anthropological encyclopedia and declared that cultural anthropology should extend to the study of all non-western peoples, irrespective of size (small or large-scale), or their degree of social differentiation (more versus less complex). But was the admission of anthropologists to that wider arena not blocked by the presence of non-western sociologists in the same field? Under the motto 'not choosing but sharing', Köbben proposed a division of the spoils whereby he and his colleagues would focus on tradition, whilst non-western sociologists would concentrate, as was already their inclination, on the newly-emerging social formations (Köbben 1964a). Köbben realized, however, that such a division would not be easy to adhere to. In his own dissertation he conceded that he had arrived "too late" in that sense, since the young boys in his fieldwork village much preferred to play football than to take part in the traditional dances (Köbben 1955: 12). In reacting to this reasoning Wertheim did not insist on fixed boundaries between his own Chair (of non-western sociology) and that of his immediate colleague (of anthropology) in Amsterdam. Instead, he concentrated his critique on the tendency of (western) sociologists to assume



that their conceptual apparatus, theory and research methodology, which was based on the study of their own type of society in past and present, would also apply without further qualification to the study of non-western societies (Wertheim 1964: 15-17).

Wertheim and Köbben worked closely together during the 1950s and early 1960s, a team effort from which their students benefited. Although they differed in opinion on many issues, including politics, their cordial relations continued until they agreed to disagree in the 1960s about the need to democratize the academic establishment and on how to respond to the student revolt.

The fusion of cultural anthropology and non-western sociology in a joint course of studies was accentuated by the decision to share a building on one of Amsterdam's canals. A separation between the partners might have occurred if non-western sociology in Amsterdam had converted to the sociology of development. It was certainly no coincidence that such a conversion found much greater support at the University of Leiden and the Agricultural University of Wageningen. Non-western sociology had originated, after all, in the academic training of civil servants or policy experts for a large variety of colonial agencies. Although Wertheim did not judge the impact of colonial rule solely in negative terms, he did not favour a prolonged western presence in former colonies, in the guise of development aid. In his opinion, the societal stagnation that had come about in the Asian world due

to colonial rule in preceding centuries, had now come to an end and should not be prolonged under a new guise. He maintained that not guidance and surveillance from outside, but social forces from within and from below, already expressed in the struggle for national liberation, would be the mainspring in shaping a new and better future. Time and again he voiced his scepticism about the underlying motives as well as the results of western aid. Mainly for that reason he shied away from the idea of schooling his students to become development practitioners.

Wertheim did not want to sever the ties with (western) sociology but rather tried to strengthen them, an endeavour in which he had the sympathy of some of his colleagues at the University of Amsterdam, e.g. A.N.J. den Hollander and S. Hofstra, who, in their studies of western society, were less parochial than the majority of their colleagues. Themes that showed how Wertheim tried to promote a more comparative perspective were illustrated by his participation in a sociological workshop on the phenomenon of corruption (Wertheim 1961). Some of his students followed in his footsteps and in 1967 persuaded the editors of the leading professional journal Sociologische Gids to publish two 'non-western' issues each year. The Amsterdam-based initiators belonged to the younger generation of non-western sociologists, but were given the immediate and warm support by their anthropological friends. The disciplinary boundaries between n.w.s. and c.a. faded even further as it became obvious that the tradition-modernity opposition was not a viable way to operationalize their exclusive

tasks. Other attempts were equally unsuccessful in delineating the respective fields: cultural versus social; micro versus macro; pure versus applied research. Non-western sociologists in The Netherlands have never managed to define their own discipline in unambiguously stated terms. Most holders of Chairs in non-western sociology at a Dutch university managed to avoid formulating their agenda with precision. J.W. Schoorl was an exception in the sense that he made an attempt to reach a clear operational formula. In his search for the disciplinary identity of non-western sociology, this professor at the Free (i.e. Protestant) University in Amsterdam prioritized the study of the modernization process. He was unable to ignore the fact, however, that anthropologists showed growing interest in the phenomenon of acculturation. Schoorl also made himself vulnerable by his vagueness regarding the demarcation between non-western and western sociology, all the more so because there was a strong overlap in his usage of the terms modernization and Westernization (Schoorl 1974). All in all, the old classifications of the various disciplines became increasingly invalidated.

Pertinent questions were also asked regarding 'non-western' as an all-inclusive category. Didn't this unifying concept suggest a degree of homogeneity which understated the vast structural and cultural diversity that existed outside the western world? Nevertheless, the nomenclature 'sociology of non-western peoples' found general acceptance and dissenting voices were not raised when the discipline was given legitimacy standing by inclusion in

the Academic Statute of 1963. Wertheim did not seek exemption when, as a consequence, his chair was given a new lease of life under the title of 'the Sociology and Modern History of Non-Western Peoples, particulalyr in South and Southeast Asia'. It is interesting to note that Köbben's chair was likewise renamed as 'the Cultural Anthropology and Sociology of Non-Western Peoples'. With that partial parallelism the two Amsterdammers signalled their intention to fuse their fields of study in one and the same academic programme. The spirit of the time forced Wertheim and many others to use the term 'Third World' as an operational device to elucidate that his analyses dealt with the wide range of societies beyond the industrialized and urbanized West. To the best of my knowledge, however, he never spoke of Third World sociology, and he was even less receptive towards the new name of 'development sociology' which had become fashionable in the 1960s and 1970s. Rather than conceding to this time-bound apartheid, Wertheim was inspired by a theoretical framework that emphasized the increasing incorporation into a global order. In his introduction to Evolution and Revolution; The Rising Waves of Emancipation, he formulated this idea with a plea for a sociology of a western and non-western 'World on the Move' (1971:13).

Against the background of this farreaching ambition, Wertheim acknowledged that a certain degree of regional specialization remained unavoidable. A research agenda that included the whole

world could easily become superficial. Conversely, to give unconditional primacy to area studies might result in insular scholarship at the cost of gaining deeper understanding of more general regularities in processes of societal transformation. Wertheim tried to steer a middle course between the need to articulate historical continuity and the specific cultural identity of the society in question on the one hand, and the search for more general validity by contextualising time and space-bound analyses in a more comparative framework.

He did not compromise on his personal interest in Asian studies but shifted his emphasis more and more towards China. A first study tour in 1957 was followed by several others, in 1964, 1970-71 and 1979 respectively. These were all rather short trips since the Chinese authorities refused to issue permits to foreigners for visits of longer duration, and rejected repeated requests to be allowed to conduct rural or urban research. There was no exception to this rule even for scholars such as Wertheim, who were sympathetic to the words and deeds of the new revolutionary régime. He reported his findings in a number of essays whose tenor was invariably quite positive. His favourable assessment of the general progress made since the communist take-over in 1949 was at that time shared by many Asia watchers, both professionals and non-professionals. That propitious opinion should be understood in light of the mood of pessimism prevailing in scholarly publications on the apparent stagnation or even fall in living standards in the South Asian subcontinent and the

Southeast Asian archipelago. The prominent Swedish economist-cum-sociologist Gunnar Myrdal elaborated on this gloomy appraisal in his Asian Drama: An Enquiry into the Poverty of Nations. In that three-volume work with its ominous title, Myrdal did not comment at all on political, social and economic conditions in China, but argued his case by referring mainly to the anything but promising state of affairs in India. His treatise was not the only example of a study which praised the accomplishments of socialist China implicitly or explicitly while India's record since Independence was downgraded. Wertheim's reputation came in for critical appraisal not so much because of the hope and trust which he showed during the 1960s and 1970s in his optimistic view of the Great Leap Forward in China. Far more damaging was his steadfast refusal to retract his earlier writings once it became increasingly clear that the facade of emancipation concealed numerous phenomena and problems that, even retrospectively, should have alerted him to the need for major and fundamental reservations as to the ruthless and mechanistic manner with which the doctrine of socialism was put into practice. At the end of his long life, Wertheim did marginally recant on his earlier faith in the path of Chinese socialism. Not without qualification, however, and also without adequate explanation of why he chose to persist in his earlier views<sup>3</sup>. Wertheim and his wife were both badly

---

<sup>3</sup> Wertheim's last book Third World Whence and Whither? (1997), expresses criticism of the Mao model but his critique concerned the practice rather than the gospel.

affected by the sometimes vitriolic criticism, more in the media rather than in the profession, to which they were subjected in The Netherlands during the 1970s and basically to the very end of their lives.

That critique, although essentially understandable, was biased to the extent that it often disregarded Wertheim's incisive and relentless denouncement of the military take-over in Indonesia in 1965, and of the ruthless authoritarian nature, although pro-western, of the New Order regime that was installed. He was one of the first to draw public attention to the persecution of people suspected of leftist sympathies. The rounding-up of all so called subversive forces ended in a massacre, during which an estimated million people or more were killed, while an even larger number were held in detention often without trial. Wertheim helped to set up the Indonesia Committee in The Netherlands in 1968, subsequently becoming its chairman. It is indisputable that the many articles that he wrote were instrumental in changing international opinion from the originally rather benevolent appraisal of Suharto and his cronies to a growing awareness that they prioritized their own private interests in running the state and economy. I would conclude by observing that comments on Wertheim's contributions to public and scholarly debates are largely coloured by the political views of the commentators. However the balance is tilted, it would be only fair to consider the various dimensions of his parti pris in debating social issues in both national and international affairs. Behind his

revolutionary image Wertheim always behaved as an orderly man who took his civic duties very seriously. In the introduction to his path-breaking study The moral economy of the peasant (1976), Jim Scott expressed his admiration for and affinity with Wertheim, and has often narrated how, at the end of a visit to the Wertheim home in Wageningen, Wim took him to the bus stop. They were animatedly discussing peasant wars in the twentieth century when Jim started to cross the road without heeding the red signal. Wim grabbed his arm and reprimanded him, saying that he was setting a bad example for children.

To take one's degree under Wertheim was considered to be quite prestigious, mainly due to his ability to provide more than adequate and inspiring supervision on the road towards the Ph.D. defence. He refused to be placed on a pedestal and did not select post-graduate students on the basis of their willingness to follow his line of thinking; instead, he allowed them to make their own choice and to select the paradigm with which they found themselves at ease. The scope for manoeuvre that he insisted they should exercise was the reason why so many of the younger scholars trained by him became senior staff members in university departments in The Netherlands and abroad. Notwithstanding his enormous productivity, sustained even after his retirement in 1974, Wertheim received few Dutch awards and distinctions for his



scholarly merits<sup>4</sup>. That lack of formal recognition had much to do with his reputation of going against the grain - anti-colonial in the traumatic process of decolonization, a political deviant during the Cold War, a stubborn advocate for Maoist China even when the tide of sympathy had already turned - which caused an embarrassing lack of response among his own countrymen to the quality and originality of his publications. The international renown that he acquired during a long career found expression in a very sizeable and broad-based network of contacts. His pioneering Indonesian Society in Transition; A Study in Social Change, first published in 1956, immediately became a sociological textbook, setting a new trend in that it marked a break with a colonial inheritance that stressed the exceptionalism of Asian civilization. The basic argument was that the so-called backwardness of these countries in their societal make-up had much to do with their subordination and discrimination within the pattern of colonial rule. With this book Wertheim inspired social scientists in Indonesia to instill a more endogenous, less eurocentric imagination into their reconstruction of past and

---

<sup>4</sup> Wertheim was never elected as Member of the Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences, a neglect which he shared with many other eminent social scientists. A cautious sounding many years ago made it clear that the Board of the Netherlands Sociological and Anthropological Association would not welcome a proposal to nominate Wertheim as a Distinguished Fellow. Moreover, the Board of the Royal Institute of Linguistics and Anthropology which in recent times has granted honorary membership to various senior scientists, never found reason to give that distinction to Wertheim as well.

present. That contribution, and his unwavering support of dissidents who could not participate in public debate in their own country under military dictatorship, made Wertheim into a major figure among the younger generation of Indonesian students and scholars. In 1987 he celebrated his eightieth birthday surrounded by youngsters from Indonesia, who seized this intimate opportunity to express their respect and affection.

In his work, the social scientist Wertheim signalled in his work the end of orientalist scholarship that had for so long been dominant in The Netherlands vis à vis Asia and the extra-European world at large. The significance of his contribution was once more made clear to me in the context of a visit in 1977 to a research institute in the Gangetic plain of Northern India. Wertheim was then not even aware of the existence of the A.N. Sinha Institute in Patna, the capital of one of the most populous states of India. Not a single staff member of the institute had personally ever met Wertheim, but they were familiar with most of his books. East-West Parallels in particular had so impressed them that a sentence in a core passage had been selected as the institute's motto, even printed on its business cards. The essence of East-West Parallels is that non-western peoples do differ from western mankind, but not in the sense that they suffer a defect in their social or mental capabilities that could be explained in terms of 'backwardness'.

At the start of the twenty-first century it is not only

awkward but also counterproductive to insist on disciplinary boundaries which owe their origin to rearguard fights in the wake of decolonization. Anthropologists at the University of Amsterdam were the first to make a frontal assault on the symbolism of nomenclature. Non-Western sociology would have to go, declared the departmental board solemnly early in 1996. My own strong protest led to a public debate being held later that year in which most speakers sung their unqualified and monopolistic praise of anthropology. Staff and students apparently turned up mainly to celebrate the demise of Amsterdam's child prodigy, once so admired by Köbben in his role of proud parent. I stood alone in my willingness to speak out against the complacent attitude of my anthropological friends. That complacency, if not downright conceit, was undoubtedly due partly to the triumphalist march of anthropology, which has gained new life in the study of contemporary European societies during the past few decades. I dispute neither the right nor the utility of this expansion. Significant insights can certainly be derived from the study of non-western societies allowing a better understanding to be gained of one's own, i.e. western, society. The mobilization of knowledge produced by anthropologists can play an important role.<sup>5</sup> Their partnership in investigating the ongoing transformation of The Netherlands into a multicultural society is essential. The suggestion, however, that sociologists researching non-western

---

<sup>5</sup> A good example is Goody 1996.

societies should pass as anthropologists from now on, is shortsighted and an indication of disciplinary imperialism. The problem is not to reject that awkward phrase 'non-western' but rather to suggest a meaningful demarcation between sociology and anthropology in terms of conceptual apparatus, theoretical frameworks and research methodologies. The earlier disciplinary boundaries, based on dichotomies such as social-cultural, modern-traditional, macro-micro and quantitative-qualitative, have become irrelevant and the challenge is to construct new demarcations. Not in order to emphasize their mutual exclusion, but to stimulate collaboration. In working out how to shape this coordination, some overlap is going to be inevitable. Instead of creating border disputes, however, those encounters should lead to results in which the sum total is more than the separate parts.

Preconditional to this endeavour is that practitioners of western sociology do not persevere in their habitual inclination to avoid rather than to seek contact with their colleagues who specialize in the study of Asia, Africa and Latin America.<sup>6</sup>

---

To give just one example: mainly in order to impress policy makers and sponsors, an annual list is published in which Dutch sociologists are ranked on the dual basis of their productivity measured in research output and their rating in the professional pecking order. This exercise, published with much pomp and circumstance, has many deficiencies, including that of parochialism. When I pointed out in a letter that all sociologists working on other than western society were not taken into account, I received a reply which made it clear that those who had drawn up the list of honour had no idea what I was talking about nor were they much interested to find out. They willingly agreed to drop my name from the annual rat race. See for an exchange of these letters, the professional journal Facta, April 1995.

In an era marked by an accelerated globalization process, the case to be made for inter-continental comparison is stronger than ever before. It is no longer so that social transformations that occurred in the North Atlantic hemisphere in the past can be seen as a yardstick or role model with which to assess the dynamics that unfold in those parts of the world where the majority of mankind live and work. Similarly, it is impossible to explain the transnational process of scale-enlargement merely as an expression of westernization. Conversely, there is an imperative need to study the structural and cultural impact of changes that originate elsewhere on the institutional setting and social interaction in our own 'wester' type of societies.

The work of such close colleagues, as e.g. A. de Swaan and J. Goudsblom demonstrates that the climate in the University of Amsterdam has become conducive for an academic profile in which sociology figures with a truly worldwide agenda. This is attributable to a faculty tradition that owes a great deal to contributions by an earlier generation. The names of Wertheim and Hobbén in particular should be put on record. The post-graduate Amsterdam School of Social Science Research is founded on three interconnected articles of faith: the promotion of studies that are (i) empirically based, (ii) marked by a historical perspective, and (iii) contextualised in a comparative structural and cultural frame. To honour the man who was one of the founding

fathers of this specific brand of social sciences, the Centre for Asian Studies, part and parcel of the Amsterdam School, in 1987 established an Annual Wertheim Lecture which now marks the closure of the Academic Year.

Half-a-century ago the wonder baby was the product of a shotgun marriage. Has the discipline of non-western sociology, notwithstanding the hope and care with which the happy parents in our Amsterdam faculty cherished it, proved to be a total loss? Such a conclusion would be too hasty and also not justified. The Amsterdam School of Social Science Research (ASSR), established in 1987, is based on a close collaboration between the constituent parts, irrespective of whether their studies deal with Europe, Asia or other continents. This Research School is so far the only one in The Netherlands to have abrogated the west versus non-west dichotomy in principle, substituting it with a joint curriculum of studies.

At the inception of the sociology of non-western peoples both anthropology and (western) sociology occupied houses far distant from one another. Their rapprochement in our own Amsterdam University is almost entirely due to the efforts made by the founding fathers of non-western sociology to bridge the gap between social studies of 'far-away' and 'near-by'. The King is dead, long live the King.

Jan Breman

Amsterdam, January 2000

Note: the original Dutch version appeared in: Goudsblom, J., De Rooy, P. and J. Wieten (eds.) - In de Zevende: De Eerste Lichting Hoogleraren aan de Politiek-Sociale Faculteit in Amsterdam (In the Seventh Faculty: The First Batch of Professors in the Faculty of Political and Social Sciences in Amsterdam. Amsterdam, Het Spinhuis 1998:168-81.

References

Baks, C. (a.o. eds.) -

1971 Buiten de Grenzen. Sociologische opstellen aangeboden aan prof.dr. W.W.Wertheim, 25 jaar Amsterdamse hoogleraar 1946-1971. Meppel: Boom. (Beyond the Boundaries: Sociological essays presented to dr. W.F. Wertheim for his 25 years of professorship in Amsterdam, 1946-1971).

Breman, J.C.

1995 'Sociologen top-vijftig' (Briefwisseling met prof.dr. F.N. Stokman). in: FACTA vol.3/3:12 (The 50 top-ranking sociologists; correspondance with prof.dr. F.N. Stokman)

Geertz, C.

1995 After the fact. Two countries, four decades, one anthropologist. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Goody, J.

1996 The East in the West. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kloss, P.

1988 'Het ontstaan van een discipline. De sociologie der niet-westerse volken'. in: Antropologische Verkenningen vol.7 (1/2):123-146. (The origin of a discipline; the sociology of non-western peoples)

Köbben, A.J.F.

1955 Zwarte planters. Proeve ener facet-etnografie. Proefschrift Universiteit van Amsterdam. 'S Gravenhage: Excelsior. (Black peasants. Specimen of a facet-ethnography).

1964a 'Niet kiezen maar delen. Over de verhouding van culturele antropologie tot niet-westerse sociologie', in: Kula vol.5 (1/2): 1-9. (Not cutting up but sharing; on the relationship between cultural anthropology and non-western sociology).

1964b Van primitieven tot medeburgers. Assen: Van Gorcum. (From primitives to fellow citizens).

Myrdal, G.

1968 Asian drama. An enquiry into the poverty of nations. New York: The Twentieth Century Fund.

Schoorl, J.W.

1974 Sociologie der modernisering. Een inleiding tot de sociologie der niet-westerse volken. Sociologische monografieën. Deventer. Van Loghum Slaterus. (Sociology of modernization; An introduction to the sociology of non-western peoples).

Scott, J.C.

1976 The moral economy of the peasant. Rebellion and subsistence in Southeast Asia. New Haven/London: Yale University Press.



Wertheim, W.F.

1956 Indonesian society in transition. A study in social change. The Hague/Bandung: W. van Hoeve. 2e herziene druk.

1960 'Sociologische aspecten der achtergebleven gebieden', in: Mens en Maatschappij vol.35: 346-358. (A sociological approach to the problem of underdevelopment, in: East-West Parallels 1964: 3-22).

1961 'Corruptie als sociologisch studieobject', in: Nederlands Sociologisch Jaarboek, vo.14:1-40. (Sociological aspects of corruption in Southeast Asia, in: East-West Parallels 1964:103-132).

1964 'Inleiding Professor Wertheim (n.b. reactie op betoog Köbber), in: Kula, vol.5/1-2:15-17 (Introduction by Professor Wertheim in response to essay by Köbber).

1964 East-West Parallels. Sociological approaches to modern Asia. The Hague: W. van Hoeve.

1971 Evolutie en revolutie; de golfslag der emancipatie. Kritiese Bibliotheek. Van Gennep: Amsterdam. (Evolution and revolution; The rising waves of emancipation. Penguin. Harmondsworth:1974).

1992 Terug in Azië 1956-1957. Wageningen. (Back in Asia 1956-1957).

1993 China om de zeven jaar. Studiereizen naar het hemelse rijk. Berchem:Epo. (China every seven years. Study tours to the heavenly empire).

1997 Third world whence and whither? Protective state versus aggressive market. Amsterdam: Het Spinhuis.

Wertheim, W. & H. Wertheim- Gijse Weenink

1991 Vier wendingen on ons bestaan. Indië verloren, Indonesië geboren. Breda: De Geus. (Four turns in our life. The loss of the Indies, the birth of Indonesia).

---

<sup>22</sup> Pieter van Stuijvenberg, "Alternatives in the ICSSR/IMWOO Programme: some possible directions to proceed," n.d.

<sup>23</sup> Klaas van der Veen, "The East-West Encounter: Cooperation and communication in an Indo-Dutch research team," *Sociologische Gids* ??? 375-92.

<sup>24</sup> T. S. Papola and D. H. H. Bol, *Evaluation of the IDPAD Programme* (The Hague, New Delhi: ICSSR/IMWOO1988) 4.

<sup>25</sup> Chandra and Stuijvenberg, *Indo-Dutch Programme*, 2.

<sup>26</sup> D. H. H. Bol and T. S. Papola, *An Evaluation of the Indo-Dutch Programme on Alternatives in Development* (The Hague, November 1983) 4-5.

<sup>27</sup> Chandra and van Stuijvenberg, *Indo-Dutch Programme*, 47.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, 51.

<sup>29</sup> Bol and Papola, *Evaluation*, 10.

<sup>30</sup> Jan Nederveen Pieterse, "My Paradigm or Yours? Alternative Development, Post-development, Reflexive Development" *ISS Working Papers Series* No. 229 (September 1996) 3.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibidem.*, 6.

<sup>32</sup> Workplan for the 4th phase of the Indo-Dutch Programme on Alternatives in Development 1995-1998 (New Delhi/ The Hague: ICSSR/NUFFIC 1994)14.

<sup>33</sup> Bol and Papola, *Evaluation*, 11.

<sup>34</sup> K. G. Krishna Murthy and W. Zevenbergen, *Evaluation of the IDPAD Programme* (The Hague/ New Delhi: ICSSR/IMWOO 1993) 25.

<sup>35</sup> *Policy Relevance as a Goal of Development-Related Social Science Research*. Proceedings of a Seminar organized by IDPAD and the Werkgemeenschap Zuid-Azië (The Hague 24 November 1989) 20-21.

<sup>36</sup> Quotation from Louk Box *Ibidem.*, 25.

<sup>37</sup> *Ibidem.*, 25.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibidem.*, 29.

<sup>39</sup>

*Towards Improved Dissemination of IDPAD Research, Management in Development (MID)* (Utrecht, Hyderabad: March-April 1995).

<sup>40</sup> Pieterse, "My Paradigm," 3.