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international workshop within the framework of the bilateral research project of the Polish Academy of Sciences and the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, entitled

*The role of intelligentsia in shaping collective identities of Poles and Hungarians in 19th and 20th centuries*



***Programme***

11.00

*Opening Words* (Béla Mester)

1st section: Theoretical Frameworks (Chair: Gábor Kovács)

11.10–11.40

Pál Tamás

*Cosmopolitan Radicalism, Critical Practices and Meritocracy in the Post-Communist Intelligentsia of Central Europe*

11.40–12.10

Rafał Smoczyński

*The Feudal Origin of the Contemporary Polish Citizenship Model*

12.10–12.30

*Coffee Break*

2nd section: Interpretations (Chair: Rafał Smoczyński)

12.30–13.00

Béla Mester

*Pessimist Hungarian Utopias in the Interwar Period*

13.00–13.30

Gábor Kovács

*The Society of the Direct Producers, the Radical Needs and the Intellectuals – Two Famous Books from the Late Sixties*

13.30–14.30

*Lunch Break*

3rd section: Individual Careers: Peregrination and Emigration (Chair: Béla Mester)

14.30–15.00

Péter András Varga

*The Young Bernhard Alexander in Vienna 1868–1871*

*A Case Study in the Historiography of Philosophy and Academic Life*

15.00–15.30

Bettina Szabados

*The Viennese Entries 1869–1870 of Bernhard Alexander’s Diary*

15.30–16.00

Dániel Golden

*From science through science policy to the philosophy of science – the edifying career of Imre Lakatos*

16.00–16.10

*Concluding Remarks* (Rafał Smoczyński)

Péter András Varga

Research Fellow, Institute of Philosophy, Research Centre for the Humanities, HAS, Budapest

**The Young Bernhard Alexander in Vienna 1868–1871**

**A Case Study in the Historiography of Philosophy and Academic Life**

When the young Bernhard Alexander arrived in Vienna in 1868 he was not yet the towering figure of late nineteenth – early twentieth century Hungarian philosophy. The philosophy he encountered in Vienna was, too, not yet the Austrian Philosophy (with a capital ‘P’) which Rudolf Haller believed to have been born few years later in 1874. Based on the combination of unpublished sources from four archives (including Alexander’s Viennese diary entries, co-published by Barnabás Szekér and Bettina Szabados) and Alexander’s early occasional writings, I reconstruct the historical circumstances of Alexander’s academic peregrination in Vienna (e.g., courses attended, intellectual relationships, and writing projects). There is a considerable discrepancy – both in terms of the *dramatis personae*, their writings, and the involved philosophical doctrines – between the content of Austrian Philosophy and the snapshot of Austrian philosophy that becomes visible to us through the lens of Alexander’s peregrination. Yet, the latter not only temporally preceded the former, but it also constitutes the conceptual and historical precondition of Haller’s Austrian Philosophy. In particular, the young Alexander could provide us with an unfiltered picture of what Robert Zimmermann, his Viennese philosophical master, could have transmitted to another generation of young Viennese students, including Edmund Husserl, who convened around Franz Brentano one decade later and inaugurated Austrian Philosophy with a capital ‘P.’

 The presentation is connected to the scholarly edition of the Viennese entries in Alexander’s hitherto unpublished diary, which are presented by Bettina Szabados during this conference.
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Bettina Szabados

Junior Researcher, Institute of Philosophy, Research Centre for the Humanities, HAS, Budapest

**The Viennese Entries 1869–1870 of Bernhard Alexander’s Diary**

During his academic peregrination Bernhard Alexander, the later well-respected Hungarian philosopher and university professor, studied between the Fall Semester 1869–1870 and 1870–1871 in Vienna and visited lectures on philosophy and medical sciences. In his later studies and academic carrier Alexander focused on the Neo-Kantianism and participated in the translations of Kant’s *Critique of Pure Reason*. The early entries of his diary show a perspective in his intellectual progression, in the time when Alexander was not deepened in Neo-Kantianism. Besides the new contribution to the intellectual history, the diary contains an obvious literary and philosophical demand. However, the autobiographical documents of Alexander’s peregrination and his early letters to his philosophy professor, Cyrill Horváth, had been published, his diary remained unpublished. The Viennese entries of this yet unpublished diary have been transliterated, and thanks to the editorial work of Barnabás Szekér, Péter András Varga and Bettina Szabados, it was published in December 2018. This presentation aims to give a short summary of this diary and the Viennese entries.

Pál Tamás

Research Professor, Institute of Sociology, Centre for Social Sciences, HAS, Budapest

**Cosmopolitan Radicalism, Critical Practices and Meritocracy in the Post-Communist Intelligentsia of Central Europe**

What we try to identify here, as a special role set the ability to mix self-deprecating personal stories with incisive analysis of high culture, providing the audience, or the movement with historical, philosophical and observational knowledge structured in narrative form. That package is more than a scholar and a storyteller’s cultural forms covered with the trade of journalism.

 In these situations we are interested in creation of trends and spatial questions, why Budapest-based cultural papers, like *ÉS* and *Magyar Narancs* were unable to create in the 1990–2010 their physical spaces serving as concentration of cultural styles, and generations? And on the other side *TRAFO* for longer periods and *Petőfi Museum* and *FUGA* were able in partial forms to pub places together, or no? Is it easier to be together in cultural wars without “the” common cultural enemy, or with it? Is internet-based cultural war can with generational mixtures help to stabilize integrated visions on contemporary issues, or just vice versa? Is cosmopolitanism due its ideological characteristics can be mobilized in more radical forms, then Central European national radicalisms in big cities?

***Summaries***

Dániel Golden

Research Fellow, Institute of Philosophy, Research Centre for the Humanities, HAS, Budapest

**From science through science policy to the philosophy of science – the edifying career of Imre Lakatos**

The protagonist of this talk will be Imre Lakatos (1922–1974), a splendid young student of physics at the University of Debrecen who suddenly found himself in the middle of turbulent transformations of academic and intellectual life in Hungary taking place from the 1940s to the 1950s. Lakatos’ life story can be seen as a perfect example of an intellectual’s carrier during this period – starting from the naivety of the Karácsony Circle, ascending to the ill-famed elite of the communist regime, falling soon to a labour camp, then released to find shelter at the Institute of Mathematics as a librarian, going public once more in a precursory gathering before the 1956 revolution, only to finally leave the country forever and gain world fame as a philosopher of science at the London School of Economics.

 A considerable amount of the literature assumes that Lakatos’ famous theory about the methodology of scientific research programs owes a lot to his historical experiences collected in his early years from the special ethos of Central Europe. I will argue that the roles fulfilled by him may help indeed to understand some of his key ideas, however, the unique contribution attributed to him stems from his special ability of melting several different traditions of western thought into a hybrid system of philosophy and science.
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Gábor Kovács

Senior Research Fellow, Institute of Philosophy, Research Centre for the Humanities, HAS, Budapest

**The Society of the Direct Producers, the Radical Needs and the Intellectuals – Two Famous Books from the Late Sixties**

*The Intellectuals on the road to class power written by* György Konrád and Iván Szelényi and the and the book of György Bence, János Kis and György Márkus entitled *How is Critical Economics possible*? (known and mentioned widely as *Überhaupt-book*) are both post-1968 works: their approach had been determined by the defeat of Western youth movement and the shocking experience by the invasion of Czechoslovakia by the armies of the Warsaw Pact in August of 1968. The Konrád-Szelényi book gives a critical review on the main ideas of the disciples of György Lukács. The basic tone of it is an explicit respect: the Budapest school appears as a centre of creative critical Marxism in Eastern Europe. At the same time Konrád and Szelényi supply a polemic summary of the ideas of the Budapest School; they give an excellent sketch of this Hungarian intellectual subculture of the late sixties and early seventies. Their strive for the revitalization of the Marxian critical thought labelled as a renaissance of Marxism, in the interpretation of Konrád and Szelényi, is a conception centred upon the catchword of transcendental anthropology. Konrád and Szelényi criticize the notion of radical needs; this category, according to them, converts political radicalism into socio-psychological radicalism. At the same time they are meeting-points between the perspectives of two books; the paper’s intention is the reconstruction of them.
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Béla Mester

Senior Research Fellow, Institute of Philosophy, Research Centre for the Humanities, HAS, Budapest

**Pessimist Hungarian Utopias in the Interwar Period**

The genre of utopia has never had very serious role in the Hungarian culture. There is an important exception, a series of the *pessimist utopias* inspired by the experiences of the social transformations during the WWI, such as the emergence of a militarised mass society, the rule of ideologies and propaganda, and the re-barbarisation of the society. This series has revitalised in the last years of peace, in the shadow of the preparation for the WWII. I propose the term ‘pessimist utopia’ instead of ‘dystopia’ because of the tension between the pessimist anthropology and the technophile utopia, what appears often in the analysed novels. In my presentation it will be discussed the novels and short stories written by Frigyes Karinthy during and after the WWI, focussed on his *Voyage to Faremido*, Mihály Babits’ *Aviator Elza* and Sándor Szathmári’s *Kazohinia,* and the part of *Future* from his trilogy *Vainly: Past, Present, Future*. My presentation will be focussed on the last novel, from the point of view of the position of the intelligentsia in the novel’s world. Szathmári in his novel, written in the early thirties, created the technical and social world of a future Communist dictatorship in Hungary in 2082. It is a definite *dictatorship of the proletariat,* because the *nomenclature* is titled *vanguard proletarian,* the empirical working class is called just *machinist*. Between them, the *headworkers* are the key of the maintenance of the ruling ideology, or creation of any alternative system of ideas.

Rafał Smoczyński

Assistant Professor, Institute of Philosophy and Sociology of the Polish Academy of Sciences, Warsaw

**The Feudal Origin of the Contemporary Polish Citizenship Model**

The paper attempts to examine the historical genesis of the current Polish citizenship model. It relies on the work of Jeffrey Alexander and Thomas Humphrey Marshall and their notion of an “ideal citizen”. As it is argued, the ideal Polish citizen is a cultured intelligentsia member of gentry origin. His central symbolic position in Polish cultural and social hierarchies remains not only unchallenged but almost invisible. That current model has been institutionalized in 1918 with the birth of the so-called Second Republic and it was preceded by a long period of confrontation between rising and eventually victorious intelligentsia elites, and landowning and bourgeois elites, both of which were aspiring to elements of the aristocratic distinction.
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