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Editorial

The current sense of crisis seems to be omnipresent these days. As Nancy Fraser vividly illustrated during the Patocka Memorial Lecture 2013, the present crisis has political and economic, as well as eco- logical and social dimensions. Given the growing tendencies of commercialization and bureaucratization, an international conference in Vien- na discussed the question whether scholarly knowledge itself is in a time of crises. The contributions by Aga- ta Lisiak, Wendy Hui Kyong Chun and Stefan Collini in this issue are thus devoted to the challenges tra- ditional media and knowledge in- stitutions are facing today.

Another focal point deals with the crisis of democracy. Whilst Ivan Krastev takes the worldwide protest movements of the past few years as a starting point to think about new forms of political resistance, Jan- Werner Mueller focused his IWM Lectures in Human Sciences, sum- marized by Matthew Specter, on the phenomenon of populism. As the analysis of the parliamentary elections of 2014 by András Bozóki shows, this factor plays a key role in Hungarian politics. Populist strate- gies are also the topic of Carl Hen- rik Fredriksson’s article which ex- plores the difficulties in creating a common European public sphere by referring to the "Turkish Siege of Vienna" in 1683. The essay writ- ten by Ina Merdjanova on the histo- ry of European Islam in the Balkans particularly refutes the prejudice of Islam being incompatible with demo- cratic values.

The rediscovery of an independ- ent, East European model of liber- alism that goes beyond a purely eco- nomic understanding is at the heart of Jaroslav Kuisz’s article. A work- shop on the occasion of the 60th birth- day of Cornelia Klinger discussed the contemporary relevance of the concept of patriarchy. As the contri- butions by Susanne Lettow, Andrea Roedig, Birgit Sauer and Ewa Ma- jewska show, concepts such as pa- triarchy or gender are still essential when it comes to critically reflect- ing on power relations and social in- equalities. The article by Erna Ap- pelt on the Austrian care regime in times of neoliberal modernization is such an example.

In memoriam Szilárd Borbély, who was a Paul Colan Visiting Fel- low in 2013, this issue also includes an obituary by János M. Kovács as well as an excerpt from this book The Dispossessed.
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I n the five short years between Occupy Wall Street and Vlad- imir Putin’s “Occupy Crimea,” we witnessed an explosion of pro- tests all around the world—the Arab Spring, Russian Winter, Turkish Summer, and the dismembering of Ukraine all were part of the protest moment. Each of these demonstra- tions—and many less monumental ones—was angry in its own way, but the protests are also a worldwide phenomenon.

Do they signal a radical change in the way politics will be practiced? Or are they simply a spectacular but ultimately insignificant eruption of public anger? Is it the technology, the economics, the mass psycholo- gy or just the zeitgeist that’s caused this global explosion of revolt? Do the protests prove the technologi- cal activism almost in religious terms, stressing how the experi- ence of acting out on the street has inspired a revolution of the soul and a regime change of the mind. Perhaps for the first time since 1848—the last of the pre-Marxist revolu- tions—the revolt is not against the government but against being gov- erned. It is the spirit of libertarianism that brings together Egypt’s anti-au- thoritarian uprising and Occupy Wall Street’s anti-capitalist insurrection.

For the protesters, it is no lon- ger important who wins elections or who runs the government, not sim- ply because they do not want to be the government, but also because any time people perceive that their interests are endangered, they plan on returning to the streets. The “si- lent man” in Taksim Square, Istan- bul, who stood without moving or speaking for eight hours, is a symbol of the new age of protests: He stands there to make sure that things will not stay as they are. His message to those in power is that he will nev- er go home.

While it is popular for Europe- ans to compare the current global protest wave with the revolutions of 1848, today’s protests are the nega- tion of the political agenda of 1848. Those revolutions fought for uni- versal suffrage and political repre- sentation. They marked the rise of the citizen-voter. The current pro- tests are a revolt against represen- tative democracy. They mark the disillusionment of the citizen-vot-
Lessons of the Protest Wave in Europe

The research project “The Lessons of the Protest Wave in Europe,” in- itiated by the Centre for Liberal Strategies and the IWM and supported by Charles Stewart Mott Foundation, Robert Bosch Stiftung and Open Society Initiative for Europe, organized three seminars in 2014 which explored the experience of the current protest waves in Russia, Turkey, Spain, Ukraine and Bulgaria, and their im- plications for European politics. While the first round table, hos- ted by the Centre de Cultura Contemporània de Barcelona, focused on the various actors and their motives, the seminar in Berlin, header by the Robert Bosch Stiftung, concentrated on the perspectives of the protest’s critics and how the governments’ diverse responses re-shape European politics. The third seminar in Fall 2014 will be held in Sofia and analysis how the protest wave or the participation of NGOs.

Program Barcelona
April 26, 2014
Opening Remarks: Ivan Krastev
Session I: Where Does the Protest Come From?
Session II: Mobilization and Organization
Session III: Outcomes
Session IV: Parties and Protests
Chair: Ivan Krastev
April 27, 2014
Session V: The Protest in the National Political Context: The Analysts’ Perspective
Chair: Ivan Krastev
April 28, 2014
Session VI: Reflections on the Character and Significance of the Protest Wave
Chair: Ivan Krastev
Participants Barcelona
Jordi Vaquer
Chair: Jordi Vaquer

Participants Berlin
Jasmin Auer
Lessons in Human Rights and Social Movements; Spokesperson of the Defence Commission at the Barcelona Bar Association


**“Vienna Has Fallen!”**

**BY CARL HENRIK FREDRIKSSON**

How much in common must a community have? Quite a lot, says Carl Henrik Fredriksson, editor-in-chief of Eurozine. At the very least a common public sphere. Because without it, Europe’s publics will be an easy prey for those who know how to play the strings of history.

“Vienna Has Fallen!” suggests that there might be traces of such a trauma in Istanbul as well. For it is hard to interpret this triumphal proclamation as anything other than an expression of relief at the late gratification, the long due compensation for a historical defeat. Milliyet was setting the record straight.

The reference is the same: 1683, the second siege of Vienna. And it is no doubt a potent reference in both Turkey and Austria. The perspectives, however, are exact opposites. The interpretative matrixes in which the reference gets its meaning are so different from each other that it is almost impossible to think of them as parts of one and the same system, of the same public sphere. And yet, that is exactly what we have to do.

Turkey might be further away from EU membership today than it was ten years ago, but that does key’s biggest daily newspaper Hurriyet wrote: “Two times in history we have had to turn around at the gates of Vienna. Now we go to Europe on the road of peace and cooperation.” In an accompanying analysis, Hiriyet wondered whether Austria’s stubborn resistance should be explained as a classic “small-country syndrome” or simply as just as classic xenophobia—or indeed as a untreatable trauma that lingers on, long after the Turkish sieges of Vienna. In fact, the headline of the first daily Milliyet the same day—“Vienna Has Fallen!”—suggests that the emotive reference to the emotionally charged campaign slogans have been reactivated in the present as vehicles for projecting contemporary fears and political programmes. In 1895, mayor-to-be Karl Lueger launched his election campaign by noting that “today we remember Vienna’s liberation from the Turks, and let’s hope that we’ll be able to ward off a woe that is even greater than the Turkish danger, namely the woe of Jews.” More than a hundred years later, and almost 500 years after the first siege of Vienna, the ground for FPÖ’s 2005 campaign was prepared by Kurt Krenn, Bishop of St. Pölten, who launched the concept of a “third Turkish siege” when he told the Österreichische Rundschau in 2002 that “we’ve already had two Turkish sieges, and now there’s a third. It’s just of a different type.” And this one, he add- ed, is even more “dangerous”, since it comes from within.

These were the “good and evil spirits” that Feridun Zaimoglu brought to life on his projection screen, the flags on the walls of the Kunsthalle. And the resonance was strong, so strong that no spin-doctor would have been able to neglect it. With a campaign revolving around the slogan “Wien darf nicht Istanbul werden”, the FPÖ got 14.8 % of the vote in the 2005 municipal elections in Vienna. This was less than the party had received four years earlier, but considering the volatile situation after the split with Haider, the emotionally charged campaign certainly helped Schärer to avert a much bigger loss.

Viennese Waltz in Luxembourg—and Istanbul

That very same autumn the debate about opening EU membership talks with Turkey reached its peak. Shortly before the decisive EU summit in Luxembourg, due to take place at the beginning of October 2005, 24 member states were for, only one against: Austria. Foreign minister Ursula Plassnik, who insisted that an alternative to full membership negotiations, was under pressure from all sides. In the night of Monday 3 October, after having secured a fast track for Croatia into the EU, Plassnik finally gave up and her Turkish colleague Abdullah Gül could get on a plane to Luxembourg to join the celebrations.

The next day—under the headline “Viyana Valsı”, Viennese Waltz—Türk-
Hungary’s parliamentary elections in April 2014 saw a 61% turnout, the lowest since 1998. The high abstention rate was a sign of disaffection with Hungarian politics: four-tenths of the electorate believed it was left without a genuine political choice.

The electoral laws were passed in 2011 without meaningful public debate, in violation of both Hungarian and international practice. Constituency boundaries were shifted around to make leftwing districts more populous than rightwing districts, causing a leftwing vote to carry less weight. Different rules apply to Hungarian nationals abroad and so-called “Trianon” Hungarians living beyond state borders. Moreover, under the new system extra mandates are added to the list of the winning party, which makes the regulation extremely disproportionate. These rules violate the principle of equal vote. There has also been a failure to properly regulate a number of important areas connected to campaign financing, such as the campaign of Fidesz’s four-year term. Hungary’s EU partners could not continue to greet each outrage with embarrassed silence.

Today, Jobbik is a party with a national presence and the potential to capture the political center.

Fidesz, the rightwing populist party led by Viktor Orbán, received 45% of the vote, giving it a strong mandate to continue to govern. Thanks to the disproportional voting system introduced by Fidesz, the party retained its two-thirds parliamentary majority. However, of a total of 8 million citizens eligible to vote, only 3.1 million cast their ballot for Fidesz; this was 8% (or 600,000 votes) less than in 2010. Orbán’s description of the new electoral system as the manifestation of “national unity” is therefore clearly implausible. However, Orbán’s charismatic leadership and his anti-European, Christian-nationalist rhetoric have managed to forge an alliance between conservative voters and the lower middle class, which expects the state to halt its existential decline. In 2002 and 2006—when the previous election system was still in place—this solid, two-million-strong voter base didn’t suffice for a Fidesz victory. This time, it secured the party a supermajority.

The alliance of leftwing opposition parties came second with 28% of the vote. Led by Attila Mesterházy, the alliance is made up of the Hungarian Socialist Party (MSZP), Together (Együtt), Dialogue for Hungary (FM), the Democratic Coalition (DK) and the Hungarian Liberal Party (MLP). Since the previous elections, the alliance has managed to increase its vote by nearly 300,000, receiving a total of 1.2 million votes. Nevertheless, its performance as the polls is seen as a crushing defeat. In the last four years, the left has been unable to reinvent itself from the ground up. It has failed to communicate a clear identity or program, its leaders, who are engaged in constant rivalry, decided to field a joint list only at the last minute. The primary message of the alliance was a desire to run Viktor Orbán out of office; it had nothing to offer in terms of a genuine and positive vision. The alliance’s description of the new electoral system as the manifestation of “national unity” is therefore clearly implausible. However, Orbán’s charismatic leadership and his anti-European, Christian-nationalist rhetoric have managed to forge an alliance between conservative voters and the lower middle class, which expects the state to halt its existential decline. In 2002 and 2006—when the previous election system was still in place—this solid, two-million-strong voter base didn’t suffice for a Fidesz victory. This time, it secured the party a supermajority.
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Threats to Scholarly Knowledge

To the outside world, the ivory Tower may appear to be standing tall and strong. The higher education sector is growing steadily, as the ever higher numbers of students, new academic degrees, and scholarly institutions indicate. Newspaper headlines and politicians constantly remind us that we live in a knowledge society. Media articles and policy reports enthusiastically announce new records: more information is available than ever before, access to information has never been cheaper and faster, more people than ever hold academic degrees. And yet, there is little enthusiasm to be found in academia itself. Scholarly knowledge is perceived to be endangered, the threat coming from, among other things, commodification, digitization, information overload, and the bureaucratisation of higher education institutions. Seen from the inside, the ivory Tower seems to be crumbling.

A different type of tower served as the venue for the conference “Threats to Scholarly Knowledge”. In the sky-lounge of a steel-and-glass building owned by the University of Vienna, two dozen representatives of universities, research centers, and publishers convened to discuss the state of scholarly knowledge today. Will aware of their many privileges as tenured academics in afflu-ent Western countries, the participants acknowledged how rare their species has become as “adjunctification” and austerity policies drastically change the face of academia. Over two days, academics, publishers, and journalists addressed four major themes: the democratisation of knowledge, the new economy of knowledge, and policy reports enthusiastically manage the destruction of scholarly knowledge.

Gatekeepers: Old and New

Our expectations regarding information are often contradictory. We celebrate access and participation but want someone or something to guide us through the mass of information we encounter. We want gatekeepers, but don’t want to be restricted by them. Historically, gatekeepers of information have been criticized both for lacking objectivity and subjectivity. In contrast, the contemporary gatekeepers—the algorithms—appear to offer a new neutrality. Or so we are inclined to assume, since very few of us understand how they actually work. But can there be such a thing as a neutral algorithm? Over the course of the conference, it became very clear that the technology we use operates according to rules that are complex and far from transparent, of which most of us have only the shallowest understanding.

Today, information is no longer selected on the basis of authority but of affinity. Search engines give us suggestions generated from records of our existing preferences. They are designed not to expand our horizons, but to give us what we already like. Despite the hitherto unimaginable volume of easily accessible information, the mechanisms with which to obtain it appear to operate in schematic, more or less predetermined ways. The role of the old academic gatekeepers (universities, professors, publishers) has changed dramatically: today it is no longer about deciding who obtains how much knowledge, but about providing context for information that is obtainable through search engines.

Information and Knowledge

Some conference participants consider it their responsibility to teach students that information and knowledge need to be combined with understanding, and that understanding is a process. Others point out that young people know very little how to deal with the surge of information: they do not believe everything they read and see, and are much more likely to be skeptical about content on the internet than their parents, grandparents—and teachers. In the public debate at the Burgtheater that concluded the conference, Lawrence Lessig compared today’s young internet users to Soviet citizens: they do not trust everything they read in state newspapers, but compare various sources of information and try to make sense of the world through triangulation. Still, navigating through immense volumes of information does require a challenge. The democratisation of access to information is a topic of current debate.

In cooperation with University Press for Social Sciences Research (CSSR) and EADS Publications.

Conference
Threats to Scholarly Knowledge
April 4–5, 2014, Vienna

Program

April 4, 2014
Welcome and Introduction: Cornelia Kliger Anita Tränzer

Session I: The Democratization of Knowledge
Introduction: Lisa Anderson Dominique Cordei Michael Fleischacker Daniel Innerarity Anétra Komai

April 5, 2014
Session II: The New Economy of Knowledge
Introduction: Nicholas Lemann Ziyyad Marar Sara MillerMcCone

Session III: Knowledge Technologies
Introduction: Antonio A. Casilli Wendy Chun Henry Farrell Katherine Fitzpatrick Klaus Mainzer

Session IV: Knowledge Institutions Under Pressure
Introduction: Stefan Collini Margaret Lari Wolfgang Rohr Alexander Van der Bellen

Wrap-up Session
Cornelia Kliger Anita Tränzer Conference Chairs: Ina Kaltenbrunner Kenneth Prewitt

Participants
Lisa Anderson President, The American University, Cairo
Antonio A. Casilli Associate Professor in Digital Humanities, Telecom ParisTech; Researcher in Sociology, Edgar Morin Centre, École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales, Paris
Dominique Cordei Researcher in Sociology, Laboratoire des Usages, France Telecom R&D; Affiliated Member, Centre for the Study of Social Movements (CEMSI), École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales, Paris
Wendy Hui Kyong Chun Professor and Chair of Modern Culture and Media, Brown University; Visiting Professor, Leuphana University, Lüneburg
Stefan Collini Professor of English Literature and Intellectual History, University of Cambridge
Henry Farrell Associate Professor of Political Science and International Affairs, George Washington University
Kathleen Fitzpatrick Director of Scholarly Communication, Modern Language Association; Visiting Research Professor of English, New York University
Michael Fleischacker Journalist and author; former editor-in-chief, Die Presse, Vienna
Daniel Innerarity Professor of Political and Social Philosophy, University of the Basque Country, Spain
Ina Kaltenbrunner Riegler Professor of Political Science and History, Columbia University; President, Social Science Research Council; Deputy Chair, NIM Academic Advisory Board
Cornelia Kliger HM Acting Rector, Professor of Philosophy, University of Tübingen
Andrea Komai Adjunct Professor, Budapest Institute of Technology, Senior Scientific Advisor, Computer and Automation Research Institute, Hungarian Academy of Sciences

Conference Report by Agata Lisiak

Participants
Lisa Anderson
Professor of Journalism and Emeritus, Graduate School of Journalism, Columbia University
Lawrence Lessig
Roy L. Furman Professor of Law and Leadership, Harvard Law School; Director, Edmond J. Safra Center for Ethics, Harvard University
Margaret Lari
Director, Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, Stanford University; Jane L. Bacharach Professor of International Studies, University of Washington
Klaus Mainzer
Professor and Chair of Philosophy and Theory of Science, Technische Universität München; Director, Munich Center for Technology in Society
Ziyad Marar
Deputy Managing Director and Executive Vice President Global Publishing, SAGE Publications
Sara MillerMcCone
Founder and Executive Chairman, SAGE; President, McCrone Foundation; Verona/CA
Amir Naseri
Professor and Chair of Sociology, Ludwig Maximilian-Universität, Munich
Kenneth Prewitt
Camargo Professor of Public Affairs and Vice President for Global Centers, Columbia University
Wolfgang Rohr
Member of the Executive Team and Director, Centre for Science and Humanities, Stiftung Mercator, Essen
Blaine R. Simp
President and CEO, SAGE Publications
Anita Tränzer
Einstein Junior Fellow, Freie Universität Berlin; IBM Visiting Fellow
Alexander Van der Bellen
Professor of Economics, University of Vienna; CoChair, Commission for Universities and Research, The City of Vienna
In recent years, in connection with budgetary policies, “public in- terest” has repeatedly been invoked to justify the de-funding or even obliteration of certain branches of science and the university depart- ments devoted to them. Public de- bate on science and learning has been dominated by a new vocabulary of access only limited access to journals and re- search. In neoliberal山坡, in- stitutions of knowledge are com- pared to businesses. This explicit association between knowledge and eco- nomic danger is because it imperils those subject areas that do not pro- duce direct economic value. How- ever, as Anita Traninger remarked, it is naïve to suppose we can decide today what knowledge will be use- ful in ten or twenty years, the draw ature is that we are won- dering about the future of knowledge—knowledge that is immediately useful and knowledge “to be used” in the future—and we then need to ask questions that will decide what needs to be communi- cated to the world be- yond academia, especially to fund- ing institutions. If scholarship is knowledge to be useful, it has to be presented in an accessible way; that is, a language that people who are not experts in that field can understand. Many scholars who see themselves as having a pub- lic role, have taken to writing blogs in order to reach wider audiences. It is important to remember, however, that many academic bloggers—such as those publishing on The Mon- key Cage—can afford to write their posts because they are tenured fac- ulty members and can devote their time to intellectual inquiry of their own volition. The Monkey Cage, as contrib- utor Henry Farrell admitted, is contribu- tory only because it exists within a specific academic and economic system. The adjunctification of ac- ademia means that many scholars have little chance of sustaining them- selves through writing, they juggle various teaching jobs with publish- ing in journals, leaving them little time, and even less energy, to write on the side for no pay.

For young scholars in particu- lar, publishing in journals is part of a strategy to obtain tenure-track posi- tions in an increasingly competi- tive environment. Due to decreas- ing budgets, university libraries have only limited access to journals and kind words? Surrendering the question mark in the title of the performance, “The Burgtheater, Vienna” and often to risk their lives before and often to risk their lives before and often to risk their lives before and often to risk their lives before and often to risk their lives before and often to risk their lives before and often to risk their lives before and often to risk their lives before and often to risk their lives before and often to risk their lives before.
Knowledge Technologies: Threat = Promise?

Comment by Wendy Hui Kyong Chun

What does it mean to combine knowledge and technology in one phrase? To make knowledge describe technology, so that knowledge—a noun—becomes an adjectival? Most importantly, what does it mean to make knowledge describe a technology that few—if any of us—really know?

As I argued in Programmed Vision: Software and Memory, it is very strange that computers—understood as software-hardware machines—have become a metaphor for the mind, for culture, for ideology, and for the economy. Cognitive science, as Paul Edwards has shown, initially comprised the brain-mind distinction in terms of hardware and software. Molecular biology conceives of DNA as a series of “generic” programs. More broadly, some have described culture as “software,” in contrast to the “hardware” of nature. Although technologies such as clocks and steam engines have historically been used as metaphors to conceptualize our bodies and culture, software is unique in being a metaphor for metaphor itself. Back in 1976, Joseph Weizenbaum argued that computers have become the “rogue imitator-machine, it encapsulates what can and cannot be seen, what can be known and not known—separates interface from algorithm, from software: hardware.” If metaphors for a metaphor are veritably new or entirely evil. Many of the changes that have taken place in universities and their position in society in the past few decades have been expressions of a broader process of democratization and expansion which I believe should be liberally understood, and therefore should not characterise all recent changes as loss or see the contemporary university as in sad decline from some presumed golden age. Nonetheless, there are some pressures which have taken particularly powerful forms in the present.

One of the deep characteristics of individualist market democracies is that the combination of a reductionist economy in public policy and the consequent economism in public debate in effect clouds a kind of practical relativism. Only those goals which follow from the inner logic of the mechanisms are taken seriously. It is the case which these, ultimately, universities depend on and try to foster. It is important to keep trying to engage such values in addressing publics which go beyond policy and media circles. And finally, let me suggest three more specific tactics which may be particularly relevant to debate within universities. The first is to not allow the running of these institutions to be entirely handed over to the care of professional managers which has grown so powerful in the last couple of decades in particular. This means that senior academics have to be willing to take their turn at these administrative tasks and to embody the university’s mission. The second is to try to make clear, in the face of much contumacious disputation, that scholarly disciplines are the indispensable foundations of any broader or so-called ‘inter-disciplinary’ enterprises, and that, institutionally speaking, academic departments are the only units best placed to make sure these disciplines prosper from generation to generation. Disciplines are, of course, contraction and time bound creations, not timeless essences, but they have taken their current forms for good intellectual as well as historical reasons. Thematic clusters and problem-focused programmes have their place, but they and large have the effect of empowering managers and the managers’ control of funding at the expense of the long-term support of disciplines and appointments sustained in the little republics that are university departments.

Third, we need to constantly make the case for scholarship and the scholarly career alongside research. The latter is often considered on a scientific model as being confined to the discovery of ‘new findings’; it is inherently project-focused and not in any way related to the accumulated intellectual capital that is a scholar- ly career. We need to emphasize the distortion effect which a regime of constant competition for funding can have by comparison to the long-term benefits in terms of fruitful reading and thinking which the system of tenure and sabbatical leave encourages. A career is something built by a person, a scholar, it is not simply a sequence of funded projects, and a profession is not in good health where the main index of individual success comes to consist of the amount of time a scholar is away from their home institution. I’m well aware that all of these are ambitious and even ideological prescriptions. But if people like us don’t try to make this case, then we shall bear some of the responsibility for diminishing the value of the academic institutions from which we have benefited and which we have a duty to hand on to future generations. 

Comment by Stefan Collini

A ny attempt to understand the main ways in which the institution of the university may be said to be ‘under pressure’ throughout the developed world necessarily entails reflection on the long history of relations between universities and their host societies. We should not allow ourselves to be panicked into assuming that the pressures perceived to be threatening the institutions are entirely new or entirely evil. Many of the changes that have taken place in universities and their position in society in the past few decades have been expressions of a broader process of democratization and expansion which I believe should be liberally understood, and therefore should not characterise all recent changes as loss or see the contemporary university as in sad decline from some presumed golden age. Nonetheless, there are some pressures which have taken particularly powerful forms in the present.

One of the deep characteristics of individualist market democracies is that the combination of a reductionist economy in public policy and the consequent economism in public debate in effect clouds a kind of practical relativism. Only those goals which follow from the inner logic of the mechanisms are taken seriously. It is the case which these, ultimately, universities depend on and try to foster. It is important to keep trying to engage such values in addressing publics which go beyond policy and media circles.

And finally, let me suggest three more specific tactics which may be particularly relevant to debate within universities. The first is to not allow the running of these institutions to be entirely handed over to the care of professional managers which has grown so powerful in the last couple of decades in particular. This means that senior academics have to be willing to take their turn at these administrative tasks and to embody the university’s mission. The second is to try to make clear, in the face of much contumacious disputation, that scholarly disciplines are the indispensable foundations of any broader or so-called ‘inter-disciplinary’ enterprises, and that, institutionally speaking, academic departments are the only units best placed to make sure these disciplines prosper from generation to generation. Disciplines are, of course, contraction and time bound creations, not timeless essences, but they have taken their current forms for good intellectual as well as historical reasons. Thematic clusters and problem-focused programmes have their place, but they and large have the effect of empowering managers and the managers’ control of funding at the expense of the long-term support of disciplines and appointments sustained in the little republics that are university departments.

Third, we need to constantly make the case for scholarship and the scholarly career alongside research. The latter is often considered on a scientific model as being confined to the discovery of ‘new findings’; it is inherently project-focused and not in any way related to the accumulated intellectual capital that is a scholar- ly career. We need to emphasize the distortion effect which a regime of constant competition for funding can have by comparison to the long-term benefits in terms of fruitful reading and thinking which the system of tenure and sabbatical leave encourages. A career is something built by a person, a scholar, it is not simply a sequence of funded projects, and a profession is not in good health where the main index of individual success comes to consist of the amount of time a scholar is away from their home institution. I’m well aware that all of these are ambitious and even ideological prescriptions. But if people like us don’t try to make this case, then we shall bear some of the responsibility for diminishing the value of the academic institutions from which we have benefited and which we have a duty to hand on to future generations.

**Knowledge Institutions under Pressure**

By Stefan Collini

The clarity offered by software as metaphor should make us pause, however. Not only does software empower, it also engenders a sense of profound ignorance. Who really knows what lurks behind our smiling interfaces, behind the objects we cleverly call “smart” or “intelligent”? Who really understands what their computing interfaces, behind the objects we are shown; the more we are shown, the more we understand what their computing interfaces, behind the objects we see? And who understands what their computing interfaces, behind the objects we see and understand, the more we are shown? As I argued in Programmed Vision: Software and Memory, it is very strange that computers—understood as software-hardware machines—have become a metaphor for the mind, for culture, for ideology, and for the economy. Cognitive science, as Paul Edwards has shown, initially comprised the brain-mind distinction in terms of hardware and software. Molecular biology conceives of DNA as a series of “generic” programs. More broadly, some have described culture as “software,” in contrast to the “hardware” of nature. Although technologies such as clocks and steam engines have historically been used as metaphors to conceptualize our bodies and culture, software is unique in being a metaphor for metaphor itself. Back in 1976, Joseph Weizenbaum argued that computers have become the “rogue imitator-machine, it encapsulates the visible effects, from genetics to the invisible hand of the market; from ide- ology to culture. In particular, I want to argue that dealing directly with the limits of the present and possibilities of technology opens up ways of engaging with scholarly knowledge and teaching, for teach- ing has never been about relaxing content. If scholars feel forced to compete with Google and Wikipedia, they are doing something profoundly wrong. As Herbert Schneid- er articulated it well when he stated that what is being threatened is not scholarly knowledge but our current business models of scholarly knowledge. It is the unknowable that provides the impetus for both knowledge and technology. Scholarship has always been about using what we do know—and methods of know- ing—to reach towards what we cannot know. The things that require hypotheses. In the nat- ural and physical sciences, a lot of the early courses are indeed focused on memorization and procedure. But the later courses help stu- dents create the big picture: to weigh evidence and create a model of the world based on separate and often conflicting facts. In other words, stu- dents are taught to make sure inferences from complex situations, in order to deal with what Daniel La- ngerity describes as knowledge that is fully accessible but not derivable from personal experience. As a global climate change shows, there is real uncertainty about the future. While all models agree that global climate change is happen- ing, they predict different outcomes. This dissent, which is part of schol- arly knowledge, is not easily commu- nicated beyond scholarship. However, as the consequences of a mis- taken climate change reveals, scholars’ failure to explain scientific dissent to the public puts them in peril. Many recent and smart countries have been attacked for “hiding” ev- idence; many are afraid to publicly disagree with a prediction because any disagreement is trumpeted as proof that there is no consensus on climate change—as if consensus is what matters. In order to displace this re- ducing understanding of “knowledge technolo- gies” and to rescue it from the twin threats of obsolescence and the ever more closely. We need to en- gage with its contradictions and use it to correct experiments without giving up the goal of creat- ing democratic forms of knowledge and teaching. Teaching, that is not about showing, aiming at many listeners, but about creating a com- munity of teachers and students. 


**Wendy Hui Kyong Chun** is Professor of Intellectual History and English Literature at the University of Cambridge.
We the People: On Populism and Democracy

A man holding a puppet representing the populist leader of the Italian five stars party Beppe Grillo during a carnival celebration parade in Borgosesia, Italy.

Jan-Werner Mueller, Professor of Politics at Princeton University, delivered the IWM’s 2013 Lectures in Human Sciences on the subject of populism. As ordinary people in Ukraine struggled for democracy on a European model, Mueller identified the recent strength of populist challenges across Europe as one example of a global movement.

Mueller emphasized that he was not interested in identifying something like what scholars called “the fascist minimum,” or a determinist model of how populists attain power or govern. Rather, he focused on certain patterns which seem distinctive to populism and which form the basis of a hypothesis about processes. First, populist actors tend to emerge when party hegemonies are breaking down. Berlusconi’s emergence in Italy in the early 1990s is a good example. Second, populists reward their supporters by handing out state offices. While mass clientelism is not unique to populists, the logic of populism, i.e., the distinction between the authentic and the inauthentic person, generates a “moral surplus” that enables populists to politicize the state apparatus with a “clean conscience.” Thus Mueller noted that technocracy and populism are intertwined, but not only as cause and effect, the two have become “mirror images of the other,” borrowing from the other’s political repertoire. As he summarized, both oppose party squabbling, both envision a passive populace, both imagine singular solutions, and both are apolitical: altogether businesslike.

In this provocative lecture series, Mueller combined high theory with empirical political judgments about contemporary political parties. His conclusion: populists’ conceptions of representation are deeply undemocratic and dangerous, but liberal democrats need to listen to what today’s populists are saying, because they point to real failings in the system, including its distortion by technocratic governance.

IWM Lectures in Human Sciences

The IWM launched this series of public lectures in 2000. Selected lectures are published in English (Harvard University Press, German (Suhrkamp Verlag) and Polish (Routledge Publishers).
A Feminist Critique of Capitalism and Crisis: Theory of Solidarity?

T he current sense of crisis—economic, ecological, political, social—has prompted many critical theorists to revisit the peacetime period. Ewa Majewska was invited by the IWM to read her paper. Her lecture, held at the Institute of World Affairs (IWM) on November 7, 2013, Nancy Fraser proposed a rethinking of the political agenda of capitalism. Entitled Crisis, Critique, Capitalism: A Framework for the 21st Century, Fraser’s socialist feminist analysis reconsidered the critical and political potential of non-commodified areas of life, such as intimate relations, nature and care. Referring to Jan Patocka’s idea of the “solidarity of the shaken”, she explored the potential for common ground between people “shaken” by political and economic upheaval, including those as different as a phenomenologist and a Marxist feminist. Below, the ideas developed in Fraser’s lecture are placed in the wider context of her theoretical work.

Capitalism and Crisis

The Polish philosopher Leszek Kolakowski opened his magnum opus on Marxism, published in the late 1970s, with an oft-quoted sentence: “Marx was a German philosopher”. It was a multiply layered declaration of sentiments shaped by the Polish context, in which Marx had been subjected to serious misunderstandings, both by his official supporters, the apparatchiks of the communist state, and by his enemies, for whom Marx was merely a bad economist used by his followers to legitimize the wrongs of the Soviet system. Kolakowski’s contribution was to allow philosophical analysis of an author perceived among certain generations of eastern European authors and politicians, regardless of their position towards communism in general and state socialism in particular, as an economist or political polemicist. Regardless of how we read Marx today, the ability to see philosophical content in the thought of those who represent definitive political positions, who engage in debates on capitalism and crisis, and who offer alternatives, even if utopian, remains inspiring, after all the declared “ends” of politics, philosophy and culture.

What is Critical Theory Today?

In this sense, the American Nancy Fraser could also be called a “German philosopher”. Her lecture accentuated some of the crucial and well-known elements of German philosophy. Broadly emphasizing the fundamental character of critique, utopia and social justice, the distinction between marketized and non-marketized aspects of human existence and the appeal to capital’s beyond were more concrete elements connecting the topic of the lecture with a long line of German thought. Fraser’s analysis of the dialectic between productive labor fully colonized by neoliberal markets, on the one hand, and affective labor and subject formation by means of households, public institutions and the private sector, on the other, invokes the analysis of Sittlichkeit in both Kant and Hegel. The presumption that the current state of affairs can be overcome is a clear reference of the idea of freedom, which has preoccupied German philosophy for over two hundred years.

The Resistance of Non-Commodified Spheres of Life

In her Vienna lecture, Fraser emphasized that a good theory of the crisis of capitalism should combine a critical, Marxist analysis with feminist insights concerning reproduction, ecology and political power. Like the proletariat in Marx’s theory, the non-commodified zones of affective labor “do not merely mirror the commodified zones, but rather embody grammars of their own.” For Fraser, capitalism is more than the economy and should be seen as an institutional order. This post-Wittgensteinian perspective allows an analysis of the role of the law within capitalism, so often overlooked in the Marxist tradition and so carefully analyzed by Jurgen Habermas and scholars associated with critical legal studies. Laws protecting property and the stability of contracts preserve individual liberties but are used to limit social struggle and exploit workers, thus sharpening social divides and enabling the accumulation of capital. Fraser emphasized the necessity of a critical approach to law, which recognizes as an aspect of recognition while relativizing its significance.

Towards a Feminist Critical Theory of Resistance

At the same time, I would like to suggest that Nancy Fraser is pre-eminently a feminist scholar. Her emphasis on gender and its constitutive role in the division between capitalist production and its enabling conditions—the non-commodified sectors of reproduction, both in the human realm and in the realm of nature or the non-human—clearly mark her position as feminist. However, and this should be stressed, Fraser’s analysis of reproductive labor not only draws attention to its downsides, but also and predominantly to its potential as a zone of resistance and change. Here she differs from feminist scholars who speak either of the complete commodification of women (Lucy Fradrgy) or of affective labor (Julie Hochschild). Moreover, while Black feminists and socialist feminists have recognized the potentiality of reproductive labor, they emphasize the necessity of overcoming the division between productive and reproductive, treating both aspects as elements of a single moment of exploitation, and thus as targets of a single struggle. In the double-system theory developed by Fraser in her debates with Axel Honneth over recognition and redistribution, she considered two systems of oppression—gender and capitalism, and hence she proposes a “two-strand” critique that embraces further factors of oppression.

Another possible disagreement between Fraser and other feminists, including poststructuralist and post-colonial thinkers, is the issue of the universalized, unpolitical, monolithic feminism “we” applied throughout the Vienna lecture and in her texts published in The Guardian and other publications last year. The feminist debate over the subject of oppression is long and complicated, and I refer only to the observation of the Marxist feminist Gayatri Spivak, who argued in “Can the Subaltern Speak?” that the poststructuralist premise of dismantling the (European) subject often leads to its reinstatement as general subject. According to Spivak, certain feminist critiques and supposedly anti-authoritarian theories reiterate Euro-centric presumptions while claiming to deconstruct them. This argument, an expression of doubt concerning the position of the critical subject, was promptly addressed by Fraser in the opening section of her lecture.

Toward the “Solidarity of the Shaken”

How did Fraser’s lecture, a clear tribute to the German philosophical tradition, connect with Jan Patocka, the Czech philosopher and prominent member of the anti-totalitarian opposition of the 1960s and 1970s? Fraser addressed this question at the start of her lecture, giving a truly inspiring demonstration of her ability to connect with a representative of a different philosophical tradition, namely phenomenology, and with a different political tradition, liberalism. She also—and for many of her listeners this proved the most valuable part of her lecture—read Patocka’s work in a way that Fritz Nietzsche once called “modern,” displaying not archivist piety and heroic praise but interest in the contemporaneity of the subject. In this way, Patocka’s reference to the “solidarity of the shaken” became a response to contemporary crisis, in which global upheavals erode stability, forcing alienated individuals to search for community—one that cannot be built on sameness, but must proceed in a reflexive, mediated fashion.

For Fraser, the idea of the “solidarity of the shaken” was a way of thinking “as the Shaken” in order to understand the “transformations of the global order. Dethatched contemplation of imminent catastrophe combined with uncritical preservation of one’s privilege is one possible reaction to the fact that, as Fraser put it, “capitalism’s orientation to endless accumulation threatens to erode its own conditions of possibility.” This reaction, so popular in recent European theory, can be countered with another, more responsible one: to work on a theoretical and practical realization of the “solidarity of the shaken.” This encompasses both critical analysis of capitalism and its thought, which, as Theodore Adorno often emphasized, allows thinking as such.

Jan Patocka Memorial Lectures

Nancy Fraser is Henry A. and Louise Loeb Professor of Philosophy and Politics at the New School for Social Research in New York, where she is also chair of the Department of Philosophy and Politics. Over the last twenty years, she has published numerous books on the topics of justice, democracy, oppression and feminism.

Ewa Majewska is a feminist philosopher and a gender studies student at the University of Warsaw. She is the author of several texts and articles on feminist social and cultural theory. In 2013-14 she was a Bronisław Geremek Visiting Fellow at the IWM.
Events in Retrospect

October

October 2
Protest Politics in Post-Communist South-Eastern Europe
Marina Ivan Tatar
Assistant Professor of Political Science, University of Chicago

October 9
Yuletantis and Literary Fiction
Aleš Debeljak
Professor of Cultural Studies, University of Ljubljana

October 15
Überdenken und Eingedenken. Zu Jacques Derrida’s Religionsbegriff
Jean Greisch
Philosoph und Theologe, Paris

October 23
Aiming at a Moving Target, yet Again? Exploring the Bulgarian Protests
Marina Ivancheva
PhD in Sociology and Social Anthropology, Central European University, Budapest

October 24
Europe. What Comes Next?
Giuliano Amato
Judge, Constitutional Court in Italy; former Prime Minister of Italy

October 30
Normalizing Narratives: Collective Memories of the Bombing in Serbia
Kristina Racic
PhD candidate in Slavonic Studies, University of Ljubljana

October 28
Kenedi Goes Back Home
Introduction: Kristina Racic
PhD candidate in Slavonic Studies, University of Ljubljana

November

November 4
Women’s Embodied Narratives of the Holocaust
Louise Yerex
Professor em. of Comparative Literature and Linguistics, Stony Brook University, New York

November 6
The Living Subject: Towards an Interdisciplinary Social Scientific Method
Natalie Smelkowski
PhD candidate in Anthropology and History, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor

November 12
Locating Migrants: Locality, a Blind Spot in Migration Scholarship
Ayşe Çağlar
Professor of Social and Cultural Anthropology, University of Vienna

November 13
Between Shipyard Ruins and Post-Solidarity Nostalgia: Some Notes on Political Agency
Ewa Majewska
Lecturer in Gender Studies, University of Warsaw

November 14
Religionsgeschichte als Religionskritik?
David Hume und die Folgen
Hans-Joachim Pohlemann
Fellow, Freiburg Institute for Advanced Studies (FRIAS)

November 15
Locality, a Blind Spot in Migration Scholarship

November 17
Politics of Care-Regimes
Beispiel des österreichischen Neoliberale Modernisierung am Beispiel des österreichischen Care-Regimes
Professorin für Politikwissenschaft, Universität für Wirtschaftsnatur (see pg. 15)

November 20
Neoliberal Modernization as an Example of Austrian Care-Regimes
Erno Appelt
Professor for Politikwissenschaft, Universität für Wirtschaftsnatur (see pg. 15)

November 27–29
The People: On Populism and Democracy
IWM Lectures in Human Sciences
Jan-Werner Müller
Professor of Politics, Princeton University

November 29
Nationalist Tendencies in Contemporary Art in Eastern Europe
Andras Pihlás
Journaltipbo, Index.hu, Budapest

November

December

December 2
Unfinished Utopia: Excavations and Reflections of a Socialist City
Katharina Lubow
Research Fellow, Vienna Wissenschaft Institute

December 4
Schmitz, Grewe and the Third Reich: The Legacy of Nazi Lawyers for Contemporary Debate
Matthew Specter
Associate Professor of History, Central Connecticut State University

December 5
Every Nation Needs a Velvet Underground, Tschechische Subkultur der 70er Jahre
Havind Fekářová
Wissenschaftliche Mitarbeiterin, Geisteswissenschaftliches Zentrum Geschichte und Kultur Osteuropas, Universität Leipzig

December 10
Why Does Karl Marx Matter?
Timothy Snyder
IBPM Permanent Fellow; Professor of History, Yale University

December 11
Reflections on the Role of Ideas and Agency in Europe
Junior Fellows’ Conference

Monthly Lectures

Once a month, public lectures take place in the IWM library on subjects related to the main research fields of the Institute.

Colloquia on Secularism & Beyond Myth and Enlightenment
These lecture series, supported by the FWF and jointly organized with the University of Vienna (Institute for Philosophy and Institute for Political Sciences), discuss the fate of religion in a secular age.

Political Salons
The Political Salons, jointly organized with der Prose and the Austrian Federal Ministry of Finance, are a discussion forum on current political and social questions.

Debates at the Burgtheater
Debating Europe, organized in cooperation with the Vienna Burgtheater, ERSTE Foundation and Der Standard, is a matinée series of public debates.

Conferences and Workshops
The IWM frequently organizes international conferences, workshops and debates related to the Institute’s research interests.
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<td>Algemeine zum Nationalist, Sprecher für Frauen, Solidar und Entwicklungspolitik In Kooperation mit der Grünen Aktionseinschließlich Wien</td>
<td>Gregory Winger</td>
<td>Workshop in cooperation with the University of Vienna</td>
<td>Marci Shore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Gull Lentsdorff</td>
<td>January 15</td>
<td>January 19</td>
<td>Professor of History, Yale University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDP-Vorsitzender im Europäischen Parlament</td>
<td>January 16–17</td>
<td>Wie wirkt 1914 nach? (see p. 5)</td>
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Kritik des Patriarchats

von Susanne Lettow, Andrea Roedig und Birgit Sauer


Ist der Begriff des Patriarchats dafür geeignet? Kann das Konzept „gerettet“ werden und lösen sich eine feministische Theorierung? In welchem Verhältnis stehen Ge- sellschaftsanalyse und die Analyse von ‚Patriarchatsbegriffen‘ und beleuchten auszuwählen, Science Fiction, Universal Ingrid Birkhan
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Professorin für Wirtschaftsphilosophie, Christian-Albrechts-Universität zu Kiel

Waltraud Ernst

Universitätsbibliothek, Universität zu Kiel

Friederike Hassauer

Professorin für Kunstwissenschaft, Universität Wien

Ute Heldsäuer

Akademische Rätin, Universität Tübingen

Dagmar Fink

Professorin für Philosophie, Universität Paderborn

Katharina Pühl

Professorin für Kunstwissenschaft, Universität Wien

Suzanne Lettow

Professorin für Philosophie, Universität Paderborn

Isabella Lorey

Professorin für Philosophie, Universität Bremen

Margit Leuthold

Professorin für Politikwissenschaft, Universität Basel

Karina Reikmann

Professorin für Politikwissenschaft, Universität Bonn

Margrit Leuthold

Professorin für Philosophie, Universität Wien

Cornelia Klügler

Professorin für Kunstwissenschaft, Universität Tübingen

Andrea Roedig

Professorin für Politikwissenschaft, Universität Paderborn

Waltraud Ernst

Professorin für Politikwissenschaft, Universität Bonn

Irene Nierhaus

Professorin für Kunstwissenschaft, Universität Bremen

Christine Blüttler

Professorin für Politikwissenschaft, Universität Paderborn

Andrea Roedig

Professorin für Politikwissenschaft, Universität Paderborn

Margit Leuthold

Professorin für Politikwissenschaft, Universität Basel

Herta Noe-Dockuk

Professorin für Politikwissenschaft, Universität Wien

Ingrid Birkhan

Professorin für Politikwissenschaft, Universität Innsbruck

Gedenktag: „I don’t like what you say but I will defend to the death your right to say it.”

Waltraud Ernst

Professorin für Politikwissenschaft, Universität Paderborn

Herta Noe-Dockuk

Professorin für Politikwissenschaft, Universität Wien

Gottfried von Straßburgs

Moderation:

Subversive Herrschaft im ‚Tristan’

Urte Heldsäuer:

Moderation:

Das Andere, die Frau und die Gabe

Ingvild Birkhan:

Moderation:

Imvolviertsein II

Karina Reikmann:

Moderation:

Geben und Nehmen: von Widersprüchlichkeit und Innenperspektive

Jagdhimmel: „So Reddy Go Where No Man Has Gone Before“: Geschlechterverhältnisse in queer-feministischer Science Fiction

Irene Nierhaus:

Moderation:

Patriarchats—Who Is That?

Einführung / Auftakt:

8. März 2014


Programm

8. März 2014

Eröffnung / Auftakt:

Birgit Sauer

Professorin für Politikwissenschaft, Universität Innsbruck

Ingrid Birkhan

Lehrstuhl für Philosophie und Literatur der Universität Kiel

Miksa Verstes

Politischer Theorie, Universität Paderborn

Miksa Verstes

Professorin für Philosophie und Literatur der Universität Kiel

Christine Blüttler

Professorin für Wirtschaftsphilosophie, Christian-Albrechts-Universität zu Kiel

Waltraud Ernst

Universitätsbibliothek, Universität zu Kiel

Friederike Hassauer

Professorin für Kunstwissenschaft, Universität Wien

Ute Heldsäuer

Akademische Rätin, Universität Tübingen

Dagmar Fink

Professorin für Philosophie, Universität Paderborn

Friederike Hassauer

Professorin für Kunstwissenschaft, Universität Wien

Ute Heldsäuer

Akademische Rätin, Universität Tübingen

Dagmar Fink

Professorin für Philosophie, Universität Paderborn

Katharina Pühl

Professorin für Kunstwissenschaft, Universität Wien

Suzanne Lettow

Professorin für Philosophie, Universität Paderborn

Margit Leuthold

Professorin für Politikwissenschaft, Universität Basel

Herta Noe-Dockuk

Professorin für Politikwissenschaft, Universität Wien

Irene Nierhaus

Professorin für Kunstwissenschaft, Universität Bremen

Katharina Pühl

Professorin für Kunstwissenschaft, Universität Wien

Christine Blüttler

Professorin für Politikwissenschaft, Universität Paderborn

Andrea Roedig

Professorin für Politikwissenschaft, Universität Paderborn

Margit Leuthold

Professorin für Politikwissenschaft, Universität Basel

Herta Noe-Dockuk

Professorin für Politikwissenschaft, Universität Wien

Ingrid Birkhan

Professorin für Politikwissenschaft, Universität Innsbruck

Gedenktag: „I don’t like what you say but I will defend to the death your right to say it.”
Der Preis neoliberaler Modernisierung

VON ERNA APPELT

Sorgearbeit ist ein hochpolitisches Thema. Wie Erna Appelt am Beispiel des österreichischen Care-Regimes zeigt, haben die Reformen der letzten Jahrzehnte zwar zu einer gewissen Anerkennung von Pflegeleistungen geführt, gleichzeitig haben neoliberale Modernisierungsmaßnahmen bestehende Hierarchien verfestigt und neue Ungleichheiten geschaffen.


Die Langzeitpflege von alten und pflegebedürftigen Menschen wurde laut Sozialministerium im Jahr 2012 zu 11% von Angehörige- gen, zu 24% von dienen Pflegeleistungen oder andere nicht auf der angemessenen Be- zahlung und dem arbeits- und so- zialrechtlichen Schutz der Pflege- personen. Hingegen erfahren die Pflegebedürftigen der vorher illega- len Praxis durch weitreichende Am-

ung essenziell, um Altersarmut zu verhindern. Zu den schützlich eingefüh- ten sozialen Rechten zählen der kas- tenlose Weiterversicherung für Pfle- gende, die (kurzfristige) Freistellung für Pflegetätigkeiten bei Weiterbe- zug des Entgelts, die Familienhos- pizkarenz als Rechtsanspruch auf Heimtierpflege, der pflegerische Arbeitsausgleich, die Pflege- und Betreuungs- pflegemitteln ab, ermöglicht jedoch nicht auf der angemessenen Be- zahlung und dem arbeits- und so- zialrechtlichen Schutz der Pflege- personen. Hingegen erfahren die Pflegebedürftigen der vorher illega- len Praxis durch weitreichende Am-

ren fünfzig (p. 17) erortert in 2003. ◁

O

n Februar 16, I received an email from Szilárd, in which he wrote the fol- lowing: “(…) We are commuting between Vienna and Debrecen, (…) next week I will be in Debre- cen, then back and forth again. (…) Slowly, we are awaiting spring and sunshine.” On February 19, he com- mitted suicide. I had not known him in per- son before he came to the IWM. I had only read his most recent novel, Nincstelenek (The Dispossessed, see excerpt p. 17) published last year, a sad and unsettling work which brought enormous success to its author. When he left the Institute in December, he complained about depression impeding his work on the translation.

After his death, the obituar- ies were full of references to his ill- ness. About a year ago, he also talked about it in an interview.

Szilárd Borbély was born in Fejérkázmás, Hungary in 1964. After finishing his military service he studied Hungarian language and literature in Debrecen. He worked in a wide variety of genres, including drama, and short fiction. His first collection of poetry, Adály, was published while he was still a student. Borbély has been working as a teaching assistant and lecturer at the faculty of old Hungarian litera- ture since 1989. He received his doctoral degree in literary studies in 1998 and worked as translator from German and English. Among other distinctions, he has been awarded some of the most important Hungarian literary prizes, including the Titov Déry Prize (1996), the Szent István Prize (2002) and the Pallavicini Prize (2005).

Szilárd Borbély, noted contemporary poet, writer and literary historian, died on February 19, 2014. From September to December 2013 he had been a Paul Celan Visiting Fellow at the IWM, translating Klaus-Michael Bogdal’s Europa erfindet die Zigeuner. Eine Geschichte von Faszination und Verachtung into Hungarian. Filled with deep sorrow at the loss of such a remarkable but unassuming man, we would like to commemorate him and his literary oeuvre with an obituary by János Mátyás Kovács and two of his texts which permit us to glimpse both his exceptional talent and the two souls within his chest.

János Mátyás Kovács is a WEH Permanent Fellow and an Internal Research Fellow at the Institute of Economics at the Hungar- ian Academy of Sciences, Budapest.

Der Standard

macht dich verliebt

Aber deshalb abonnieren i ja

Erna Appelt is Professor for Politik- wissenschaft at the University in Vienna, br in die interdisziplinäre Forschungs- plattform „Geschichtsforschung: Identitäten – Transformationen – Diskurs- se“ eN. Von Oktober 2013 bis Januar 2014 war sie Visiting Fellow am IWM. Dieser Beitrag beruht auf einem Seminar, das Erna Appelt am 20. November am IWM gehalten hat.

Die Zeitung für Leuteiner

Sie behandelten die Quittenbäume in bestimmte Gärten geflo- ben waren, traten sie sofort in Accion. Doch die Ungarn geben nicht auf. Sie versteckten ihr geliebtes Bäume. Wenn einer zuweilen doch einen Nachbarn verriet, dann tat er es nur für eine ansinnliche Sache. Wo- mit die Alten verstehen sich aufs Besten. Sie versteckten ihr geliebtes Bäume. Wenn einer zuweilen doch einen Nachbarn verriet, dann tat er es nur für eine ansinnliche Sache. Womit die Väter der kaiserlichen Schützen ein erhebliches Defizit ver- versuchten. Das wird nicht dem neuen Grußwort. „Die haben leicht reden, die ha- ben nicht mal einen Eisenmützel ins Kollektiv gebraucht“, sagt Groß- vatert, der am meisten seinen Pfer- dern hinterher traut. „Die nehmen sich nur.“

Es gibt für kleine Kinder nicht.“ wie- derholt meine Mutter ständig. „Den leben auf Kosten anderer“, murrmt er angewidert. „Alles nur verprassen, das kön- nen sie“, sagt er. „Alles verprassen. Vermehren, das können sie nicht. Alles geht den Bach runter.“

Die Bauern trauten am meis- ten ihren Pferden hinterher. Mehr als dem Boden. An ihrer Stelle quälte die Pfere die in der Genossenschaft. Man schüttelte sie zu Tode. „Sie sind umgefallen, Verendet vor der Zeit. Und was hat’s gebracht?“ „Die haben leicht reden, die ha- ben nicht mal einen Eisenmützel ins Kollektiv gebracht““ sagt Groß- vater unter seinem Schnurr- nachdem, das existiert nicht. Macht end- lich Schuss mit dem, was war „Macht end- lich Schuss mit dem, was war“. Und die Dreiundzwanzig ist nur durch die Mittellosen: Ist der Messias schon weg? 

Die Mittellosen: Ist der Messias schon weg? 

W er noch nie Quitten- brot gegessen hat, der ist gewiss kein Ungar. Oder nicht Ungar genug. Dem fehlt was am Ungarsein. Wer nun sein Holzweg. Die Quitte ist ein Teil des Holzweg. Die Quitte ist ein Teil des „Ein Ungarnbild
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In Memoriam Szilárd Borbély 1963–2014

Übersetzung: Hans Skirecki
Erna Appelt Visiting Fellow (October 2013–January 2014) Professorin für Politik- wissenschaften, Universität Innsbruck

Österreichische Betreuungspolitik. Ein Politikfeld im Spannungsfeld zwischen Pluralisierung und Europäisierung

Ascal Aleshin Juniper Visiting Fellow (October 2013–March 2014) PhD candidate in Romance and Latin American Studies, Hebrew University, Jerusalem

Hebrew Translations and Adaptations of Iberian Liberal Literatures (18th and 19th Centuries)

Szállád Borzdei Paul Celan Visiting Fellow (September 2013–December 2013) Associate Professor of Hebrew Literature, University of Debrecen

Klaus-Michael Bogatáj: Europa eröffnet die Zigeuner (Hungarian)


Simon Reynolds: Rip It Up

Hernáig Czoch Visiting Fellow, Austrian Academy of Sciences (February–April 2014)

Habilitation (Geschichte), Institut für Zeitgeschichte, Universität Wien, Dokumentationsarchiv des Österreichischen Widerstan- des

Gesundheit, Künstler und Tod. 1944–1948

Negotiations of Cultural Memory: Human Rights and Rhetoric of Modernity

Jan Frei Paul Celan Visiting Fellow (October–November 2013) Research Fellow, Czech Academy of Sciences, Prague

Eric Wiegand: Foreigners, Existence, Truth, and Immortality. Selected Essays (English > Czech)

Eugenj Gamarnik Alexander Herzen Junior Visiting Fellow (January– June 2013) Associate Professor of History, Moscow Academy of Entrepreneurship, Blagoveschensk

Representations of Democracy. The Experience of the Political Rhetoric of Contemporary Russia, India and the EU

Alexei Delyakon Robert Bosch Visiting Fellow (February–July 2013) PhD in Cultural and Political Science, Ludwig-Maximilian Universität, Munich

Writers of Yuliannica: Post-Yugoslav Literature and the “Common Cultural Space”

Andrey Ersdikinov Alexander Herzen Junior Visiting Fellow (October 2013–February 2014) Freelance journalist, Chechnya

Transformers MMXX. The Power of Culture in Social Change

Ekaterina Gudriašvili Alexander Herzen Junior Visiting Fellow (January– June 2013) Assistant Professor of Religion Studies, Tudor Federal University, Kemerberg

Orthodox Christianity and Political Discourse in Russian Blogs

Lucy Hagedorn Research Director (December 2013–June 2014) Editor-in-chief, East European Review, Vienna

“Forward into History!” Diverging Historical Narratives and the Prospects of a Eurasian Public Sphere

Jan Frei Paul Celan Visiting Fellow (October–November 2013) Research Fellow, Czech Academy of Sciences, Prague

Vladimíra Imajevaicka Guest Editor of the Global Dialogue (March 2014)

Michaela Kastendieck Junior Visiting Fellow (February–April 2013) PhD in Sociology and Social Anthropology, Central European University, Budapest

Alternative Higher Education: A Case or a Cause?

Alkashev Khatkar Visiting Fellow (January–May 2013) PhD candidate in European Studies and Politics, Central European University, Bratislava

Eurasian Regional Integration and Political, Institutional and Economic Fragmentation in Eastern Europe: The Post-Soviet Area

Nanivít Kúzt József Jánoska Junior Visiting Fellow (February–July 2013) PhD candidate in Legal, Culture Librarians, Warsaw

Towards a Central-Eastern European Liberalism? Polish Liberal Culture after 20 Years of Democracy

Agata Anna Łubik EÜRAS Junior Visiting Fellow (September 2013–June 2014) Postdoctoral Researcher, TRANSFORm, Institute of Sociology, Humboldt Universität, Berlin; Lecturer, Bard College, New York

The Image of Women in Visual Representations of Revolution: From the French Revolution to Occupy Wall Street

Matthew Maguire Junior Visiting Fellow (September 2013–June 2014) PhD candidate in Political Science, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia

From Private Regulation to Public Policy: The Case of Corporate Financial Reporting

Eva Majwoka Bronisław Geremek Junior Visiting Fellow (September 2013–June 2014) PhD candidate in Gender Studies, University of Warsaw

Political Solidarity Within Contemporary Polish Social and Political Theories

Juliette Maymodern Visiting Fellow (April–June 2013) Editor, Krytyka Polityczna, Warsaw

Book Project: Cine-Art

Svetlana Marinova Paul Celan Visiting Fellow (August–October 2013) Associate Professor, St. Kliment Ohridski University, Sofia

Boris Buđen: Zone des Übergangs. Von Ende des Postkommunismus (German > Italian)

Radu Rădulescu Visiting Fellow (February–March 2014) Professor of Political Science, Drexel University, Philadelphia

Romania: The State of the State

Democracy in Europe: Citizens, Democratic Values, Institutions and Context

Ioana Ulianov Visiting Fellow (January–June 2013) PhD candidate in European Studies and Politics, Central European University, Bratislava

Eurasian Regional Integration and Political, Institutional and Economic Fragmentation in Eastern Europe: The Post-Soviet Area

Marko Maricic Bronisław Geremek Junior Visiting Fellow (October 2013–July 2014) PhD candidate in Political Science, Nosica Carnovan University, Zagreb

Toni Quintards: “The History of Sovereignty in Conflict and Normalism

Kateryna Mischchenko Paul Celan Visiting Fellow (February–March 2013) Freelance translator, author, editor, Przyroda, Kyiv

Public Sphere and its Impact on Poland after 1989

T.W. Adams F W. Benjamin: Traum- produktion / Traumproduktion/ Traumproduktion (German > Ukrainian)

Oskar Multa CEU Junior Visiting Fellow (November–January 2013–June 2014) PhD candidate in History, Central European University, Budapest

National Liberalism in the Intermar Party Politics of the Former Czecho slovic Lands

Sofia Neshiva Alexander Herzen Junior Visiting Fellow (September–June 2013) PhD candidate in Sociology, Alba University, Baimo

Social Exclusion of Older Persons. A Comparative Analysis

Arkady Ostrovsky Guest, Round in Dialogues (January 2013)

Philippe Bourgois, The Economist

Christina Plank Junior Visiting Fellow, Academy of Sciences of Sciences (October 2013–March 2014)

Doktorandin (Politik- wissenschaften), Universität Wien:

Burhan succes in Social Movements, University of North Dakota, Grand Forks

Vladimir Skolkin Visiting Fellow (September–June 2013–July 2014) Assistant Professor of History, Chinese University of Hong Kong

 Phenomenological Encounters: Scenes from Central Europe

Sara Silberstein Junior Visiting Fellow (April–July 2014) PhD candidate in Social and Political Sciences, University of Warwick

Before Doctors Without Borders: The Rights of Refugees and the Social Frontiers of Postwar Europe

Vladyslav Siklenkin Junior Visiting Fellow (September–June 2013–July 2014) Assistant Professor of History, Eastern Ukrainian Branch of the International Solomon University, Kluhner

The Social Relevance of History in Poland, Russia and Ukraine: A Comparative Context (1990–2012)

Natalia Smolenskaja Großbritannien Visiting Fellow (February–July 2013) PhD candidate in Anthropology and History, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor

“Christian Europe”: The Legacy of John Paul II’s Papacy in the Political Theology in Contemporary Poland

Matthew Specter Visiting Fellow (September–December 2013) Professor of History, Central Connecticut State University

Wolfgang Gresch: Envisioning World Order in the 1930s and 1940s

Marius Iosif Tatar Robert Bosch Junior Visiting Fellow (July–December 2013) Assistant Professor of Political Science, University of Ottawa

Democratic Without Engagement: Political Participation, Post-Communist South-Eastern Europe

Anna Trapani Visiting Fellow (January–April 2014) Eastern Junior Fellow, Institute for Romanistic Philosophy, Free University Berlin

The Genealogy of Utopianness

Nelia Vakhonska Paul Celan Visiting Fellow (January 2014) Freelance translator and editor

Boris Budon: Zone des Übergangs. Von Ende des Postkommunismus (German > Ukrainian)

Mário Vences CES Junior Visiting Fellow (February–June 2014) PhD candidate in Political Science, European University, Brussels

Philosophical Theology, the Autonomy of Popular Religion, and Religion as Moral Theory in the Hol- stian Eras and Beyond

Jack Russell Weinstein Guest (November 2013) Professor of Philosophy; Director, Institute for Philosophy in Public Life, University of North Dakota, Grand Forks


Changing Norms of Political Violence in Intrastate Disputes

Katharine Younger Jan Marius Visiting Fellow (April–August 2013) PhD in Russian and East European History, Yale University

The Great Catholic Church in the USSR. 1919, 1839–1882
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Fellows and Guests

The WIM offers a place for research and scholarly debate across borders and disciplines. Its various fellowship programs are thus a fundament- al component of its work. Each year, 50–60 Visiting Fellows and Guests—mainly from Eastern and Western Europe as well as from North America—are awarded fellow- ship grants to pursue their independent research projects at the WIM. Since its inception in 1982, the WIM has hosted more than 1,000 scholars, journalists and translators.
Lessons from the Balkans

Islam in Europe is a topic that attracts a great deal of attention in Europe, particularly in the media and in policymaking and academic circles. The growing Muslim population in Western Europe has led to concerns about Muslims’ lack of economic, political, and cultural integration and to doubts about their ability to adapt to a predominantly secular society.

Muslims in Europe are suspected of pursuing foreign Islamic agendas, of being influenced by Islamic networks and being supported by foreign funds. After 9/11 and the bombings in Madrid and London, Muslims in Europe came to be perceived as a security threat. Anti-Muslim attitudes have been exacerbated further by anti-immigrant sentiments and images linking local Muslims to the violence in the Middle East. None of this has been conducive to objective study or accurate representation of Muslim communities in Europe.

When speaking about Islam in Europe, people often forget completely that Southeast Europe, or the Balkans, has been home to Muslim communities for more than six centuries. My recent book Rediscovering the Umma: Muslims in the Balkans between Nationalism and Transnationalism (Oxford University Press, 2013) challenges representations of Islam from the perspective of those who lived in the Balkans.

It discusses the dynamics of identity building among Balkan Muslims and the national and transnational factors involved, and looks at successful models developed by Muslims living in secular polities, often as minorities among majority Christian populations.

Who are the Balkan Muslims?

The massive expansion of Islam in Southeast Europe was a result of the Ottoman conquest of the Balkan Peninsula in the 14th and 15th centuries, which added a new community to the Byzantine Orthodox Christians, Roman Catholics, and Jews who already lived in the region. The rise of nationalism in the 19th century and the national liberation struggles triggered the emergence of modern states from the ruins of the Ottoman Empire. In these predominantly Christian states (Albania is the exception), Muslims lost the privileged legal and social status they had enjoyed as followers of the dominant faith in the Empire.

From this moment they embarked on a long process of defining their place in society and identities under shifting political and social circumstances. While both Islam and Christiani- ty were suppressed under communist rule, the end of the Cold War has brought new opportunities for religious and cultural revitalization, as well as for political mobilization.

Today, some 8.5 million Muslims live in different countries throughout the Balkan region. Geographically, they are distributed unevenly: the largest community is in Albania (around 2.3 million), the smallest in Slovenia (40,000). Linguistically, Balkan Muslims are divided into Albanian speakers (close to 4.5 million), Slavic speakers (over 2.5 million), Turkish speakers (around one million), and Roma (an estimated 500,000, though the real number might be higher). Most Balkan Muslims are Sunni and follow the Hanafi madhab (school of law), while Sufi Islam is represented through a number of Sufi orders (religious brotherhoods) such as Bekahshy, Naqshbandiyya, Khwattiyiya, Qadiriyya and Kifa’iyah.

Depending on the country in which they lived, Balkan Muslims followed different historical paths, on the one hand dealing with nationalist projects, on the other hand developing their own ethnic-national identities. In Bulgaria, Muslims are a minority population divided into a large community of ethnic Turks and a smaller community of Bulgarian-speaking Pomaks with more fluid ethnic identities. The Turkish Muslims are predominantly Sunni, though a small number of them are Alevis. Muslim identities in Bulgaria underwent complex transformations resulting from the policies of the communist state. After initial attempts to marginalize Islam by encouraging ethnic Turkish identities, the Bulgarian government attempted to form a homogeneous nation by erasing ethno-cultural differences. The traditional Turco-Arab names of the Pomaks, the Muslim Roma and Turks were forcefully changed to Bulgarian names in the 1970s and 1980s, only after the fall of communism were Muslims able to take their former names. In Albania, where the Muslims make up the majority of the population, Albanian national identity prevails over religious identity. Among Muslim Albanians in Kosovo and Macedonia, on the other hand, religion has played a stronger role, the result of conflicts with Orthodox Serbs and Orthodox Macedonian Christians respectively. For Bosnian Muslims, who shared a common language and Slavic origins with Catholic Croats and Orthodox Serbs in Bosnia-Herzegovina, Islam was a key element in nation-building. Overall, the divergent historical trajectories and identity-building strategies of Muslims in the region defy simplistic talk of a unified Islam penetrating Europe through the Balkan Peninsula.

Some writers and policy-makers have expressed fears about transnational Islamic links and influences among Balkan Muslims, a factor related to the influx of aid and foreign fighters during the post-Yugoslav wars in Bosnia-Herzegovina and Kosovo and to the channeling of funds to Muslim communities throughout the Balkans from Iran and various Arab countries. In my book, I describe the ambivalent role of this foreign assistance to the local Muslims, who saw it as a challenge to their “traditional Islam”.

After 2000, with Turkey’s increasing “soft-power” and influence among Muslim communities in the region, the role of Arab Islam has subsided considerably. References to Islamic solidarity notwithstanding (most often expressed through the political symbol of the umma, the worldwide community of the faithful), a Pan-Islamic platform in the region has never materialized. Without stereotyping “Balkan Islam” as a model of peace and tolerance, or claiming that the Balkans have been spared the threat of religiously-inspired extremism, I point to a number of factors that have hindered radicalization among Balkan Muslims. Amongst others, the geopolitical and national developments, these factors include strong intellectual and grassroots traditions that affirm the values of peaceful coexistence in a pluralist society.

Lessons for Islam in Europe

Obviouly, there are major differences between Muslims in the Balkans and in Western Europe, in terms of historical, geographic, ethnic, and linguistic backgrounds, as well as cultural specificities and ideological orientations. However, what Balkan and Western European Muslims do have in common is their struggle with the question of what it means to be a Muslim in Europe.

The notion of a “European Islam” has emerged in connection with political efforts for the social integration and administrative institutionalization of Islam throughout the continent. Cautiously embracing the project, Balkan Muslim leaders and theologians have claimed a representative status for “their” Islam as a centuries-old presence on European soil. They have emphasized that Balkan Islam is civic, tolerant, democratic and pluralistic, and that local Muslim communities have developed inclusive and participatory institutions that accept the secular state and secular laws. Balkan Muslim leaders such as Dzemal Bijedic, Hussejn Dozo, Ahmad Smajlovic, and Vlastko Vasiljic have made important contributions to debates on how to reconcile Islam and European modernity, engaging on issues such as the reform of Shari’a, women’s equality and the modernization of educational and religious institutions.

Most of them (with the exception of Karić) have not been translated into English and remain largely unknown in Western Europe.

In short, Balkan Muslims’ adaptation to modernity, secularism and national identity, together with their positive attitude towards religious and cultural pluralism, confound the unqualified presentation of Islam as an exclusionary faith that is incompatible with European democracy.

Balkan Muslims’ experience shows that multiple identities and forms of belonging are more conducive to peace than the straight-jacket of rigid identities that privileges national identities over personal choice and force people to self-define in fine strict categories. The history of Islam in the Balkans shows that Balkan Muslims, who depend on the ability of public institutions in Europe to articulate inclusive, pluralist and participatory social models that respect Muslims’ individual rights, are...
Books by Fellows and Alumni

Mihai Gogiu
Afaceri Române Montane [The Romanian-Montan Affair] (English > Romanian) on the Blog Numerous posts [in Romanian] on the Blog VoxPublica.ro Miruna Mihailetchi
Borotin Zone of the Overhang. "Vom Endes des Postkolonialismus (Urwelt) neugest. 19. Jahrhundert


Micah Sherr

Since the financial meltdown of 2010, political protests have spread around the world like chain lighting—from the "Occupy" movements of the United States, Great Britain, and Spain to more destabilizing forms of unrest in Tunisia, Egypt, Russia, Thailand, Bulgaria, Turkey, and Ukraine. In his latest book, Micah Kravetz proposes a provocative interpretation of these popular uprisings—one with ominous implications for the future of democratic politics.

In his award-winning book Michael Lusczewski embarks the reader on an exciting journey from the Middle Ages all the way to the present day, where we will learn about how Poland became a nation and how said nation became Catholic. It received the Foundation for Polish Science Prize (2013), the Wrocław University Prize (2012), the Józef Tichner Prize for the best essay in humanities 2013, and the Stanisław Ossowskiego Prize for the best book in sociology 2013.

Krzysztof Michalski

This book examines the key 2008 publication of the Russian Orthodox Church on human dignity, freedom, and rights: its stance on how the attitude of the Russian Orthodox Church has shifted from outright hostility towards individual human rights—the advocacy of "traditional values."

How can people of diverse religious, ethnic, and linguistic allegiances and identities live together without committing violence, interfaith suffering, or oppressing each other? In this volume contributors explore the limits of tolerance and suggest how we think beyond them to mutual respect.

Edward W. Said

"Critique" , Or Korszak: "Postkolonialismus" un vescinas "postkomunizmu"

The 2013 Junior Fellows' Conference discussed the interplay between human thought and human action, given the inadequacy of the great ideological systems which have (remade and continue to remake) Central and Eastern Europe over the past century. In this talk, IWM Junior Fellows approach the question of the relationships between our mental constructs and our worlds—and what we choose to do about them.

Transit – Europäische Revue
Heft 45 (Sommer 2014)
Verlag Neue Kritik, Frankfurt a.M.
Mihai Gogiu: Die unverwaltete Revolution
Timothy Snyder: Europa und die Ukraine: Vergangenheit und Zukunft
Kaja Miličenko: "Es gab keine Gewalt mehr zwischen Tsanaw and Reichard"
Interview, geführt von Timothy Snyder und Tatiana Zhukhrenko
Oksana Forestyna: Land der Kinder
Mykola Miroshnyk: Möser and Prometheus: Die Ukraine zwischen Befreiung und Freiheit
Mykola Viatkou: Eine Ukraine?
Tatiana Zhukhrenko: Ist Osten nichts Neues?
Svetlana Lashkevich: Hinter den Kulissen: Eine Typologie der idealistischen Oligarchen
Anton Shevchenko: Sovoboda: Aufstieg und Fall einer Partei
Cyril Hovorun: Die Kirche auf dem Maidan
Nikolay Mitrokhin: Die Rolle der Einrichter in der Ukraine
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The Liberalism of Small Nations

BY JAROSŁAW KUISZ

Taking the "small nation perspective" is one of the greatest challenges for liberalism in Central Eastern Europe today, says Jarosław Kuisz, editor-in-chief of the Polish weekly Kultura Liberalna. Established in 2009 by a group of young academics, artists and students, the online journal aims at transcending a narrow, strictly economic understanding of liberalism.

I
n the heart of old Warsaw, on Królewska Street, it was once possible to see an impressive, classicist building. It was neither pretty nor exceptionally ugly. The portico, with its richly decorated frieze, was supported by six massive columns. At the beginning of the Second World War, the building was destroyed by German bombs, like many others on that street. For a long time, the ruins of Warsaw stock exchange served as a monument of the old financial world. It has never been rebuilt.

For half a century, the average citizen of a Central Eastern European "people's democracy" would have had no idea what a stock exchange was, or what stocks were. In 1991, when most people were still dizzy from the collapse of the communist economic system, the old utopia of Marx, Engels and Lenin had been replaced by pictures from popular movies representing the West as a veritable Aladdin's cave. The popular imagination created a new utopia. The unfulfilled promises of the socialist economy caused a backlash: private initiative flourished and real-life experience seemed to confirm the philosophy of "not-counting-on-the-state". The popular embrace of conservatism does not seem to be accidental. Sociology of ageing statesmen, as well as the ideological transformation of state enterprises. From that time on, the concept of "liberalism" seems little more than a label.

Ten years on, the liberal watchwords that were used in the 1990s to explain the downfall of the old economy and to garner solutions from the West. Indeed, the greatest strength of the liberal "revolution" might have been the ignorance of the revolutionaries. They knew hardly anything about party politics or the functioning of the free market. The former dissident Jacek Kuroń, for example, confused that neither the opposition nor the communists were liberal. They promised the moon and tried to create jobs from above. Even Leszek Balcerowicz, known for his libertarian views on economics, admitted that state intervention was needed in some areas.

Blindly imitating the West, individual freedom was too often equated with the liberty of homo oeconomicus. Meanwhile, what was left of the communist state was hardly working in the late 1980s. In Poland, an act on the freedom of private business was passed in 1988, when the communist state was hardly working at all. The popular imagination of impatient people: "To my horror, I have realised that my impatient visions from popular movies representing the West as a veritable Aladdin's cave. The popular imagination created a new utopia. The unfulfilled promises of the socialist economy caused a backlash: private initiative flourished and real-life experience seemed to confirm the philosophy of "not-counting-on-the-state". The popular embrace of conservatism does not seem to be accidental. Sociology of ageing statesmen, as well as the ideological transformation of state enterprises. From that time on, the concept of "liberalism" seems little more than a label.

"Triumph" of liberalism in the region began to seem doubtful to historians very early on. Today, many of those who once proudly referred to themselves as liberals are now conservatives, some of them even Eurosceptics. This raises the central question: to what extent did the history of liberalism in Central Eastern Europe after 1989. How could politicians soon had to correct their promises of the socialist economy. The former dissident Jacek Kuroń, for example, confused that neither the opposition nor the communists ever actually understood the term "unemployment".

Long before the fall of communism, the old utopia of Marx, Engels was destroyed by German bombs, like many others on that street. For a long time, the ruins of Warsaw stock exchange served as a monument of the old financial world. It has never been rebuilt.

For half a century, the average citizen of a Central Eastern European "people's democracy" would have had no idea what a stock exchange was, or what stocks were. In 1991, when most people were still dizzy from the collapse of the communist economic system, the old utopia of Marx, Engels and Lenin had been replaced by pictures from popular movies representing the West as a veritable Aladdin's cave. The popular imagination created a new utopia. The unfulfilled promises of the socialist economy caused a backlash: private initiative flourished and real-life experience seemed to confirm the philosophy of "not-counting-on-the-state". The popular embrace of conservatism does not seem to be accidental. Sociology of ageing statesmen, as well as the ideological transformation of state enterprises. From that time on, the concept of "liberalism" seems little more than a label.

"Triumph" of liberalism in the region began to seem doubtful to historians very early on. Today, many of those who once proudly referred to themselves as liberals are now conservatives, some of them even Eurosceptics. This raises the central question: to what extent did the history of liberalism in Central Eastern Europe after 1989. How could politicians soon had to correct their promises of the socialist economy. The former dissident Jacek Kuroń, for example, confused that neither the opposition nor the communists ever actually understood the term "unemployment".

Long before the fall of communism, the old utopia of Marx, Engels was destroyed by German bombs, like many others on that street. For a long time, the ruins of Warsaw stock exchange served as a monument of the old financial world. It has never been rebuilt.

For half a century, the average citizen of a Central Eastern European "people's democracy" would have had no idea what a stock exchange was, or what stocks were. In 1991, when most people were still dizzy from the collapse of the communist economic system, the old utopia of Marx, Engels and Lenin had been replaced by pictures from popular movies representing the West as a veritable Aladdin's cave. The popular imagination created a new utopia. The unfulfilled promises of the socialist economy caused a backlash: private initiative flourished and real-life experience seemed to confirm the philosophy of "not-counting-on-the-state". The popular embrace of conservatism does not seem to be accidental. Sociology of ageing statesmen, as well as the ideological transformation of state enterprises. From that time on, the concept of "liberalism" seems little more than a label.
gists at the time were writing extensively about an identity and the disintegration of social norms. The attitude of
dissent was the one element of the liberal agenda able to attract individuals unwillingly. In 1988, Marcin Król, a supporter of liberal reforms, nevertheless, in
certain about the reassessment of dissidents, familiar from early 1990s-centu-
ry writings.4 The liberal program around 1989 consisted of more than merely tak-
ing power away from the commu-
istories together with a vague plan for ecological reforms. Nevertheless, in
certain social memory, liberalism has been confused with dissent—mean-
it never possessed in any classi-
cal sense, and might be writing them as themselves as liberals made no attempt to develop their own po-
itical language. Blindly imitating whole peoples. The Shah still over-
shadows the memory of the region. However, the experience of Na-

The Liberalism of Small Nations

Central Eastern Europe is a re-
gion of small nations. Even before postmodernism dawned, intellec-
tuals such as István Bibó or Milan Kundera noted that the 20th cen-
tury had made them realize their own contingency. It was not only centu-
rial states that were threat-
ened, but the physical existence of

whole European culture of progress that included giving up
tolerance: the “politics of fear” and

the reduction of individual free-
dom to the concept of homo oeconomic-
us is a poor guarantee of individ-
ual freedom. It suffices to mention issues such as freedom of con-

tracception. Surrendering anthro-
po logical grounds to classical liberalism and leads directly to lo-
cal mutations of neo-conservatism and old-fashioned social conform-
ism.5

Taking the “nation-sphere perspective” is one of the greatest challenges for liberalism in Central Eastern Europe.
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Julian Pekay, who joined the IPW in February 2014 as PhD assistant, will leave the Institute for a doctoral scholarship financed by the Polish
niversity. We thank him for his dedication and commit-
manship and wish him all the best for the future.

In the academic year 2014/15, the IPW will launch two new fellowships program: the Ryszard Michalski Fellowship Program committing the Institute’s founding Rector, and the Jan Piatkowski Fellowship Program in honor of the Czech philologist

Jan Piatkowski and his legacy. Further details will be announced on the IPW website: www.tam.tartu.ee/ fellowshipsprograms.
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not make the differences between Turkish and Austrian publics any less relevant. When the decision to open accession negotiations was taken in Luxembourg in 2003, Turkey had no representation until a few years later in the European Economic Community, a predecessor of the European Union, for 42 years. Turkey was one of the first countries to become a member of the Council of Europe in 1949 and is a founding member of the OSCE. The futures of Turkey and Austria—and every other European country—are inevitably intertwined. But their public spheres are not. Not yet. Equally divergent perspectives are the rule, not the exception, all over Europe.

The European Public Sphere: A Complex Task of Translation

The Europeanization of identities and frames of reference still seems like a far-off dream. But the long-term prospects for a more meaningful European community hinge on the emergence of these two responsibilities. Notwithstanding that identity is constructed, it would not only be futile but also dangerous to try to preclude Europeans to a certain potentially hegemonic narrative that should fit all contexts and account for what is in fact a multitude of social, economic, political and historical experiences. However, divergent historical narratives remain one of the most difficult challenges facing anyone who wants to contribute to the emergence of a European public sphere.

EU enlargement in 2004 made the narrative gap painfully visible. In Western Europe, 1945 constitutes both a starting point and an ending point: Never again! That was the founding impetus of the European integration project, beginning with the Coal and Steel Community. In Eastern Europe, however, 1945 was neither an ending nor a starting point: It was an intermediary moment between two oppressive systems, signifying little more than the transition from Nazi rule to Soviet rule. “The future of European solidarity,” writes Timothy Snyder, “depends on a rethinking of the immediate European past. Without historical knowledge of the East, European mass publics will be swayed by simple arguments flowing from national prejudice. European leaders, whether they know the facts or not, will be tempted to resort to such arguments in the whirl of domestic political competition.”

But instead of a Grand European Narrative dictated from above, the narrative gap painfully visible. In Western Europe, 1945 constitutes both a starting point and an ending point: Never again! That was the founding impetus of the European integration project, beginning with the Coal and Steel Community. In Eastern Europe, however, 1945 was neither an ending nor a starting point: It was an intermediary moment between two oppressive systems, signifying little more than the transition from Nazi rule to Soviet rule. “The future of European solidarity,” writes Timothy Snyder, “depends on a rethinking of the immediate European past. Without historical knowledge of the East, European mass publics will be swayed by simple arguments flowing from national prejudice. European leaders, whether they know the facts or not, will be tempted to resort to such arguments in the whirl of domestic political competition.”

But instead of a Grand European Narrative dictated from above, the narrative gap painfully visible. In Western Europe, 1945 constitutes both a starting point and an ending point: Never again! That was the founding impetus of the European integration project, beginning with the Coal and Steel Community. In Eastern Europe, however, 1945 was neither an ending nor a starting point: It was an intermediary moment between two oppressive systems, signifying little more than the transition from Nazi rule to Soviet rule. “The future of European solidarity,” writes Timothy Snyder, “depends on a rethinking of the immediate European past. Without historical knowledge of the East, European mass publics will be swayed by simple arguments flowing from national prejudice. European leaders, whether they know the facts or not, will be tempted to resort to such arguments in the whirl of domestic political competition.”