

- 9 *Workshop*
Citizenship and Identity
- 11 *Kolloquium*
Offene Seele – Harmonische Welt
- 12 *Conference*
When Globalization Fails...
- 15 *Seminar with Slavenka Drakulic*
The Politics of Truth and Justice
- 25 *Notes on Books*
Charles Taylor on Multiple
Modernities
Sorin Antohi on Ioan Petru Culianu
- 26 *Guest Contributions*
Michel Serres and Pierre Nora
on Memory
- 31 *Political Commentary*
Lord Dahrendorf on Parliamentarism



Newsletter 72

CONFERENCE |

The IWM's first major conference of the year took place March 9th through the 11th at the Palais Ferstel in central Vienna.

Scholars and public figures from around the world gathered to discuss the problem of historical memory, a problem that has moved into the center of political, social, and cultural debates in many countries as they reflect upon the recent past.

The Memory of the Century

FRENCH PHILOSOPHER **Paul Ricoeur** opened the conference on Friday evening, March 9th with a public lecture on the relation between memory and history. As in his main work, *Temps et Récit*, Ricoeur's arguments in this keynote speech revolved around the presence of the absent in our imagination, which he identified as the main problem of epistemological and chronological reflection and hence of philosophy and history in general. According to Ricoeur, the intersecting lines of "actual presentation" and "representation of the past" constitute a riddle in the phenomenon of memory with respect to the question of truth. The talk's three parts considered memory as the fundamental matrix, the external object, and the informed product of history, and addressed the paradoxes that result from these different functions.

As the matrix of history, memory is a condition for representing the past and always requires a narrator. Hence truth and objectivity of history are, for example, related to the credibility of the witness. But the witness is contradicted by the epistemology of the document and the archive. Making reference to the notion of mentality in the *Annales* and *Nouvelles Histoire* schools of historiography and to Carlo Ginzburg's conjectural paradigm of the trace, Ricoeur argued that memory as a matrix of history does not become an object of "scientific" history because memory itself is an object of the historian qua human scientist. Thus memory as a product remained out of sight until the questions of the narration and rhetoric of history appeared. Ricoeur's psychoanalytic conclusion was that we should not separate the work of memory from the work of grief.

Pierre Nora, historian and editor of *Les lieux de mémoire*, began the Saturday session with a paper on the causes and effects of what he called the current world-wide upsurge in memory. It was in France, in Nora's view, that the ardent, "almost fetishistic memorialism" began that later



Paul Ricoeur



Pierre Nora, Charles S. Maier

spread to Latin America, South Africa, and Eastern Europe.

According to Nora, there were three basic reasons for this increased

awareness of memory, in contrast to history, in France. The economic crisis of 1974 made very clear that development after the Second World War, industrialization and urbanization, had swept away the entire rural way of life. This end of the LeGoffian “long Middle Ages of France” led in turn to a growing interest in the French past. The second reason was a process of reinterpretation of the national past, a consequence of the post-de Gaulle era. The third was the intellectual collapse of Marxism along with the factual end of the revolutionary idea. The concept of historical time based on revolutions and informed by the notion of rupture, Nora argued, has been replaced by another concept of time based on a renewed notion of tradition.

In Nora’s view, two major historical phenomena have facilitated the rise of “the age of commemoration.” The first is the so-called “acceleration of history”: utterly uncertain about the future, we do not know how to constitute and preserve our past. The end of any sort of historical teleology imposes on us a “duty to remember,” and leads to a kind of stockpiling of vestiges from the past. The second phenomenon is the “democratization” of history. Every group of people, former minorities in any sense of the word, today strives to rehabilitate its past as a part and an affirmation of its identity. Hence, the previous distinction between history as a sphere of the collective, and memory as a sphere of the individual with respect to the elaboration of the past has ceased to exist.

Nora mentioned two main effects of the recent upsurge of memory. One is a dramatic increase in the uses of the past for political, commercial, and touristic purposes. The second is a change in the role of the historian. Although historians once had a monopoly on the interpretation of the past, they must now share this task

with other actors such as judges, witnesses, media, and legislators. In conclusion, Nora warned, “To claim the right to memory is, at bottom, to call for justice. In the effects it has had, however, it has often become a call to murder.”

Following Nora’s lecture, **Reinhard Koselleck** took up the matter of war memorials in the 19th and 20th centuries. The theme of his empirically-based analysis was the transformation of memorials to the unknown soldier. Using photographs of memorials from several eras and countries, Koselleck illustrated a substantial change in the way the soldier is represented, with the strong monarchic traits in the 19th and the beginning of the 20th centuries giving way to the “democratized” face of the common man.



Reinhard Koselleck

The meaning of war memorials showed an even deeper and more important shift. The 19th century made a strong effort to give meaning to death on the battlefield in order to assure that soldiers would not die in vain. Such “endowing with meaning” (*Sinnstiftung*) was, however, replaced by a “quest for meaning” (*Sinnsuche*) or even a “demand for meaning” (*Sinnforderung*) after the First World War, and was finally substituted by a “denial of meaning” (*Sinnverweigerung*) after the Second World War.

Koselleck showed how memorials stopped trying to justify death and war. Instead of trying to answer the question, “Why?” today’s memorial only tries to demonstrate the imperative, “Never again!” The death of the lone soldier is no longer represented, and the illustrative emphasis is placed upon those who survived. In the case of Holocaust memorials the figural motif has disappeared altogether.

After lunch the main topic remained present, but the character of the speeches changed significantly. Following the academic lectures of Ricoeur, Nora, and Koselleck, the audience witnessed a political debate between two Polish speakers: **Adam Michnik**, historian and editor-in-chief of *Gazeta Wyborcza*, and **Aleksan-**

der Smolar, political scientist and director of the Warsaw-based Batory Foundation.

The problem of the legacy of Communism reveals itself as a problem of the whole history of the last 50 years, Michnik stated, seeking to historicize the picture of Communism in Poland. Communism underwent a firm evolution, and people’s attitudes toward it changed fundamentally in the course of time. It lasted much longer than Nazi-rule, and the vast majority of Poles were involved in one way or another in the structures of Communist power and helped to maintain this power. Thus there could be no analogy to post-war de-nazification in Poland. Moreover, the political transition at that time was a result of negotiations, and the absence of a clear break made the effort to confront the Communist legacy all the more difficult.

The best way to break with the Communist past, Michnik argued, would indeed have been to reveal the whole truth. But what is the truth? Michnik made no secret of his doubts that it is contained in secret police documents. In his view, the opening of secret police archives only leads to demagoguery or even to a threat to democracy. Some voices from the audience argued against Michnik, claiming that it is not the opening but the sealing of archives that damages democracy, for in that case there would still be a small number of people with access to secret documents who could misuse them.

Michnik’s old friend and opponent Smolar altered the debate as he spoke more about the role of “memory” of Communism in current politics rather than about the past itself. He discerned three groups in Polish politics, each of which has its own specific approach to the past. The first group he called radicals. This group considered the Communist regime to be a mere occupation. Its adherents wanted a clear break with the legacy of Communism and were dissatisfied with the way the ancien regime had been dismissed. The second group, Smolar continued, was the moderates. Many of them, Michnik included, fought against Communism before 1989 and used the language of totalitarian theory in those days. After the fall of Communism, however, they switched to a more pragmatic language in order to facilitate communication with former Communists and provide a chance for reconciliation.

In an allusion to Emerson, Smolar stated that there is a realm of memory and a realm of hope. While the former tries to analyze the past, the latter aims toward the future. Hence the moderates, who preferred to develop the vision of a democratic society, had to dispense with the real working-out of history. Moreover, there was a fear of the dynamics of revolution (even though there was, according to Smolar, no such revolution at all), a fear that the radicals are the Jacobins of contemporary Poland. The third group was the post-Communists, who did not see any discontinuity between the time before and after 1989 and instead spoke of a gradual democratization and liberalization of the Communist regime.

According to Smolar, the “historisophic” view does not play such an important role in Poland today as it did at the beginning of 1990s. However, with the return of right-wing government in 1997 the past was again on the political agenda in the form of “lustration” and “decommunization”. In contrast to Michnik, Smolar considered this “moderate” form of the cleansing of public life to be warranted, since it hindered the “privatized” (and more dangerous) form of lustration that had been taking place previously. This lustration according to law could, Smolar argued, even help some people to clear their names.

Whereas in Poland there is a vivid debate about the memory of Communism and the relevance of the past for contemporary politics, according to the next panel speakers, historians **Yuri Afanasiev** and **Richard Pipes**, in Russia there is nothing of the kind. The rational approach to the past was limited to a few scientific institutions, Afanasiev complained. On the other hand, politicians, especially President Putin, attempt to resurrect the myth of Russian history associated with the “Russian Idea”.

This kind of thought, with its origins in the 19th century, was developed by famous men of letters like Pushkin, Tolstoy and Dostoyevsky, and surfaced again in the Soviet Union in its later days. Today, Afanasiev argued, Putin promotes “patriotic history” in which the “unique character” of Russia and Russian history was also its “greatness”. Richard Pipes agreed with this view. According to Pipes, Russia has separated itself from its Communist past, but there is in fact no “active divorce” in public life. The problematic “yearning for Great Power status” has melded with a personal feeling of “compromised” citizens. Almost everybody, according to Pipes, was complicit in one way or another with the former regime, and feels guilty about it. This is why there has been no significant demand for a true confrontation with Soviet history, and why we will have to wait until the next generation comes to power and begins its reappraisal of the past.

“Memory and Identity in Austria” was the

theme of the public podium discussion Saturday evening. The discussion, chaired by **Lord Weidenfeld**, began with statements from each of the five speakers (three Austrians and two Americans) about the role of memory in the formation of the Austrian Republic and contemporary Austrian politics. All spoke on short notice following late cancellations by the originally scheduled speakers.

Rudolf Burger of the University of Applied Arts in Vienna pointed to the paradox that while the present is a result of history, so also is history in an important sense a product of the present. According to Burger, “The past is always a present phenomenon; hence it is penetrated through and through by the interests, above all the political interests, of the present.” He suggested that while the process of Austrian nation-building has experienced much success in the past half-century, the “patheticization” of historical perspectives in what are often relatively minor political conflicts shows that this process is not yet at an end.

Tuat's net politisieren! – Stop Politicizing! – was the title of Austrian writer **Josef Haslinger's** talk. Like Burger, he described Austria's halting construction of a national identity, relating his experience of the phenomenon of *Wienhass* – the countryside's contempt for the capital – and its corollary, Viennese disdain for country life. Haslinger suggested that Austrians tend to overlook persistent political divisions and instead direct their gaze to an imaginary “middlepoint” of idyllic Austrian life, or to the “ersatz Kaiser” of national ceremony. In Haslinger's view, the attempt to avoid a left-right schism after the war has led to “political disinterestedness,” and to the false expectation that everything can still be arranged to the general advantage “from above.”

Gerald Stourzh, Professor Emeritus of Contemporary History at the University of Vienna, discussed the overlapping tendencies toward, on the one hand, acknowledgment of Austria's part in National Socialism and, on the other hand, the mentality of the *Schlussstrich*, a decisive break with the past. The allied powers' ambiguous view of Austria as both complicit in the Nazi regime and as “the first victim of Hitlerite aggression,” Stourzh suggested, helped to establish this persistent dualism of historical understanding.

Charles S. Maier of Harvard University expressed “great discomfort with the notion of national identity in general,” which he thought unsuited to a “postmodern era” in which citizens constantly adopt and cycle through many different identities. Maier argued that current Austrian political disputes are better understood as expressions of the defining problems of post-war Europe – for example, immigration, globalization, and national sovereignty – rather than as a struggle over national



Aleksander Smolar, Tony Judt



Richard Pipes, Tony Judt, Yuri N. Afanasiev



Lord Weidenfeld, Fritz Stern



Josef Haslinger, Rudolf Burger



In the foreground: Gerald Stourzh

Das historische Gedächtnis ist heute in vielen Ländern und für viele politische, gesellschaftliche und religiöse Institutionen zu einer akuten Frage geworden. Noch nie sind die Mythen der Vergangenheit so vehement angegriffen und so leidenschaftlich verteidigt worden. Den Gründen für dieses Phänomen widmete sich eine international besetzte Konferenz des IWM von 9.-11. März. Eine Sammlung der Konferenzbeiträge wird *Transit 22* (erscheint Winter 2001) bieten.

identity. "The fact that populism appears on the right with ugly nationalist accents is hardly surprising and hardly isolated," he said.

Maier gently criticized the diplomatic sanctions imposed on Austria by the European Union last year, which he thought were "misconceived as a call against the government" instead of a more specific "call to maintain the values that are common to the new Europe." He spoke of the need for inclusive debate on the most difficult European issues, stating, "I don't think we're helped very much by using the word 'neo' all the time."

Picking up on Pierre Nora's statements about the democratization of history, **Fritz Stern**, Professor of History at Columbia University, asserted the need for careful attention to complete contexts in the study of history. He criticized both the wholesale ignoring of the tragic events of past – as exemplified, in Stern's view, by Japan – and what he called "a predilection for the negative" in much current historiography, especially that which would claim that even approximating historical truth is impossible.

The discussion of memory and identity in post-Communist democracies continued on Sunday with a lecture by **Timothy Garton Ash** of Oxford. In remarks that were also reminiscent of Nora's reflections on recent times as an "age of memorialism," Ash showed how *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* or "past-beating" has become a sort of global industry. He discussed several goals – e.g., truth, justice, and democratization – and several means – e.g., trials, public apologies, and the criminalization of denial of certain past events – of this now widely practiced activity.

Garton Ash then turned to a historical scheme, claiming that until 1945, the standard approach to the past by political leaders was not to remember, but precisely to forget. He discussed the historically close tie between forgetfulness and forgiveness, as implied also in the linguistic affinity between "amnesty" and "amnesia." Churchill could still speak of a "blessed act of oblivion," but since then the predominant political approach to the past has been deliberately to remember it. But while history may present us with a dichotomy, one of whose elements seems to be morally superior to the other, according to Ash this view conceals the complexity of the problem of remembering the past.

Like Nora, he quoted Nietzsche on the plasticity of memory, and also like Nora he pointed to the problem of the political exploitation of memory, citing the example of the Serbian army's legitimization of the Srebrenica massacre by the need to avenge Turkish massacres of Serbs in the 19th century. Garton Ash proposed a middle way that would achieve a "subtle blend of memory and forgetting," and counseled against demands for fast

reconciliation. He characterized the process of dealing with the past as "a journey between the Scylla of amnesia and the Charybdis of hypermnesia to the more tranquil if ambiguous waters of mesomnesia."

Joachim Gauck, former Federal Commissioner for the Archives of the State Security Service of the former GDR in Berlin, was the first to comment on Garton Ash's paper. Gauck discussed the problem of the *Schlussstrich* in post-reunification Germany, stating firstly that the political purpose of the government's taking possession of the Stasi files was "the political, juridical, and historical working-out (*Aufarbeitung*) of the past."

Referring to the problem – raised most clearly at the conference by Adam Michnik – of the political misuse of the files, Gauck argued that this was not so much an endemic political problem as a matter of abuse by individuals of certain specifically outlined rights to receive information. As with any abuse of a right, political misuse of these files can be punished and deterred through the usual juridical means, Gauck stated. The immediate goal of opening the files was not reconciliation; it was rather "so that the oppressors could no longer determine their positions in society, and that the civil and human rights of the oppressed could prevail over the interests of the earlier ruling elites." Gauck concluded: "I am against cheap grace."

Following Gauck, **Alex Boraine**, who occupied a comparable position to that of Gauck in South Africa as Vice-Chairman of the Truth and Reconciliation Committee, took the floor. Boraine cautioned against neglecting the goal of reconciliation. "In a very divided society," he said, "if you are going to have any real guarantee of stability and peace, and not a return to hostility, there ought to be a very real commitment to reconciliation, both between individuals and within communities – especially if there are two or more major groups in competition." He emphasized, however, that reconciliation is necessarily a process, and cannot be instantly realized.

In South Africa, Boraine said, this process was essentially one of negotiation and compromise, and not of one group lording it over another, even though pressure may have been used – as, for example, when the security forces insisted on a limited amnesty clause before they would guarantee protection in the first post-apartheid election. The commission itself was, in his view, a fundamentally democratic process that became "a daily experience



Joachim Gauck, Alex Boraine

of the entire nation.”

Boraine agreed with Garton Ash that there must be a tension or blending of remembering and forgetting, but he qualified this by saying that “the duty of memory is to forget, but you do that by remembering, and you do not to that by ignoring.” In South Africa, he said, “It was important to deal with the past. Not to stay there, not to dwell in it, but to move beyond it, having first remembered.” “We will turn the page,” he said, “but we must first read it.”

In the afternoon the topic shifted to memory of Communism and fascism. Fritz Stern was the chairman, and first to speak was **Leszek Kolakowski**, Professor of Philosophy at Oxford, on the topic of Communist mendacity. Kolakowski began by recalling the massive importance of

the party in the Communist regimes, so important even that the Marxist claim about the withering away of the state is in a certain sense accurate. He then turned to the

nature of the Communist lie, which he claimed was unique in political history because of its “immunity” to facts. The “dialectics” of Communist ideology allowed the party to “transform any fact into its opposite,” generating what Kolakowski called “a mentality of sincere lies” in the Communist countries.

Next, in a paper entitled “Hot Memory, Cold Memory,” **Charles Maier** took up the following question: “Why does the black book of Nazism remain, in the consciousness of so many of those preoccupied by the history of the twentieth century, blacker than the black book of Communism?” He employed the metaphor of the atomic “half-life” of radioactive elements to discuss why he thinks “memory of Nazi crimes” – above all the Holocaust – “has not faded, but memory of Communist crimes has.”

Maier disputed the thesis – recently advanced by Norman Finkelstein in his book “The Holocaust Industry” – that the durability of Holocaust memory can be explained by interest-group politics orga-

nized around financial incentives. He offered instead a two-part explanation that he called a “very speculative hypothesis.” First was the contrast between the “targeted terror” of the Nazi regime and the “stochastic terror” of Stalinist regimes. It is the former “that bequeaths hot memory,” in Maier’s view, because of the inescapability it implies. And whereas the stochasticism of Soviet terror meant that there was often little one could have done to prevent atrocities, the specificity of Nazi terror raises the problem of complicity or “bystanding:” knowing who the likely victims were but failing to do everything possible to save them.

Unlike that of Communism, “the ‘memory’ of fascism asks us to think not whether we would have been fascists, but anti-fascists, and the answer is often a disturbing no.” Nazism’s connection to the “almost universal question” of courage in the face of evil helps explain why its memory remains “hot,” in Maier’s view.

The final session of the Conference, “Jewish Memory, Jewish Tradition, and European Identity,” moderated by **Shlomo Avineri** of Hebrew University of Jerusalem, featured papers by **Yehuda Bauer** and **Aviezer Ravitzky**, both also from Hebrew University. Both Bauer and Ravitzky addressed the impact of the Holocaust on the lives of Jews in the past half-century, Bauer with respect to politics and society, Ravitzky with respect to theology.

Ravitzky discussed how three major Jewish theological concepts – redemption, revelation, and the creation of man – have been transformed as a consequence of memory of the Holocaust. He suggested that messianic movements within contemporary Judaism can be understood as responses to the sudden incursion of history into the traditionally non-historical consciousness of ultra-orthodox pantheistic movements such as Lubavitcher Hassidism. Memory of the Holocaust has, according to Ravitzky, introduced a messianic dimension into the major Jewish redemptive movements, so that the historical and political successes of Israel – however ethically partial – have been vested by many Jews with immediate messianic significance.

Whereas memory of the Holocaust has positively intensified the thought of redemption, it has also, Ravitzky claimed, introduced a deep pessimism into Jewish

thinking about revelation and creation. The attempt to find religious meaning in the Holocaust has led to an “implicit transformation” of the traditional view according to which God reveals himself through salvation and light. Ravitzky linked this transformation to the massive revival in recent years of Jewish mysticism, which tends to emphasize the real existence of evil, and to a darker and more pessimistic view of the human being in Jewish theology. According to Ravitzky, this helps account for the increased rigor of the Jewish law within many orthodox communities in the post-war decades.

Bauer’s talk focused on the problem of the tension between politics and historiography in memory of the Holocaust. Like Charles Maier, he disputed claims that allege a large, organized, historically distortive attempt to use the memory of the Holocaust to political ends. But he defended a certain instrumentalization of



Leszek Kolakowski, Alain Besancon



Shlomo Avineri, Yehuda Bauer, Aviezer Ravitzky

memory as a normal and acceptable part of democratic politics: “What appears as instrumentalization, and in part indeed is so, is mainly a reaction to the trauma of the Holocaust.” The roots of this reaction, in Bauer’s view, are less willful manipulation than “a growing realization that something unprecedented happened in the genocide of the Jews, something that is so extraordinary and yet so indicative of the human condition in general, that a vague feeling exists that that is a matter that a person living in our generation ought to know something about it.”

Andrew Bove / Michal Kopecek

Pressestimmen (Auswahl)

Bei Annäherung an das neue Jahrhundert hat Hans Blumenberg vor Jahren die Vermutung ausgesprochen, man werde beim Wechsel des Jahrhunderts die Gunst der Stunde nutzen, sich zu entschuldigen, indem man so viel wie möglich dem zwanzigsten Jahrhundert als einem unheilvollen aufladen würde. Das zwanzigste Jahrhundert, das einst angetreten war, das neunzehnte durch Neuheit zu überbieten, könnte der „damnatio memoriae“ verfallen. Derzeit sieht es so aus,



Ulrich Speck, Henning Ritter

als trete das Gegenteil ein: Wie kein Jahrhundert zuvor ist das jüngst vergangene immer noch

Gegenstand von Aufarbeitung, von „Erinnerungsarbeit“ und neuerdings sogar einer Gedächtnisgeschichte, die sich anschiebt, die herkömmliche Geschichtsschreibung von Grund auf umzuwälzen und an die Aufgabe der Erinnerung von Greueln, von Völkermord, Verfolgung und Benachteiligungen zu binden.

Henning Ritter, *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*

Vorsichtshalber gab das Wiener Institut für die Wissenschaften vom Menschen seiner Tagung vom letzten Wochenende einen englischen Titel: „The Memory of the Century“: „Memory“ für das Gedächtnis des vergangenen 20. Jahrhunderts und zugleich als Bezeichnung für Erinnerung. Eine glückliche Themenwahl, war es doch an der Zeit, sich den Kopf über die Schwemme der öffentlichen Gedenkfeiern zu zerbrechen, die uns mittlerweile bei jedem Jahrestag wichtiger Ereignisse heimsucht, über die Ursachen des Erinnerungskults.

Christian Semler, *tageszeitung*

(...) Doch betonte Krzysztof Michalski, der Direktor des IWM, am Beginn der Tagung, dass es sich hier keinesfalls um rein akademische Fragen handle, sondern um Probleme von hoher politischer Brisanz. Wie recht Michalski mit dieser Bemerkung hatte, zeigte sich im weiteren Verlauf der Tagung in aller Deutlichkeit: Denn der Komplex, der mit den Begriffen „Geschichte und Erinnerung“ umschrieben ist, wurde nicht nur im reinen Raum der begrifflichen Abstraktion abgehandelt, sondern auch dort aufgesucht, wo er sich politisch konkretisiert.

Hermann Schlösser, *Wiener Zeitung*

Wenn man die Bedeutung von Diktatur als Zerstörung von Strukturen und Individuen erlebt hat, denn muss man Zeugnis davon ablegen. Das kann man tun, indem man staatliches Erinnern so gestaltet, wie es früher meine Aufgabe war. Da fragen wir und dann nicht, wie groß die Wirkung ist, sondern wir tun es, weil wir nicht anders können.

Joachim Gauck im Gespräch mit Hans Rauscher, *Der Standard*

Timothy Garton Ash ist um eine geistreiche Provokation nie verlegen. In Anlehnung an die „Holocaust-Industrie“, die der linke Politikwissenschaftler Norman Finkelstein in seinem jüngsten Buch brutal attackierte, prägte der Historiker aus Oxford bei der Wiener Konferenz zum „Gedächtnis des Jahrhunderts“ das Wort von der „Vergangenheitsbewältigungsindustrie“.

Burkhard Bischof, *Die Presse*

Die Erinnerungsindustrie füllt nunmehr ein Vakuum, das durch den Untergang der teleologischen Geschichtsauffassung entstanden ist. Wem die Geschichte ohne Sinn erscheint, der versucht, ihr einen zu geben. So setzt sich zu guter Letzt die Überzeugung durch, es gebe eine individuelle und kollektive „Pflicht zur Erinnerung“.

Michael Mertes, *Rheinischer Merkur*

Während das Erinnern heutzutage zur Pflicht gehört, geht die Bedeutung des Vergessens fast vergessen.

Guido Kalberer, *Tages-Anzeiger*

Das Unrecht der Vergangenheit kann nicht ohne die Utopie enzyklopädischer Erinnerung gesühnt werden, doch kehrt sich jede Utopie da gegen sich selbst, wo sie zwanghaft wird. Der den Menschen mögliche Weg zur Wahrheit folgt dem Wechselspiel von Präsenz und Absenz: Erinnern, ohne vergessen zu dürfen – das ist wie reden, ohne schweigen, leben, ohne schlafen zu können.

Andreas Breitenstein, *Neue Zürcher Zeitung*



Roger de Weck, Guido Kalberer, Andreas Breitenstein

Während der vorchristliche Dichter Ovid das Vergessen als einziges Heilmittel gegen eine unglückliche Liebe preist, herrscht heute die Meinung, dass nur die schmerzhaft Seelenzergliederung zu wahrhaft neuem Glück führt. (...) Von Ovid trennt uns Sigmund Freud. Seit wir von dem Wiener Gelehrten wissen, dass nicht Aufgearbeitetes, bloß Verdrängtes uns zu einem späteren Zeitpunkt wieder heimsuchen kann, hat das Vergessen seine Unschuld verloren. Vielleicht kein Zufall, dass ausgerechnet in Wien eine hochkarätig besetzte Tagung nach den Gründen fragte für die obsessive Beschäftigung des 20. Jahrhunderts mit der Erinnerung.

Claudia Keller, *Der Tagesspiegel*

In drei Tagen gelang es, das Gedächtnis, diese Qualle unter den Begriffen, zu fassen, auf die Philosophie, Politik und die Gesellschaft anzuwenden und anhand verschiedener Länder sichtbar zu machen.

Jacques Schuster, *Die Welt*

Die Frage nach dem Königsweg, wie denn nun mit Erinnerung und Geschichte umzugehen sei, blieb auch in der Wiener Expertenrunde ungeklärt. Dass dies das bestmögliche Ergebnis der dreitägigen Konferenz ist, war die inoffizielle Pointe der Veranstaltung. In einer offenen, pluralistischen Gesellschaft sei die vollständige Versöhnung nicht möglich, und eben auch keine Homogenisierung der Erinnerungen und Geschichtsbilder, meinte Garton Ash.

Ulrich Speck, *Frankfurter Rundschau*

Participants

Yuri N. Afanasiev, Professor of History and President, Russian State University for the Humanities, Moscow

Mitchell Ash, Professor of History, University of Vienna

Shlomo Avineri, Professor of Political Science and Director, Institute for European Studies, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem; Member of the IWM Academic Advisory Board

Jeff Barak, Editor-in-Chief, Jerusalem Post

Yehuda Bauer, Professor of History; Academic Advisor, International Institute for Holocaust Studies at Yad Vashem, Jerusalem

Ivan Bernik, Professor of Social Sciences, University of Lubljana, Slovenia

Alain Besançon, Professor of History; Member of the Académie Française, Paris

Ernst-Wolfgang Böckenförde, Professor of Law, Universität Freiburg; Richter des Bundesverfassungsgerichts a.D.; Member of IWM's Academic Advisory Board.



Klaus Nellen,
Ernst-Wolfgang Böckenförde

Alex Boraine, Vice-Chairman of South Africa's Truth and Reconciliation Commission; Global Law School Program, New York University

Maarten C. Brands, Professor of History and Director, Duitsland Instituut, University of Amsterdam; Member of the IWM Academic Advisory Board

Gabriele Bucher-Dinç, Project Manager EUSTORY, Körber-Stiftung, Hamburg

Rudolf Burger, Professor of Philosophy, University of Applied Arts, Vienna

Günther Burkert-Dottolo, Director, Politische Akademie – modern politics, Vienna

Alexandre Chevyrev, MIROS Institute, Moscow

Roger Cohen, *The New York Times*

Roger de Weck, Journalist, Berlin

Slavenka Drakulic, Essayist and Journalist, Stockholm/Vienna/Zagreb; IWM Milena Jesenská Fellow

Benita Ferrero-Waldner, Austrian Federal Minister for Foreign Affairs, Vienna

Timothy Garton Ash, Historian, St. Antony's College, Oxford

Joachim Gauck, Former Federal Commissioner for the Archives of the State Security Service of the former GDR, Berlin

Abigail Gillman, Assistant Professor of German and Hebrew, Boston University; Visiting Fellow, IWM

Simon Golin, Geschäftsführer des Deutschen Studienpreises, Körber-Stiftung, Hamburg

Josef Haslinger, Writer, Vienna

Friedrich Hoess, Botschafter i.R., Vereinigung der Österreichischen Industrie, Wien

Ivan Iltschev, Professor of History, University of



Bernard Lewis, Ira Katznelson

Sofia

Tony R. Judt, Professor of History and Director, Remarque Institute at New York University; IWM Permanent Fellow

Ira Katznelson, Professor of Political Science, Columbia University, New York; Member of the IWM Academic Advisory Board

Dina Khapaeva, St. Petersburg State University, Smolny Institute of Liberal Arts and Sciences, St. Petersburg

Leszek Kolakowski, Professor of Philosophy Emeritus, University of Chicago; Fellow, All Souls College, Oxford; Member of the IWM Academic Advisory Board

Nikolay Kopusov, St. Petersburg State University, Smolny Institute of Liberal Arts & Sciences, St. Petersburg

Reinhart Koselleck, Professor of History Emeritus, Universität Bielefeld; Member of the IWM Academic Advisory Board

János M. Kovács, Permanent Fellow, IWM; Professor of Economics, Eötvös Lorand University, Budapest

Marcin Krol, Professor of History, University of Warsaw; Member of the IWM Academic Advisory Board

Bernard Lewis, Professor of Near Eastern Studies Emeritus, Princeton University; Member of the IWM Academic Advisory Board

Charles S. Maier, Professor of History and Director, Center for European Studies, Harvard University, Cambridge

Michael Mertes, Deputy Editor, *Rheinischer Merkur*, Bonn

Krzysztof Michalski, Professor of Philosophy, Boston University; Director, IWM

Adam Michnik, Historian; Editor-in Chief, *Gazeta Wyborcza*, Warsaw

Alexei Miller, Senior Research Fellow, Russian Academy of Sciences; Guest Professor of History, CEU Budapest; Visiting Fellow, IWM

Klaus Nellen, Permanent Fellow, IWM

Pierre Nora, Professor of History, École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales (EHESS), Paris

Wiktor Osiatynski, Professor of Law, University of Chicago and CEU Budapest; Member of the Board, Open Society Institute, New York

Irene E. Pipes, President, Jewish-Polish Historical Society, Cambridge,

Massachusetts

Richard Pipes, Professor of History Emeritus, Harvard University

Gerhard Rainer, Federal Ministry for Foreign Affairs, Vienna

Andrzej Rapaczynski, Professor of Law, Columbia University; Director, Project Syndicate, New York/Prague



Timothy Garton Ash, Andrzej Rapaczynski,
Adam Michnik

Aviezer Ravitzky, Professor of Jewish Thought, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

Paul Ricoeur, Professor of Philosophy Emeritus, University of Chicago and Sorbonne; Member of the Académie Française; Member of the IWM Academic Advisory Board

Pierre Rosanvallon, Professor of Political Science, EHESS - Le Centre de Recherches Politiques Raymond Aron, Paris; Member of the IWM Academic Advisory Board



Pierre Rosanvallon

Sabine Rosenblatt, Deputy Editor, *Die Woche*, Hamburg



Fürst Schwarzenberg, Kardinal König, Benita Ferrero-Waldner

Jacques Rupnik, Professor of Political Science, CERI – Fondation Nationale des Sciences Politiques, Paris
Wolf Schmidt, Member of the Board of Directors, Körber-Stiftung, Hamburg
Fürst zu Schwarzenberg, Vienna
Dieter Simon, President, Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Berlin; Member of the IWM Academic Advisory Board
Jan Skórzynski, Deputy editor, *Rzeczpospolita*, Warsaw



Dieter Simon, Wolf Schmidt

Aleksander Smolar, Professor of Political Science, CNRS, Paris; President, Stefan Batory Foundation, Warsaw
Eugeniusz Smolar, Editor-in-chief, *Polskie Radio SA*
Robert Spaemann, Professor of Philosophy Emeritus, University of Munich, Member of the IWM Academic Advisory Board

Fritz Stern, Professor of History Emeritus, Columbia University, New York; Member of the IWM Academic Advisory Board
Gerald Stourzh, Professor of History Emeritus, University of Vienna
Jerzy Szacki, Professor of Sociology, University of Warsaw; Member of the IWM Academic Advisory Board
Lord Weidenfeld, Publisher, London
Jon Westling, President, Boston University
Dorothee Wierling, Universität Erfurt, Arbeitsstelle Historische Anthropologie

Journalists

Samuel Abraham, *Vyberovy Vzdělávací Spolok*
Evelyn Adunka, *Zwischenwelt / Israel Nachrichten*
Camilo Antonio, *Filipinos Abroad*
Eldad Beck, *Ma'ariv*
Burkhard Bischof, *Die Presse*
Andreas Breitenstein, *Neue Zürcher Zeitung*
Lorenzo Cremonesi, *Corriere della Sera*
Burgi Czeitschner, Kirch Media Group
Marianne Enigl, *profil*
Yair Ettinger, *Ha'aretz*
Dieter Festl
Michael Freund, *Der Standard*
Claudia Gabriel-Schneider, *Neue Zürcher Zeitung*
Eugen Georgiev, Verband der Auslands-presse
Marta S. Halpert, *Focus*
Karin Heitsch, United Nations, Vienna
Ewa Holubowicz, Polskie Radio Sa
Informacyjna Agencja

Radiowa
Milan Ilic, *Delo*
Guido Kalberer, *Tagesanzeiger*
Stefan Karner, *steirische berichte*
Claudia Keller, *Der Tagesspiegel*
Joanna King, Radio Austria International
Deniz Kite, *Yeni Yasan Gazatesi*
Hans Michael Kloth, *Der Spiegel*
Johann Kneihls, ORF Radio
Franz Kössler, ORF Radio
Eva Kovacs, *Magyar Naranacs*
Florian Korczak, *Berliner Zeitung*
Julius Kratky, ORF TV / BR Alpha
Martin Kugler, *Die Tagespost*
Susanne Kummer
Krzysztof Kuziel, *Bulgarisches Wirtschaftsblatt*
Peter Lachnit, ORF Radio
Samuel Laster
Gabriele Lesser, *taz / Der Standard*
Helene Maimann, ORF TV
Andreas Maislinger
Vladislav Marjanovic, ORF Radio
Peter Mayr, *Der Standard*
Walter Mayr, *Der Spiegel*
Margit Maximilian, ORF TV
Rudolf Mitlöhner, *Die Presse*
Rafael Newman, *du*
Anna Niedzialkowska, *Radio Plus*
Elisabeth Nöstlinger, ORF Radio
Bernhard Odehnal, *Die Weltwoche*
Karl Pfeifer, *Kol Israel Radio / Searchlight*
Tomasz Pompowski, *Radio Plus*
Hans Rauscher, *Der Standard / Format*
Henning Ritter, *Frankfur-*

ter Allgemeine Zeitung
Hermann Schlösser, *Wiener Zeitung*
Ulrike Schmitzer, BR Alpha TV / ORF
Jacques Schuster, *Die Welt*
Christa Schwab, Austria Presse Agentur
Karl-Peter Schwarz,



Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung
Andrea Seibel, *Die Welt*
Christian Semler, *taz / WDR*
Michael Siegert, *profil*
Martin M. Simecka, *Domino Forum / SME*
Martha Simecka, *SME*
Ulrich Speck, *Frankfurter Rundschau*
Hansjakob Stehle, *Die Zeit*
Françoise Stonborough-Blaser, *Le Temps*
Stephan Teichgräber, *Buchkultur*
Friedrich Tietjen, ORF Radio
Mariann Unterluggauer, ORF Radio
Markus Wailand, ORF TV
Erika Wantoch
Ulrich Weinzierl, *Die Welt*
Marie Woodhams, Tschechischer Rundfunk
Peter Zajac, *Vyberovy Vzdělávací Spolok*
Jacek Zakowski

On 28 February 2001, IWM launched a new workshop series sponsored by the British Embassy and the British Council, and in cooperation with the Austrian Ministry for Foreign Affairs. Workshop debates focus on how identities are changing at regional, national and European levels in the context of European Integration and Enlargement. Particular attention will be devoted to various forms of citizen participation, "sense of belonging" and the inclusion/exclusion processes affecting ethnic minorities.

Citizenship, Identity and Ethnicity in Europe

THE FIRST WORKSHOP comprised of three sessions which took an overview of the major themes of the workshop series. In the first session on **Changing Europe – Changing Identities**, **Ash Amin** (University of Durham, UK) posed the question of the relevance of the 'Idea of Europe' in a multi-ethnic European Union. Does the idea of a common Europe woven around Enlightenment values, Christian humanism, Roman Law, and liberal democracy make sense any more in a cosmopolitan and multi-cultural Europe? This question is conceptually important because it raises interesting dilemmas about how far territorial affiliation remain the central source of belonging and identity formation.

Amin argued that the old 'Idea of Europe' means very little to not only the growing ethnic minority population in the EU, but also to sections of the 'majority' population whose affiliations are increasingly forged around lifestyle and consumption patterns constructed on varied and shifting geographies of identification. However, the desire for cultural difference, both within majority and minority cultures, remains strong and cannot be brushed aside in discussions on what might make a progressive Europe. Amin asserted that, paradoxically, a new universalism based on the offer of material benefits to all citizens at the level of Europe might gather popular endorsement for the European project and, at the same time, allow cultural diversity to flourish. In short, therefore, he promoted the idea of a new European commons, but one based on rights that are neither reducible to deep 'European' values, nor confined to fixed notions of citizenship.

Sonja Puntscher-Riekmann (Austrian Academy of Sciences) tackled the concept of the construction of a European Identity. She noted that conventional wisdom asserted that there was no such thing as European Identity. In spite of European citizenship enshrined in the Treaty on European Union, Europeans did not feel themselves as Europeans or they did so only to a small degree. She suggested that the idea of constructing a European identity might be better advanced by focussing on the processes of institution-building, rather than invoking 'grand narratives' of challenges and dan-

gers to bind a sense of European togetherness. A thorough analysis of European constitutions and political systems will reveal that there is a common political culture in the European states, the differences being smaller than often claimed. Why not then focus our political discourse on these constitutional factors common to member States? It is alleged that people are not interested, and that such a discourse is highly abstract and a matter for legal experts. Why then do citizens respond so favourably to the question about a European Constitution in the surveys of EUROSTAT etc, while in the same polls they profess considerable scepticism as to the existing institutional arrangements?

Puntscher-Riekmann concluded that European citizens seem to want to express a voice in the process of the distribution of power on the European level as they did in the struggles for national democracies. To give them a voice is more, and much more risky, than to announce elite strategies of 'getting closer to the citizens' by explaining to them the intricacies of the European treaties and European policy-making. To find forums and procedures in which this voice can be articulated and mediated is the major task facing European elites.

The morning session concluded with a **key note speech** from **Keith Vaz**, UK Minister for Europe, who outlined the British viewpoint on Citizenship, Identity and Ethnicity. Starting with the assertion that "Britain today is without doubt a multicultural society", Vaz, who himself is from an ethnic minority background, overviewed both progress achieved and the challenges remaining on these issues in the UK, and the European level efforts taking place to move forward these issues in the interests of all EU citizens. The lively debate generated in the first session encouraged Vaz to depart from his prepared text and speak personally of his own experience and expectations as a new migrant arriving in the UK, and those that he had for his children today as UK and European citizens.

After lunch, the second session focused on **Citizens' Political Participation in Europe**. **Paul Whiteley** (University of Essex, UK) reported on the initial findings of the Citizen Audit of Britain, a national sample survey of the adult popula-

Gemeinsam mit der Britischen Botschaft und dem British Council in Wien und unterstützt durch das österreichische Außenministerium hat das IWM am 28. Februar eine neue Veranstaltungsreihe zu Staatsbürgerschaft, Identität und Ethnizität ins Leben gerufen. Im Mittelpunkt steht die Frage, wie sich Identitäten auf der regionalen, der nationalen und insbesondere der europäischen Ebene vor dem Hintergrund der Europäischen Integration und der bevorstehenden Osterweiterung verschieben. Der nächste Workshop der Reihe wird am 5. November – wiederum in der Diplomatischen Akademie – stattfinden und dem Themenkomplex „Migration, Multi-Ethnische Gesellschaften und soziale Stabilität“ gewidmet sein.



Keith Vaz giving the keynote speech

Hans Rauscher, Sonja Puntischer-Riekmann,
Ash Amin

Kenneth Newton, Raimund Löw



tion, focusing on the nature and meaning of citizenship in contemporary Britain. He emphasised four key aspects of citizenship: the balance between citizen demands for rights and their awareness of the obligations which come with those rights; citizen participation in politics and the sense of efficacy associated with this, or perceptions that participation can make a difference to outcomes; identities and perceptions that the individual belongs to various communities and is loyal to place within those communities; and, trust in other people and in institutions of the State. Preliminary evidence from the audit supported recent theoretical work which suggested that trust is a key factor in determining the willingness of citizens to participate in politics and voluntary activity, and to identify and support the political system.

Moving from micro to a macro level of analysis, **Rainer Bauböck** (Austrian Academy of Sciences) argued that the EU Treaties to date have broadened the bundle of individual rights established within the European legal order but have failed to design a proper 'architecture' of European citizenship. While political and legal integration of the Union has had important impacts on domestic systems of government, EU citizenship has been constructed in such a way that it leaves national conceptions of membership virtually unaffected. Majority nationalism is the most powerful obstacle to further integration and enlargement. With the introduction of a common currency and the abolition of internal borders, national citizenship remains a strong symbol of member state sovereignty.

Bauböck argued for two key issues to be put on the European agenda. Firstly, a federal conception of European citizenship which would be multinational rather than postnational; that is, instead of ignoring national affiliations, it would try to integrate and pluralize them within a federal framework. Secondly, taking federal citizenship seriously requires harmonising the nationality laws of the member states and opening citizenship to third country nationals.

The final session addressed the **contemporary debate on migration**, the integration of immigrants and the growing phenomenon of xenophobia. **Adrian Favell** (University of Sussex, UK) elaborated on the paradoxes of integration whereby multiculturalism and nationalism tended to work hand in hand. In part this was because of the proximity of matters concerning integration, ie policies on education, acculturation, social inclusion and political participation, to traditional nation-building concerns in each country. Across Europe, different nation-states had developed various 'philosophies' concerning how immigrants were to be integrated, and how these issues can be reconciled with longer standing historical conceptions of

national culture and nationally-specific ideas of liberal democracy. Favell argued that, in the context of the wider trend towards European Integration, each country has in fact seized the challenge of new immigration or ethnic diversity to come up with new, often mildly nationalist versions of pluralism or multiculturalism that typically affirm a kind of inbred national superiority in dealing with issues seen to be problematic elsewhere. National arrogance on this question has helped to prevent a meaningful cross-national dialogue about common issues faced by all West European countries.

Claire Wallace (Institute for Advanced Studies, Vienna) presented results of research on four Central European post-communist countries (Poland, Czech Republic, Hungary and Slovakia). She emphasised that these countries have now developed from being countries of emigration to being countries of immigration as out-migration has fallen and in-migration increased over the 1990s. In this period, migration has also taken on some new dimensions. The traditional patterns of East-West permanent migration have been replaced by shorter, circulatory flows and the possibilities of maintaining cross-border lifestyles and identities. Traditional notions of citizenship, tied to the nation state, do not encompass these changes.

One consequence of this has been the growing visibility of xenophobia in these countries, even though it has not been widely manifested in popular politics. Migration issues have formed an important part of the "acquis communautaire" process for EU enlargement. Under pressure from the EU, these countries have been forced to restrict migration and impose limitations on migration from the East, even when they are reluctant to do so. Consequently, migration policies are concerned increasingly with closing rather than with the opening of borders.

Wallace argued that this has resulted in a series of tensions; inter alia, between a mono-cultural ideal and a multi-cultural reality, and between economic demand for migrant labour and their political rejection. Such tensions will shape the kind of Europe that will emerge and the extent and nature of her borders, and pose challenges for the whole of Europe and not just for the EU accession countries.

The three workshop sessions were chaired respectively by the series planning committee, **Janos Matyas Kovacs** (IWM, Vienna) **Kenneth Newton** (University of Southampton, UK) and **Karl Müller** (Institute of Advanced Studies, Vienna) together with journalists, **Hans Rauscher**, **Raimund Löw** and **Barbara Coudenhove-Kalergi**. The workshop series is hosted at the Diplomatic Academy. The next workshop will be held on 5 November 2001 on the topic of "Migration, Multi-Ethnic Societies and Social Stability".

„Der andere Weg in die Moderne“, das IWM-Projekt zu Jan Patockas Beitrag zur Erforschung der Frühen Neuzeit, führte das internationale Forschungsteam im März zur Arbeitskonferenz nach Prag.

Offene Seele – Harmonische Welt

Die frühe Neuzeit in der ideengeschichtlichen Reflexion

Jan Patockas

IM RAHMEN DES IWM-FORSCHUNGSPROJEKTS *Der andere Weg in die Moderne. Jan Patockas Beitrag zur Genealogie der Neuzeit* fand vom 22. – 24. März in Prag ein internationales Kolloquium statt, in dessen Mittelpunkt die ideengeschichtliche Auseinandersetzung des tschechischen Philosophen mit der frühen Neuzeit stand.

Das Leitmotiv eines „anderen Wegs in die Moderne“ wird für Patocka maßgeblich von dieser Epoche mitbestimmt, weil er hier neben der mit dem Namen Descartes zu verknüpfenden Entstehung der neuzeitlichen Philosophie und Wissenschaft bei dessen Zeitgenossen Comenius auch den Ansatz einer anderen Modernität zu finden meint. Die Referate gingen dieser Hypothese teils aus historischer, teils aus einer an der philosophischen Systematik orientierten Perspektive nach.

Das Kolloquium wurde in enger Kooperation zwischen dem Prager Zentrum für phänomenologische Forschung (cfb) und dem IWM organisiert und finanziell von der Volkswagen-Stiftung, dem Bildungsministerium der Tschechischen Republik sowie dem Österreichischen Ost- und Südosteuropa-Institut, Außenstelle Brunn, unterstützt.

Vorträge

Elmar Holenstein

Andere Wege in die Moderne. Versuch einer kartographischen Wegleitung

Josef Moural

Two Underappreciated Paths on the Way to Modernity: Educational Reform(s) and Reception(s) of Scepticism

Ludger Hagedorn

„Bewegung“ als Grundmotiv von Patockas Ideengeschichte

Klaus Schaller

Jan Patockas Philosophie der offenen Seele Anknüpfung an Comenius und weiterführende Wiederholung

Vera Schifferová

Über eine merkwürdige Interpretation der Philosophie des Comenius

Pauline van Vliet

Zwischen Konservatismus und Innovation
Ein kontrastiver Blick auf die Modernität bei Comenius

James Dodd

Hope in Comenius, Descartes and Pascal

Sigmund Bonk

Descartes' Kritik an der Weltseele und die Aktualität seiner Theorie der Zeit

Hans-Martin Gerlach

„Das Zeitalter ist aufgeklärt – woran liegt es, dass wir noch immer Barbaren sind?“ Vom Nutzen und Nachteil der Aufklärung für das Leben: Aufklärung und Aufklärungskritik im 18. Jahrhundert

Teilnehmerinnen und Teilnehmer

Michele Basile, Mailand

Marta Becková, Akademie der Wissenschaften, Prag

Helga Blaschek-Hahn, cfb Prag

Sigmund Bonk, Universität Regensburg

Ivan Chvatik, cfb Prag

James Dodd, Boston University

Hans-Martin Gerlach, Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz

Ludger Hagedorn, Berlin / IWM Wien

Elmar Holenstein, ETH Zürich

Zdenek Kalva, CTS Prag

Pavel Kouba, Karls-Universität / cfb Prag

Aleksandr Matoušek, cfb Prag

Dr. Jirí Michálek, Karls-Universität Prag

Gerhard Michel, Heinrich Heine-Universität Düsseldorf

Josef Moural, Karls-Universität / cfb Prag

Klaus Nellen, IWM Wien

Karel Novotný, Karls-Universität / cfb Prag

Inma Perez Rocha, Santiago de Compostela

Francesca Perfetti, Mailand

Jirí Polivka, Karls-Universität Prag

Christian Rabanus, Wiesbaden

Klaus Schaller, Ruhr-Universität Bochum

Vera Schifferová, Akademie der Wissenschaften, Prag

Hans Rainer Sepp, cfb Prag

Jan Sokol, Karls-Universität Prag

Michael Staudigl, Universität Wien

Martin Steiner, Akademie der Wissenschaften, Prag

Pauline van Vliet, Gieten (NL)



Descartes



Comenius

IMW's research project "The Other Way into Modernity: Jan Patocka's Contribution to the Genealogy of the Modern Age" focuses on Patocka's treatises on the history of ideas, which are still largely unpublished. Patocka's conception of the Renaissance and the early modern age was the subject of an international conference in March, starting from Descartes and Comenius as antagonistic key figures in Patocka's genealogy of modernity. The project is funded by the Austrian Science Fund (FWF) and pursued in close cooperation with the Patocka Archive at the Center for Phenomenological Study (CFB) in Prague. The research will also serve as a basis for the publication of selected relevant texts in German.

From April 20-22, an international conference on cultural encounters, in which global effects are being offset, distorted or moderated by local conditions, jointly organized by the Institute for the Study of Economic Culture at Boston University and IWM, took place at the Institute.

When Globalization Fails ... Patterns of Cultural Resistance and Compromise

IN CONTRAST TO THE CONVENTIONAL INTERPRETATION of globalization, which considers worldwide homogenization an accomplished fact or an iron law of current history, the conference focused on those cultural encounters in which global effects are being offset, distorted, or moderated by local conditions. The participants presented empirical cases in which global cultural goods have met considerable resistance in the local environment and where their influence has become neutralized, attenuated, or mixed with local effects.

Undoubtedly, "cultural compromise" has more faces than these. The concepts of globalization, culture, success, failure, etc. were discussed in great detail during the course of the conference. The speakers avoided buzzwords such as "globalization" and "hybridization" to describe a great variety of cultural mixes emerging from resistance on the local level. Internal proportions matter: there are essentially "globalized" and essentially "localized" types of mixes, as well as a great many variants.

Globalization is not a one-sided game. One may find competitors on both sides of cultural exchange, on that of the "exporters" and the "importers" – competitors, who can modify each other's effects and form peculiar alliances. Cultural borrowing can take extremely different forms such as enthusiastic identification, pragmatic imitation, or cynical simulation. The congruence of cultural supply and demand is rare, a dose of resistance may be observed with most encounters.

Quite a few observers tended to celebrate local self-defense against global impacts, and showed sympathy with the recipient – the alleged "weaker" party in cultural transaction. However, the papers did not rely on prefabricated value judgements, no matter if they were of a "global is bad – local is good" style or of the opposite. Local resistance to external pressures and temptations can be based on rather controversial pieces of tradition, indigenous interest, or even on an intervention by another external actor. Resistance ranges from passive dissent to organized protest action that can even use global techniques for anti-globalist purposes.

The conference was based on the results of the *Cultural Globalization* project led by Peter Berger. While that project aimed at a comparison of ten country cases ranging from Taiwan to Chile and

from Hungary to South Africa, the conference concentrated on Europe and – in line with the traditions of the IWM – applied a special focus to Eastern Europe. Nevertheless, for the sake of comparability, Asia, Africa, and Latin America were also represented, not to mention the United States, the major driving force of cultural globalization.

The conference began with a keynote speech delivered by Peter Berger, in which he compared the working hypotheses of the research project with its actual results. The next evening, conference participants attended a panel discussion in which the "The Millennium Day Global Television Program 2000," the most ambitious live-broadcast undertaken in the last century, was analyzed in terms of conflicts between global and local aspirations.

One of the co-producers of the event, Maria Leao, opened the panel by describing the content guidelines of the program, which prohibited political and/or religious propaganda in addition to commercial messages. Jyoti Mistry presented the example of South Africa, showing how the newly democratic nation took the opportunity to promote their political success through symbolic gestures and the iconic personality of Nelson Mandela. Pal Sipos discussed the Hungarian case, demonstrating how the coverage from Budapest was not just botched on account of a fog-covered city but as a result of unimaginative production and political myopia. In the last presentation on Austria, Anita Traninger delivered an analysis of cultural tourism, which was based on conventional images of Vienna packaged for global consumption.



Peter L. Berger



Jyoti Mistry

Die Konferenz, die dem – ebenfalls global beobachtbaren – Widerstand gegen die kulturelle Globalisierung gewidmet war, schloss inhaltlich an die Ergebnisse des von Peter Berger und Samuel Huntington geleiteten Projekts „Cultural Globalization“ an. Doch während dieses Projekt zehn Beispielfälle von Taiwan bis Chile und von Ungarn bis Südafrika untersuchte, lag der Fokus der Konferenz am IWM – gemäß dessen Traditionen – auf den spezifischen Problemstellungen in Osteuropa.

Keynote Speech Friday, April 20

Peter L. Berger

Many Globalizations: Cultural Dynamics in the Contemporary World

Europe Saturday, April 21

Hansfried Kellner

Cultural Globalization in Germany

Jeanette Hofmann

Between Monoculturalism and Virtual Diversity: The Interplay between Global Networks and Local Culture

Fuat Keyman

Cultural Globalization and Turkey: Actors, Discourses, Strategies

12

Thomas Fillitz

Processes of Globalization and Austria

Eastern Europe

Miklós Haraszti

Western Patterns against Post-Communist Conditions:
Media Democratization in Hungary

Pál Nyiri

Chinese in Hungary and Their Significant Others:
Narrating the Incorporation of Non-Co-Ethnics in a
Transnational Social Field

Violetta Zentai

Gifts of a Mercurial Donor or How Open Society
Becomes Localized and Globalized

Comments: **Jacek Kochanowicz, Alexei Miller**

Maria Leao, Jyoti Mistry, Pál Sipos, Anita Traninger

Global versus Local? The Millennium Day
Global Television Program 2000

Comparative Cases

Sunday, April 22

Arturo Fontaine Talavera

Trends toward Globalization in Chile

Tulasi Srinivas

"A Tryst with Destiny." The Indian Case of Cultural
Globalization

Ann Bernstein

Globalization, Culture and Development: Can South
Africa be More Than an Offshoot of the West?

James Hunter

Among the Vanguard of Globalization: The World of
American Globalizers

Participants

Peter L. Berger, *Institute for the Study of Economic
Culture, Boston University*

Ann Bernstein, *Center for Development and
Enterprise, Johannesburg*

Thomas Fillitz, *University of Vienna*

Miklós Haraszti, *CEU, Budapest*

Jeanette Hofmann, *Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin*

James Hunter, *University of Virginia*

Don Kalb, *University of Utrecht*

Hansfried Kellner, *University of Frankfurt*

Fuat Keyman, *Bilkent University, Ankara*

Jacek Kochanowicz, *University of Warsaw*

Janos Matyas Kovacs, *IWM*

Maria Leao, *WGBH, Boston*

Alexei Miller, *INION, Moscow; IWM*

Jyoti Mistry, *New York University; IWM*

Pal Nyiri, *Oxford University*

Pal Sipos, *Satelit Television, Budapest*

Tulasi Srinivas, *Boston University*

Arturo Fontaine Talavera, *Center for Public Studies,
Santiago, Chile*

Charles Taylor, *McGill University, Montreal; IWM*

Anita Traninger, *IWM*

Violetta Zentai, *OSI Budapest; University of Pecs*

Das diesjährige Treffen der Mitglieder und Freunde des IWM am 30. März stand im Zeichen der Zukunft der Europäischen Union.

Dilemmata der Europapolitik



Bronislaw Geremek



Alfred Gusenbauer



Gerfried Sperl

IN WELCHE RICHTUNG soll sich die Europäische Union entwickeln? Die Aufnahme neuer Mitglieder, die eng damit verknüpften Fragen einer gemeinsamen europäischen Identität und einer Reform der EU-Institutionen sowie die Zukunft der Arbeitsmärkte diskutierten Bronislaw Geremek, früherer polnischer Außenminister und nunmehr Vorsitzender der liberalen Freiheitsunion, und der Vorsitzende der Sozialdemokratischen Partei Österreichs, Alfred Gusenbauer. Als Moderator fungierte Gerfried Sperl, Chefredakteur der österreichischen Tageszeitung *Der Standard*.

Entscheidende Dilemmata sah Bronislaw Geremek zum einen in der andauernden Instabilität des Balkans und der Frage, welche Strategie für Europa hier zielführend sein würde. Das zweite sei die Formulierung einer europäischen „Ostpolitik“ gegenüber Russland, der Ukraine und Weißrussland. Von diesen Ländern könne eine Gefahr für die gesamte EU ausgehen, es könnten sich aber auch echte Chancen der Zusammenarbeit eröffnen. Es liege vor allem an den EU-Institutionen, wie diese sensiblen Beziehungen gestaltet würden.

Priorität komme freilich der Frage der Erweiterung zu, wobei die Debatte darüber vielerorts von nationalen Einzelinteressen und offener Fremdenfeindlichkeit geprägt sei. Nach wie vor offen sei die Frage, ob die am Gipfel von Helsinki präsentierte Idee einer „Mega-Erweiterung“ mit 12 und mehr neuen Beitrittskandidaten mehr Probleme oder mehr Chancen schaffe. Faktum sei, dass die Bevölkerung der meisten westeuropäischen Länder sich vor dieser Perspektive eher fürchte. Dem hielt Geremek entgegen, dass aus polnischer Sicht keineswegs mit einer massiven Wanderungsbewegung zu rechnen sei, wenngleich gerade dies den Kern verbreiteter Ängste ausmache.

Alfred Gusenbauer hielt für eine erstes und grundlegendes Dilemma der Europapolitik die Konzeption der Osterweiterung als räumliche Ausdehnung der bestehenden Strukturen, nicht aber als Transformationsprozess hin zu einem neuen Europa. Zweitens werde die europäische Integration gleichsam an den Kandidatenländern vorbei diskutiert, so dass diese den Eindruck haben müssten, zu spät in die Gemeinschaft vorgelassen zu werden. Die Herausforderung liege nun darin, die Beitrittskandidaten in geeigneter Weise in die laufenden Diskussionsprozesse zu integrieren. In bezug auf eine Europäische Verfassung sprach sich Gusenbauer für eine föderalistische Konzeption aus und auch für eine stärkere Einbindung der Bürger.



Kardinal Schönborn



Fürst Schwarzenberg



Roger de Weck



Slavenka Drakulic

On March 30, IWM held its annual Fellows' Meeting. This year **Bronislaw Geremek**, Former Foreign Minister of Poland and present leader of the Liberal Freedom Union, and **Alfred Gusenbauer**, Leader of the Austrian Social Democratic Party, discussed dilemmas facing European Politics. The debate was chaired by **Gerfried Sperl**, Editor-in-chief of the Austrian daily *Der Standard*.



Im Vordergrund: Heinz Hofer-Wittmann und Ulrike Wittman, Dieter Simon, Miriam Rinderer

Slavenka Drakulic, during her stay as a *Milena Jesenská Fellow at IWM*, began a new project on the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia in The Hague. In a seminar, held at IWM on April 2nd, the following article served as a starting point for the discussion. **Michal Kopecek** (Czech Republic), **Janos M. Kovacs** (Hungary), **Alexei Miller** (Russia) and **Jyoti Mistry** (South Africa) acted as commentators.

The Politics of Truth and Justice

THE NEW SERBIAN GOVERNMENT did not send a single war criminal to the International Criminal Court for the former Yugoslavia (ICTY) in The Hague, nor did the new Croatian government for that matter.

Mass demonstrations recently of some 100,000 people in Split, protesting against the extradition of General Mirko Norac emphasize the significance of The Hague as the center of political controversy in Croatia. Now Serbs are afraid of the same thing – splitting the nation along The Hague line. People in Split were protesting against the extradition of the Croatians, which was seen as a degradation of the Homeland War; however, this is only one aspect of the whole affair. In fact, the HDZ party (Croatian Democratic Union) with the help of war veteran organizations, whose aim was to provoke collapses of both the government, and the new elections, in a strategy to regain power, orchestrated the event. Surprisingly, to put it mildly, the government's reaction has been moderate. Apparently the government fearful of the demonstrators cannot contradict them. Such an ineffectual stance shows the government as lacking any strength.

As of yet, the situation in Serbia is not as dramatic. Serbian president Vojislav Kostunica is resolute in his decision not to extradite Milosevic or anyone else. But there are different signals as well. For example the internal battles in government are reflected in the problems of the Minister of Justice. In fact it is hard to say if both governments have enough power to extradite suspects, even if they decided to do so. (...)

Mass protest in Croatia, and eventually in Serbia against the ICTY should be taken seriously. Not only because of its political significance, but because the protests are revealing something important – the conflict between justice and truth. There is no truth about the war in these two societies, justice seems like injustice. For ten years during its rule in the country, the HDZ propaganda machine created an undisputed ideology about the Homeland War. It was not a war of ethnic cleansing, for dividing Bosnia and extending the borders of Croatia. In their interpretation it was a defensive war in which no Croatian soldier could have committed a war crime. After ten years it is only to be expected that this ideology became official truth.

So much so, that even the new post-Tudjman parliament had to make a declaration about the Homeland War. Such statements repeat the same lies about the war.

In Serbia there is the same conflict between justice and truth, with similar consequences, where justice appears as injustice. Slobodan Milosevic is accused by the ICTY of war crimes – not by the Serbian people. If tried in Serbia, he will be tried for what he did to the Serbian people and that alone. How can he be a war criminal, if the aggression of Croatia and Bosnia is never recognized? The war is not a topic in Serbian society, much less the truth about the war – 250,000 people died and two million refugees in Bosnia alone. For a decade nobody in Serbia disputed the official truth about the war. The result is that now people have grown accustomed to living with the lie. In both Croatia and Serbia there is a public consensus about the lie.

People protesting in Split firmly believe in the lie about the Homeland War. Just yesterday, they were decorated for killing civilians and burning homes, yet today their actions are considered a crime. This change in perception is difficult for them to understand – yesterday's heroes are today's criminals threatened with imprisonment? This confusion is possible because nobody bothers, let alone dares, to tell the truth about the Homeland War.

The truth is that in 1993/94 the Croatian army was indeed the aggressor in Bosnia. Croats established 44 concentration camps for some 24,000 Muslims, in an attempt to ethnically cleanse parts of Bosnia, as well as parts of Croatia.

Of course, there are other reasons behind demonstrations in Split, such as preserving privileges of veterans or the political calculations of the right-wing parties involved. However, as long as there are no serious intentions within society to search for the truth about the war both in Serbia and Croatia the protests will continue, and any attempts to distribute justice, especially from abroad, will appear like the worst kind of punishment and humiliation. The need to establish truth must come from within. Until truth is determined, justice will have to come from outside. Nobody on the inside sees the need for prosecuting war crimes at all. The consensus about the lie appears to make it impossible.



Während ihres Aufenthalts als *Milena Jesenská Fellow* am IWM begann die Schriftstellerin und Journalistin **Slavenka Drakulic** ein neues Projekt zur Arbeit des Kriegsverbrechertribunals in Den Haag. In einem Seminar am 2. April stellte sie ihre Thesen zur Diskussion – **Michal Kopecek**, **Janos Matyas Kovacs**, **Jyoti Mistry** und **Alexei Miller** kommentierten aus tschechischer, ungarischer, südafrikanischer bzw. russischer Perspektive.

Every Tuesday evening, the IWM hosts a speaker, often a current fellow or monthly guest, who holds a public lecture related to one of the Institute's projects or research fields. An e-mail information service on upcoming events is available on IWM's website www.iwm.at

Jeden Dienstag ist die Bibliothek des IWM Schauplatz eines öffentlichen Vortrags, gefolgt von einer informellen Diskussion. Fellows und Gäste des Instituts sowie internationale Wissenschaftler und Intellektuelle werden eingeladen, ihre aktuellen Forschungsergebnisse zu präsentieren. Einen e-mail-Informationsservice zu bevorstehenden Veranstaltungen bietet die Website des IWM, www.iwm.at

16

Tuesday Lectures

6 FEBRUARY

Michal Pawel Markowski **Desire, Time and Interpretation**

THE LECTURE DEALT with a „metaphysical“ understanding of the key concepts mentioned in the title. It consisted of two parts: a story and an argument. The story began with Plato and Hegel and ended with Levinas and Derrida. The argument said that desire and interpretation are rooted in an original dissymetry between the Same and the Other. The real source of desire is neither a lack (as in Plato) nor a negation (as in Hegel), but an affirmation of the never present *Autre* (as in Levinas



and Derrida). The interpretation is another name for this affirmation, which is concerned neither with a deciphering of the obscure, nor with a positing of meaning, but takes as its goal *the impossible*.

Michal Pawel Markowski is Professor of Literary Anthropology and Cultural Studies at the Institute of Polish Studies at Jagellonian University, Kraków, and was guest of IWM in February.

12 FEBRUARY

Palais Clam-Gallas, Vienna

Michel Serres **Les nouvelles technologies**

MICHEL SERRES, WRITER AND ESSAYIST, gave a paper about the new technologies. Member of the Académie française, Professor at the Sorbonne, philosopher and historian of sciences, he is an eclectic intellectual whose work covers many aspects of human activity: from the doctoral thesis on the German philosopher Leibniz submitted in 1968 to his dictionary of sci-

ences, published in 1997. Communication and education have been important themes for Serres, whence his interest in new technologies, distance learning and information technology. Please see the Guest Contributions section for an excerpt from his talk in French.

In cooperation with the Institut Français de Vienne.

20 FEBRUARY

Janos Matyas Kovacs **Rival Temptations – Passive Resistance: On Cultural Globalization in Eastern Europe**

ACCORDING TO the conventional interpretation of cultural change under post-communism, the vacuum left by Soviet civilization has attracted Western cultures to Eastern Europe and offered a chance for the revival of indigenous ones. The incoming culture is essentially American, which seems to defeat a new mix of communist and ethnic cultures easily. The region is rushing through a process of cultural globalization that began with the collapse of communism. The “colonizer” is lucky: the irresistible invasion of low-quality mass culture has met a powerful drive of assimilation by the “natives” who display the tragic irony of *nouveaux riches*. The speaker has

challenged these assumptions on the basis of 14 case studies made in Hungary during the past two years. He presented a vast turbulence in the alleged vacuum and a clear tendency



for cultural resistance and compromise.

Janos Matyas Kovacs is **Permanent Fellow of IWM and member of the Institute of Economics, Budapest.**

27 FEBRUARY

Michel Maffesoli Du drame moderne au tragique postmoderne

ALORS QUE LE FONDEMENT historique de la modernité repose sur la potentielle résolution de tous les problèmes (individuels ou sociaux), ce dont la conception dramatique du monde rend bien compte, la postmodernité pourrait bien reposer sur l'acceptation du mal sous ses diverses formes. D'où le sentiment tragique de l'existence qui tend à répondre dans l'ensemble du corps social.



In cooperation with the Institut Français de Vienne.

Michel Maffesoli ist **Professor für Soziologie an der Sorbonne (Université René Descartes – Paris V) und Chefredakteur der Zeitschrift «Sociétés».**

6 MARCH

Werte in der Gesellschaft von heute I Bernard Lewis Religion and the Meeting of Civilizations

FOR A LONG TIME civilization meant us, and the rest were barbarians; religion meant ours, and the rest were infidels. Some religions, such as Judaism and most of the religions of Asia, concede that men may use different religions to speak to God, as they use different languages to speak to each other. This relativist view was rejected and condemned by Christians and Muslims, who shared the conviction that theirs was the one true faith, which it was their duty to bring to all



mankind. Between two such religiously defined civilizations, theologically akin and territorially contiguous, conflict was inevitable. Is it now?

In cooperation with Politische Akademie – modern politics.

Bernard Lewis is **Professor Emeritus of Near Eastern Studies at Princeton University.**

13 MARCH

Werte in der Gesellschaft von heute II Robert Spaemann Europa: Rechtsordnung oder Wertegemeinschaft

DIE REDE VON DER europäischen Wertegemeinschaft ist zweideutig. Sie enthält die Gefahr, den zentralen Wert, der die neue Freiheit definiert, schon im Anfang auszuhebeln: das Recht. Grund zu dieser



Sorge sind u.a. die Weise der Rechtfertigung des Kosovo-Krieges, die staatliche Diskriminierung von „Sekten“, die zeitweise Ächtung Österreichs wegen einer demokratischen Regierungsbildung. Die Zweideutigkeit liegt bereits im Begriff des „Wertes“, der ebenso absolutistische wie

relativistische Konnotationen hat und beliebig instrumentalisierbar ist. Zur Zeit droht die Instrumentalisierung im Dienst eines weltanschaulich-fundamentalistischen Liberalismus, der mit einer liberalen Rechtsordnung unvereinbar ist.

In cooperation with Politische Akademie – modern politics.

Robert Spaemann ist **seit 1962 Professor für Philosophie an den Universitäten Stuttgart, Heidelberg und München sowie Honorarprofessor in Salzburg.**

20 MARCH

Regine Gildemeister Von Geschlechtsunterschieden zur Geschlechterunterscheidung: Folgen eines Perspektivenwechsels in der (empirischen) Forschung

IN DEN 50ER JAHREN des letzten Jahrhunderts hatte sich eine ganze Forschungsrichtung darauf spezialisiert, Unterschiede zwischen den Geschlechtern in Eigenschaften, Charaktermerkmalen und psychischen Profilen zu untersuchen und nach Möglichkeit messbar zu machen. In der Frauenforschung der 70er und beginnenden 80er Jahre stand wiederum die Geschlechterdifferenz im Mittelpunkt der Forschung; immer wieder ging es auch darum, die besonderen Fähigkeiten von Frauen zu unterstreichen und mit einer positiven Wertung zu versehen. Gleichzeitig zeigt sich soziale Wirklichkeit immer weniger eindeutig hinsichtlich der „Polarität“ der Geschlechter – die Kodierungen sind brüchig geworden, ihnen entsprechen keine eigenen sozialen Welten mehr, keine eindeutig voneinander geschiedenen Sphären. Trotz vielfacher Grenzverschiebungen aber hat die „Natur der Zweigeschlechtlichkeit“ ihre Selbstverständlichkeit und Selbstevidenz nicht verloren. In den Forschungsergebnissen der



letzten Jahre zeigt sich, dass zwar Unterschiede zwischen den Geschlechtern so einfach nicht mehr dingfest zu machen sind, die soziale Ungleichheit der Geschlechter aber sich tagtäglich neu reproduziert. Diesen Prozess zu analysieren, stellt die empirische Forschung vor erhebliche Probleme. Im Vortrag ging es einerseits um diese Bewegung von Unterschieden zur Unterscheidung, andererseits um konkrete Fragen und Paradoxien in aktuellen empirischen Forschungsprojekten.

Regine Gildemeister ist Professorin für "Soziologie der Geschlechterverhältnisse" an der Universität Tübingen und war im März Gast des IWM.

27 MARCH

Martin Palouš Freedom of Expression in the European Context



THE RECENT DEBATE on public television in the Czech Republic opened a series of major questions: Has freedom of expression – one of the fundamental human rights – been violated or threat-

ened in this case? What does freedom of expression mean in the European legal and political context? What is the underlying concept of the public space? What policies have been successfully applied – or can be recommended – to protect the free flow of information in Europe? What are its philosophical underpinnings and implications? The lecture tried to provide at least partial answers to these questions, taking at its point of departure the recent Czech experience in this field.

In Cooperation with the Institute for Eastern and Southeastern Europe (department Brno) and the Embassy of the Czech Republic in Vienna.

Martin Palouš is Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Czech Republic. He actively participates in many non-governmental

organizations and civic initiatives and is the author of numerous publications and articles, including the chapter on the Czech Republic in the European Commission publication „Democratization in Central and Eastern Europe“.

17 APRIL

André Tosel Mondialisation et Philosophie

ANDRÉ TOSEL MACHTE IN SEINEM VORTRAG die Vorgänge, die in der aktuellen Diskussion unter den Titel von Globalisierung gestellt werden, zum Gegenstand philosophischer Reflexion. Den Ausgangspunkt bildete die Kritik an den entgegengesetzten Positionen einer liberalen, formalistisch argumentierenden Rechtstheorie einerseits und einer von Nietzsche und Heidegger ausgehenden Fundamentalkritik der Moderne andererseits.



Beiden Richtungen warf Tosel mangelnden Geschichts- und Gesellschaftsbezug vor. Demgegenüber knüpfte seine eigene Analyse an den Kategorien von Arbeit, Kapital und Produktionsverhältnissen an. Den derzeitigen Globalisierungsprozess fasste er in diesem Sinn als neue Entwicklungsstufe der kapitalistischen Ökonomie auf, in deren Verlauf sich das Verhältnis von Politik und Wirtschaft deutlich verändere.

Trotz der eindeutigen Hegemonie, welche die Wirtschaft im Zuge dieser Entwicklung über die Politik gewinne, könne deswegen nicht von einem Verschwinden der Politik oder des Staates gesprochen werden. Tosel bestand auf der Möglichkeit und Notwendigkeit einer radikalen Kritik an einer auf den Punkt der Irreversibilität zulaufenden extremen Ungleichheit zwischen Subjekten, Nationen und Weltregionen, die zur völligen Verarmung der großen Mehrheit und überdies zu einer Bedrohung der planetaren Lebensgrundlagen führe. Unter den Titel einer

„negativen Ontologie der Gesellschaft“ stellte er seine Forderung, der unter dem Vorzeichen von Globalisierung fortschreitenden Inhumanität Widerstand zu leisten.

In cooperation with the Institut Français de Vienne.

André Tosel is Professor of History of Modern Philosophy and Director of the Centre de recherches d'histoire des idées, Université de Nice – Sophia Antipolis.

24 APRIL

Werte in der Gesellschaft von heute III Józef Zycinski Church, Postmodernity and Human Values

THE CONTEMPORARY RADICAL critique of modernity follows the deep cultural transformations in which the basic values of the Enlightenment and of the Christian intellectual tradition are called into question. In this approach, the classical concept of truth is regarded as useless whereas liberal democracy with its social praxis is to provide pragmatic substitutes for such basic values as truth and beauty, justice and compassion. After considering the pragmatic critique of the traditional hierarchy of values, as offered by Richard Rorty, the paper introduced the axiology proposed by John Paul II. in his encyclical *Fides et ratio*. It directs our attention to the grandeur of being which would be ignored by someone who interprets reality in purely pragmatic terms.

In cooperation with Politische Akademie – modern politics.

Jozef Zycinski, Archbishop of Lublin, Grand Chancellor for the Catholic University of Lublin; Professor – Chair of the Relationship between Religion and Science.



On 30 March, the jury for the Milena Jesenská Fellowships for Journalists and the jury for the Paul Celan Fellowships for Translators met at the IWM to select the fellows for 2001 and 2002, respectively.

Fellowships for Journalists and Translators



Milena Jesenská

THE MILENA JESENSKÁ FELLOWSHIPS are awarded to enable journalists from across Europe to work in Vienna for three months in order to complete long term projects while free of daily obligations. The program has been set up in cooperation with **Project Syndicate** (New York / Prague) and has been supported by the **European Cultural Foundation** from the beginning. In 2001, an additional fellowship could be awarded thanks to Austrian journalist **Hans Rauscher** and publisher **Oscar Bronner** (*Der Standard*). Rauscher, who was awarded the Concordia Award for Freedom of the Press, donated the prize money in order to make it possible for Zsafia Mihancsik to pursue her project on a openly anti-Semitic radio program in Hungary.

The 2001 recipients and their projects are as follows:

Reinhard Engel, an Austrian freelance writer of economics whose articles have appeared in publications such as *The Financial Times* and *Newsweek*. His project entitled "The Economic Chances of the Latecomers Among the CEECs on the Balkans" will focus on Bulgaria, Croatia, Yugoslavia, and Romania. (July – September 2001)

Fatos Lubonja, a former political prisoner under Albania's Hoxha regime, plans to retrace the steps leading up to the collapse of pyramid investment schemes and their aftermath in his native country in his project entitled "The False Apocalypse." Lubonja currently writes for the cultural journal *Perpjekja*. (July – September 2001)

Zsafia Mikancsik, free-lance journalist, translator and founder of the online-magazine *TINTA*, is planning to analyze a Hungarian Public Radio program, *Sunday Journal*, which is being considered a

representative forum for the Hungarian extreme right. Title of the project: „Professional, ethical and methodological analysis and criticism of the Hungarian Public Radio program *Sunday Journal*“ (September – December 2001)

Anna Politkovskaia, a contributor to the Russian periodical *Novaya Gazeta*, will explore the Chechen conflict through portraits of her countrymen affected by the war in her book entitled, „Russians 2001. Russia after the Chechen War.“ (October – December 2001)

Paul-Christian Radu, an investigative reporter for the Romanian newspaper *Evenimentul Zilei*, will document organized crime activity in his project "The New International Patterns of the Organized Crime in Central and Western Europe." (January – March 2002)

Mykola Riabchuk, co-founder and deputy editor-in-chief of the Ukrainian bi-weekly magazine *Krytyka*, will research problems that the media faces, and search for effective solutions from both external and internal forces in his project "Not so free at last: Mass Media in Post-Communist Countries: Perilous Way to Freedom." (October – December 2001)

Jury
Roger de Weck, *journalist, Zurich and Berlin*
Sarmite Elerte, *editor-in-chief of Diena, Riga*
Helena Luczywo, *managing editor-in-chief of Gazeta Wzborcza, Warsaw*
Frank Schirmmacher, *editor-in-chief of Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung, Frankfurt*
Gerfried Sperl, *editor-in-chief of Der Standard, Vienna* (Chair)
Laura Starink, *NRC-Handelsblad, Rotterdam*
Rüdiger Stephan, *Secretary General of the European Cultural Foundation, Amsterdam*
Anita Traninger, *Program Coordination and Public Relations, IWM*

IWM AWARDS A SERIES of **Visiting Fellowships** each year in support of the translation of major works in the humanities or social sciences between Western European and Eastern European languages, or from one Eastern European language into another. The program, which was established in 1987, has been funded by the European Cultural Foundation for many years and by the City of Vienna since 2000.

In 2002, the following fellows will join the IWM:

Géza Horváth (Hungary)
 Friedrich Nietzsche: *Menschliches, Allzumenschliches*. Band 1
 Translation from German into Hungarian

Taras Korpalo (Ukraine)
 Eric J. Hobsbawm: *Nations and Nationalism since 1780*
 Translation from English into Ukrainian

Adam Lipszyc (Poland)
 Gershom Scholem: *Essays, Briefe und andere Texte*. Eine Auswahl
 Translation from German and Hebrew into Polish

David Mik (Czech Republic)
 Hans-Georg Gadamer: *Wahrheit und Methode*.
 Translation from German into Czech

Zsuzsa Rakovszky (Hungary)
 Thomas Nagel: *The View from Nowhere*
 Translation from English into Hungarian

Jury
Gottfried Boehm, *Professor für Neuere Kunstgeschichte, Universität Basel*
Endre Bojtár, *Ungarische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Budapest*
Peter Demetz, *Yale University*
Malgorzata Lukaszewicz, *Translator and literary critic, Warsaw*
Klaus Nellen, *Permanent Fellow, IWM*
Stephan Sattler, *Ressortleiter Kultur, Focus*



Paul Celan

Visiting Fellows

The following Visiting Fellows have begun their stay at the IWM:
Die folgenden Wissenschaftlichen Mitglieder haben ihren Aufenthalt am IWM angetreten:

Abigail Gillman

Assistant Professor of German and Hebrew, Boston University

Length of stay March – June

Specialization Viennese modernism; German-Jewish literature and thought

IWM Project Inventing Memory in Turn-of-the Century Vienna

Publications “The Jewish ‘Bildung’ of a Viennese Baron: Arthur Schnitzler’s ‘Der Weg ins Freie’”, in: *Festschrift for Jeffrey Sammons*, forthcoming 2002; “Between Religion and Culture: Mendelssohn, Buber-Rosenzweig, and the Enterprise of Biblical Translation”, in: *Biblical Translation in Context*, forthcoming 2001; “Ich suche ein Asyl fuer meine Vergangenheit: Arthur Schnitzler’s Poetics of Memory”, in: *Arthur Schnitzler: Contemporenaities/Zeitgenossenschaften*, forthcoming 2001; “Hofmannsthal’s Jewish Pantomime”, in: *Deutsche Vierteljahresschrift fuer Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte* 1997



Alexei Miller

Research Fellow at the Russian Academy of Sciences; Research Fellow at the Russian State Humanitarian University; Guest Professor at Central European University, Budapest

Length of Stay February – June

Specialization History of ideas

IWM Project Nationalism in Eastern and Central Europe in 19th Century; National and ethnic stereotypes in post-Communist European countries

Publications *Imperial Authorities, Russian Public Opinion and the Ukrainian Question in the Second Half of the 19th Century*, (in Russian), Moscow 2000; *Nation and Nationalism*, (ed., in Russian), Moscow 1999

Charles Taylor

Professor Emeritus of Philosophy, McGill University, Montreal; Chairman of the IWM Advisory Board, Robert Bosch Visiting Fellow

Length of stay April – June

Specialization Philosophy of social science, philosophy of language, philosophy of history and epistemology, philosophy of action

IWM Project The Sources of Violence

Publications *A Catholic Modernity*, New York 1999; *Multiculturalism: Examining the Politics of Recognition*, Princeton 1994; *Hegel and Modern Society*, New York 1979

Galia I. Valtchinova

Research Fellow Senior at the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, Institute of Thracology; Associate Fellow of the I.S.T.A – University of Franche-Comté, Besançon, Andrew W. Mellon Visiting Fellow



Length of stay April – June

IWM Project Women’s Ways to Religion in the Balkan Context: The Christian-Orthodox Patriarchal Setting

Publications *Local Religion and Identity in Western Bulgaria* (in Bulgarian, extensive French abstract), Sofia 1999; *Généalogie de l’Europe*, Paris 1994

The following Visiting Fellows have been continuing their stay at the IWM:
Die folgenden Wissenschaftliche setzten ihren Aufenthalt am IWM fort:

Catalin Cioaba

Doktorand an der Universität Bukarest; Paul Celan Visiting Fellow

Length of stay January – June 2001

Specialization Philosophie, Phänomenologie im 20. Jahrhundert

IWM Project Übersetzung von Heideggers „Prolegomena zur Geschichte des Zeitbegriffs“ ins Rumänische

Publications *Timp si temporalitate*, Bukarest 2000; Übersetzung der Monographie *Der Denkweg Martin Heideggers* von Otto Pöggeler, Bukarest 1998; „Die mannigfache Bedeutung des Begriffs Eigentlichkeit“, in: *New Europe College Jahrbuch*, Bukarest 2000



Todorka Mineva-Pramatarova

Lecturer of French at the Sofia University Kliment Ohridski; Paul Celan Visiting Fellow

Length of stay January – June 2001

Specialization Translator of contemporary French philosophy and in the field of the history of religion

IWM Project Translation of Emmanuel Levinas’ *Autrement qu’être ou au-delà de l’essence* into Bulgarian

Publications Several translations from French into Bulgarian (Bachelard, Levinas, Derrida, Bergson, Eliade, Lyotard, Sartre, Comte; Perrault, A. Dumas, St. Exupéry, Camus)



Mieke Verloo

Lecturer in Political Science and Gender Studies at the University of Nijmegen, the Netherlands

Length of stay January – June 2001

Specialization Gender Equality Policies; Feminist movements

IWM Project Gender mainstreaming in Central and Eastern Europe

Publications (with Y. Benschop, S. Eyckmans, H. van Roost) "Gender in Balance: an action research to integrate gender in the personnel policy of the Flemish government administration", in: S. Nelen & A. Hondeghem (eds.), *Equality oriented Personnel Policy in the Public Sector*, Amsterdam 2000; "Gender Mainstreaming: Practice and Prospects", *Council of Europe* (1999); (with C. Roggeband) "Global Sisterhood and Political Change. The unhappy marriage of women's movements and national contexts", in: C. van Kersbergen, R. Lieshout & G. Lock (eds.), *Expansion and Fragmentation. Internationalization, Political Change and the Transformation of the Nation State*, Amsterdam 1999



The following Visiting Fellows ended their stay at the IWM:
Die folgenden Wissenschaftliche Mitglieder haben ihren Aufenthalt am IWM beendet:

Slavenka Drakulic

Novelist and Journalist, Vienna / Stockholm; Milena Jesenská Visiting Fellow

Length of stay January – March 2001

IWM Project Working on a book of essays on Europe and xenophobia

Publications u.a. *Als gäbe es mich nicht*, Berlin 1999; *Marmorhaut*, Berlin 1998; *Café Paradies oder die Sehnsucht nach Europa*, Berlin 1997

Junior Visiting Fellows

Junior Visiting Fellows for the first half of 2000 (January – June) and their research topics:

Die Junior Visiting Fellows der ersten Hälfte 2000 (Januar – Juni) und ihre Projektthemen:

Alessandro Barberi

Doktorand der Geschichtswissenschaften, Stipendiat im Rahmen des Doktorandenprogramms der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften; Lektor am Institut für Wirtschafts- und Sozialgeschichte der Universität Wien

Specialization Historische Epistemologie, Diskursanalyse und Mediengeschichte

IWM Project Nietzsche, Freud, Saussure. Eine historisch-

epistemologische Transformation des Historischen rund um 1900

Publications *Clio verwunde(r)t. Hayden White, Carlo Ginzburg und das Sprachproblem in der Geschichte*, Wien 2000.

Andrew J. Bove

Ph.D. candidate in Philosophy, Boston College

Specialization Political Science

IWM Project How is Universal Education Possible? Hegel's Critique and Reconceptualization of the Idea of Culture

Publications Reviews of *Franco: Hegel's Philosophy of Freedom* and *Pinkard: Hegel. A Biography*, in: *Review of Metaphysics*, March 2001.

**Chien-yu Julia Huang**

Ph.D. candidate in Anthropology, Boston University

Specialization Anthropology of Religion; Gender; Transnationalism and Globalization; Chinese Cultures

IWM Project Gender, Ethnicity, and Globalization in a Taiwanese Transnational Buddhist Movement

Publications (with Robert P. Weller) "Merit and Mothering: Women and Social Welfare in Taiwanese Buddhism", in: *Journal of Asian Studies* 57, no. 2 (May 1998); "Charitable Women's Movements in 19th-Century Western Societies and 20th-Century Taiwan" (in Chinese), in: H. H. Michael Hsiao and Kuo-ming Lin (eds.), *Taiwan de shehui fuli yundong (Social Welfare Movements in Taiwan)*, Taipei 2000

Michal Kopecek

Ph.D. candidate in International Relations, Charles University, Prague; Robert Bosch Junior Visiting Fellow

Specialization Contemporary history of Central Europe; political philosophy

IWM Project "Revisionism" in Marxist Thought and its Political Role in Central Europe in the 1950s and 1960s

Publications Several articles in the Czech historical journals *Soudobé dejiny* (Contemporary History) and *Dejiny a soucasnost* (Past and Present)

**Kamila Kulik**

Ph.D. candidate at the Graduate School for Social Research Institute of Philosophy and Sociology of the Polish Academy of Sciences, Warsaw; Robert Bosch Junior Visiting Fellow and Jan Patocka Junior Visiting Fellow

Specialization Contemporary philosophy

IWM Project The Problem of Truth in the Philosophy of Hannah Arendt



Katarina Leppänen

Ph.D. candidate in History of Ideas, Göteborg University, Sweden

- Month of stay April 2001
- Specialization Gender Studies
- IWM Project Elin Wägner – Matriarchy and Sexual Difference in the Light of European Feminism, 1920-1940
- Publications „Ekofeminismen mahdollisuudet feministisenä kritiikkinä (Ecofeminism as Feminist Critique)“, in: *Naistutkimus Kivnoforskning* 1998; „Feminist Critique of the Notion of Scientific Objectivity“, in: Ingemar Nilsson (ed.), *Vetenskap och historia: 7 essäer*, Göteborg 1999; „Internationella feministiska samtal: att läsa Elin Wägners Väckarklocka som en replik (International feminist dialogue: Reading Elin Wägner's Alarm Clock as a Re-joiner)“, in: Ulla Holm (ed.), *Filosofiska samtal – Samtalsfilosofi* (forthcoming)



Meike Schmidt-Gleim

Meike Schmidt-Gleim

Doktorandin am Institut für Philosophie der Universität Wien; Stipendiatin im Rahmen des Doktorandenprogramms der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften

- Specialization Political Philosophy
- IWM Project Dissertation „Grenzlogiken und Europa“
- Publications „Ich will Teil einer Antirassismusbewegung sein“, in: *Agenda* 2000; „Das Unpolitische am Rassismus“, in: *Kulturrisse* 1999; „Die Demonstration der Demokratie“, in: *Springerin* 5, Heft 4 (1999)

Tatiana Zhurzhenko

Associate Professor, Department of Philosophy, V. Karazin Kharkov National University, Ukraine

- Specialization Gender studies, Social Theory, Philosophy of Economics
- IWM Project Ukrainian Feminism as a Political Project: from Importation to Domestication
- Publications „Free Market Ideology and New Women's Identities in Post-Socialist Ukraine“, in: *European Journal of Women's Studies*, 8.1 (2001); „Gender and Identity Formation in Post-Socialist Ukraine: the Case of Women in the Shuttle Business“, in: R. Anderson, S. Cole, H. Howard-Bobiwash (eds.), *Feminist Fields: Ethnographic Insights*, Broadview Press 1999; „Ukrainian Women in the Transition Economy“, in: *Labour Focus on Eastern Europe* 60 (1998)



Tatiana Zhurzhenko

The following Junior Visiting Fellows have continued their stay at the IWM

Die folgenden Junior Visiting Fellows setzen ihren Aufenthalt am IWM fort

Jyoti Mistry

Ph.D. candidate at the Department of Cinema Studies, New York University

- Specialization Cinema Studies and Film Policy
- IWM Project The Use of Cinema in Imagining a New National Identity in a Post-Apartheid South Africa
- Filmography *anOther ny story* (USA/SA/A 2000), co-production commissioned by South African Broadcasting Corporation (SABC-TV); *paw-paw* (USA/A 1998), *B.E.D.* (USA 1998)

Inna V. Naletova

Ph.D. candidate at the Department of Religious Studies, Boston University

- Specialization Religion und Culture in Russia
- IWM Project Religion in Contemporary Russia: The Orthodox Church and its Impact on Russia's Political and Cultural Life
- Publications *Hermeneutics* (a textbook for graduate students), Novosibirsk 1995; *Changing Values of the Modern World*, Novosibirsk 1995; *Hermeneutics and Rhetoric*, Novosibirsk 1994 (all in Russian)

Veronika Wittmann

Doktorandin der Soziologie, Universität Linz; Stipendiatin im Rahmen des Doktorandenprogramms der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften

- Specialization Gender Studies und Politik in Afrika
- IWM Project Gender Empowerment im Transformationsprozess der Post-Apartheidgesellschaft Südafrikas
- Publications *Nehandas widerspenstige Töchter. Eine Analyse zimbabwenischer Frauenorganisationen*, Linz 1999; „Kritik am tanzanischen Modell des Ujamaa-Sozialismus“, in: *From Ujamaa to Structural Adjustment*, Linz 1997

Guests

Michal Pawel Markowski

Professor at the Chair of Literary Anthropology and Cultural Studies, Jagellonian University, Kraków

- Month of stay February

Regine Gildemeister

Professorin für „Soziologie der Geschlechterverhältnisse“, Institut für Soziologie, Eberhard Karls Universität Tübingen

- Month of stay March

Publications

Transit 20

Polen und Europa

siehe Seite 24

Slavenka Drakulic

Milena Jesenská Visiting Fellow, 2001

„Diese andere Welt“,

in: *Kafka. Zeitschrift für Mitteleuropa*, 1/2001

John K. Glenn

Junior Visiting Fellow, 1997

Framing Democracy: Civil society and civic movements in Eastern Europe

Stanford University Press 2001

„How was the founding of democratic states in Eastern Europe affected by the ways communism fell? In a penetrating comparison of Poland and Czechoslovakia, John Glenn answers this question through a careful analysis of two main mechanisms, mobilization and bargaining. By emphasizing the role of key cultural institutions – the Church in Poland, the theater in Czechoslovakia – he shows how future paths toward democracy were shaped by the processes within each country that led to the collapse of their regimes. And by examining the trope of “civil society,” not as an outcome but as a framing and mobilizing strategy, he connects the study of contentious politics to that of democratization. A must-read.“ – Sidney Tarrow, Cornell University

Cornelia Klinger

Permanent Fellow

„Wann war Moderne – wo war Moderne? Überlegungen zur Datierungsproblematik von Moderne im Lichte ihres möglichen Endes“,

in: *Moderne als Konstruktion. Debatten, Diskurse, Positionen um 1900. (= Studien zur Moderne 14)*. Hg. v. Antje Senarclens de Grancy und Heidemarie Uhl. Wien: Passagen Verlag 2001.

Jyoti Mistry

Junior Visiting Fellow 2000/2001

„Über Vergewaltigung in Südafrika“,

in: *Le Monde Diplomatique*, March 2001 (deutschsprachige Ausgabe der französischen Monatszeitung)

Philipp Steger

Junior Visiting Fellow, 1998

Abschied vom katholischen Land? Polens Kirche nach dem Kommunismus.

Wien: Braumüller 2001

Konkreter Untersuchungsgegenstand des vorliegenden Buches ist ein katholisches Land *par excellence*: die Republik Polen. Die Darstellung orientiert sich an den Kernfragen des Konkordats und der Abtreibung und dokumentiert die Entwicklung der polnischen Kirche seit 1989. Grundlage sind intensive dreijährige Recherchen vor Ort. Untersucht werden zum einen die Hintergründe der realen politischen Macht der Kirche, andererseits die Manifestationen dieser Macht und der konkrete Einfluß auf politische Prozesse und Inhalte.

Anita Traninger

Program Associate

„Lullismus“

(gemeinsam mit Roger Friedlein), in: *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik*. Hg. von Gert Ueding. Bd. 5. Tübingen: Niemeyer 2001.

IWM Junior Fellows' Conferences

New series published on the IWM Website www.iwm.at

Vol. XI

Stephen Dawson, Jyoti Mistry, Thomas Schramme and Michael Thurman (eds.)

Extraordinary Times

IWM 2001.

Travels and Talks

Cornelia Klinger

Permanent Fellow

Vortrag: „Von der weiblichen Logik zum devenir-femme der Philosophie. Frauen- und Geschlechterforschung in der Philosophie“, Universität Freiburg/Breisgau (14. Februar).

Lehrveranstaltung zum Thema

„Feministische Wissenschaftskritik“ beim Nachdiplomkurs Sozialpädagogik, Zürich (16. Februar).

Vortrag „Reform oder Revolution?

Feministische Kritik auf dem langen Marsch durch die Institutionen“ beim Direktionsbereich Soziale Arbeit, Brugg/Schweiz (16. Februar).

Teilnahme an einer **Diskussion** im ZDF Nachtstudio zum Thema „Romantik – Herzschlag der Moderne“ in Berlin (12. März).

Vortrag “The Subject of Politics and the

Politics of the Subject”. Plattform 1 Documenta XI: Democracy Unrealized, Akademie der bildenden Künste Wien (7. April).

Teilnahme an einer **Podiumsdiskussion**

„Multikulturalismus und Fremdenfeindlichkeit – Braucht Europa eine Leitkultur?“, Universität Linz (25. April).

Vortrag „Die Sehnsucht nach Identität.

Zwischen Einschluss und Ausschluss im Vorzeichen von Globalisierung“, München, Philosophische Nachtgespräche im Café Muffathalle (27. April).

Janos Matyas Kovacs

Permanent Fellow

Teilnahme an der **Podiumsdiskussion**

„Europäische Kulturzeitschriften – Kulturelle Intergration Europas“ im Österreichischen Kulturinstitut, Budapest (4. April).

Krzysztof Michalski

Permanent Fellow and Director

Gast in der Ö1-Radiosendung „Von Tag zu Tag“ anlässlich des 10jährigen Bestehens der Zeitschrift *Transit*; Moderation: Peter Huemer (27. Februar).

Participation in the Third Session of the

Reflection Group Meeting on “Diversity and Unity in the Enlarged European Union: What Influences the Process of Transition and Adaptation in Central and Eastern Europe?: The Nation, Democracy and the State”, Brussels (1-2 March).

Vortragsreihe: “Drei Vorträge zu Nietzsche”: “I. Vernunft, die weh tut”, „II. Inkarnation“; Krakau, Theaterhochschule

Polen und Europa

- Hanna Krall** Gespräch über die Unnormalität der Welt
Aleksander Smolar 1989 - Gedächtnis und Geschichte
Marcin Krol Am Rande Europas
Pawel Spiewak Politik und Demokratie in Polen heute
Jacek Kucharczyk Polens Weg nach Europa
Jacques Rupnik Die Osterweiterung der Europäischen Union
Kinga Dunin Die junge Generation in Polen
Umweltpolitik in Polen **T. Podgajniak** im Gespräch mit **R. Pilat**
Photographien Ein Tag im Leben der Polen.
Andrzej Stasiuk Mein Europa
Jurij Andruchowitsch Mittelöstliches Memento
Samanta Stecko Ideologie und Erinnerung
Jozef Tischner Solidarität der Gewissen
Krzysztof Michalski Jozef Tischners Philosophie
Charles Taylor Überlegungen zur Idee der Solidarität

verlag neue kritik 20

- o Ich abonniere Transit-Europäische Revue ab Heft ____
(2 Hefte pro Jahr zum Preis von DM 36,-).

Transit feiert im Jahr 2001 sein 10-jähriges Bestehen. Wenn Sie sich bis 31. 03. 2001 für ein Transit-Abo entscheiden, erhalten Sie als **Jubiläumsgeschenk**

Piotr Wandycz: Die Freiheit und ihr Preis. Eine Geschichte Ostmitteleuropas, Wien 1993.

- Ich möchte meine Bibliothek ergänzen und bestelle
- o das Transit-Paket Nr. 6-10 zum Preis von DM 30,- (plus Porto).
 - o aus dem Paket die Nr. ____ zum Heftpreis von DM 10,- (plus Porto).
 - o aus den Heften 11-19 die Nr. ____ zum Heftpreis von DM 20,- (plus Porto). Für Abonnenten DM 18,-.

- o Senden Sie mir bitte kostenlos Ihr Gesamtverzeichnis.

Ort, Datum
Unterschrift _____

Adresse:
Name
Straße
PLZ, Ort

Transit (ISSN 0938-2062) ist zu bestellen über:
Verlag Neue Kritik, Tel. +49-69-72 75 76, Fax +49-69-72 65 85
Kettenhofweg 53, D-60325 Frankfurt a.M.
oder online: www.univie.ac.at/iwm/transit

Herausgegeben am
Institut für die
Wissenschaften
vom Menschen

Preis: Abo DM 36,- / 6S 262,-
Zwei Hefte pro Jahr
Einzelheft DM 20,- / 6S 146,-
portofrei (in Dt und Ö)

Verlag **neue kritik**
Kettenhofweg 53
D-60325 Frankfurt
Tel. (069) 72 75 76

(6. März, 5. April) und Universität Warschau (7. März, 4. April).

Seminar zu Nietzsches Zarathustra an der Theaterhochschule in Krakau (6. April).

John Smith

Executive Director

represented IWM at the launching of the European Movement's "Contact Group of Research Centres and Think Tanks" contributing to the Debate on the Future of Europe held in Brussels (21-22 March).

Anita Traninger

Program Associate

Vortrag: "Im Keller. Zur architekturellen Visualisierung von Gedächtnis im 17. und frühen 18. Jahrhundert" im Rahmen der Konferenz „Gehäuse der Mnemosyne“, Universität Gießen / Schloss Rauschholzhausen (23.-24. März).

Presentation: "Austria's Contribution to The Millennium Day Global Television Program 2000", at the conference "When Globalization Fails ... Patterns of Cultural Resistance and Compromise", jointly organized by the Institute for the Study of Economic Culture, Boston University, and IWM (20-22 April).

Varia

Julia Huang, IWM Junior Visiting Fellow, passed her defense on March 30, 2001 at the Department of Anthropology, Boston University. Her dissertation examines the *Ciji (Tzu-chi) Gongde Hui* (Compassionate-Relief Merit Society), a Taiwanese transnational Buddhist humanitarian foundation with a charismatic female leader.

Huang conducted an anthropological study based on twenty months ethnographic fieldwork in Taiwan (1997-99 in Jiayi, Hualian, and Taipei) and shorter periods of field research among its overseas branches. Research methods included participant-observation, individual interviews of devotees, foundation employees, and monastic disciples, and a review of *Ciji's* publications and local press coverage.

The study employed Max Weber's theory of charisma to examine how participants maintained their charismatic emotional commitments to the movement as religious devotees while simultaneously rationalizing their practices to become a powerful modern transnational nongovernmental organization (NGO).

Notes on Books

Exploring the Legacy of Ioan Petru Culianu Sorin Antohi



ON MAY 21, 1991, Ioan Petru Culianu, a Romanian-born Professor of Religion at the University of Chicago's Divinity School, was shot in the back of his head, at close range, in the restroom next to his office. He died instantly. He was 41.

Ten years on, the riddle of his untimely death remains unsolved, and his killer, or killers, are still at large. Local police, the FBI, his family and friends, the author of a book on this enigmatic case (Ted Anton, *Eros, Magic, and the Murder of Professor Culianu*, Northwestern University Press, 1996), and many journalists believe that Culianu was killed by one or more people linked to the (vestiges of the) Iron Guard – a far right movement in interwar Romania –, in cooperation with the (heirs to the) Securitate – Romania's infamous 'secret police'. Why?

On this point, speculations flourish, just as the alternative causal scenarios of the killing. One strong line of argument suggests that Culianu was made into a symbolic scapegoat and warning because he was vehemently and convincingly putting the finger on the continuity between Romania's worst nightmares and their native architects/builders/successors, from the Iron Guard to the post-communist regime. In the process, Culianu was also engaging in a radical critique of Romania's most cherished idols of the tribe, from ideologies to personalities. For instance, Culianu was starting to expose the Iron Guard connections of his role-model, teacher, and rather reluctant protector, Mircea Eliade (1907-1986).

Ioan Petru Culianu's multifaceted and seminal legacy lives on. It has also had a major impact on my own modest intellectual pursuits, ever since the days in 1980 when I was able to first read him. As a historian of ideas, theorist of history, Romanian studies specialist, and public intellectual, I was deeply influenced by Culianu's quite different ideas, experiences, and research agenda, especially in

the sense of a more critical reading of several canons, ranging from epistemology and cognitive science to political theory, from cultural studies to the history of science and the history of religions. This is the personal reason behind my project of a Culianu *Festschrift*, on which I embarked more than one year ago, while a Fellow at the Center of Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, Stanford, and which I was able to finish here, at the IWM.

The volume has more than thousand pages, and is in fact two volumes. Forty authors from seven countries revisit Culianu's lives and works: the precocious student and the struggling immigrant; the path-breaking scholar and the haunting fiction writer; the smiling mentor and the challenging colleague; the radical political journalist and the iconoclastic cultural critic; the spiritual pilgrim and the all-too-human being. Thus, the memory of a man and the presence of his mind are comprehensively celebrated and critically examined.

Ioan Petru Culianu's many publications include: *Eros and Magic in the Renaissance* (University of Chicago Press, 1987); *Out of This World: Otherworldly Journeys from Gilgamesh to Albert Einstein* (Shambhala, 1991); *The Eliade Guide to World Religions* (with Mircea Eliade, and the collaboration of Hillary S. Wiesner, HarperCollins, 1991); *The Tree of Gnosis: Gnostic Mythology from Early Christianity to Modern Nihilism* (HarperSanFrancisco, 1992).

Sorin Antohi (ed.)

Religion, Fiction, and History. Essays in Memory of Ioan Petru Culianu

Nemira, Bucharest 2001

Provincializing Europe Charles Taylor

WE OFTEN TALK THESE DAYS of "multiple modernities" – how modernity can be understood both as a single constellation of developments happening globally, i.e. industrial economies, markets, bureaucracies, universities, etc., and also as inhabited and sustained by quite different cultural forms in different parts of the world, not

at all simply clones of the original Western variant.

Provincializing Europe, the fascinating book by Bengali historian Dipesh Chakrabarty, is an attempt to give some depth and concreteness to this idea. This Chakrabarty attempts on two levels, and that is the great strength of the book. He not only tries to offer a theoretical account of the way in which these processes can be understood in a language of universal theory, but at the same time have to compose in different contexts with quite different understandings of time, agency and the sacred. He also fills in some of "thick" context for certain groups and movements in modern Bengali history.

The problem with which the book starts is the assumed universal validity of languages of history and social science designed to make sense of European history. The aim of the argument is to resist the resultant attempt to translate without remainder all the phenomena of extra-European societies into these paradigm languages. It is not that they are no use at all; on the contrary, to the extent that modernity is a project which spreads they capture some of what is going on. But something crucial only comes to light when we can articulate exactly what in different contexts resists this translation; what shows the side of the universal which is provincially European – hence the title. The great value of this book lies in Chakrabarty's exceptional ability to bring to light what constantly gets glossed over and forgotten when we can only speak the standard languages of the academy. To do this requires the kind of bilingual consciousness which can bring into illuminating relation Adam Smith and Tagore. Chakrabarty makes you regret that so few are capable of doing this with a high degree of eloquence and insight.

Dipesh Chakrabarty:

Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference

Princeton University Press 2000



“The Memory of the Century”, the international conference organized by the IWM in March, was dedicated to the new relevance of the past. Pierre Nora, Professor of History and Political Philosophy at EHESS (Paris), looked into the reasons for the current upsurge in memory.

The Tidal Wave of Memory

EVERY COUNTRY, every social, ethnic or family group has undergone a profound change in its relations with the past in recent decades. This change takes many forms: criticism of official histories and recovery of repressed ones; demands for confiscated or suppressed pasts; interest in “roots” and genealogy; commemorative events and new museums; opening archives to the public; fondness for what English-speakers call “heritage” and the French “*patri-moine*.”

If France was the first to embark on this almost fetishistic “memorialism,” this is because its memories of WWII are so divided. After the death of General de Gaulle, France witnessed a fascination for its wartime Vichy government and the birth of a form of Jewish “memory” unseen before. But others soon followed. After the fall of the Berlin Wall and the Soviet Union, Eastern Europe underwent its own “recovery of memory,” followed in turn, after the fall of military dictatorships in Latin America and of apartheid in South Africa, by a global settling of scores with the past.

This upsurge in memory intersects with powerful historical phenomena. Call one the “acceleration of history,” which suggests that the key feature of modernity is not continuity but change – an accelerated precipitation of all things into a swiftly retreating past. This change shattered the unity of historical time, that straightforward linearity which traditionally bound the present and the future to the past.

The way in which a society, nation, group or family envisaged its future traditionally determined what it needed to remember of the past. This gave meaning to the present, which linked the two. Broadly speaking, the future could be envisaged as a form of restoration, a form of progress, or a form of revolution.

Today, these ways of interpreting the past are discarded because we do not know what form the future will take. Because we cannot anticipate what our descendants will need to know about us in order to understand themselves, we stockpile – piously and indiscriminately – any visible trace that might testify as to what we are or what we will have become. It is this dissolution of any teleology of history – the disappearance of a history whose end is known – that creates an urgent “duty to remember,” a sense more mechanical and heritage-based than moral, and linked, not to the idea of “debt” but to “loss,” a very different matter altogether.

This “acceleration of history” also leaves us cut off, communing with the past only through vestiges. We recover the past by reconstructing it in detail, aided by documents and archives; a form of memory once called “history.” But this is a radical, indeed, dangerous alteration in meaning, for “memory” now means something so all-inclusive that it tends to be used as a substitute for “history” and places the study of history at the service of memory.

A second reason for this outbreak of memory is a pronounced emancipatory trend among peoples, ethnic groups, and even certain classes of individuals – the emergence of all those forms of memory bound up with minority groups for whom rehabilitating the past reaffirms identity.

Minority memories mainly arise from three types of decolonization: *international* decolonization, which provided societies stagnating in colonial oppression with access to historical consciousness and the rehabilitation (or fabrication) of memories; *domestic* decolonization of sexual, social, religious and provincial minorities for whom reaffirming their “memory” – in fact, their history – is a way of having their “particularism” recognized by a community that refused them that right; and *ideological* decolonization, which reunited people with memories confiscated, destroyed or manipulated by totalitarian regimes.

This explosion of minority memories profoundly altered the status and reciprocal nature of history and memory. Indeed, it enhanced the idea of “collective memory,” once little used.

History used to be in the hands of public authorities, scholars, and specialized peer groups which used it to mold the collective meaning of a nationhood. It taught children to be (good) Frenchmen, Germans, and Englishmen. Although *founded* on memory, history, as a discipline aspiring to scientific status, was in the past built up in opposition to memory, which was thought to be idiosyncratic and misleading. History was the sphere of the collective; memory of the individual. The idea that memory can be collective, emancipatory, and sacred turns its meaning inside out. Individuals had memories, collectivities had histories.

History in this sense has now been replaced by memory, which acquired the prestige of a popular protest movement and resembles the revenge of the underdog and outcast, the history of those denied history. Hitherto, if history did not have truth, it at



Pierre Nora

Die Vorstellung, die eine Gesellschaft, Gruppe oder auch Familie von ihrer Zukunft hatte, bestimmte traditionell ihr Verhältnis zur Vergangenheit. Die Erwartungen an die Zukunft legten fest, was erinnert werden musste. Dieser Zugang zur Vergangenheit sei heute schlechthin verunmöglicht, argumentierte Pierre Nora im Rahmen der IWM-Konferenz „Das Gedächtnis des Jahrhunderts“. Weil wir nicht mehr wissen, wie unsere Zukunft aussehen wird, horten wir die Erinnerungen als Zeugnisse unserer Identität. Aber Nora identifiziert noch weitere Gründe für die plötzliche Flutwelle des Gedächtnisses... Diese Kurzfassung ist Teil einer gemeinsam mit Project Syndicate, einem internationalen Verband unabhängiger Zeitungen konzipierten Reihe von Kommentaren und Analysen zu brennenden Fragen von Politik und Gesellschaft. Der vollständige Text erscheint in deutscher Übersetzung in *Transit* 22 (Winter 2001).

least had loyalty on its side. But the last century's sufferings incited demands for a truth more "truthful" than history, the truth of personal experience and individual memory.

The idea that collectivities have a memory implies a far-reaching transformation in the status of individuals and their relations to the community. Here lies the secret of that mysterious shift in our understanding of *identity*, without which it is impossible to understand this *upsurge in memory*. For identity has gone from being an individual and subjective notion to a collective, quasi-formal and objective one.

Traditionally, identity characterized all that is unique about an individual – so much so that it acquired an essentially administrative sense: our fingerprints expressed our "identity," we carried "identity" papers. Nowadays, expression of iden-

tity implies a group category, a way of defining us *from without*. "One is not born a woman," Simone de Beauvoir remarked, "one becomes one." It might serve as a catch-phrase for all identities created by self-assertion.

So identity, like memory, becomes a form of *duty*. I am asked to become what I am: a Corsican, a Jew, a worker, an Algerian, a Black. It is at this level of obligation that the decisive tie is forged between memory and social identity. The two become almost synonymous; their near merger reflects a change in the way history and society interact.

How is "memory" now organized? Two patterns are visible. The first consists of a dramatic increase in the uses made of the past. Many reasons exist for today's proliferation of commemorative events, but each shows that the past has ceased to have a single meaning and that a present

overlaid with awareness of its own history allows for several possible versions of the past.

The second effect of this change in the way memory is organized deprives historians of their monopoly on interpreting the past. In a world in which you had *collective history* and *individual memories*, the historian exercised exclusive control. Today, historians share their duties with judges, witnesses, the media and legislators.

The problem raised by memory's sacralization comes in recognizing the moment at which emancipation becomes exclusion. For to claim the right to memory is to call for justice, but this proliferation of moral claims can degenerate into a call to murder. It is this message of memory that we must also remember.

In his IWM Tuesday Lecture organized together with the Institut Français de Vienne, French philosopher and historian of sciences **Michel Serres** reflected on human memory which seems to be threatened by the new technologies. But is it really?

L'Homme Cognitif et Collectif

L'exemple de la mémoire

CHANGER DE TEMPS HISTORIQUE et de lieu d'habitat ne laisse pas, en effet, l'homme invariant. Autre manière encore d'interpréter le geste de stocker : déposer de l'information sur un parchemin, du papier imprimé ou un support électronique consiste à construire une mémoire. Nos ancêtres ressemblaient aux acteurs d'aujourd'hui qui peuvent réciter par cœur des milliers de vers ou de répliques. De tels exploits dépassent désormais notre capacité. A mesure que nous construisons des mémoires performantes, nous perdons la nôtre propre, celle que les philosophes appelaient une faculté. Peut-on vraiment dire : perdre ? Pas tout à fait, car le corps dépose, peu à peu, dans ces supports changeants, cette ancienne faculté ; cervicale et subjective, elle s'objective et se collectivise. Une stèle de pierre, un rouleau de papyrus, une page de papier, voilà des mémoires matérielles, propres à soulager la nôtre, corporelle. Déjà vrai pour les bibliothèques, cela le devient plus encore pour la Toile, mémoire globale et encyclopédie collective de l'humanité.

Voici quelques siècles, griots ou aèdes, les apôtres de Jésus, les interlocuteurs d'un dialogue de Platon, même un étudiant de la Sorbonne au Moyen Age, pouvait restituer, des années après, sans en omettre une syllabe, les propos d'un maître ou d'un récitant, ouï pendant sa jeunesse. Sauve des erreurs de copistes trop intelligents, la tradition orale traçait une voie plus sûre que la transmission écrite. Nos prédécesseurs cultivaient donc leur mémoire et disposaient de fines stratégies mnémotechniques. A mesure que nous primes des notes ou lûmes des imprimés, nous perdîmes moins cette faculté que nous ne la déposâmes sur les livres et les pages. De même que la roue appareilla du corps, des chevilles et des rotules en rotation dans la marche, de même le stockage de l'information appareilla de fonctions cognitives antiques. Contrairement aux animaux, verrouillés dans un organisme sans « sécrétion » de cette sorte, nous ne cessons de verser nos performances corporelles dans des outils produits à partir de celles-ci. Nous perdons la mémoire parce que nous en construisons de multiples.

Perdre, gagner ?

Nous rejoignons ici les pleureurs anciens et modernes, dont les discours et les textes déplorent la perte de l'oralité, de la mémoire, de la conceptualisation et de tant d'autres choses, précieuses à nos aïeux.

A revenir aux neiges d'antan, n'hésitons pas à remettre en scène le processus même d'homini- sation, tel que le décrivait le préhistorien Leroy-Gourhan, par exemple. A mesure, disait-il, que des ancêtres lointains se levèrent, de la position quadrupède à la station debout, évolution qui dura sans doute des milliers d'années, leurs membres antérieurs *perdirent* la locomotion. Certes, mais la main y gagna de nouvelles performances : prendre suppose, en effet, une différenciation grâce à laquelle cet organe devint, peu à peu, celui du matelotage ou de la charpente, de la chirurgie ou du clavecin, de la règle et du compas, de la prestidigitation... Mais dès lors que les deux mains s'adonnèrent à cette préhension raffinée, qui conditionne la compréhension, la gueule, jusqu'alors prognathe, parce que les dents en avant favorisaient la prise, *perdant* à son tour cette fonction, vint en retrait, de sorte que l'angle facial changea ; le crâne se remodela, libérant des espaces antérieurs, où le cerveau put développer des lobes frontaux ... et la bouche se mit à parler.

Le bilan de ces changements fait paraître de petites déperditions : portage sur les deux membres antérieurs, préhension par les lèvres et la mâchoire, face à des profits sans rapport avec ces pertes : fabrications multiples de la main, langages divers et raffinés, dialogues et objets. Du coup, mieux vaut dire : les bras se libèrent de l'écrasante obligation de porter, la bouche s'alléga de l'épuisante nécessité de prendre, la main devint experte et le cerveau réfléchit. Lorsqu'un appauvrissement induit un meilleur investissement, la privation d'une fonction signifie plutôt que l'on s'en délivre et que l'on invente du nouveau.

Ainsi la perte de la mémoire, à l'époque qui suivit celle où l'on chantait par cœur les poèmes d'Homère, libéra les fonctions cognitives de la charge impitoyable de millions de vers ; alors apparut, dans sa simplicité abstraite, la Géométrie, fille de l'écriture. De même, à la Renaissance, une déperdition plus forte encore soulagea les savants de l'écrasante obligation de la documentation, appelée alors doxographie, et les ramena brusquement à l'observation nue, qui fit naître les sciences expérimentales, filles de l'imprimerie. Au bilan, les bénéfices l'emportent de manière transcendante sur les préjudices, puisque naissent dans ces circonstances deux autres mondes, qui permirent de comprendre celui-ci. Savoir consiste alors non plus à se souvenir, mais à objectiver la mémoire, à la déposer dans des objets, à la faire glisser du corps

Der französische Philosoph Michel Serres weigert sich, in das Gejammer jener einzustimmen, die die menschliche Gedächtnisfähigkeit durch die neuen Medien endgültig für obsolet erklärt sehen. Vielmehr singt er das Loblied der Erleichterung – befreit vom Ballast der Erinnerung sind wir endlich frei zu denken. Der vollständige Beitrag erscheint in deutscher Übersetzung in Transit – Europäische Revue 21 (Sommer 2001).

dans des artefacts, laissant la tête libre pour mille découvertes.

J'ai mis longtemps à comprendre ce que voulait dire Rabelais lorsque mes professeurs m'obligeaient à dissertar sur sa phrase fameuse : *Préférez une tête bien faite à une tête bien pleine*. Avant de pouvoir ranger des livres dans leur librairie, Montaigne et ses ancêtres les doctes devaient apprendre par cœur l'*Illiade* et Plutarque, l'*Enéide* et Tacite, s'ils voulaient en disposer pour méditer. L'auteur des *Essais* les cite désormais en se souvenant seulement de leur place sur les étagères pour les consulter : quelle économie ! Du coup, la pédagogie que cette Renaissance souhaite videra la tête, naguère pleine, et en modèlera la forme sans souci du contenu, désormais inutile puisque disponible dans des livres. Libéré de la mémoire, un entendement bien fait se tournera vers les faits du monde et de la société pour les observer. En réalité, Rabelais loue, dans cette sentence, l'invention de l'imprimerie et en tire des leçons éducatives.

Décidemment, il faut récrire *Pantagruel* ou *les Essais*. Comme des vieillards caducs, les enfants d'aujourd'hui ne se souviennent même plus de l'émission vue hier au soir, à la télévision. Quelle science immense cette autre perte de mémoire va-t-elle promouvoir ? Ce savoir récent, vous pouvez déjà l'apprendre ou au moins le visiter, sur la Toile, tel que le nouvel oubli l'a déjà modelé. Oui, l'encyclopédie, dont le réseau mondial ruisselle d'informations singulières, vient de changer de paradigme, sous l'effet de la nouvelle libération. Notre appareil cognitif se libère encore de tous les souvenirs possibles pour laisser place à l'invention. Nous voici donc livrés, tous nus, à un destin redoutable : *libres de toute citation, libérés de l'écrasante obligation des notes en bas de page, nous voici réduits à devenir intelligents !*

L'homme sans facultés

Ce long raisonnement se reconduit, invariant, pour les autres fonctions cognitives. Les calembres, la mosaïque moirée des pixels sur écrans et mille logiciels *ad hoc* libèrent de même autant de fonctions opératoires, ainsi que l'imagination, en partie. Les nouvelles technologies rendent *collectives* et *objectives* les anciennes facultés *cognitives*, que nous croyions *personnelles* et *subjectives*. Nous perdons celles-ci, nous gagnons celles-là. Ne raisonnons plus comme si restait vraie la psychologie des facultés. De quel miroir magique, de quelle lampe frontale d'alpiniste ou de mineur disposaient donc les philosophes qui les avaient inventées, après avoir prétendu explorer en détail les couloirs noirs et les sommets de l'entendement humain ? Pour parodier Robert Musil, je nomme volontiers celui qui naît ce matin : *l'homme sans facultés*.

Comme à la Renaissance, adviennent une nou-

velle science et une nouvelle culture dont les grands récits produisent une autre cognition qui les reproduit, enrichis en retour. Ce changement d'entendement eut lieu plusieurs fois dans l'histoire, par exemple lorsqu'advinrent les modèles abstraits de la Géométrie ou les expérimentations, en Physique, justement quand changeaient les technologies. Ainsi l'histoire de la philosophie et l'histoire tout court, tributaires de celle de la connaissance, suivent-elles celle des supports.

Supplice de saint Denis

Lorsque les soldats déchaînés lui tranchèrent la tête et que celle-ci tomba par terre, il se pencha, tout décapité, pour la ramasser, puis la tint un moment dans ses bras levés. Ce geste formidable fit, dit-on, reculer même ses persécuteurs. Ainsi des Actes légendaires, d'après Grégoire de Tours, racontent le martyr, vers 250, de l'évêque de Paris, nommé Denis. Vous pouvez voir cette scène au Panthéon, représentée, en 1888, par Léon Bonnat, peintre pompier.

Cueillir des fleurs, prendre à la main roche ou motte sur le sol, pour les examiner, cela nous arrive parfois, et suppose que nous les apercevions d'abord, puis que le corps s'accroupisse et se plie, enfin que le bras les rapproche des yeux ; que, donc, siège du regard, de l'ouïe, de l'odorat, du goût, de la langue qui parle et du cerveau dont on dit qu'il trie et décide, la tête serve, en tout, de référence suprême, puisqu'elle paraît commander de se baisser, de saisir, d'approcher d'elle ce qui la captive. Cette instance, juge ou chef, la philosophie la nomme : sujet. Ce qui traîne à terre et que les doigts serrent s'appelle, alors, un objet, que, s'ils le peuvent, la main prend et le sujet comprend. Cette figure, si ordinaire de l'exercice de la perception et de la connaissance, le supplice ici relaté la transforme, merveilleusement, puisque l'objet à ramasser, à rapprocher du tribunal pour examen, y devient le juge lui-même, exactement le chef, et que les doigts qui s'en saisissent le présentent à une instance absente et décollée. Quelle sainteté permit à Denis décollé de repérer sa tête à terre ?

L'objet, mal reconnu pour tel par l'assemblée terrifiée, s'élève, soudain, au-dessus des regards assassins et fascinés : oui, la tête même de la victime tenue par ses mains, soulevées au-dessus de son propre cadavre ancéphale, demeure encore un sujet. Mais quelle autre tête, absente, la voit sans yeux, la hume sans odorat, l'entend sans ouïe claquer des dents et sangloter de souffrance, qui, sans cerveau, la juge et, sans bouche, la proclame ? Aveugle, la tête-fantôme regarde la tête réelle, séparée après décollation. Le voyez-vous, enfin, le sujet nu et vide, *sans faculté*, que Bonnat peignit dans un nimbe éclatant de transparence, face au *cognitif objectivé* ?



Michel Serres

IWM-Vorlesungen zur modernen Philosophie



Bernard Lewis Kultur und Modernisierung im Nahen Osten

Passagen Verlag, Wien 2001
DM 24,80/öS 178
ISBN 3-85165-483-8
96 Seiten, Broschur

Lewis, der international als einer der besten Kenner des Nahen Ostens und der langen, komplexen Beziehungen zwischen Orient und Okzident gilt, untersucht in seinen Vorlesungen das traumatische Verhältnis zwischen der muslimischen und der westlichen Welt. Einst eine politische Macht und eine Kultur, die ihren Nachbarn in fast jeder Hinsicht überlegen war, befindet sich der Islam seit dem Ende des 17. Jahrhunderts auf dem Rückzug. Lewis geht drei Leitfragen nach, die sich die muslimischen Reformer im Laufe der Geschichte angesichts dieses Problems stellten: Zunächst suchten sie nach den eigenen Fehlern: „Was haben wir falsch gemacht?“, dann nach den Stärken des Gegners: „Was ist das Geheimnis des westlichen Erfolgs?“. Heute stehen sie vor der Frage „Modernisierung oder Verwestlichung?“. Von der Möglichkeit eines eigenständigen Weges der Modernisierung hängt die Zukunft des Islam und seines Verhältnisses zum Westen ab.

A quoi ou à qui comparer votre console, votre ordinateur et sa mémoire immense, son écran aux images, sa puissante rapidité de calcul, son classement foudroyant des données... *à quelle tête bien pleine et bien faite*, maximalement dense et génialement fabriquée ? A quelle lumière transparente comparer, alors, votre propre *tête vide* face à ses facultés matérialisées sous verre et plastique, en silicium et fibres optiques ? Tous devenus des saints Denis, nous nous saisissons désormais tous les jours, pour nous en servir, de cette tête bien pleine et bien faite qui gît devant nous, porteurs d'une tête vide et inventive sur le cou.

L'autre sens du verbe perdre

Etrange pouvoir du corps humain de se transformer pour parties en objets ! Nous peuplons le monde d'outils en forme de poing : masse ou marteau, de coude: levier ou poulie, d'œil : loupe ou télescope, puis de mille combinaisons de fonctions venues, dehors, méconnaissables ; nous les mesurons même avec des pouces, des coudées ou des brasses... sans nous demander jamais comment ces machines sortent de nos organismes. A ma connaissance aucune explication ne rend compte de cette perte, prise alors dans un second sens ; par bonheur, mythes ou hagiographies suppléent ce manque de théorie rationnelle. Car *le corps perd, comme un vieux tonneau percé*. Comme celui de l'évêque perd sa tête avant de la reprendre, il laisse sortir de soi des fragments, des membres épars qui, tout aussitôt, se transsubstantient en objets techniques ou en substituts. Avant que l'on explique les fonctions corporelles et l'organisme par les machines, les appareils eux-mêmes apparaissent du corps ; ce cercle sans arrêt s'alimente de soi. Seuls animaux dont le corps perd, les hommes produisent des techniques, *dont l'histoire promeut l'humanisation*. *L'irruption des nouvelles technologies marque donc une ère de cette dernière*.

Ainsi l'évolution qui sculpte les autres vivants épargne notre organisme, car le temps humain se mesure moins sur les changements de notre corps que sur ceux de ses produits, c'est-à-dire de ces pertes, qui entrent alors dans l'histoire et la construisent, en évoluant à leur manière, d'une façon, si j'ose dire, exo-darwinienne. *Par ces pertes qui forment un monde évoluant hors des corps*, nos performances

physiques, lorsqu'il s'agit de l'énergie ordinaire, et cognitives, lorsqu'il s'agit de l'information, se transforment donc. Du coup, les individus changent, en même temps que les échanges nécessaires à leur vie, mais aussi les transmissions parmi les collectivités.

What Happened to Parliaments?



SOMETHING HAS HAPPENED to parliaments. Parliaments were the key institutions of representative democracy. They translated the voice of the people into reasoned debate and ultimately into law. They also held governments to ac-

count; of all the checks and balances of power they were the most effective. They symbolized the constitution of liberty. For my father – and later for me – becoming a member of parliament was an affirmation of our deep belief in democracy.

Much of this however has to be said in the past tense today. A number of developments have conspired to weaken parliaments:

Governments have increasingly used orders, regulations and other secondary legislation which is not subject to parliamentary scrutiny.

There is also a tendency for governments to turn directly to the people – by referenda, but more ominously by relying on polls and the views of „focus groups“.

This process goes hand in hand with phenomena like celebrity politics (candidates have to be telegenic), and snapshot or throwaway politics (what counts is the moment, not the extended debate).

Self-elected crowds and groups, demonstrations in the streets, non-governmental organizations, increasingly claim to be the people, to speak for the people.

All this happens at a time at which important decisions have emigrated to political spaces for which there are no parliaments anyway. This is as true for international decision-making as it is for the role of economic markets.

Do we have to accept such trends which carry forebodings of a creeping authoritarianism? I think not, but the answers are not simple. Strengthening parliaments is still a worthwhile task for democrats. Beyond that we need to apply our imagination to the creation of institutions which apply the principles of democracy without necessarily copying its traditional institutions. Few tasks can be more challenging for think tanks in the years to come.

Lord Dahrendorf

Upcoming events

In June, a new lecture series on the question „**What is Social Justice today?**“ will be launched at IWM in cooperation with the Renner Institute.

June 19

John Roemer

Professor of Political Science and Economics, Yale University

Equality of Opportunity

September 18

Stephen Holmes

Professor at the New York University School of Law; Visiting Scholar at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace

When do the Rich Care about the Poor?

November 6

Gerald A. Cohen

Professor of Social and Political Theory, All Souls College, Oxford

Why Not Socialism?

December 11

Michal Boni

Chief Advisor to the Polish Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Labor and Social Policy

Equality of Opportunities as a Chance for the New Model of Social Policy in Poland: How Can We Do It?

Impressum

Responsible for the contents of the IWM Newsletter:
Institute for Human Sciences © IWM 2001

Editor

Anita Traninger

Editorial Assistance

Joan Avery,
Rachel Hart,
Nadja Lobner

Production Manager, Layout

Iris Strohschein

Photos

Renate Apostel, IWM

Design

Gerri Zotter

Address

IWM
Spittelauer Lände 3
A - 1090 Wien
Tel. (+431) 31358-0
Fax. (+431) 31358-30
iwm@iwm.at
www.iwm.at

The IWM Newsletter is published four times a year.

Current circulation: 6200.

Printed by RemaPrint.

