



Institut für
die Wissenschaften
vom Menschen

Institute for
Human Sciences

A-1090 Wien
Spittelauer Lände 3

Tel. (+431) 313 58-0
Fax (+431) 313 58-30

iwm@iwm.at
www.iwm.at

Contents

6 "Evil" in Politics

10 Charles Taylor on Hans-Georg
Gadamer's contribution to 20th
century philosophy

25 Timothy Snyder on the Breakup
of the Soviet Union

27 Wolfgang Schaeuble and
Wolfgang Nowak on
pre-election Germany

29 Petya Kabakchieva on
Europe as a Nation State



Spring 2002/No.2

Newsletter 76

FELLOWS' MEETING |

In 1982 the Polish philosopher Krzysztof Michalski, together with Cornelia Klinger and Klaus Nellen, both from Germany, moved to Vienna, a city then unknown to all of them, in pursuit of an Eastern European dream: to establish a research institution in Western Europe, where people and ideas from Eastern Europe would be welcome. It proved a good choice. Their project, which was to become the IWM, has just turned 20.

Twenty years of IWM

THE TRADITIONAL IWM FELLOWS' MEETING, an informal gathering of current and former visiting fellows, friends, supporters and sponsors of the IWM, was dedicated this year to the celebration of the Institute's 20th anniversary.

The evening was opened with speeches by Prince Schwarzenberg, chairman of the IWM Board of Trustees, Dieter Simon, president of the *Verein IWM*, and the Federal Chancellor of the Republic of Austria, Wolfgang Schüssel. Charles Taylor, chairman of the Academic Advisory Board, then offered useful advice on "Understanding the Enemy", before Michael Naumann, Adam Michnik and Lord Dahrendorf debated a topic of permanent interest to the IWM. Krzysztof Michalski chaired their discussion which comprised contrasting comments on "The U.S. as *the* European problem?" as seen from their Eastern and Western European perspectives.

The party continued till the early hours, with many happy reunions, much laughter and also moments of nostalgia at the sight of a collection of snapshots from the last 20 years.



Pressestimmen

Wiens west-östlicher Intellektuellen-Treff Das Institut für die Wissenschaften vom Menschen feiert den 20. Geburtstag

Am Anfang stand der Traum zwei junger deutscher und eines polnischen Wissenschafters, im Westen Europas eine Forschungsstätte einzurichten, an der Menschen aus dem damals unbekanntem, kommunistisch beherrschten Osten ihre Ideen präsentieren konnten. Das war 1982, als der Kalte Krieg gerade wieder besonders tobte – Stichwort: Nato- Nachrüstungsdebatte.

Gerade vor diesem Hintergrund fiel die Standortwahl für eine solche Forschungsstätte auf Wien: „Wir haben Wien gewählt, weil wir dachten – richtig, wie sich mit der Zeit herausstellen sollte –, daß Kontakte mit unabhängigen Köpfen im Osten von einem neutralen Staat aus leichter sein würden“, berichtet Krzysztof Michalski, der mit Cornelia Klinger und Klaus Nellen an der Wiege des „Institutes für die Wissenschaften vom Menschen (IWM) stand.

Der Krakauer Priester und Philosoph Jozsef Tischner, ein enger Vertrauter von Papst Johannes Paul II., der damalige Wiener Vizebürgermeister Erhard Busek und und Karl Schwarzenberg waren weitere Geburtshelfer des IWM.

Das Institut hat sich in den vergangenen 20 Jahren auch international einen bedeutenden Namen als Forschungs- und Treffpunkt für Intellektuelle aus Ost und West gemacht. Viele seiner Forscher und Freunde haben im historischen Jahr 1989 an vorderster Front die „samtenen Revolutionen“ vorangetrieben und nach der Wende beim demokratischen Aufbau ihrer Länder mitgewirkt. Zu erwähnen wären etwa die Polen Adam Michnik, Bronislaw Geremek oder Tadeusz Mazowiecki,

erster nichtkommunistischer Premier in Warschau nach dem Kollaps des Kommunismus, der übrigens gestern, Donnerstag, seinen 75. Geburtstag feierte.

Das IWM, das heute, Freitag, seine offizielle Geburtstagsfeier hat, brachte ungezählte Geistesgrößen aus aller Welt nach Wien und trägt wesentlich mit dazu bei, daß diese Stadt nach wie vor als herausragender Begegnungsort Mittelosteuropas gilt. Bedeutende Philosophen, Historiker, Soziologen und Ökonomen finden immer wieder den Weg zum IWM, um hier zu forschen und Forschungsergebnisse zu präsentieren. Freilich, meinen manche Kritiker, richte das Institut seine Schwerpunkte mitunter zu sehr an amerikanischen wissenschaftlichen Modeströmungen aus.

Die Presse, 19. April 2002

Zwischen Ost und West: Zwanzig Jahre IWM Ein geistiger Aufbauhelfer feiert Jubiläum

Die Nachbarn hießen Beilhack und Grausam (wahrscheinlich Rechtsanwälte), die winzige Wohnung lag in der Wiener Lichtensteinstraße, man schrieb das Jahr 1982. So heben Gründungsmythen an, im konkreten Fall die des Instituts für die Wissenschaften vom Menschen (IWM), das vor zwanzig Jahren von drei Wissenschaftlern mit einem gemeinsamen Traum gegründet wurde: Krzysztof Michalski (aus Warschau), Klaus Nellen und Cornelia Klinger (aus Köln) wollten im Westen Europas eine Forschungsstätte gründen, „wo Ideen und Menschen aus dem fast vergessenen Osten Europas – damals unter kommunistischer Herrschaft – willkommen wären“. (Michalski in der Festtagsbroschüre). Der Rest ist, wie man so sagt, Geschichte: Seit dem Jahr 1982 hat sich das Institut für die Wissenschaften vom Menschen zu einer Institution entwick-

kelt, die im Dialog zwischen Intellektuellen im Westen und Intellektuellen im Osten eine international maßgebliche Rolle gespielt hat. 1989 standen viele Visiting Fellows, Mitarbeiter und Freunde des IWM an der vordersten Front der Revolution – und nach 1989 beim demokratischen Aufbau ihrer Länder. Unter den zahlreichen Freunden, Förderern und Unterstützern des Instituts hebt Michalski Erhard Busek, den damaligen Wiener Vizebürgermeister und jetzigen Koordinator für den EU-Stabilitätspakt für den Balkan hervor, den amerikanischen Finanzmagnaten und Philantropen George Soros, den vor kurzem verstorbenen Philosophen Hans-Georg Gadamer, den britischen Verleger Lord Georg Weidenfeld, Lord Ralf Dahrendorf, aber auch Papst Johannes Paul II., der das – konfessionell ungebundene und unabhängige – Institut mehrfach zu den Sommergesprächen in seine Residenz Castel Gandolfo eingeladen hat. Angesichts dieser Liste mag man auch ermes- sen, welchen Glücksfall das IWM für das Geistesleben Wiens in den vergangenen Jahren bedeutet hat und auch in Zukunft noch bedeuten wird.

Der Standard, 20./21. April 2002

Europas heikle Beziehungen zu Washing- ton: Von Trojanischen Pferden und Eseln

Das Institut für die Wissenschaften vom Menschen feierte seinen 20. Geburtstag – mit einer Diskussion über den Stand der transatlantischen Beziehungen.

Die USA als das europäische Problem? Das Wiener Institut für die Wissenschaften vom Menschen (IWM), das an diesem Wochenende seinen 20. Geburtstag feierte, fragte hochkarätige Wissenschaftler im Rahmen einer Podiumsdiskussion im Wiener Palais Schwarzenberg nach Antworten. Und es bekam sie



Erste Reihe: Kardinal König, Lord Dahrendorf, Aube Billard, Charles Taylor, Alfred Gusenbauer, Wolfgang Schüssel, Heinz Fischer, Alexander Van der Bellen

auch – und naturgemäß fielen sie sehr unterschiedlich, sehr differenziert aus:

Die analytische Erklärung lieferte Lord Ralf Dahrendorf, legendärer Bannerträger des Liberalismus in Europa. Für ihn unterscheidet sich Europa von den USA heute vor allem in zwei Punkten: Europa verfolgte in der internationalen Politik eine andere Linie, weil es die Dinge einfach vielschichtiger, komplexer sehe als Washington; die unterschiedlichen Einschätzungen der Entwicklungen in Afghanistan und Nahost seien dafür augenscheinliches Beispiel.

Zum zweiten habe Europa im Gegensatz zu den USA ein anderes, sozial-ökonomisch orientiertes Modell: „Im Gegensatz zum neoliberalen amerikanischen Modell suchen die Europäer nach einer offenen Wirtschaftspolitik mit starken sozialpolitischen Elementen.“

Aber trotz dieser Differenzen glaubt Dahrendorf, daß Europa und die USA an einem Strang ziehen sollten: „Das Beste, was die Europäer tun können, ist es, amerikanische Aktionen zu ergänzen. Ich glaube aber nicht, daß sie etwas gegen den Willen der USA unternehmen können.“ Gerade nach dem 11. September sei er in seiner politischen Einstellung ganz persönlich „schärfer“ geworden: „Wer den Rechtsstaat als die Grundlage meiner liberalen Ordnung attackiert, der ist auch mein Gegner.“

Mangelnder Heroismus

Die romantische Erklärung für die amerikanisch-europäischen Gegensätze lieferte beim IWM-Geburtstagsfest Michael Naumann, Herausgeber der Hamburger Wochenzeitung „Die Zeit“. Seine Kernthese:

Den transatlantischen Gegensatz mache gerade auch aus, daß den Europäern im Gegen-

satz zu den Amerikanern der „Geschmack am Heroismus“ fehle. Konkret: Die Amerikaner zeigten gerade auch in ihren Filmen eine enorme Lust, „Gewalt blutig und kraftvoll zu inszenieren“, was für Europäer vielfach einfach abstoßend sei.

Doch gerade aus dieser Heldenrolle schöpfe die amerikanische Außenpolitik: „Sie versteht sich als Transmissionsriemen eines heroischen Menschenbildes, das manchmal eben auch Opfer verlangt. Die USA sehen sich buchstäblich als Retter der Welt. Und der jetzige Präsident Bush hat diesen Anspruch geradezu verinnerlicht.“

Die emotionale Erklärung: Adam Michnik, polnischer Paradeintellektueller und Chefredakteur der Warschauer Zeitung „Gazeta Wyborcza“, hat für antiamerikanische Reflexe insbesondere der Franzosen und Deutschen vor allem blanken Hohn übrig: „Sie beschimpfen die Polen als Trojanisches Pferd der USA, aber sie sind selbst Trojanische Esel. Lieber freilich bin ich ein Pferd als ein Esel.“

Michnik analysierte die verschiedenen Formen des Antiamerikanismus in Europa: den antisemitisch unterlegten der Rechten; den Abwehrreflex gegen den Weltpolizisten USA auf der Linken; den Antiamerikanismus der Fundamentalisten („die USA sind ein gottloses Babylon“) und der selbsternannten Moralisten („die USA sind seicht, oberflächlich, McDonaldisiert“), schließlich den Haß auf Amerika von seiten roter Nostalgiker, die sich zurücksehnen nach der bipolaren Weltordnung, als die kommunistische Sowjetunion den USA noch die Stirn bieten konnte.

Michnik macht im Palais Schwarzenberg unmißverständlich klar, daß ihm die – wenn auch arrogante – Ordnungspolitik der Amerikaner viel lieber ist als die absolute, perfekte Herrschaft, wie sie Polen unter der sowjetischen

Fuchtel erdulden mußte. Er empfiehlt den vielen Amerika-Kritikern in Europa ehrlich der Frage nachzugehen, ob die USA wirklich eine Bedrohung darstellten, oder ob sie nur manchmal einfach ein unangenehmer Freund seien.

Ungeliebter Hegemon

Fürst Karl Schwarzenberg brachte das jetzige amerikanisch-europäische Verhältnis schließlich in einen breiteren Kontext: „Je mehr ein Hegemon sich mit seiner Rolle anfreundet und sich an sie gewöhnt, desto weniger wollen das seine Untergebenen akzeptieren.“ Michael Naumann empfahl den Europäern in diesem Zusammenhang: „Wir müssen die Heldenrolle, die sich die Amerikaner selbst zugeschaut haben, einfach verstehen lernen. Aber das soll bei Gott nicht bedeuten, daß wir sie auch als das allein Seligmachende akzeptieren.“

Die Presse, 22. April 2002

„Eselei des Antiamerikanismus“

Eine Debatte zum 20. Geburtstag des Instituts für die Wissenschaften vom Menschen

Der Bundeskanzler war da und der Nationalratspräsident, der SPÖ-Chef ebenso wie der der Grünen, Kardinal Franz König ebenso wie Stabilitätspakt-Koordinator Erhard Busek: Bedeutender (und hier nur in Auszügen geschilderter) Aufmarsch zum 20-jährigen Jubiläum des Wiener Instituts für die Wissenschaften vom Menschen (IWM), das Freitagabend im Palais Schwarzenberg zelebriert wurde. In diesen 20 Jahren, so Hausherr Karl Schwarzenberg, habe man miterlebt, wie sich „ein Institut in eine Institution“ verwandelt habe.

Der kanadische Philosoph Charles Taylor warnte in seinem Festvortrag „Understanding the enemy“, einer Reflexion über die Welt nach



Kardinal König, Raoul Kneucker



Krzysztof Michalski, Lord Dahrendorf, Michael Naumann, Adam Michnik

dem 11. September, vor „pausiblen, aber fehlerhaften Erklärungsmodellen“, wie sie etwa in Benjamin Barbers „Jihad versus McWorld“ dargeboten würden: Arme Länder werden durch Bilder aus den reichen Ländern zu einer Abwehr provoziert, die ihrerseits dann in Gewalt umschlägt.

Diese Sicht der Dinge schien Taylor nicht nur vereinfachend, weil sie gleichsam von mechanischen Reaktionen der beteiligten Akteure ausgeht, sondern auch gefährlich: Das sei eine These, die sehr leicht zur „Self-fulfilling Prophecy“ werden könne.

Um „Amerika als europäisches Problem“ ging es dann in einer Podiumsdiskussion, in der Lord Ralf Dahrendorf gegen die USA gerichtete Integrationstendenzen innerhalb der EU ortete, die im Namen der Außen- und der Sozialpolitik stattfänden. Dahrendorf rief dagegen eindringlich ins Gedächtnis, dass „der Westen größer als Europa ist“.



Fond memories, old friends

Michael Naumann von der Hamburger Zeit machte einen Gegensatz zwischen dem „heroischen“ Geschichtsverständnis der Amerikaner aus und einem Europa, dem nach seiner blutigen Geschichte die Lust auf Helden

vergangen sei. Adam Michnik, Chefredakteur der polnischen *Gazeta Wyborcza*, wandte dagegen mit ein, dass es im US-Selbstverständnis nicht nur um Fragen des Heldentums gehe, sondern auch um Fragen der Moral. Den Antiamerikanismus nannte er eine „Eselei“: Als Pole sei ihm die angebliche Arroganz der Amerikaner allemal lieber als eine Ordnung nach russischen Vorstellungen. „Man hat uns Polen oft als ein Trojanisches Pferd bezeichnet. Aber lieber ein Trojanisches Pferd als ein Trojanischer Esel.“

Dahrendorf hob im Gespräch mit dem STANDARD hervor, dass es den IWM-Gründern gelungen sei, eine Institution sui generis ins Leben zu rufen: Weder nur „Think-Tank“ noch nur „Institute for advanced studies“, sondern in der Mitte zwischen den beiden. Und dem Geschick des polnischen Philosophen Krzysztof Michalski sei es zu verdanken, dass sich das Institut einer nun schon so langen Existenz erfreut: „In Großbritannien sind solche Institutionen meist nur ephemere.“

Der Standard, 22. April 2002

Guests

Samuel Abraham
Zoltán Aczél
Helen J. Addison
Michaela Adelberger
Juraj Alner
Thomas Angerer
Lidia Antonik
Bogdan Barbu
Etelka Barsi-Pataki
Rainer Bauböck
Elfriede Beroun
Aube Billard
Burkhard Bischof
Gottfried Boehm
Danielle Bourcier
Judith Bösch
Gudrun Braunsperger
Kirstin Breitenfellner
Gertrude Brinek
Oscar Bronner
Eva Brunner-Szabo
Dietrich von Brühl
Rudolf Burger
Alice Burton
Erhard Busek
Christoph Chorherr
Simon Cole
Katharina Coudenhove-Kalergi
Burgl Czeitschner
Erich Danneberg
Roger de Weck
Peter Demetz
Eilin Derakshan
Karl A. Duffek
Reinhard Engel
Hanna Fischer
Heinz Fischer
Carl Henrik Fredriksson
Roswitha Fritscher
Susanne Fröschl
Wolfgang Gaerte
Stefan Gehrler
Joanna Grabińska
Alfred Gusenbauer
Christian Haerperfer
Elisabeth Hagen
Rudolf Haller
Marta S. Halpert
Friederike Hassauer
Waltraud Heindl
Tobias Heinrich
Annette Höslinger-Finck
Jaroslav Hrytsak
Slavica Jakelic

Lonnie Johnson
Petya Kabakchieva
Charles Kasdon
Volker Kier
Ewa Kirschenhofer
Cornelia Klinger
Axeli Knapp
Karin Kneissl
Raoul Kneucker
Stefanie Kolowratnik
Florian Korczak
János Mátyás Kovacs
Kardinal Franz König
Franz Kössler
Slavomir Krekovic
Agnieszka Kubicka-Dzieduszycka
Andrea Kuch-Lachnik
Annette Laborey
Christina Lammer
Francois Laquière
Oliver Lehmann
Alexander Lellek
Paul Lendvai
Margit Leuthold
Konrad Paul Liessmann
Wolfgang Libal
Irena Lipowicz
Paul Löw-Beer
Helena Luczywo
Flip Maas
Andrea Marenzeller
Flip Maas
Herbert Maurer
Rainer Metzger
Jyoti Mistry
Lutz Musner
Gerald Müller-Niklas
Rainer Münz
Ludwig Nagl
Herta Nagl-Docekal
Michael Naumann
Klaus Nellen
Alojz Némethy
Gerda Neudeck
Maria Nicklas
Beatrix Novy
Eva Nowotny
Thomas Nowotny
Karin Nußbaumer
Alojz Némethy
Herbert Ohrlinger
Reinhard Olt
Herlinde Pauer-Studer
Ted Paul
Katharina Pewny
Martina Pfeifhofer

Eva Pfisterer
Ursula Plassnik
Boris Podrecca
Gisela Podrecca
Martin Pollack
Maria Rauch-Kallat
Dorothea Rein
Gabriele Reinharter
Aaron Rhodes
Marie Ringler
Charles E. Ritterband
Sonja Ruß
John Sailer
Birgit Sauer
Gerald Schmickl
Heide Schmidt
Arnold Schmidt
Kitty Schmidt
Karin Schmidt-Gerlich
Inge Scholz-Strasser
Dkfm. Christopher
Schönberger
Norbert Schuh
Wolfgang Schüssel
Fürst zu Schwarzenberg
Dieter Simon
Aleksander Smolar
Gerfried Sperl
Jana Starek
Michael Stavaric
Bettina Steckelhuber
Gerald Stourzh
Iris Strohschein
Ernst Sucharipa
Alexander Szpor
Joanna Tokarska-Bakir
Anita Traninger
Gert Tschögl
Oldrich Tuma
Barbara Tóth
Peter Ulram
Alexander Van der Bellen
Jason Varsoke
Mieke Verloo
Gottfried Wagner
Josef Wais
Bernhard Waldenfels
Claire Wallace
Ulrich Weinzierl
Simon Wiesenthal
Christoph Winder
Beate Winkler
Rosemarie Winkler
Alexander Winkler
Waldemar Zacharasiewicz
Andrea Zederbauer
Christa Zöchling

20 Jahre IWM Wesen und Erscheinungen von Gudrun-Axeli Knapp

Es kennt der Mensch mit Überblick
Die Lehren der Atomphysik
Wonach gar manches, was der Fall ist
Dem Auß'ren nach recht minimal ist.
Dies gilt im Kosmos der Protonen
Doch auch im Felde der Institutionen.
Aus gutem Anlaß, wenn's genehm,
Dien' als Exempel das IWM:

Ein Fellow, *neu*, verläßt mit viel Plaisir
Bei der Spittellauer die Linie vier
Und sucht, den Finger auf der Route
des Stadtplans, nach dem Institute,
Das sich nun seit geraumer
Zeit
Den Wissenschaften vom
Menschen weiht
(und d'rob derweil in Land
und Stadt
ein Renommee erworben
hat).

Doch: was so stolz der *Name*
kündet
Man *praktisch* nicht auf
Anhieb findet,
Nur eine schmale Häuser-
scheibe
Dient dem IWM als Bleibe !
Eingerahmt von dicken Blöcken
Scheint es gar sich zu verstecken
Und man muss schon näher geh'n
Will man die Adresse seh'n.

Doch halt, schon Hegel gab zu lesen
Erscheinung ist nicht eins mit Wesen,
Negativ dialektisch Adorno verkündet
Dass nur *jenseits* des Großen man Großes
findet.
Und Freud betont, dass sehr sich räche
Das Weilen auf der Oberfläche.
Vermutlich läßt sich hier in Wien
Dies auch auf *Anderes* bezieh'n.

Gestattet, dass ich innehalte
Und dies Szenario entfalte:

Das IWM – man ahnt es gleich
Ist klein, doch äußerst wirkungsreich.
Ein Understatement die Fassaden:
Dahinter steckt ein super Laden.
Vor zwanzig Jahren frisch gegründet
Auf dass sich West mit Osten findet

Begleitet es höchst engagiert
Mit Forschung, was sich transformiert.
Überdies mit viel Geschick
Mischt man sich ein in Politik
Auf das sich einst zuguterletzt
Europa neu zusammensetzt.
Den Transit fördert mit Genie
Die Europäische Revue:
Ihr Diskurs ist pluralistisch
(Vielleicht gerade deshalb post-pessimistisch ?).

Das Patocka-Archiv, ein Markenzeichen
Des IWM, hat nur in Prag noch seinesgleichen.
Und ganz besonders tun ergötzen
Die Celan-Stipendien zum Übersetzen:
Max Weber auf Tschechisch und sehr inspiriert
Wird Nietzsche gerade ungarisiert.



Das IWM, als Treffpunkt der Nationen,
Hat programmatische Visionen:
Ein Platz zum Denken soll es sein
Drum lädt es die Gelehrten ein.
Der Uni-Alltag, was entzückt,
Scheint hier in weite Fern' gerückt.
Kosmopolitisch inkliniert
Wird vorgetragen, debattiert,
Und manches Mal, wenn es gelang,
Erschloss sich ein Zusammenhang.
Und wenn der Gast sich dann entfernt,
Hat er was dazugelernt.
Dann ist der Chef von Herzen froh
Denn: dieses ist nicht *immerso*.

Es lehrte das Leben dass Institutionen
mehr sind als diejenigen, die sie bewohnen.
Selbst Wissenschaft ist, so will es uns scheinen,
keineswegs Springquell des Allgemeinen
sondern ganz in concreto, als ob wir's nicht wüßten,
ein wahrer Brutplatz für Individualisten
und mancher demonstriert zu Zeiten
das Spektrum seiner Eigenheiten.
Dann muss der Staff sich taktvoll wehren

Gegen Meister diversifizierter Begehren.
Am IWM aus gutem Grunde
Macht d'rob ein Zirkular die Runde
Als mikrokosmische „philosophy“:
Der „Fellow's Guide für die Community“.
Unbürokratisch wird, zu aller Nutz und Frommen,
Der „small planet“ in Regie genommen.

Doch all die kleinen Regelungen
Wären eitel und misslungen,
Vergebens wär' das Tun der Stäbe
Wenn es nicht diese *Küche* gäbe !!!
In dieser waltet mit Geschick
Seit Jahren schon Frau Antonik.
Viel gelesen, oft ermessen,
Im Fellow's Guide das Stichwort „Essen“.
Denn Speisen steh'n seit alter Zeit

Im Zentrum jeder Gastlichkeit
Steigt man mittags in den Keller
Wird das Leben gleich viel heller.

Nimmt man die Botschaft à la
carte
Ist sie von besonderer Art:
Am IWM steckt tiefer Sinn
Selbst noch in der Küche drin:
Man zeigt etwas Eig'nes – leicht
modifiziert
Und schon kommt es näher,
attrahiert,
Nicht völlig fremd – nicht ganz
vertraut
Diese Differenz erbaut.

Seit Jahren schon und mit viel Mumm
Kämpft man sich so vom Vom zum Zum
(Entgegen Jandl und zum Glück
Meistens vorwärts statt zurück).
Woher man weiß, wo „vorwärts“ ist?
Solch Fragen voller Hinterlist
Die die postmoderne Welt
Gern an die Engagierten stellt
Sieht man souverän beschieden:
Das hängt ganz ab von den Präsidien.
(Und diesbezüglich – ungelogen –
Hat man am IWM ein gutes Los gezogen.)

Auch wenn sich politisch die Wind dreh'n
Wird das Ganze weitergeh'n:
Zu viele Netze sind gespannt
Und zu viel Wichtiges begonnen
Gar manch Projekt auf eigne Weise
Begann von hier aus seine Reise
Und wird, da kann man sicher bleiben,
an vielen Orten Früchte treiben.
In diesem Sinne wünsch' ich Institut und Land
Für weit're Jahre eine gute Hand.

On March 25, 2002, in conjunction with the first meeting of the Board of Directors of the new Institute for Human Sciences at Boston University, three members of the board were featured in a panel discussion.

Evil in Politics: Overstated or Underestimated?



Lilia Shevtsova



Aleksander Smolar



Fareed Zakaria, Krzysztof Michalski



THE PANEL WAS INTRODUCED by Jon Westling, President of Boston University and moderated by IWM Director Krzysztof Michalski. The speakers were Lilia Shevtsova (Senior Associate, Carnegie Endowment for Peace and Carnegie Moscow Center), Aleksander Smolar (Political Scientist, CNRS, Paris, and President, Stefan Batory Foundation, Warsaw), and Fareed Zakaria (Editor, *Newsweek International*).

Krzysztof Michalski began with brief opening remarks in which he posited two opposite views of the notion of “evil in politics”: first, the idea that while politics is all about evil because it is all about death and violence, politics is no place for absolute moral categories; and second, that without an attempt to distinguish good from evil in politics, politics becomes little more than a frivolous game.

A Faustian Bargain

The remarks of the first speaker, Lilia Shevtsova, were grounded in the first of these accounts, emphasizing the dangerous practical implications of the way the term “evil” is being used by politicians today. In particular, Shevtsova noted her unease with the introduction of the concept of evil especially against the backdrop of efforts to make a “war on terrorism” the major project of the new international order. As a Russian, and an expert on Russian Politics, she noted that President Putin’s embracing of the concept of evil as recently used in the public discourse helps to legitimize Russia’s military actions in Chechnya.

Shevtsova also called attention to what she referred to as a Faustian Bargain between Russia and the West, the terms of which allow the West to use Russia as a resource and base for combating terrorism, in tacit exchange for closing its eyes to events in Chechnya, to the crack-down on the Russian media, and to Russia’s “imitation democracy.” This bargain, she argued, is hardly an effective organizing principle for the new world order, and is certain to lead to growing international dismay and alarm. The real question, she suggested, was a profound but pragmatic one: how can Russia (and China, the Islamic countries and others) be helped to join modernity?

The Evil Empire

Aleksander Smolar began his remarks by referring back in time to 1983, to the shocking reference to “Evil in Politics” made by American president

Ronald Reagan, when he called the Soviet Union “The Evil Empire”. Throughout the 1960’s and 1970’s the view had become increasingly popular that the soviet and western systems were more or less converging on each other, that socialism would inevitably democratize and that capitalism would necessarily socialize. Smolar noted that Reagan’s bold comment that the USSR was an empire of evil effectively called attention to the fact that the Soviet Emperor had no clothes, to borrow the fairytale analogy.

Not surprisingly, given the dominance of what Smolar called the “wishy-washy ideological paradigm” suggesting that the two systems would increasingly approach each other, Reagan shocked the world by suggesting publicly that a fundamentalist system based on violence and fear and the deaths of millions of people was evil. Shocking or not, however, his statement played a constructive role, particularly in Eastern and Central Europe.

Reagan’s comment challenged the socialist notion of historical inevitability, and called attention to the fact that when we see evil we can name it and do something about it. It was only after this time that ordinary people in the Soviet bloc were able to begin to pass around jokes like the well known riddles about the definition of socialism (the longest and most painful road from capitalism to capitalism) and the definition of capitalism (the highest stage of socialism).

Smolar then addressed the current object of the “evil” discourse – radical Islamic terrorism – noting some similarities to Soviet totalitarianism, but also calling attention to crucially important differences. Chief among these is the fact that radical Islamic terrorism does not involve any state, any particular geographical territory, and therefore has a much larger base of support: the millions of people who do not accept the post-cold-war world order. Destroying those who perpetrate terror does not address the question of how to deal with their widely dispersed support among people who responded positively – *not* to the fact that innocent civilians were killed on September 11, 2001 – but *rather* to the fact that the US was humiliated.

Finally Smolar noted two probable reasons for the strong negative reaction in Western Europe to the recent references to evil made by the current President Bush. First, there is the fear that Western Europe may be increasingly irrelevant, to the extent that the US is willing and able to act unilaterally in

its efforts to eradicate evil. Second, the Western Europeans are rightly concerned that the conflict may be transformed into a purely military one, without regard to the critical social and economic questions attaching to it.

Sharpening the term

Fareed Zakaria began with the observation that in politics the term “evil” is used too loosely and frequently, in part because it is easy to assume that while one’s own actions are the result of circumstances and objective constraints, the “other side” acts as it does because it is bad. However, Zakaria went on to ask the question: If we do not use the term “evil” to describe the events of September 11, 2001, then when *can* we use it?

It has been common to refer to the social and other contributing factors underlying the terrorist acts of 9/11, but in Zakaria’s view these are not so easy to identify. For instance, he asked, if it is poverty that lies at the root of terrorism, how can we explain the fact that all of the nineteen men who piloted the four US planes on 9/11 were from relatively rich countries (Saudi Arabia and Egypt), and many were from rich families? Their actions were rooted not in poverty, but in some more inchoate disorientation associated with being trapped in a world that is at once modern and traditional. But since most people who are trapped in this disorienting world *do not* commit terrorist acts, are we not forced to call those who do “evil”? If we fail to call them evil, are we not losing an something valuable in the vocabulary of politics?

Zakaria stated that the larger project of trying to reverse the spread of western, liberal values should also be called evil. Liberalism must defend itself, and this defense must be regarded in moral terms. He tempered these last remarks by stating that in this regard it is reasonable to take care not to allow our invocation of the term “evil” to lead us into recklessness, or to blind us to the many shades of gray in international politics.

The “evil” discourse – a backlash

After the panelists’ remarks several members of the audience joined the discussion. One speaker reframed the question about evil in terms of vengeance: If vengeance is wrong, he asked, then isn’t the US action in Afghanistan wrong? Alternately, if vengeance is right, can we not also call it evil? Another characterized the use of the term “evil” in the current circumstances as “opportunistic,” suggesting that we call the events of 9/11 evil not because of the damage they caused or the motivations underlying them, but because they were targeted against the United States.

Charles Mayer of the Center for European Studies at Harvard University, stated his concern about the backlash to the “evil” discourse, and noted that simply saying something is evil never solves the real political problem – the problem of the costs of acting, or of the likelihood of success.

He noted that the use of the language of evil can make us more willing to act without regard to the costs, and cautioned that we keep in mind the questions: What are the real objectives here? Are they to show the person who says that we have to attack terrorism “at its root” is naïve? Are they to make us feel good because we have identified evil? In what sense is this a political term that will help us?

Finally, Faith Whittlesea, former US Ambassador to Switzerland, posed a question about the (perhaps unintended) consequences of a potential US move against Saddam Hussein in Iraq, which would likely be virtually unilateral. Lilia Shevtsova noted that, unlike in the past, Russia would likely support such an action in the United Nations Security Council, and China would probably remain neutral – so dramatically has the world changed. However, she also noted, as did Aleksander Smolar and Fareed Zakaria, that the real question was who would succeed Hussein, and with what sort of political regime.



Kirsten Wever

Am 25. März präsentierte sich das Ende vergangenen Jahres ins Leben gerufene Institute for Human Sciences at Boston University mit einer Podiumsdiskussion zum „Bösen“ in der Politik der Öffentlichkeit. Das Institut ist ein joint venture des IWM in Wien und der Boston University und erarbeitet und betreibt praxisorientierte Forschungsprojekte.

7



Von 18. bis 20. April 2002 organisierten das IWM und das Center for Phenomenological Study (CFB) eine Konferenz in Prag zur Bedeutung der Renaissance im Werk Jan Patockas.

Jan Patocka und die Philosophie der Renaissance

In Jan Patocka's writings on the history of ideas, Renaissance philosophy is of crucial importance. Patocka's interests stretch from Cusanus and the Italian humanists to reflections on the history of science and art. The majority of these writings have remained unpublished. The conference, which was jointly organized by the IWM and the Center for Phenomenological Research (CFB) in Prague, was dedicated to the scientific acknowledgment of these manuscripts, something which had not been undertaken before.

IN PATOCKAS ideengeschichtlichen Schriften nimmt die Auseinandersetzung mit der Philosophie der Renaissance eine zentrale Stelle ein. Sie reicht von der ausführlichen Beschäftigung mit Cusanus und den Protagonisten der italienischen Renaissance bis hin zu wissenschafts- und kunstgeschichtlichen Überlegungen. Ein Großteil dieser Schriften blieb bislang unpubliziert. Das Konvolut wird am IWM im Rahmen eines vom FWF finanzierten Projekts erforscht. Im Rahmen der Konferenz wurde es erstmals im Kontext der Forschung diskutiert.

Programm

Donnerstag, 18. April

Eröffnungsvortrag

Jan Sokol (Prag)

Die Waage: Der Beitrag des Kaufmanns zur modernen Wissenschaft

Freitag, 19. April

Filip Karfik (Prag)

Patocka über Cusanus, Ficino, Pico und Pomponazzi in seiner unvollendeten "Philosophie der Geschichte" aus den vierziger Jahren

Detlef Thiel (Wiesbaden)

Zwischen phänomenologischem Sokratismus und geistesgeschichtlicher Archäologie: Patocka und Cusanus

Paul Richard Blum (Budapest)

Sokrates in der Renaissance

Cyril Riha (Prag)

Leonardos theoretische Malerei

Samstag, 20. April

Uwe Voigt (Bamberg)

Die Renaissance in der Sicht des J. A. Comenius (Via Lucis)

Diskussionsbeiträge:

Thomas Leinkauf (Münster)

Zur Differenz von Cassirers und Patockas Renaissance-Deutung

Helmut Kohlenberger (Freilassing)

Fragen zur Epochenschwelle Renaissance Mit Blick auf Patockas Europa

Participants

Paul Richard Blum

Professor of Philosophy, Pazmany University, Budapest

Ivan Chvatik

Director, Jan Patocka Archive, CFB/CTS, Prague

Ludger Hagedorn

Research Associate, IWM/CFB, Vienna/Prague

Robert Kanocz

Research Associate, Institute of Philosophy, Charles University, Prague

Filip Karfik

Associate Professor of Philosophy, Charles University, Prague

Helmut Kohlenberger

Freilassing

Jaroslav Kohout

Professor Emeritus of Philosophy, Charles University, Prague

Pavel Kouba

Director, Institute for Philosophy, Charles University Prague

Thomas Leinkauf

Professor of Philosophy, Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität, Münster

Alexandr Matoušek

Research Associate, CFB, Prague

Radim Palouš

Professor Emeritus of Philosophy, Former Rector of Charles University, Prague

Miroslav Petříček

Associate Professor of Philosophy, Charles University, Prague

Cyril Riha

Research Associate, IWM, Vienna, and CFB, Prague

Klaus Schaller

Professor Emeritus of Theory and Methodology of Education, Ruhr-Universität Bochum

Hans Rainer Sepp

Research Associate, IWM, Vienna, and CFB, Prague

Jan Sokol

Professor of Philosophy, Dean, School of Humanities at Charles University, Prague

Stanislav Sousedík

Professor Emeritus of Philosophy, Charles University, Prague

Štěpán Špínka

Associate Professor of Philosophy, Charles University, Prague

Detlef Thiel

Associate Professor of Philosophy, University of Trier

Uwe Voigt

Associate Professor of Philosophy, Otto-Friedrich-Universität Bamberg

Within the framework of the IWM research program ACCESS (After the Accession ... The Socio-Economic Culture of Eastern Europe in the Enlarged Union: An Asset or a Liability?), a launch workshop was held at the Centre for Advanced Study in Sofia on April 28 and 29, 2002, to establish the Bulgarian research team and discuss major methodological problems

Understanding Socio-Economic Cultures in Central and Eastern Europe – Methodological Challenges

THE PROJECT FOCUSES ON strategic problems of the post-accession period: the cohabitation of “Eastern” and “Western” socio-economic cultures in the enlarged EU and the likelihood of their convergence. It examines current cultural encounters between “East” and “West” to predict future patterns of cultural compromise. The research fields – from the shop floor, through business and government administration to social sciences and policy advocacy – are being explored in several Central and Eastern European countries by focusing on entrepreneurship and governance, with special attention to the problem of informality. Instead of insisting on a simplistic scheme, in which the “strong” culture devours the “weak”, the project expects to examine the emergence of peculiar blends of economic and social behaviour, norms, habits, values etc. In so doing, it will go beyond the world of the *acquis communautaire* to discover forms of cultural coexistence in the enlarged EU which are not, and cannot be, regulated *ex ante* through agreements on institutional/legal systems and policies.

The project has four research objectives. First, to identify the types and estimate the frequency of cultural conflicts in economic and social matters in the enlarged EU and contribute to the resolution of those conflicts. Second, to predict the patterns of convergence and the extent of diversity within the “European Social Model”. Third, to map those fields in which the new entrants can contribute to the rejuvenation of socio-economic cultures in the EU. Fourth, to bring the cultural problématique back from populist rhetoric in the socio-economic discourse of Enlargement. Additionally, the project will help re-assess the procedures for the ongoing accession process, and enable the European Commission to draw lessons for future accession rounds, in particular, for the one including the South-East European ex-communist countries, which are excluded from the current round.

The research activities of the national teams are coordinated by the Institute for Human Sciences, Vienna. The Bulgarian project is, among others, supported by the Austrian Ministry for Foreign Affairs in the framework of the “‘Included’ and the ‘Excluded’. Economic and Social Culture in Central and Eastern/Southern Europe” project.

Das Forschungsprogramm des IWM beschäftigt sich mit dem Problem der Kompatibilität ökonomischer Kulturen zwischen „Ost“ und „West“ nach dem EU Beitritt. Denkbar ist, dass die neuen Mitglieder nur langsam aufholen, über einen längeren Zeitraum hinweg innerhalb der Union segregiert bleiben und aus ihrem osteuropäischen Umfeld herausgerissen werden. Man darf also die Möglichkeit einer anhaltenden und konfliktreichen Kohabitation der ökonomischen Kulturen nicht ausschließen. Statt davon auszugehen, dass die „starke“ Kultur die „schwache“ schluckt, kann mit dem Auftreten spezifischer Mischformen, in denen ein kultureller Kompromiss eingegangen wird, gerechnet werden.

Das Hauptaugenmerk liegt auf Forschungsfeldern, in denen die Begegnung der ökonomischen Kulturen zwischen den EU-Mitgliedstaaten und Ostmitteleuropa während der letzten zehn bis fünfzehn Jahre ein empirisches Faktum war. Diese reichen von der Arbeitswelt über Management und öffentliche Verwaltung bis zu Sozialwissenschaften und Politikberatung.

So dient der *acquis communautaire* als Gradmesser im Vergleich zwischen „Mitte“ und „Osten“ des ehemaligen Ostblocks. Die vorbildlichen Transformer werden in die Union kooptiert und Bestandteil des „Westens“, während die übrigen Länder später einmal einen weiteren Beitrittstest durchlaufen und bis dahin im „Osten“ verbleiben müssen.

Doch welche Art von Modernität, welche Art von Westlichkeit misst der *acquis* eigentlich? Warum spielen symbolische Geographiekonzepte wie „Osten“, „Westen“ und „Mitte“ eine so große Rolle für die Auswahl aus den Reihen der EU-Beitrittskandidaten?

Die Forschungsarbeiten der internationalen Teams werden vom Institut für die Wissenschaften vom Menschen koordiniert. Das Projekt der bulgarischen Gruppe wird, neben anderen, vom Bundesministerium für auswärtige Angelegenheiten im Rahmen des Projektes „Social Costs of Transformation – The ‚Included‘ and the ‚Excluded‘“ unterstützt.

Participants

Haralan Alexandrov,
New Bulgarian
University

Roumen Avramov,
Centre for Liberal
Strategies

Tanya Chavdarova,
Department of
Sociology, Sofia
University

Georgi Dimitrov, Centre
for European Studies at
Sofia University

Georgi Ganev, Center for
Liberal Strategies

Ilia Iliev, Department of
History, Sofia University

Petya Kabakchieva,
Department of
Sociology, Sofia
University

Janos Matyas Kovacs,
IWM, Vienna

Mila Mineva, Depart-
ment of Sociology, Sofia
University

Ivaylo Ditchchev, Depart-
ment of Cultural Studies,
Sofia University

Ivan Krastev, Center for
Liberal Strategies

Daniel Smilov, CEU,
Budapest

Hans-Georg Gadamer (1900-2002) was chairman of the Academic Advisory Board from the IWM's inception and honorary chairman since 1989. His successor, Charles Taylor, assesses Gadamer's contribution to 20th century philosophy.

Remembering Gadamer

GADAMER is one of a small group of 20th Century philosophers who will be long remembered. This is because his work has been immensely fruitful. He started new paths in philosophy which will be long pursued. Without addressing the issue directly himself, he laid the philosophical groundwork for one of the major activities of the 21st Century: in depth understanding of other cultures. This is because, at the present stage of world affairs, we can sum up our predicament in an amended version of Auden's much discussed line: "we must understand one another or die".

In fact, the great challenge of the coming century, both for politics and for social science, is that of understanding the other. The days are long gone when Europeans and other "Westerners" could consider their experience and culture as the norm towards which the whole of humanity was headed, so that the other could be understood as an earlier stage on the same road which we had trodden. Now we sense the full presumption involved in the idea that we already possess the key to understanding other cultures and times.

But the recovery of the necessary modesty here seems always to threaten to veer into relativism, or a questioning of the very ideal of truth in human affairs. The very ideas of objectivity which underpinned our social science seemed hard to combine with that of fundamental conceptual differences between cultures; so that real cultural openness seemed to threaten the very norms of validity on which social science rested.

What doesn't often occur to those working in these fields is the thought that their whole model of science is wrong and inappropriate. It is here where Gadamer has made a tremendous contribution to 20th century thought. For he has in fact proposed a new and different model, which is much more fruitful, and shows

promise of carrying us beyond the dilemma of ethnocentrism and relativism.

It is not that Gadamer addressed the issue of cross-cultural understanding directly. For Gadamer, the main issue was understanding texts, particularly those from the past. But the past is in this respect another country, and in clarifying our relation to history, Gadamer in fact has taught us also to understand the contemporary Other.

Gadamer's insights in this domain are inseparable from his pathbreaking idea of linguisticity (*Sprachlichkeit*), the way in which human life is not only expressed but also formed in language; and con-

knowledge of our own past that needs to be understood on the "conversation" model, but knowledge of the other as such, including in disciplines like anthropology, where student and studied often belong to quite different civilizations.

This is in fact a very radical shift; so much so, that it is still not very adequately understood. I'd like to try to make clearer what is involved.

First, I want to contrast the two kinds of operation: knowing an object, and coming to an understanding with an interlocutor. Some differences are obvious. The first is unilateral, the second bilateral. I know the rock, the solar system; I don't have to deal with its view of me.

But beyond this, the goal is different. I conceive the goal of knowledge as attaining some finally adequate explanatory language, which can make sense of the object, and will exclude all future surprises. But coming to an understanding can never have this finality. For one thing, we come to understandings with certain definite interlocutors. These will not necessarily serve when we come to deal with others. Understandings are party-dependent. And then, frequently

more worrying, even our present partners may not remain the same. Their life-situation or goals may change, and the understanding may be put in question. True, we try to control for this by binding agreements, contracts, but this is precisely because we see that what constitutes perfect mutual understanding at one time may no longer hold good later.

Third, the unilateral nature of knowing emerges in the fact that my goal is to attain a full intellectual control over the object, such that it can no longer "talk back" and surprise me. Now this may require that I make some quite considerable changes in my outlook. My whole conceptual scheme may be very inadequate



Castel Gandolfo (1985)
Pope Johan Paul II and Hans-Georg Gadamer

nected with this, the insight that language is primordial conversation.

I want to offer a few words in explanation of the illuminating contribution, the way in which these insights were brought together into a new model of understanding the other.

In *Wahrheit und Methode*, Gadamer shows how understanding a text or event which comes to us out of our history has to be construed, not on the model of the "scientific" grasp of an object, but rather on that of speech-partners who come to an understanding (*Verständigung*). If we follow Gadamer's argument here, we come to see that this is probably true of human science as such. That is, it is not simply

when I begin my enquiry. I may have to undergo the destruction and remaking of my framework of understanding in order to attain the knowledge that I seek. But all this serves the aim of full intellectual control. What doesn't alter in this process is my goal. I define my aims throughout in the same way.

By contrast, coming to an understanding may require that I give some ground in my objectives. The end of the operation is not control, or else I am engaging in a sham, designed to manipulate my partner while pretending to negotiate. The end is being able in some way to function together with the partner, and this means listening as well as talking, and hence may require that I redefine what I am aiming at.

So there are three features of understandings – they are bilateral, they are party-dependent, they involve revising goals – which do not fit our classical model of knowing an object. To which our “normal” philosophical reaction is: quite so. These are features unsuited to knowledge, real “science”. The content of knowledge shouldn't vary with the person who is seeking it; it can't be party-dependent. And the true seeker after knowledge never varies in her goal; there is no question of compromise here. Party-dependence and altered goals are appropriate to understandings precisely because they represent something quite different from knowledge; deal-cutting and learning the truth are quite distinct enterprises, and one should never mix the two, on pain of degrading the scientific enterprise.

How does Gadamer answer these “obvious” objections? In fact, his answer contains many rich and complex strands. I just want to mention two here, leaving aside others which are equally, perhaps even more important.

The first is a negative point. Gadamer doesn't believe that the kind of knowledge which yields complete intellectual control over the object is attainable, even in principle, in human affairs. It may make sense to dream of this in particle physics, even to set this as one's goal, but not when it comes to understanding human beings.

Whatever we might identify as a fundamental common human nature, the possible object of an ultimate experience-transcending science, is always and everywhere mediated in human life through culture, self-understanding, language. These not only show an extraordinary variety in human history, but they are clearly fields of potentially endless innovation.

Here we see a big watershed in our intellectual world. There are those who hope to anchor an account of human nature below the level of culture, such that cultural variation, where it is not trivial and negligible, can be explained from this more basic account. Various modes of sociobiology, and accounts of human motivation based on the (con-

jectured) conditions in which human beings evolved, share this ambition. They have the necessary consequence that most cultural variation is placed in the first category, and seen as merely epiphenomenal, a surface play of appearances. And then there are those who find this account of human life unconvincing, who see it as an evasion of the most important explananda in human life, which are to be found at this level of cultural difference.

Suffice it to say that Gadamer is one of the major theorists in the second camp, and that hence he sees the model of science which I opposed above to understanding as inapplicable to human affairs.

This may help explain why he refuses this model, but not the adoption of his alternative, based on interpersonal understanding. How does he justify party-dependence, and what analogue can he find to revising goals?

The first can be explained partly from the fact of irreducible cultural variation. From this, we can see how the language we might devise to understand the people of one society and time would fail to carry over to another. Human science could never consist exclusively of species-wide laws. In that sense, it would always be at least in part “idiographic”, as against “nomothetic”. But for Gadamer, party-dependence is more radical than that. The terms of our best account will vary not only with the people studied, but also with the students. Our account of the decline of the Roman Empire will not and cannot be the same as that put forward in 18th Century England, or those which will be offered in 25th Century China, or 22nd Century Brazil.

It is this bit of Gadamer’s argument which often strikes philosophers and social sciences as scandalous, and “relativist”, abandoning all allegiance to truth. This interpretation is then supported by those among Gadamer’s defenders who are in a “post-modern” frame of mind.

But this grievously misunderstands the argument. Gadamer is anything but a “relativist” in the usual sense of today’s polemics. To see this, however, we have to bring out another way in which Gadamer breaks with the ordinary understanding of “science”.

As we often have been led to understand it in the past, scientific explanation deploys a language which is entirely clear

and explicit. It is grounded in no unthought-out presuppositions, which may make those who speak it incapable of framing certain questions, and entertaining certain possibilities. This false view has been very largely dispelled in our time by the work of such thinkers as Kuhn and Bachelard. We now understand the fact that the practices of natural science have become universal in our world as the result of certain languages, with their associated practices and norms, having spread and being adopted by all societies in our time.

But what has been less remarked is that these specialist idioms became thus universally diffusible precisely because they were insulated from the languages of human understanding. The great achievement of the 17th century scientific revolution was to develop a language for nature which was purged of human meanings. This was a revolution, because the earlier scientific languages, largely influenced by Plato and Aristotle, were saturated with purpose- and value-terms. These could only have travelled along with a good part of the way of life of the civilizations which nourished them. But the new austere languages could be adopted elsewhere more easily.

We can see how different the situation is with the languages of “social science”. These too have travelled, but very much as a result of the cultural influence of and cultural alignment on the “West”. Moreover, they seem incapable of achieving the kind of universality we find with natural sciences. The study of human beings remains in a pre-paradigmatic condition, where a host of theories continue to compete, and there is no generally recognized “normal” science.

This difference in the fate of the two kinds of “science” is connected to the fact that the languages of human science always draw for their intelligibility on our ordinary understanding of what it is to be a human agent, live in society, have moral convictions, aspire to happiness, etc. No matter how much our ordinary everyday views on these issues may be questioned by a theory, we cannot but draw on certain very basic features of our understanding of human life, those which seem so obvious and fundamental as not to need formulation. But it is precisely these which may make it difficult to understand people of another time or place.

Thus we can innocently speak of people in other ages holding opinions or subscribing to values, without noticing that in our society there is a generalized understanding that everyone has, or ought to have, their own personal opinion on certain subjects – say, politics or religion; or without being aware of how much the term ‘value’ carries with it the sense of something chosen. But these background understandings may be completely absent in other societies. We stumble into ethnocentrism, not in virtue so much of the theses that we formulate, but of the whole context of understanding which we unwittingly carry over unchallenged.

If our own tacit sense of the human condition can block our understanding of others, and yet we can’t just neutralize it at the outset, then how can we come to know others? Are we utterly imprisoned in our own unreflecting outlook? Gadamer thinks not. The road to understanding others passes through the patient identification and undoing of those facets of our implicit understanding which distort the reality of the other.

This will happen when we allow ourselves to be challenged, interpellated by what is different in their lives, and this challenge will bring about two connected changes: we will see our peculiarity for the first time, as a formulated fact about us, and not simply a taken-for-granted feature of the human condition as such; and at the same time, we will perceive the corresponding feature of their life-form undistorted. These two changes are indissolubly linked; you can’t have one without the other.

Our understanding of them will now be improved, through this correction of a previous distortion. But it is unlikely to be perfect. The possible ways in which we in our background could enframe them distortively cannot be enumerated. We may still have a long way to go. But we will have made a step towards a true understanding, and further progress along this road will consist of such painfully achieved, particular steps. There is no leap to a disengaged standpoint which can spare us this long march.

We can now see how our grasp of the other, construed on the model of coming to an understanding, is doubly party-dependent, varying not only with the object studied but also with the student: with

the object studied, because our grasp will have to be true to them in their particular culture, language, way of being. But it will also vary with the student, because the particular language we hammer out in order to achieve our understanding of them will reflect our own march towards this goal; it will reflect the various distortions that we have had to climb out of, the kinds of questions and challenges that they in their difference pose to us. It will not be the same language in which members of that culture understand themselves; but it will also be different from the way members of a distinct third culture will understand them, coming as they will to this goal through a different route, through the identification and overcoming of a different background understanding.

The coming-to-an-understanding model fits here, with its corollary of party-dependence, because the language of an adequate science of the Ys for the Xs reflects both Xs and Ys. It is not, as with the knowledge-of-object model, a simple function of the object, the scientific theory which is perfectly adequate to this reality. It is a language which bridges those of both knower and known. That is why Gadamer speaks of it as a "fusion of horizons".

The 'horizons' here are at first distinct, they are the way that each has of understanding the human condition in their non-identity. The "fusion" comes about when one (or both) undergo a shift; the horizon is extended, so as to make room for the object which before didn't fit within it.

Here we see the full force of the Gadamerian image of the "conversation". The kind of operation we are describing here can be carried out unilaterally, and must be when we are trying to write the history of the Roman Empire, for instance. But it borrows its force from comparison with another predicament, in which live interlocutors strive to come to an understanding, to overcome the obstacles to mutual comprehension, to find a lan-

guage in which both can agree to talk undistortively of each. The hermeneutical understanding of tradition limps after this paradigm operation; we have to maintain an openness to the text, allow ourselves to be interpellated by it, take seriously the way its formulations differ from ours; all things which a live interlocutor in a situation of equal power would force us to do.

The picture of a language for science which varies with both knower and known is quite different from the common idea of "relativism", and has a clear place for the concepts of correctness and

Some accounts will be more ethnocentric and distortive than others, still others will be more superficial. Accounts can be ranked for accuracy, comprehensiveness, etc. In short some will be righter than others, will approach closer to the truth.

We can see now that there is another virtue of accounts. They can be more or less comprehensive in a new sense; not depending on how much detail and coverage they offer of the object studied, but rather on their taking in and making mutually comprehensible a wider band of perspectives. In other words, the more comprehensive account in this sense fuses more horizons.

And so, for human affairs, the model of scientific theory which is adequate to an object is replaced by that of understanding, seen as a fusion of horizons. "Verstehen [ist] immer der Vorgang der Verschmelzung [...] vermeintlich für sich seiender Horizonte." If understanding the other is to be construed as fusion of horizons and not as possessing a science of the object, then the slogan might be: no understanding the other without a changed understanding of self.

Gadamer's account of the challenge of the other and the fusion of horizons applies also to our attempts to understand quite alien so-

cieties and epochs. The claim here comes not from their place within our identity, but precisely from their challenge to it. They present us different and often disconcerting ways of being human. The challenge is to be able to acknowledge the humanity of their way, while still being able to live ours. That this may be difficult to achieve, that it will almost certainly involve a change in our self-understanding, has emerged from the above discussion.

Meeting this challenge is becoming ever more urgent in our intensely intercommunicating world. This is why the 21st Century will continue to be in debt to Hans-Georg Gadamer, who has helped us so immensely to conceive this challenge clearly and steadily.

Verehrter, lieber Herr Tischner,

es drängt mich, Ihnen nochmals für Ihr Kommen nach Dubrovnik zu danken und zugleich, wie ich meine, im Namen aller deutschen Teilnehmer unser Bedauern auszusprechen, daß Sie uns aus so schwarzlichem Anlaß vorzeitig verlassen mußten.

Ihr Vortrag hätte noch öfters in die Diskussion hineingezogen werden müssen. Dann hätte die Überbrückung der verschiedenen Wissenschaftsstile, die in Dubrovnik miteinander konfrontiert waren, noch bessere Erfolge gehabt. Aber auch so können wir, glaube ich, mit dem Ergebnis unseres Unternehmens von beiden Seiten aus sehr zufrieden sein. Möge die allgemeine Weltlage und die Besonderheit des deutsch-polnischen Austausches uns recht bald eine Wiederaufnahme des so schön begonnenen Gespräches gestatten.

Mit herzlichsten Grüßen

HG Gadamer

From the early life of the IWM: Gadamer to Tischner

truth. Relativism is usually the notion that affirmations can be judged valid not unconditionally, but only from different points of view or perspectives.

It doesn't seem to me that Gadamer is into this position at all. If the historiography of the Roman Empire in 25th Century China is different from our own, this will not be because what we can identify as the same propositions will have different truth values. The difference will be rather that different questions will be asked, different issues raised, different features will stand out as remarkable, etc.

Moreover, within each of these enterprises of studying Rome from these different vantage points, there will be such a thing as better or worse historiography.

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

14

Tuesday Lectures

19 FEBRUARY

Pavol Demeš NGOs in Central and Eastern Europe: Problems of Democratization and European Integration

THE EMERGENCE OF NGOs in post-communist countries is one of the clearest manifestations of the transition from totalitarianism to a pluralism. In the last decade, thousands of NGOs emerged in almost all CEE countries and are active in addressing issues from almost every aspect of life. Besides playing an important role in their given societies by addressing domestic social needs, they are also focusing on strengthening cross-border cooperation and exchanging „best practices“ with other countries, thereby advancing CEE's European and transatlantic integration. The specific focus of the discussion was on the advocacy role of NGOs and how they can act as partners as well as „watchdogs“ to local and national governments.



Pavol Demeš is Director for Central and Eastern Europe of the German Marshall Fund of the United States, Bratislava.

26 FEBRUARY

Irene Dölling Geschlechtervertrag und praktizierte Geschlechterarrangements in den Neuen Bundesländern

IM RÜCKBLICK auf mehr als 10 Jahre deutscher Einheit wird deutlich, was am Beginn weder von Politikern noch von (Sozial-)Wissenschaftlern so klar gesehen wurde: die für die neuen Länder unter dem Stichwort der „nachholenden Modernisierung“ prognostizierte und in Gang gesetzte Transformation ist nicht als schlichte Adaptation an Strukturen und Institutionen der „alten“ Bundesrepublik zu verste-

hen. Vielmehr ist sie in ihrer Dynamik und Richtung zunehmend durch Umbrüche und Prozesse des Umbaus im Organisationsgefüge moderner Gesellschaften gekennzeichnet, die in der Soziologie unter „zweiter“ oder „reflexiver“ Moderne bzw. Modernisierung firmieren.

Es liegt auf der Hand, dass in diesen Umbauprozessen bisherige Formen sozialer Regulierung und Steuerung tendenziell dysfunktional werden und dass dies auch die Geschlechterverhältnisse betrifft. Bisherige Institutionalisierungen des modernen (hierarchischen) Geschlechterverhältnisses geraten in „Unordnung“ und erscheinen gemessen an den sich abzeichnenden Entwicklungen als „veraltet“.

Für eine sozialwissenschaftliche Beobachtung und Analyse dieser Umbrüche aus einer genderkritischen Perspektive ist auf jeden Fall notwendig, die unterschiedlichen Bedingungen in den alten und neuen Bundesländern, nicht zuletzt in bezug auf Geschlechterarrangements zur Kenntnis zu nehmen. Das wiederum hat zwei Dimensionen: neben dem empirisch gesättigten Wissen um die feststellbaren Unterschiede und ihr historisches Gewordensein ist auch ein gesellschaftstheoretisch fundiertes Verständnis des Geschlechterverhältnisses in der kapitalistischen wie sozialistischen Variante moderner Gesellschaften notwendig.



Irene Dölling ist Professorin für Soziologie an der Universität Potsdam und war Gast des IWM im Februar.

5 MARCH

Hans Rainer Sepp Parallele Welten: Differenz auf japanisch

IN JAPAN IST VIELES ANDERS. Doch auch das Anderssein ist hier anders. Japanische Lebensweise besitzt die paradoxe Eigentümlichkeit, Fremdes zu integrieren, ohne es dem Eigenen anzugleichen: Das Heterogene differenter Welten wird in fließenden Übergängen aufbewahrt – zu



erspüren in der Atmosphäre des traditionellen Wohnraums, dem Zusammenspiel von Architektur und Natur im Verhältnis von Innen und Außen, der Bild-

kunst wie überhaupt in der Kultur des Zen. Liegt diesen Zeugnissen ein stummes Konzept zugrunde, das auf den Begriff gebracht werden kann? Wenn ja, dann ist die Differenz von Globalisierung versus Partikularität ihrerseits eurozentrisch.

Hans Rainer Sepp ist am Zentrum für Phänomenologische Forschung (CFB) und an der Karls-Universität in Prag tätig und ist wissenschaftlicher Mitarbeiter des Forschungsprojekts „Der andere Weg in die Moderne“ im Rahmen des Patocka-Schwerpunkts des IWM.

Der Vortrag ist als IWM Working Paper auf der Website des IWM erhältlich.

12 MARCH

Rainer Münz Weltmacht Deutschland?

SEIT DEN 1990ER JAHREN sucht das wiedervereinigte Deutschland ganz offensichtlich nach einer neuen Rolle in Europa und der Welt. Die Größe und wirtschaftliche Stärke sollen zukünftig zu mehr politischem Einfluss führen. Dazu gehört auch der Einsatz militärischer Mittel. Der Vortrag gab einen Ausblick



auf die innenpolitische Situation im Wahljahr 2002 und fragte nach den sich abzeichnenden längerfristigen Veränderungen, die weniger vom Wahlausgang abhängen.

Rainer Münz ist Professor für Bevölkerungswissenschaft an der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin.

19 MARCH

Radoslaw Markowski Diffuse Political Support in New and Stable Democracies: Do Institutions Matter?

THE LECTURE BEGAN by recalling the Eastonian and Lipsetian traditions and then moved to the problems in operationalizing the concept of “diffuse political support”. In the main part, Radoslaw Markowski sought to answer the question under what conditions – institutional, cultural and procedural – diffuse political support is likely to manifest itself in new and stable democracies. In explaining the main relationship between the institutional infrastructure and the discussed phenomenon, accounting for intervening factors (social structure, economic and political attitudes, and the like) contributes substantially to the overall



picture under scrutiny.

Radoslaw Markowski is Director and Principal Investigator of the Polish National Election Study and is affiliated with the Institute of Political Studies at the Polish Academy of Sciences. He was a Mellon Visiting Fellow from February to April 2002.

16 APRIL

Blandine Kriegel Quelle philosophie pour la démocracie?

LE „TRIOMPHE“ de la démocratie, annoncé quoiqu’avec certaines nuances par un Fukuyama, survient paradoxalement au moment même où plusieurs constatent une véritable „stagnation de la pensée démocratique“. Déclin des passions politiques, individualisme „narcissique“, nihilisme, les diagnostics ne manquent pas concernant l’état déplorable dans lequel se

trouveraient nos démocraties. Ces critiques devant être prises au sérieux, il importe, suivant Blandine Kriegel, d’en analyser les fondements, ce qui permettra par ailleurs de montrer les ressources dont on dispose afin de repenser la démocratie – plus précisément: afin à la fois de „républicaniser“ la démocratie et de „démocratiser“ la république.

In Zusammenarbeit mit dem Institut Français

Blandine Kriegel est professeur de philosophie politique à l’université de Paris-X Nanterre.

23 APRIL

Marina Calloni Women’s Human Rights and the Development of Human Capability

FROM THEIR INCEPTION human rights were characterised by a lack. Although they were intended to be universal, nevertheless women were excluded from the domain of citizenship and “humanity”. Cultural prejudices and a limited conception of “reason”, attributed only to a male public man, obstructed the “inclusion” of women in the political sphere. Therefore, the struggle of women for the recognition of human rights was firstly connected with the request of the political right to vote. However, in the last two centuries women’s movements have radicalised struggles for obtaining not only civil and political but also socio-economic rights, contributing to transform the structure of the nation-state in the form of a fairer welfare state.

Yet the constitutive ambivalence of the notion of women’s human rights (the dynamic between gender equality and gender difference) persists. While gender equality concerns parity and fairness between women and men, gender difference implies ex-negativo the struggle against gender-based violence and discrimination, while ex-positivo it should interest the admission of reproductive rights.





However, while UN conferences and European legislation have confronted the issue of gender-based violence through promoting relevant legislation and policies in the last few decades, there is still a lack of recognition of reproductive rights (from abortion to in-vitro fertilisation) in

terms of women's human rights. On the contrary, new forms of bio-politics are emerging not only due to the opposition of conservatives and the Catholic Church, but also due to the increasing power of biotechnologies and genetic discoveries, which create new bio-ethical problems. These new frontiers of the discussion about life and death will constitute challenges for women. A new approach to human and reproductive rights in terms of the development of human capabilities can be helpful for facing these new questions.

In Zusammenarbeit mit dem Italienischen Kulturinstitut

Marina Calloni is Professor of Social and Political Philosophy at the Department of Sociology – University of Milano-Bicocca, and Director of the "International Network for Research on Gender".

30 APRIL

Danièle Bourcier Coping with New Forms of Regulation: States between local and European governance

DURING THE LAST FEW DECADES an increasing number of criticisms have been raised about the ability of the nation-state to deal with the practical dimensions of rule, such as the design of regulatory processes, the management of risk, or the improvement of citizen confidence. In brief, there has been a lack of satisfaction with the 'representativeness' of the nation-state.

At the same time, new forms of regulation have emerged from within 'civil society' – self-regulation, direct democracy, and regulatory agencies. These models have been adopted by new political actors such as the European Union and the re-

gions to reinforce their roles and demonstrate their efficiency. Starting from some case studies, Danièle Bourcier discussed changes in the level of public policy making and the challenges for state law.



Danièle Bourcier is directrice de recherche at the C.N.R.S., Centre de Théorie du Droit, Université de Paris X, Nanterre and IWM Visiting Fellow.

16

IWM Working Papers www.iwm.at

IWM offers its guests the possibility to present their work for discussion on the Internet. Since 1996, IWM Working Papers have been published regularly on IWM's Website.

Das IWM bietet seinen Gästen die Möglichkeit, ihre Arbeit im Internet zur Diskussion zu stellen. Seit 1996 erscheinen auf der Website des Instituts regelmäßig die IWM Working Papers.

New Papers forthcoming in July 2002

Danièle Bourcier

Is governance *merely* a form of regulation? Balancing the roles of the State and civil society

The last few decades have seen a declining optimism with regard to the ability of the nation-state to deal with the practical dimensions of rule, e.g. the development of regulatory processes and the means of increasing public confidence. At the same time, new forms of regulation have emerged from within civil society, such as self-regulation, direct democracy and regulatory agencies. These models have been adopted by new political actors, notably the European Union, whose intention is to reinforce its roles and demonstrate its efficiency. The paper reflects on regulation and governance, two concepts at the core of the so-called "crisis of the State".

Danièle Bourcier, directrice de recherche at C.N.R.S., Centre de Théorie du Droit, Université de Paris X, Nanterre, is IWM Visiting Fellow in 2002.

Sidonia Blättler

Nationale Identität, nationaler Gegensatz und die Geschlechterdifferenz am Beispiel von Fichtes "Reden an die deutsche Nation"

Der Nationalstaat als das dominante politische Ordnungsmodell der letzten 200 Jahre verdankt seine Integrationskraft nicht zuletzt einer symbolischen Struktur, die vielfältige Entsprechungen zur Ordnung der Geschlechter aufweist. Daraus ließen sich Handlungsnormen ableiten, die Männer und Frauen in je besonderer Weise an den nationalen Staat banden. Umgekehrt dürfte der Umstand, dass für seine Konstruktion die Thematisierung von Männlichkeit und Weiblichkeit eine eminent politische Bedeutung hatte, nicht unwesentlich zur Durchsetzung der modernen Geschlechteranthropologie beigetragen haben.

Sidonia Blättler, Wissenschaftliche Assistentin am Institut für Philosophie, FU Berlin, war 2001 Gast des IWM.

Visiting Fellows

Danièle Bourcier

Directrice de recherche au C.N.R.S., Centre de Théorie du Droit, Université de Paris X, Nanterre

Length of Stay: January – June 2002

Specialization: Law, language and political institutions

IWM Project: Law and cognition; the computability of law and the limits of the so called legal thinking machine: can laws be replaced by software?

Publications: *Savoir innover en Droit. Concepts, Outils, Systèmes – Hommage à Luvien Mehl* (ed. with Louise Cadoux), Paris 1999; *L'écriture du Droit... face aux technologies de l'information* (ed. with Claude Thomasset), Paris 1996; *La Décision Artificielle. Le droit, la machine et l'humain*, Paris 1995

Geza Horvath

Assistant Professor of German Literature, University of Szeged; Paul Celan Visiting Fellow

Length of Stay: April – June 2002

Specialization: Neuere deutschsprachige Literatur

IWM Project: Friedrich Nietzsche, *Menschliches, Allzumenschliches, Bd.1*, Übersetzung aus dem Deutschen ins Ungarische

Publications: *Wege der deutschen Innerlichkeit am Beispiel von Johann Wolfgang von Goethes Die Leiden des jungen Werther, Hermann Hesses Siddhartha und Thomas Manns Doktor Faustus*, Budapest 2001; verschiedene Übersetzungen von Dürrenmatt, Nietzsche, Hesse, Gadamer u.a. vom Deutschen ins Ungarische



Taras Korpalo

Petya Liubomirova Kabakchieva

Associate Professor and Head of Department of Sociology, Sofia University

Length of Stay: January – June 2002

Specialization: Political sociology; European integration

IWM Project: After the Accession: Social and Economic Culture in Eastern Europe – Is it EU Compatible?

Publications: *Civil Society vs State: the Bulgarian Case* (in Bulgarian), Sofia 2001; “Building of ‘Europe’ or Integrating in Europe,” (in Bulgarian) in: *Soziologicheski problemi*, 1-2, 2000; *Bulgaria: Consultations with the Poor*; National Synthesis Report, The World Bank 1999

Taras Korpalo

Senior Lecturer at the Philosophy Department, Kyiv National Economic University, Paul Celan Visiting Fellow

Length of Stay: January – March 2002

Specialization: Epistemology, Ontology, Philosophy of Sciences, Social and Political Philosophy, History of Culture

IWM Project: E. J. Hobsbawm, *Nations and Nationalism since 1780*, Translation from English into Ukrainian

Publications: George Herbert Mead, *Mind, Self, and Society from the Standpoint of a Social Behaviorist*, Kyiv 2000 (translation from English into Ukrainian; author of the preface)

Adam Lipszyc

Ph.D. candidate in Philosophy, University of Warsaw; Paul Celan Visiting Fellow

Length of Stay: January – June 2002

Specialization: Philosophy; 20th century Jewish philosophy; postmodern theories of subjectivity

IWM Project: Translation of a selection of Gershom Scholem's essays and letters into Polish

Publications: Charles Taylor: *The Sources of the Self* (Part I, transl. into Polish), Warsaw 2001; Bertrand Russell: *The History of Western Philosophy* (Part I, transl. into Polish), Warsaw 2000; Ludwig Wittgenstein: *Blue book* (transl. into Polish), Warsaw 1999; Book reviews and essays in *Literatura na Swiecie*

Radoslaw Markowski

Director and Principal Investigator, Polish National Election Study, Institute of Political Studies, Polish Academy of Sciences; Andrew W. Mellon Visiting Fellow

Length of Stay: January – March 2002

Specialization: Comparative politics, electoral studies, democratization

IWM Project: Democratic Consolidation: Choice or Fate? On the Impact of Institutional Design and Cultural Legacies in Eastern European and Latin American Settings

Publications: “Political Institutions and Electoral Behavior in Central and Eastern Europe”, in: D. Fuchs, E. Roller, B. Wessels (eds.), *Citizens and Democracy in East and West. Studies in Political Culture and Political Process. Festschrift in Honor of Hans-Dieter Klingemann*, Berlin 2002; “Party System Institutionalization; *Post-Communist Party Systems: Competition, Representation and Inter-party Cooperation* (co-author), Cambridge 1999



Paul Cristian Radu

Investigative reporter with “Evenimentul Zilei”, Bucharest, Romania; Milena Jesenská Visiting Fellow

Length of Stay: January – March 2002

Specialization: Investigative journalism on organized crime

IWM Project: Interactions between the former communist secret services and the organized crime groups in Eastern and Central Europe

Publications: Articles published in Romanian and U.S. newspa-



pers and magazines; worked for the US based TV channel ABC 20/20 and for BBC News Night

Zsuzsa Rakovszky

Writer and translator, Budapest; Paul Celan Visiting Fellow

Length of Stay: January – June 2002

Specialization: Translations of poetry and fiction, philosophy, history and psychology

IWM Project: Translation of Thomas Nagel's *The View from Nowhere* into Hungarian

Publications: A book of poems in German, translated by Zsuzsa Gahse, has been published in March 2002 by Edition Korrespondenzen in Vienna; *The shadow of the Snake* (in Hungarian), forthcoming May 2002, Budapest; *One Way Street* (in Hungarian), Budapest 1998; *New Life. Poems translated by George Szirtes*, Oxford 1994



Cyril Riha

Ph.D. candidate in Philosophy and Research Associate at the Center for Phenomenological Study, Prague; Research Associate, Patocka Project

Length of Stay: January – March 2002

Specialization: Philosophie, Doktorarbeit zum Thema „Visualität und Diskursivität“

IWM Project: Erschließung der Handschriften Jan Patockas zu seiner „Philosophie der Geschichte“ (im Rahmen des Projekts „Der andere Weg in die Moderne. Jan Patockas Beitrag zur Genealogie der Neuzeit“)

Publications: „Jan Patocka: Renaissance: Ficinus, Pico, Pomponatius“ (mit Filip Karfik), in: *Kritický sborník* 20, 2001



Hans Rainer Sepp

Eugen Fink-Archiv, PH Freiburg i. Br.; Center for Phenomenological Study, Prag; Mitarbeiter am Center for Theoretical Study in Prag, Research Associate, Patocka Project

Length of Stay: February – April 2002

Specialization: Phänomenologie

IWM Project: Im Rahmen des IWM-Projekts „Der andere Weg in die Moderne. Jan Patockas Beitrag zur Genealogie der Neuzeit“ Studien zur Geschichtsphilosophie sowie zur Theorie der Phänomenalität bei Jan Patocka

Publications: *Jan Patocka: Texte – Dokumente – Bibliographie*, (hg. mit Ludger Hagedorn), Freiburg, München, Prag 1999 (= *Orbis Phaenomenologicus*, Abt. II, Bd. 2); *Metamorphose der Phänomenologie. Dreizehn Stadien von Husserl aus* (hg.), Freiburg/München 1999 (= *Phänomenologie. Kontexte* Bd. 7); Edith Stein: *Potenz und Akt. Studien zu einer Philosophie des Seins* (hg.), Freiburg 1998 (= *Edith Steins Werke XVIII*)



Junior Visiting Fellows

Bogdan Barbu

Ph.D. candidate in History and American Studies, University of Birmingham; Robert Bosch Junior Visiting Fellow

Length of Stay: January – June 2002

Specialization: Cold War/Post Cold War history, American cultural studies

IWM Project: The Symbolic Presence of the United States in Cold War Romania. This project is intended to discuss the nature, peculiarities and consequences of the cultural/ideological presence of the United States in Romania/Eastern Europe during the Cold War Period. It analyses how knowledge about the United States was disseminated in Eastern Europe through institutional channels, and explores the production of popular mythologies about “America” in the region. It also discusses the transmission, dissemination and reception of US cultural products in the region seen as part of a long-term process of cultural transfer operating as a vector of cultural globalization.

Publications: “Images of the United States in Cold War Romania”, in: *Americanisation and the Teaching of American Studies*, Web project, University of Central Lancashire, December 2001, www.uclan.ac.uk/amatas/resource/romania.htm; “Sounds of Freedom, Sounds of Decay. Perceptions of American Music and Associated Lifestyles in Romania in the 20th Century,” in: *American Studies Journal* 47, 2001



Slavica Jakelic

Ph.D candidate in Religious Studies, Boston University

Length of Stay: July 2001 – June 2002

Specialization: Sociology of religion, religious studies

IWM Project: The Roman Catholic Church in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia and Slovenia: Religion and Collective Identity

Publications: *The Future of the Study of Religion* (with Lory Pearson, eds.), forthcoming, Brill N.V.; “The Public Role of Religion Institutions and the Privacy of Faith” (in Croatian), in: *Svjetlo Rijeci*, 1999; “Faith and Reason: The Two Faces of Responsible Christianity (in Croatian)”, in: *Svjetlo Rijeci*, 1998

Slavomir Krekovic

Ph.D. candidate, Comenius University Bratislava; Robert Bosch Junior Visiting Fellow



Length of Stay: January – June 2002

Specialization: Musicology, aesthetics of contemporary meta-genre music, transformation of culture in post-communist countries

IWM Project: Between Global and Regional: The Internet as a Tool of Cultural Transformation in Central Europe

Publications: *Tristvrte revue*. Contemporary art and culture magazine (Founder and Editor-in-chief)

Carla Lovett

Ph.D. candidate in European History, Boston University



Length of stay: June 2002

Specialization: Social and religious history of modern Europe

IWM Project: Front Altars and Back Alleys: Religion and Society in Late Nineteenth Century Vienna

Jyoti Mistry

Ph.D., Department of Cinema Studies, New York University



Length of Stay: March – June 2002

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)

Katharina Pewny

Kulturtheoretikerin, externe Lektorin an verschiedenen Universitäten (Wien, Graz, Innsbruck, Salzburg), Systemischer Coach und Gruppentrainerin, tätig im feministischen Bildungszentrum Frauenhetz (Wien)

Length of stay: März – Dezember 2002

IWM Project: Habilitationsprojekt: “Der Ruhe auf der Spur” Bedeutungen und Bedeutungswandel von “Ruhe” anhand der Sichtung kultureller Repräsentationen. Entwürfe von Weiblichkeit als “unruhigem” und “ruhiggestelltem” Geschlecht, von “Ruhe” als politischer Haltung und von Kritik am aktuellen Beschleunigungssog sind dabei drei wichtige Knotenpunkte.

Publications: *Ihre Welt bedeuten. Feminismus – Theater – Repräsentation*, Königstein/Taunus 2002;



Begehren Macht Politik, in: Regina Trotz und Maria Maice-Egger (Hg.), *Macht begehren? Zu einer Repolitisierung der Gruppendynamik*, Wien 2001; Theorie, Sozietät, Körper, In: *Katedra. Gender Studies UW nr. 2. Oska Kultura*, Warschau 2001

Paulo Pinto

Ph.D. candidate in Anthropology, Boston University

Length of Stay: January – June 2002

Specialization: Anthropology of religion and knowledge, Islam, Sufism, Middle Eastern societies, religious identity and experience, ritual, embodiment, ethnicity

IWM Project: Dissertation on the construction of religious identity in contemporary Syrian Sufism based on 16 months of fieldwork research done in the Sufi communities of Aleppo and the villages of the Kurd Dagh, in northern Syria. The research was done among the two major ethnic groups, Arabs and Kurds, and aims at the understanding of the experiential basis of the social expression of Sufi identities.

Publications: *Academic Practices and Higher Education: an ethnography of the forms of transmission and legitimization of knowledge in the university* (in Portuguese), Niteroi 1999; “The House of Islam: Egalitarianism and Universality in Muslim Societies” (in Portuguese), in: *Antropolitica* 3, 1997



Adam Lipszyc, Paulo Pinto and a friend

Natascha Vittorelli

Doktorandin (Geschichte), Universität Wien; Stipendiatin im Rahmen des Doktorandenprogramms der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften



Length of Stay: January – June 2002

Specialization: Geschichte Südosteuropas (19. und 20. Jahrhundert) – speziell Jugoslawien, feministische Geschichtswissenschaften, Nationalismusforschung

IWM Project: Arbeit an der Dissertation mit dem Arbeitstitel *Geschichte der ersten Frauenbewegungen in den südslawischen Gebieten der Habsburgermonarchie*

Guests

Irene Dölling

Professorin für Sozialwissenschaften, Universität Potsdam

Length of Stay: February 2002

Specialization: Kulturtheorie, Frauenforschung, Geschlechterstudien

IWM Project: DDR-Geschlechtervertrag und Arbeitsbiografien ostdeutscher Frauen als Ressourcen für eigen-sinniges Handeln in transformierten Verhältnissen „Geschlecht – eine analytische Kategorie mit Perspektive in den Sozialwissenschaften?“, in:

Publications: *Potsdamer Studien zur Frauen- und Geschlechterforschung*, 1, 1999; „Das Veralten der Frauenforschung“, in: *MKF* 37, 1996; „Das Eigene und das Fremde der Deutschen im Alltagsleben vor und nach der ‚Vereinigung‘“ (mit Ina Dietzsch), in: *BIOS. Zeitschrift für Biographieforschung und Oral History*, 1996

Albena Hranova

Associate Professor of Literary Studies, Plovdiv University, Bulgaria

Length of Stay: March 2002

Publication: *New Debates. Bulgarian Debates in 1999*, Sofia 2000

Gudrun Axeli Knapp

Professor of Social Sciences and Social Psychology, University of Hannover

Length of Stay: April 2002

Publications: *Feministische Theorien – Zur Einführung*, Hamburg 2000; *Soziale Verortung der Geschlechter. Gesellschaftstheorie und feministische Kritik* (mit Angelika Wetterer), Münster 2001; „More Power to Argument“, in: *Feminist Theory* 1(2) 2000.



Slavica Jakelic, Gudrun Axeli Knapp

Tomasz Szarota

Professor of History, Institute for History, Polish Academy of Sciences, Warsaw

Length of Stay: May 2002

Publications: *U progu Zagłady. Zajścia antyżydowskie I pogromy w okupowanej Europie. Warszawa-Paryż-Amsterdam-Antwerpia-Kowno* (An der Schwelle zur Vernichtung. Antijüdische Ausschreitungen und Pogrome im besetzten Europa. Warschau-Paris-Amsterdam-Antwerpen-Kaunas), Warszawa 2001; *Prasa niemiecka o Jedwabnem* (Die deutsche Presse über Jedwabne), in: *Prawda I Pojednanie* (Wahrheit und Versöhnung – Eine Festschrift für Wladyslaw Bartoszewski), hg. von Jan Barcz, Warszawa 2002; *Mord w Jedwabnem. Dokumenty, publikacje I interpretacje. Czerwiec 1941 – maj 2000* (Mord in Jedwabne. Dokumente Veröffentlichungen und Interpretationen. Juni 1941 – Mai 2000), im Druck (Sammelband des Polnischen Instituts des Nationalen Gedenkens).

Adalbert Evers

Professor of Comparative Health Policy and Social Policy, University of Gießen

Length of Stay: June 2002

IWM-Project: Civil society and social policy, social and occupational integration – the role of the local level.

Publications: *Bürgerschaftliches Engagement in Nordrhein-Westfalen. Eine explorative Studie in den Handlungsfeldern Sport, Kultur, Stadtentwicklung und soziale Dienste* (mit Norbert Wohlfahrt und Birgit Riedel, i.E.); *Developing Quality in Personal Social Services. Concepts, Cases and Comments* (ed. with Kai Leichsenring, Riitta Haverinen and Gerald Wistow), Aldershot 1997

Bill Egginton

Assistant Professor of Modern Languages and Literatures, University at Buffalo

Length of Stay: June 2002

IWM-Project: Perversion, Ethics, Psychoanalysis

Publications: *How the world became a stage: Presence, Theatricality, and the Question of Modernity*, Albany, NY 2002; Lisa Block de Behar, *Borges: The Passion of an Endless Quotation*, translated and with an introduction by William Egginton, Albany, NY 2002; „Reality is Bleeding: A Brief History of Film from the 16th Century,“ in: *Configurations* 9.2 (2002)



Danièle Bourcier, Bill Egginton

Bernadette Wegenstein

Assistant Professor at the Department of Media Study, SUNY Buffalo

Length of Stay: June 2002

IWM Project: Getting under the skin: Corporeal Configurations at the Turn of the Millennium

Publications: „Shooting up Heroines,“ in: *Reload: Rethinking Women and Cyberculture*, eds. Mary Flanagan/ Austin Booth, Cambridge, MA 2002; Getting Under the Skin, or, How Faces have become Obsolete,“ in: *Configurations*, special issue, Volume 7, 2002, ed. Timothy Lenoir; *Die Darstellung von AIDS in den Medien: semio-linguistische Analyse und Interpretation*, Wien 1998.

The following scholars will take up their fellowships at IWM from July 2002:

Die folgenden Wissenschaftlerinnen und Wissenschaftler werden von Juli 2002 an Fellows des IWM sein:

Visiting Fellows

Marcin Król

Professor of History of Ideas and Dean of the Faculty of Applied Sciences and Social Prevention, Warsaw University; Robert Bosch Visiting Fellow

Length of Stay: July – December

IWM Project: An Introduction to Political Philosophy

Włodzimierz Medrzecki

Assistant Professor at the Institut of History at the Polish Academy of Sciences; Robert Bosch Visiting Fellow

Length of Stay: July – December

IWM Project: The Intelligentsia in the Process of Modernising Central and Eastern European Societies in the 19th and 20th Centuries

Ciprian Mihali

Associate professor of Philosophy at the University „Babes-Bolyai“ Cluj-Napoca; Andrew W. Mellon Visiting Fellow

Length of Stay: July – September

IWM Project: Politics between Architectural and Biological Approaches: from the modern paradigms to the „post“ symptoms

David Mik

Professor of History of Ideas and Dean of the Faculty of Applied Sciences and Social Prevention, Warsaw University; Paul Celan Visiting Fellow

Length of Stay: July – December

IWM Project: Hans Georg Gadamer: *Wahrheit und Methode. Grundzüge einer Philosophischen Hermeneutik*, Übersetzung vom Deutschen ins Tschechische

Junior Visiting Fellows

Eric Brown

Ph.D. candidate in Political Philosophy, Boston College

Length of Stay: July – December

IWM Project: Pluralism, Reason, and Political Life

Dimitri Constant

Ph.D. candidate in Philosophy, Boston University

Length of Stay: July – December

IWM Project: Frege and Husserl on Psychologism in Logic and Mathematics

Shawn Gorman

Post-graduate student in Modern Foreign Languages and Literatures, Boston University

Length of Stay: July – December

IWM Project: Proust's Essences and Sartre's Anti-Essentialism

Bradley Herling

Ph.D. candidate in Philosophy of Religion, Boston University

Length of Stay: July – December

IWM Project: The Initial Reception of Indian (specifically Hindu) Religion and Philosophy among Early 19th Century German Intellectuals

Berthold Molden

Ph.D. candidate in History, University of Vienna Stipendiat im Rahmen des Doktorandenprogramms der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften

Length of Stay: July – December

IWM Project: Gerechtigkeit und nationale Versöhnung – Die Nachkriegsgesellschaften Österreichs und Guatemalas im historischen Vergleich

Terese Novak

Graduate student in Business Administration and International Relations, Boston University

Length of Stay: July – December

IWM Project: Gender-Based War Crimes: Evolution of International Law, Policy and Justice

Transit

EUROPÄISCHE REVUE

Das Gedächtnis des Jahrhunderts

Paul Ricoeur Zwischen Gedächtnis und Geschichte

Pierre Nora Gedächtniskonjunktur

Timothy Garton Ash Mesomnesie – Plädoyer für ein mittleres Erinnern

Kommentare: Joachim Gauck
Alex Boraine

Reinhart Koselleck Transformation der Totenmale im 20. Jahrhundert

Was tun mit der kommunistischen Vergangenheit?

Andrzej Paczkowski über Polen
Jacques Rupnik über die Tschechische Republik
Alexei Miller über Russland

**Eva Brunner-Szabo/
Gert Tschögl** Museum der Erinnerungen. Ein Projekt

Charles S. Maier Die Halbwertszeit von Nazismus und Kommunismus

Aviezer Ravitzky Holocaust und jüdisches orthodoxes Denken heute

Yehuda Bauer Holocaust, Geschichtsschreibung und Gedächtnis

Michel Serres Neue Technologien und Ökonomie des Vergessens

verlag neue kritik 22

Ich abonniere Transit–Europäische Revue ab Heft ____
(2 Hefte pro Jahr zum Preis von € 20,- (D) portofrei)

Ich möchte meine Bibliothek ergänzen und bestelle

Hefte 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10 (bitte ankreuzen) zum S
Sonderpreis von je € 5,- (D) plus Porto

ab Heft 11 die Nummern _____ zum Einzelpreis
von je € 11,- (D) plus Porto

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.iwm.at/transit.htm

Herausgegeben am
Institut für die
Wissenschaften
vom Menschen

Preis: Abo: € 20,- (D)
Zwei Hefte pro Jahr
Einzelheft € 11,- (D)
portofrei (in D und Ö)

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

FELLOWS AND GUESTS

Charles Robinson

Ph.D. candidate in Philosophy, Boston College

Length of Stay: July – December

IWM Project: A Battle of Giants Concerning Being: Hegel and Heidegger on the Beginning of Science

Balázs Trencsényi

Ph.D. candidate in History, Central-European University, Budapest

Length of Stay: July – December

IWM Project: The Reception of Western Political Ideas

Teresa Vajdová

Ph.D. candidate in Social Sciences, Charles University, Prague; Robert Bosch Junior Visiting Fellow

Length of Stay: July – December

IWM Project: Public Accountability of the Czech EU Accession Process

Guests

Claus Leggewie

Professor of Political Sciences, University of Gießen

Month of stay: September

Regina Becker-Schmidt

Professor of Social Psychology, University of Hannover

Month of stay: October

Robin May Schott

Director of Research, FREJA-project, Department of Education, Philosophy and Rhetoric, Copenhagen

Month of stay: November

Iver B. Neumann

Research Professor of Political Science, Norwegian Institute for International Affairs and Senior Adviser, European Department, Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Month of stay: December

On 19 April, 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 2002 and 2003, respectively.

Fellowships for Journalists and Translators



Milena Jesenská

THE MILENA JESENSKÁ FELLOWSHIPS are awarded to enable journalists from across Europe to work in Vienna 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.

Milena Jesenská Fellows are invited to spend three months at the IWM. Recipients of the fellowships are – in addition to a stipend – provided with office space and access to IWM's in-house research facilities as well as other relevant sources in Vienna.

The two first journalists to take up their fellowships in 2002 are Barbara Tóth (Austria) and Nelly Becus-Goncharova (Belarus). Both will join the IWM in fall 2002.

Barbara Tóth aims at writing a magazine story which could be the starting point for a book project on the "generation 1989":

The project combines elements of oral history with a genuine journalistic approach. I want to research and describe what became of members of a class that graduated in 1989 in Prague, then Czechoslovakia. By describing their lives and attitudes I want to form a portrait of the first generation after the fall of the iron curtain, a generation which I would like to call the "Generation 1989". I don't know whether they share a certain consciousness about their "historical" date of birth or whether there are feelings and attitudes they have in common at all. I want to explore how this generation perceives itself and how they assess the history of their country. How did they feel when they were 18 and not only graduated from school, but also were confronted with a fundamental change of the coordinates of their lives? Where do they stand now? How did the social and economic changes influence their biographies?

Nelly Becus-Goncharova will work on a project entitled *The Invisible Wall: The hidden factor of Belarusian reality*.

Belarus is experiencing its own way of existing which lies beyond the usual logic of modern cultural and social development trends towards globalisation, liberalisation and democracy. What is really conspicuous in the "new", recent history of Belarus is the lack of any "break" with the past in terms of state ideology. There was simply no decisive historical turning point when a new life began, as it happened in countries like Poland, the Czech Republic, Ukraine or Lithuania. Actually, the majority of Belarusians did not experience any social change at all in their own live. For them, Belarus today is the same Belarus of the socialist past, which is in fact not over for them. But there is also an ideological opposition, reading and supporting independent newspapers and distancing themselves from state politics.

Thus, two streams of information that convey different fundamental ideas about society, values, intentions, and various everyday practices are separated by a real, invisible, impenetrable "wall". On either side of it, there are two different pictures of Belarus – both equally real.

As the situation before the presidential elections has shown, while ideological work on both sides of the "wall" was extremely intensified, all political and information efforts just led to the wall being strengthened. Consequently, Belarusian society resembles two cinemas divided by the same wall, in which two different films are being projected onto the screen on both sides of the wall. What is more, each projection is full and self-sufficient enough to provide a complete picture of the world.

The first step would be just to see the people on the other side of the wall as real individuals...

Jury

Sarmite Elerte, editor-in-chief of Diena, Riga
Helena Luczywo, managing editor-in-chief of Gazeta Wzborcza, Warsaw

Gerfried Sperl, editor-in-chief of Der Standard, Vienna (Chair)

Laura Starink, NRC-Handelsblad, Rotterdam
Anita Traninger, Managing Director, IWM

Gottfried Wagner, Secretary General of the European Cultural Foundation, Amsterdam
Roger de Weck, journalist, Zurich and Berlin



Paul Celan

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, was funded for many years by the European Cultural Foundation and has been supported by the City of Vienna since 2000. In 2002 five Visiting Fellows are invited to translate works by Hans-Georg Gadamer, Eric J. Hobsbawm, Thomas Nagel, Friedrich Nietzsche and Gershom Scholem. In 2003, the following Paul Celan-Fellows will be invited to join the IWM:

Andras Barabas (Hungary)

Benedict Anderson: *Imagined Communities*
Translation from English into Hungarian

Mikhail Khorkov (Russia)

Jürgen Habermas: *Die Zukunft der menschlichen Natur*
Translation from German into Russian

Viktor Shovkun (Ukraine)

Michel Foucault: *Archéologie du savoir*
Translation from French into Ukrainian

Edit Király (Hungary)

Hans Blumenberg: *Schriften zur Metaphorologie und zum Mythos*
Translation from German into Hungarian

Nowak-Juchacz Ewa (Poland)

Immanuel Kant: *Metaphysik der Sitten*
Translation from German into Polish

Jury

Gottfried Boehm, Professor of Modern Art History, University of Basel

Endre Bojtár, Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Budapest

Peter Demetz, Yale University

Klaus Nellen, Permanent Fellow, IWM

Martin Pollack, Writer and Translator, Vienna/Bocksdorf

Publications

János M. Kovács

Permanent Fellow

“Rival Temptations – Passive Resistance. Cultural Globalization in Hungary” in: Peter Berger & Samuel Huntington (eds), *Many Globalizations*, Oxford University Press, 2002.

“Approaching the EU And Reaching the US? Transforming Welfare Regimes”, in: *East-Central Europe: Rival Narratives, West European Politics*, April 2002; and in: Peter Mair & Jan Zielonka (eds), *The Enlarged European Union. Diversity and Adaptation*, Frank Cass, London 2002.

Travels and Talks

Danièle Bourcier

Visiting Fellow

Workshop on the European Project of E-government (with Professor Traummüller), University of Linz (during spring semester 2002).

Lecture: «L'Etat et les nouveaux modes de régulation. Gouverner sans gouvernement», Centre de Théorie du Droit, Université de Paris 10 (8 April).

Lecture: „Internet et le Droit“, Institut Français de Vienne (22 April).

Slavica Jakelic

Junior Visiting Fellow

Lecture: “The Problem of Secularization in Peter Berger’s Sociology of Religion”, Fakulteta za družbene vede, Univerza v Ljubljani, Ljubljana, Slovenia (12 April).

Cornelia Klinger

Permanent Fellow

Vortrag: „Die Überschätzung des Themas Identität in der aktuellen Diskussion und ihre Ursachen“. Ringvorlesung des Gender Kollegs der Universität Wien „Brüche – Geschlecht – Gesellschaft. Lokale Fragmentierungen“ (22. April).

Petya Kabakchieva

Visiting Fellow

Organised and participated in a workshop on “Understanding Socio-Economic Cultures in Eastern Europe – Methodological Challenges” Sofia (April 28-29, see p. 9).

János M. Kovács

Permanent Fellow

Participation: Social Science Research Council (NY) meeting on the “Remembering Communism” project, Budapest (February 8).

Participation: Blue Bird Project annual meeting, CEU, Budapest (March 8-9).

Teaching: A module on transfer of institutions and political ideas from West to East and the role of intellectuals within a course on Enlargement, Institute for Advanced Study (IHS), Vienna (16./17. April).

Participation: Conference of the Centre for Advanced Study, Sofia (April 26-28).

Krzysztof Michalski

Rector

Seminar: „Über Ewigkeit“, Universität Warschau (28. Februar).

Teilnahme: Öffentliche Debatte über Jozef Tischner’s Buch „Der unmögliche Dialog“, veranstaltet vom Verlag ZNAK in den Räumlichkeiten der Stefan Batory Stiftung, Warschau (4. März).

Teilnahme: Polnisch-Deutsch-Jüdischer Dialog, Bertelsmann Stiftung, Warschau (5.-6. März).

Klaus Nellen

Permanent Fellow

Teilnahme: Podiumsdiskussion “Cultural Periodicals: Problems of Publishing”, veranstaltet von der Zeitschrift *Critique and Humanism*, American Center, Sofia (1.-3. Februar).

Teilnahme: Podiumsdiskussion auf der Leipziger Buchmesse zum Thema „Kulturzeitschriften – Spiegel Europas?“, veranstaltet von der Universität Leipzig und der Buchmesse-Akademie veranstaltet wurde (22. März).

Katharina Pewny

Junior Visiting Fellow

Leitung des Open Space-Seminars für Habilitandinnen und Dissertantinnen, Projektzentrum für Frauenförderung/Universität Wien (2. Februar).

Natascha Vittorelli

Junior Visiting Fellow

Vortrag: “Wären Sie mein Freund böse auf mich, wüssten Sie das? Ein Beispiel von Antisemitismus in der südslawischen Literatur”, Erstes Österreichisches Osteuropa-Forum, Niederösterreichische Landesakademie St. Pölten (4.-5. April).

Varia

Karin Nussbaumer verstärkt seit März diesen Jahres das Team des IWM. Nach ihren früheren Tätigkeiten u.a. als Einkäuferin bei der Amerikanischen Botschaft, als Vorstandsassistentin eines Konzerns in der Keramikindustrie und zuletzt hauptsächlich im medizinischen Bereich hat sie nunmehr das Office Management des IWM übernommen.



On February 15, a group of students from the **Marie Curie-Sklodowska University** (UMCS) in Lublin (Poland) visited the IWM to learn more about its role in Central Europe and Vienna before and after 1989. Their stay in Vienna was jointly coordinated by the Renner Institute and UMCS and supported by the Robert Bosch Foundation.

Notes on Books

The Inevitability of the Unexpected: Russia, Ukraine, and the Breakup of the Soviet Union

Timothy Snyder

FEW THINGS are so little rewarded as being right at the time. Those who provide plausible reconstructions of the past are respected as historians; those who provide controversial running commentaries do well as media personalities. A historian making informed educated guesses about the shape of present trends and their possible future outcomes falls between two stools. Moreover, the irony of the present moment is that the totality of its truth is invisible: we cannot see the sources as quickly as they appear, cannot interpret events as quickly as they happen, cannot prove in real time that one guess is better than another. Then, by the time a guess has been proven right, everyone has forgotten the original guesser.

After the end of communism in eastern Europe, one cliché quick off the mark was that “no one predicted this.” This was trivially true, in that no one predicted the actual chain of events, or its timing. In some sense, however, this apparently modest claim was the faux innocent last stand of a certain hegemonic scholarly consensus about the modernity and stability of the Soviet Union and the durability and even legitimacy of its rule in eastern Europe. To believe that no one had predicted the end of communism was to accept that if mistakes of interpretation were made, these mistakes were general, they were made by everyone. This was not quite so. There were some educated guesses.

As Roman Szporluk made his career as a historian of Central Europe, as intellectual biographer of Masaryk and author of a comparative study of Marx and List, he published shorter scholarly and popular articles on the Soviet Union. These articles, or rather some of those originally written in English between 1971 and 1997, have been collected in *Russia, Ukraine, and the Breakup of the Soviet Union*. The republication of essays of the 1970s and 1980s is particularly interesting, since it demonstrates a continuous and fruitful interest in the national prob-

lems of the Soviet Union. Usually the puzzle was how various spaces – periphery and center, Russia and the rest, city and countryside – could be held together. Always implicit (and sometimes explicit) in this approach was always the matter of whether the attempt might ultimately fail.

Szporluk posed this question in specific ways, which addressed one aspect of the national problem at a time, and which usually admitted empirical research. Following Richard Pipes, he also emphasized the institutional original sin of the Soviet Union: its nominally federal constitution. Although the Soviet Union was in so typical sense a federation, its constitution created nominally national republics and its practices defined individuals in ethnic terms. The territories of these republics changed, to be sure, and more often and more radically than is realized. Yet these lines on maps and lines on internal passports created at least the simulacrum of national political existence, and simulacra in the right circumstances can take on life.

Szporluk saw that the westward expansion of the Soviet Union in 1945 was a risky maneuver, since it imported millions of people with lively understandings of national identity into a system not designed for national life. The Baltic Republics were never seen as Soviet by the rest of the Soviet Union, and even came to be seen as representing a superior form of social life. The conclusion that national independence or European traditions were of some value could not be avoided. The importance of “West Ukraine,” as we now call Galicia, Volhynia, Sub-Carpathia, and Chernivtsi, was harder to see. These regions, previously part of Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Romania, disappeared into the larger notion of “Ukraine” and the still larger “Soviet Union.” Szporluk suspected that the attempt to Sovietize these western peripheries, seen as unproblematic from a Leninist or a modernization point of view, was in fact fraught with dialectical contradiction. Under Soviet rule, Lviv and Galicia became more culturally Ukrainian than they had ever previously been.

Szporluk paid special attention to the city. He recognized that republican capitals such as Kyiv became, in the postwar period, cities where the urban and rural

languages were one and the same for the first time in modern history. This recognition, simple though it may seem, was at odds with two conventional narratives of urban development in the Soviet Union. On the Soviet account, urbanization meant Sovietization, and therefore the end of national questions, at least in the long run. On an ethnic nationalist account, these cities had “always” been Ukrainian (or Lithuanian, etc.), and the heroic local nationality was successfully resisting Russification. On Szporluk’s view, the Soviet Union was failing overall as a national project in the heyday of Russification in the 1970s and 1980s. The national character of republication characters was not the sign of ethnic continuity, but rather the promise of future political problems.

A middle ground is not the same thing as a compromise. One cannot simply strike a compromise between (for example) the Soviet and the ethnic view of urbanization. The middle ground must always be the higher ground, an independent perspective that casts light not only on the subject of inquiry, but also on the other explanations. Szporluk found this middle ground by taking modernization theory as an empirical project. Rather than seeing the Soviet Union as itself modern, or ineluctably moving towards the modern, he investigated the social institutions thought to signal progress: urbanization, but also demography, and the reading habits of the public. These were among the few avenues of empirical social enquiry available, and Szporluk took them. What must have been a particularly thankless task at the time, the investigation of the languages and readership regional press, now appears a singularly useful approach.

By taking modernization theory seriously in this empirical way, Szporluk ended with conclusions similar to those of Karl Deutsch: that the needs of communication are good predictors of nationality – but that the social changes that lead to changes in the needs of communication are complex and difficult to direct. The nation might be a modern phenomenon, but the national was unlikely to be Soviet. This did not mean that rival national ideas flourished in the 1970s and 1980s,

merely that they survived and even thrived in unexpected places, and that in the right circumstances could legitimize (if not cause) the breakup of the Soviet Union into its “constituent” national republics. In his introduction, Szporluk hastens to make clear that his was not an attempt to prediction or complete explanation: at most, he says, he attended to some of the relevant problems.

To explain the emergence of an independent Ukrainian state after 1991, Szporluk invokes Leon Wasilewski’s explanation of the failure of the same project after 1918: “the conjuncture,” the total international political history of the particular nationally relevant moment. National histories are usually constructed around the dates of national failures and successes; histories that explain must accept that national leaders and their followers usually have little influence on the overall international environment. There is something touching about the citation of Wasilewski: what Ukrainian historian these days cites this leading Polish federalist and student of east European nationalism? Wasilewski was another student of nationality who took the middle ground and was right about many things at the time. Szporluk’s reference to him suggests one further virtue of his approach: a habit of comparison, in which the east European nations are not unique until proven to be so. Szporluk’s historical studies of Ukraine take Russia and Poland as seriously as they take Ukrainian domestic politics.

As the documentary basis for the study of Soviet nationality has improved from nearly nothing to nearly everything, the field has taken two courses: a useful documentary neo-positivism and a sometimes premature intellectualization of the Soviet national project. Szporluk’s essays remind us of a few basic tools of the craft: the attention to chronology, the inevitability of the unexpected, the importance of the deep investigation of the small problem, the utility of the unexpected comparison, the need to take theory as seriously as it takes itself. They also give hope that historians do have something to say about the present moment. As we ask why the Soviet Union collapsed, and what the nation meant while it survived, here is one of the best places to start. They provide answers, and a lesson in the framing of questions.

Russia, Ukraine, and the Breakup of the Soviet Union

Roman Szporluk

Stanford: Hoover Institution Press, 2000.

ISBN:0-8179 9542-0

Timothy Snyder is Assistant Professor of History at Yale University and was a Junior Visiting Fellow at the IWM in 1996.

With the German parliamentary elections due in September, we invited representatives of both the Socialdemocrat and the Conservative parties to comment on the pre-election situation.

Wolfgang Schaeuble: A German Conservative *Credo*

FEW CONCEPTS are as elastic as that of “Conservatism.” At one end of its spectrum of meanings, conservatism has (over the last two decades) come to be viewed as promoting too much of a civic life of greed and grab. At the other end, conservatism in many European countries has historically veered too close for comfort to right-wing extremism. In Germany today, conservatism was forged in the wake of the Weimar Republic’s failures, experiences unknown to Anglo-Saxon conservatives. This history accounts for the type of conservatism practiced by the Christian-Democratic Union (CDU) and Christian-Social Union (CSU), who focus on moderation and balance, preservation and innovation, and on commanding Germany’s political center.

With federal elections due in Germany this autumn, much will be said about the nature of German conservatism. Some, looking at the CDU/CSU candidate for Chancellor, Edmund Stoiber’s emphasis on his economic success in Bavaria, will seek to portray the coalition as shaded dangerously by the “anything goes” market conservatism practiced in America. Others, pointing to the German conservatives’ emphasis on social values, will say that we are as statist as the Social Democrats. The truth itself, however, is far more complex than these facile comparisons, which also makes it more durable.

CDU/CSU policies are, of course, founded on the idea of individual freedom, but we believe in an individualism tempered by Western culture and the Christian tradition. We are skeptical about unfettered individualism because of our awareness of man’s sins, but also because of our profound awareness of historical defects and aberrations in Germany’s 20th century history. Yet, despite this deeply ingrained skepticism about human nature, we embrace humanity’s talent for progress and innovation, because we recognize man’s ability to correct mistakes and errors.

These two traits, although they seem to conflict and are certainly different from the values of American and British conser-

vatives, nonetheless form a sound basis for a realistic pragmatism and the shunning of ideological politics B which is precisely the politics that Germany now requires. For far from being willing to coerce people to live in a certain way, German conservatives seek a politics that recognizes limits B the limits of the state, the market, and the individual.

We conceive of politics as a mechanism to reconcile enduring conflicts, such as those that exist between freedom and security. Each, indeed, is unsustainable without the other. Security is useless without freedom, but freedom makes no sense without security B both national security and economic security. The social market economy, which we continue to embrace, is based on these principles. It sees competition as the most effective means to promote economic growth, but also embraces state interference, when necessary, to secure equality of opportunity, social solidarity, and social balance. This interference is also intended to help avoid the “economicization” of all aspects of civic life. The market is merely a tool, not an answer.

It is in recognition of this fact that German conservatives strive, for example, to strike a balance between economy and ecology. We feel responsible, on a global level, for the environment, which is why we disagree with unilateral decisions by individual nations when such decisions ignore the needs of the rest of the world.

For globalization is both a challenge and an opportunity. As we open ourselves to the winds of globalization, we must also strengthen the more local institutions that foster social ties and identity, such as the family, local and regional communities, religious communities, and the tradition of voluntary worker solidarity, which have been neglected in recent years. This is the principle of subsidiarity which supports placing, wherever and whenever possible, the power of decisionmaking in governmental bodies nearest to the individual citizen.

This is of particular importance for our ideas about the European Union, where we seek an effective balance be-

tween the nation and Europe. For German conservatives, European integration and national identity are not warring concepts, as they seem to be to our opponents and so many others. They are, instead, two sides of the same coin. The EU was founded in recognition that certain goals could only be achieved through cooperation. Decades later, the European Union still needs the binding power and legitimacy of its constituent nations, as well as of the historical regional political structures of those nations, because a common European identity is emerging only slowly and cannot yet justify a unitary constitutional structure.

In essence, the form of government we seek within Germany and across Europe is built on a sense of moral discourse and moral decision-making rather than on the supposedly eternal truth of some abstract political concept. Indeed, only an ongoing skepticism of fashionable political nostrums – both of the statist and market fundamentalist variety – can promote pluralism and tolerance, and avoid the bureaucratic hypertrophy that enfeebles our economy.

In a fast changing world, this skepticism of the center is the only sensible attitude a responsible political party and government can strike. Our political approach embraces this humane and realistic pragmatism, for it is only such an approach that offers a chance to secure a prosperous stability within which necessary change can be made without ending up in an extremist euphoria or a fear of the future. Moderation, tolerance, and a capacity for reform in equal measure are the watchwords of today’s German conservatism.

Wolfgang Schaeuble is member of the German parliament and Member of the chairman’s committee of the Christian Democratic Union.

Wolfgang Schaeuble’s commentary appeared in the “Worldly philosophers” series, jointly organized by IWM and Project Syndicate, an independent association of more than 130 quality newspapers worldwide.

Wolfgang Nowak: Politik – Wahlkampf aus der Distanz

SEIT 1998 stehen Sozialdemokraten und Grüne gemeinsam in der Regierungsverantwortung. Sie wurden gewählt, um in Deutschland einen Veränderungs- und Reformprozess einzuleiten. Alle waren dafür, verbunden mit der Hoffnung, dass Reformen nur die anderen, aber nicht einen selbst treffen würden. Für die Sozialdemokraten stellte sich das Problem, tiefgreifende Einschnitte vorzunehmen, ohne unmittelbar damit verbunden Belohnungen austeilern zu können. Eine harte Sparpolitik war und ist nötig, um Deutschland handlungsfähig zu machen.

So überzieht eine Enttäuschungshässlichkeit viele Teile unserer Gesellschaft. Sie wird von den Medien gepflegt. Alle haben viel erwartet, mehr noch für sich erhofft, man lebt gut, aber keiner hat die Distanz zu sich und den anderen, um zu erkennen, welche großen Einschnitte in einem überschuldeten Staat, der zudem international hoch vernetzt ist, erforderlich sind, um Veränderungen in den nächsten Jahren einzuleiten. Die Reformen der Regierung, Ergebnisse eines zermürbenden Konsenses, werden von den einen als zu einschneidend von den anderen als nicht ausreichend diskreditiert. Die Notwendigkeit, endlich in Deutschland nicht mehr auf Kosten der künftigen Generationen zu leben, die Zukunft zu verbrauchen, wird von den Gewerkschaften und vor allem den Älteren und zunehmend auch der Opposition in Frage gestellt. Im Wahlkampf geht die Opposition vorsichtig auf Distanz zur Zukunft.

Der Wahlausgang ist ungewiss. Der Wahlkampf wird erschwert durch die politischen Parteien. Ihnen vertrauen nur noch 10% der Bevölkerung. Geistige Zentren sind die Parteien schon lange nicht mehr. Die Lebenswirklichkeit der vom Öffentlichen Dienst mit seinen von Denkverboten und Laufbahndenken geprägten Parteien unterscheidet sich schon erheblich von derjenigen der Bürger, die mehrere Berufe im Leben ergreifen müssen, in ständiger Sorge um ihren Arbeitsplatz und die Aktualität ihres Fachwissens.

Bei jüngeren Bürgern hat sich vor allem bei den Wahlen des Jahres 1999 und 2002 die Tendenz gezeigt, sich von Wahlentscheidungen fern zu halten. Sie sind kaum noch bereit, sich in einer Partei zu engagieren. Gleichzeitig nimmt das Engagement in der Politik zu. Die Globalisie-

rungsgegner, die aus einem bunten Flickenteppich unterschiedlicher Strömungen zusammengesetzt sind und sich nicht über Ortsvereine, sondern über das Internet organisieren, erfreuen sich eines großen Zuspruchs. So diffus sie auch auftreten, so betrachten sie sich alle als Kritiker einer Globalisierung, in der weltweit angeblich das Recht des Stärkeren gilt. Sie sprechen den großen Konzernen die demokratische Legitimität ab, für die Menschen zu entscheiden. Sie setzen sich ein für eine Demokratisierung der globalen Institutionen. Ihr griffiger Slogan lautet: „Es geht um nichts weniger, als unsere Zukunft wieder selbst in die Hand zu nehmen.“

Und dennoch: Trotz aller Enttäuschung über den Zustand suchen die Menschen immer wieder nach Festigkeit und Sicherheit in der Stärke politischer Führung.

Das ist die verborgene Kernfrage im deutschen Wahljahr 2002: Wie vermag Politik nach dem Zusammenbruch der Gewissheiten, in der so oft beschworenen Zeit des Übergangs langfristige Orientierung zu geben und damit das Bedürfnis nach Vertrauen zu befriedigen? In Wahlkämpfen spielt sie seit Jahren keine Rolle.

Dagegen ist der schnelle Rückgriff auf das Feindbild, auf Ausländerfeindlichkeit, Angst vor dem Islam, der EU-Erweiterung nicht ohne Erfolg. Aus dumpfen Ängsten wird versucht Vertrauen zu gewinnen für eine Politik, die statt zu gestalten wie zur Zeit des Kalten Krieges Feindbilder produziert.

Und wo Mitte-Links-Regierungen keine ausreichende Antwort auf die Frage der Integration von Ausländern und die Gestaltung einer multikulturellen Gesellschaft gefunden haben, verharren sie in einer politisch-korrekten Beschreibung der Gegenwart. Überall, wo sie verloren haben, waren sie von den Realitäten des Lebens weitgehend entfremdet. Weil vieles Notwendige unsagbar blieb, konnten die Unsäglichen kommen und das bisher Unsagbare aussprechen. Überall dort, wo die sozialdemokratischen Parteien in Europa eine politisch nicht korrekte Wirklichkeit politisch korrekt beschrieben haben, haben sie sich von ihren Wählern entfremdet und sind auf dem Rückzug.

Mehr und mehr sind Bürger aber bereit, Bündnisse auf Zeit einzugehen, statt als Stammwähler mitzulaufen. Dieser punk-

tuelle Pragmatismus der Politik, die Forderung an den Bürger selbst Verantwortung zu übernehmen als Partner, das schafft Vertrauen. Orientierungsmaßstab für Engagement ist dann nicht mehr ein Parteiprogramm, die Vergangenheit einer Partei, die aus Problemen des 19. Jahrhunderts entstanden ist, wie zum Beispiel CDU oder SPD, sondern ein konkretes Problem. Es verbindet sich mit der Überzeugung, dass sich Politik Problemen stellt und überzeugend und transparent handelt. Empört sind die Bürger immer dann, das hat die Abwahl von Helmut Kohl gezeigt, wenn die Politik mit Stillstand und damit ratlos auf greifbare Probleme reagiert. Politik generiert Vertrauen, wenn sie handelt, damit eine bessere Welt Wirklichkeit wird, wohlwissend, dass dies nie der Fall sein wird und dieses Wissen mit den Bürgern teilt.

Ich bin zuversichtlich, Politiker und engagierte Bürger können ihre Rolle in ständig wechselnden Problemlösungs-Netzwerken finden. Das Knüpfen von Netzwerken schafft Vertrauen. Die Parteien müssen begreifen, dass sie den Bürgern und Bürgerinnen Bündnisse auf Zeit zur Erarbeitung von Problemlösungen anbieten müssen, anstatt sich mit ihren Ritualen selbst zu genügen.

Noch müssen wir einen Wahlkampf mit unreformierten Parteien führen. Ich verlasse die gebotene Distanz und ergreife Partei: Als Sozialdemokrat sage ich, gegen einen Gegner, der zwar den Stillstand jahrelang geschaffen hat, sich aber verbirgt, der sich nicht zeigt. In keiner Bundestagsdebatte, z.B. zur Wirtschafts- oder Familienpolitik, hat er den deutschen Kanzler mit programmatischen Alternativen herausgefordert. Bei einem unsichtbaren Kandidaten steht begrifflicherweise die Regierung im Scheinwerferlicht der Presse, nicht die beiden Kandidaten. Über das „noch nicht“ der Regierung wird spekuliert. Sie wird zum Herausforderer eines Kandidaten, der sich versteckt. Gelingt es der Regierung den Herausforderer herauszufordern, kann sie ihn zwingen, sich mit seinem Programm zu zeigen, dann wird der Wahlkampf spannend. Und dann kann sie ihn gewinnen und den Wandel Deutschlands weiter gestalten.

Wolfgang Nowak ist Leiter der Abteilung Analysen und Grundsatzfragen im Bundeskanzleramt zu Berlin.

What is the fate of the local in the process of European Enlargement? Petya Kabakchieva takes a glance at Europe and the EU from a local place in Bulgaria, defending the thesis that Europe emerges as the new symbolic and economic authority replacing the nation state as its centre.

Situating the local in this wider context redefines it as *Eurolocal* – local histories are retold as European ones and local culture is re-interpreted, re-invented from the point of view of the current symbolic and economic centres.

Imagining the European Union as a “Nation State”

Building the EU and Imagining Europe

It is becoming increasingly obvious that the European Union is a challenge to traditional political structures, as well as to the ways of imagining a new type of political status quo. Something unique is afoot in Europe, indeed, and we ask ourselves, as Jacques Derrida has put it, “What will Europe’s new face resemble. Will it resemble the face of some persona whom we believe we know: Europe?”

This new face of Europe is usually regarded as a problem above all for the elites – in terms of both the EU’s institutional reform and future strategy of development (as a union of nation states or as a federation, etc.), and it is constructed by applying a classical political “technique” – as an elitist project it is built in imitation of the nation-state, i.e. top-down. The problem examined in this text is the “bottom-up” perception of “Europe” and the EU; how this clearly delineated but conceptually vague structure is imagined by the everyday consciousness of people – to be specific, people from an EU candidate country, Bulgaria.

Why is this important? Because reality is a product of both building and imagining, because those two processes are interrelated, and the stability of the structure depends on the application of building practices which correspond to people’s values and norms and, in this sense, are superstructured and adequate to this imaginary reality. The Bulgarian perspective is “bottom-up” in two ways: first, Bulgaria is not in the first wave of accession, and second, this is a perspective not of elites but of residents of a provincial town, i.e. this is a local perspective on Europe. Last but not least, this is a perspective of a Balkan country that has not suffered violent outbursts of nationalism. The second problem discussed here is what happens to a local place in the context of European enlarge-

ment – does it fit to its locality or does it become glocalized (to use R. Robertson’s term)?¹

Imagining Europe from a Local Perspective

The New Symbolic Authority: “Europe” as the Norm

All interviewees invariably assessed Bulgaria’s situation in comparison to Europe as: “Europe” sets the standards in terms of both quality of life and professionalism. These standards are perceived as the Norm, understood as “normal life,” the life all people should have. “Our normal salaries should be five times as high if we are to be a bit closer to Europe.” “We are far from the European standards”; or “In education we have European standards” – these are commonly used phrases. This perception is ambivalent – “we, as all Europeans, should have a normal life but usually don’t.” People felt far from Europe in regards to living standards and logistics, and close to, even *in* Europe, in terms of professional skills. They felt *like Europeans*, but *outside Europe*.

Here is an excerpt from a newsletter of a local NGO with the motto, “Let us prepare for worthy dialogue” (meaning with “Europe”). The text begins as follows: “Albeit in Bulgaria, albeit in Europe, the population of the Rhodopi area is far more de-motivated and disadvantaged by a combination of geographical and socio-economic circumstances.” And ends: “We have the ambition for versatile training of personnel who... will ultimately *reach the level* of European and world dialogue.” One can see that the text begins with an explicit periphery complex and, from this perspective, “Bulgaria” is seen as being as far away from Rhodopi mountains as “Europe.” Yet at the end the text sidesteps Bulgaria and compares itself directly with “Europe” and the “world.” So, the new

symbolic centre is already established and it is “Europe” as incarnation of “the highest Norm”, as “the Peak” one could reach if properly trained – a new cultural homogenization, as E. Gellner would have put it, begins with a new high cultural norm.² And this is both on the official (the implementation of the *acquis communautaire* means the same) and everyday levels.

“Europe” as the Donor, as the New Economic Centre

At the same time people usually associate “Europe”, already understood as “the EU” or “Western Europe,” with an important economic donor, with a rich place where people know how they could earn money. This is mostly an NGO image of Europe, but with the current benefits from the SAPARD and ISPA pre-accession financial instruments this image is becoming increasingly popular. The question of “how can we catch up with them” is raised again in this context, but in far more concrete and instrumental terms: how can we get European money, in particular, and, more generally, how is money made “in Europe”. So, this image of Europe is instrumental, and utilitarian; the image of a successful, well-run commercial enterprise, which presumes a particular business and organizational culture, is not a civic political image. This “business” image has proved to have at least two important positive effects: first, the notion of successful style of management has changed, and second, a new type of corporate culture is emerging, especially in the business community, which is trying really hard to win new niches in the “West” and, for instance, to attract Western tourists in Bulgaria.

The old image of the nation state as the main re-distributor of economic resources has now been substituted by the image of the EU, which could give money

and could teach how money is made in order to become “true Europeans.” As the nation state is seen as poor, giving nothing, this leads to a

Redefinition of the Main Centre of Political Power

and to the appearance of a new local-based supra-national regionalism. Since they cannot count on central government for extra subsidies, the municipality officials have concentrated on fund-raising, targeting international programmes and European structures:

“ Our Municipality is a member of a European structure – the European Association of Border Regions. On our own initiative – and this helps, mainly in terms of contacts – the contacts with neighbouring Greece are established through this Association. We are a border region. This prepares us for the eventual opening of the borders in this region. We have joint projects with the Greeks and are preparing to utilize European structural funds.” This leads to a clear idea about regional government: “One of the major obstacles to a balance between centralization and decentralization is the absence of a regional level of self-government – or as they call it in Europe, the second level of self-government. The second level is relevant to the construction of infrastructure, since the latter is not the priority of a single municipality only.” This directly leads to a “Europe-of-regions” ideology for pure pragmatic purposes. “We prefer to become a region of Europe and to bond with Greece. This will also help us get rid of our inferiority complex vis-a-vis Sofia, and we’ll become European directly” (NGO activist). In fact, they had already established a Bulgarian-Greek Euro-region.

What is happening with the nation state then, what is happening to national identity?

Local History as European History

If we accept the main characteristics of a national identity as defined by Anthony Smith: notion of “us-community” based on commitment to a common historical territory, common myths and historical memories, common mass public culture, common legal rights and obligations for all members, common economy and territorial mobility, we could say that for the local people common national economy has disappeared and they are looking to EU economic resources; common legal rights and obligations are adjusted to European legislation; with the spread of the modern media and new information technologies, common mass public culture is no longer nationally specific; territorial mobility is still restricted, but a lot of people are going abroad to work illegally; and it seems that the only things which could have remained relatively stable should be the common historical territory, common

myths and memories. So, let us look at local versions of the local history and how the territory is perceived.

A travel guide : “Homer described these vast lands as ‘the snowy mountains of the Thracians... The mineral springs welling forth at the foot of the mountains offer a unique opportunity to combine a vacation in the spa resorts with *cultural studies travels*. Traces of several civilizations – Thracian, Ancient Greek, Byzantine, Roman – are scattered in unbelievable mountain sites.” In other publications the history of the Rhodopi mountains starts from the Neolithic and moves on to the numerous Thracian tribes which created “high culture on the level of the Greek colonies”; eventually, “the *Rhodopian* Thracians” were conquered by the Romans, but “the empire failed to Romanize them.” Later, they lived peacefully within Byzantium. Next the Thracians became Slavs – the *Rhodopian Slavs*. Then Bulgar troops liberated the Rhodopian Slavs from Byzantine rule and they became part of the Bulgarian state. The only constant characteristic in this history is the focus on the *Rhodopians*, who

were part of a lot of different cultures, even civilizations. So, the local history is beginning to be retold as a local version of a more global European history, and the message somehow is, “we, as belonging to this place, are part of this European culture and civilization.” If one were to look at the websites of different Euro-regions, one would find similar narratives.³

The local history is beginning to be de-ethnocentrized and is focusing on the place itself. The place itself, the “local”, is not interpreted by its unique folk culture anymore, it becomes an empty place of belonging, the place where one is living and where one’s ancestors lived, but whose culture is always contextual, re-interpreted, re-invented, recycled, imagined from the point of view of the important for the moment symbolic and economic centres. This “local” is both premodern and post-modern – the place you belong to is important, it is “your” place which you are interpreting as “the whole significant for me world.” *The place is becoming global indeed, more precisely at that case – Eurolocal.*

¹ The analysis is based on qualitative research data from a small town in Southern Bulgaria.

² The language used in Bulgarian political parties’ programs is the same: “we shall follow the European directives in the sphere of...”; “we are adopting European standards”; “we are observing European norms”; “we have to reach European levels,” etc.

³ Let us take as an example the history of the Neisse-Nisa-Nysa Euro-region, as described on the web: “Nature has granted the Czech-German-Polish border lands an individual beauty, while history has given them the thousand year flow of the fate of people ... Looking back at the history of our region, it is possible to find

signs of human habitation from the stone age. Later, during the era of the Romans, the Celtic Boii left their mark upon the region followed by the Germanic Markoman tribe at the turn of the millennium. Slavonic people began to make their homes there from the 6th century ... At that time, however, a wave of colonisation arrived bringing with it new German settlers. This meant that the older Slavonic settlements were supplemented by new settlements with Germanic populations or mixed populations of Germanic and Slavonic origin.”

An extended version of Petya Kabakchieva’s analysis is available on the IWM website in the Working Papers series.



Petya Kabakchieva, Visiting Fellow des IWM und Mitglied des ACCESS Forschungsteams (siehe S. 9), reflektiert in ihrem Gastbeitrag die Rolle des Lokalen im Erweiterungsprozess der Europäischen Union. Dabei vertritt sie die These, dass die EU als neue symbolische und ökonomische Autorität den Nationalstaat ersetzt. Lokale Geschichte wird als europäische Geschichte verstanden und erzählt, lokale Kultur wird im Verhältnis zum neuen symbolischen Zentrum re-interpretiert.

Upcoming Events, Fall 2002

The following events will take place at the IWM at 6 p.m.
Die folgenden Veranstaltungen finden um 18:00 Uhr
in der Bibliothek des IWM statt.

September 17

Luc Boltanski

Professeur de sociologie, Directeur d'études à l'École des Hautes Etudes en Sciences sociales, Paris

Justification et critique dans la dynamique du capitalisme

In Zusammenarbeit mit dem

**Institut Français
de Vienne**

September 24

Claus Leggewie

Professor für Politikwissenschaft an der Justus-Liebig-Universität Gießen

Die Globalisierung und ihre Kritiker – eine transnationale soziale Bewegung?

IWM Lectures in Human Sciences

IWM-Vorlesungen zu den Wissenschaften vom Menschen

Cornelia Klinger

Permanent Fellow, IWM

**„Nicht nach dem Maße des Menschen gebaut“
Der verlorene Ort des Subjekts im System der modernen Gesellschaft**

1. Oktober

I. Freiheit – Liebe – Bildung

Die bürgerliche Ordnung der Geschlechter und der Prozess der Moderne (um 1800)

3. Oktober

II. Interieur und Innerlichkeit in der Krise

Im Anschluss an eine Reflexion in Walter Benjamins Passagen-Werk (um 1900)

7. Oktober

III. Glück wie Glas

Sinnfragen, Politik und Konsum im Individualisierungsprozess (um 2000)

**Internationale Konferenz
Polen in Europa**

11 – 12 Oktober

Wien, Kunsthistorisches Museum und IWM

Speakers will include:

Norman Davies

*Professor emeritus of History, University of London;
Supernumerary Fellow of Wolfson College, Oxford*

Marcin Król

Professor of History of Ideas, University of Warsaw

Jerzy Kloczowski

Professor of History and Director, Institute for Central Europe, Lublin

Alexei Miller

Professor of History, CEU Budapest; Senior Researcher, Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow

Krzysztof Pomian

Professor of History and Philosophy, EHESS, Paris

Joanna Sabina Tokarska-Bakir

Professor of Cultural Anthropology, University of Warsaw

and others

In Zusammenarbeit mit



IWM

Impressum

Responsible for the contents of the IWM Newsletter:
Institute for Human Sciences © IWM 2002

Editor

Anita Traninger

Editorial Assistance

Tobias Heinrich

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
www.iwm.at
The IWM Newsletter is published four times a year. Current circulation: 6000. Printed by Wograndl Druck.