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‘NEW’ SOCIAL STUDIES
If we talk about sociology in Hungary, we talk about a profession carried by a few hundred people altogether. The Hungarian Sociological Association has been founded in 1986 by 100 founding members. In 2015, it has more than 400 members and half of this number can be counted active. The number gives however a good estimate of the extension of the profession, mainly in higher education and in some posts of public administration. Most of the students who enter a sociology BA programme of any university plan to go further to get an MA degree in sociology. Recently, Hungarian government intervened directly by limiting the number of state sponsored students, particularly in social sciences, so the number of students cannot offer an estimate of interest in sociology for a while.

Prehistory: the first half of the XXth century
Authors who treat the subject used to stress discontinuity in the history of sociology in Hungary (see e.g. Némedi and Róbert, 2002). Not denying this basic feature of this history I would show lines of continuity rather. The history of sociology in Hungary can be reconstructed generation by generation. When no institutions existed which could unite people of sociological interest, people were still there and they could contact each other in different significant ways. As early as 1900 there were thinkers who introduced the new discipline of sociology in Hungary through the launching of a sociological review, 

Huszadik Század (Twentieth Century) which became a forum for progressive critical thinking, published by the Társadalomtudományi Társaság (Social Science Society) from 1901 and had been edited by Oszkár Jászi (1875-1957) for 13 years. Important works like Durkheim’s Suicide, and Methods of sociology; Herbert Spencer’s Basic principles; even Sidney and Beatrice Webb’s Workers’ democracy and others were translated into Hungarian and published during the first decade of the XXth century. Besides the traditional German orientation English and French orientation appeared in social science. It was a hopeful beginning of a new discipline, brought upon by a generation born in the XIXth century. Political turbulences by the end of WWI – the revolution abolishing the monarchy in 1918, the “red” communist putsch and “white” retaliation in 1919 as well as the dismantling of the country by the Trianon Treaty –

---

1 Spencer himself greeted the starting of the Huszadik Század by a letter. (Cited by Huszár, 2015:15.)
broke the continuity of social science. The *Huszadik Század* was banned after the breakdown of the communist dictatorship in 1919. Philosophers like Károly Mannheim (1893-1947) – he became sociologist of knowledge later – and the communist György Lukács (1885-1971) run a philosophy circle named *Vasárnapí Kör* or *Sonntagskreis* under WWI in Budapest and later in Vienna, where they had to emigrate. In exile they had had no significant impact on scientific developments in Hungary for a long time. Under the new right wing authoritarian regime of Regent Miklós Horthy there was no place to critical sociology. After 1923 conservative professors, who left the Társadalomtudományi Társaság in 1906, tried to re-establish the Society under a similar but not identical name. The idea of the installing a Chair of Social Science at the Faculty of Philosophy of the Pázmány Péter University, remained an idea, however.

In the thirties, a new generation of intellectuals with various political views shared a common interest in rural living and working conditions, without theoretical ambition. Various intellectuals from writers over philosophers to ethnographers prepared this way for sociology with loose contact among them. They were born while *Huszadik Század* had been regularly published, but socialised in a different political and cultural climate when the Hungarian national identity had been severely shaken by the reduction of the territory of the country to 1/3. They saw the genuine Hungarian roots in the “sane” villages compared to the “sinful” cities, particularly Budapest. Most of them were rather writers – like Gyula Illyés (1902-1983) who painted the Hungarian reality in his *Puszták népe* (People of the Puszt, 1936) in dark colours – but they undertook the collecting of data on everyday rural life of different strata of agrarian population effectively. They published their experiences in literary form with ethnographic content. They are known in Hungary as the “falukutató” movement (rural researcher movement) and their activity is labelled sociography – to distinguish it of the science of sociology. Several of them studied ethnography in the seminar of professor István Győrffy (1884-1939), the first professor of the ethnography at the Pázmány Péter University, Budapest, appointed in 1934. He was engaged for field research and attracted youth to his chair. The movement of rural research has an impact on the cultural ideas in Hungary in many aspects up to our days. In sociology, e.g. Imre Kovács’ (1913-1980) first book, *A néma forradalom* (1937 – The silent revolution) explored the distribution of landed property and the rural discontent and treated the various sects of the time which spread in rural Hungary as ways of escaping the heavy situation of everyday life. Later, his work gave useful insights to new born sociology of religion in the seventies and eighties. (See e.g. Horváth, 1995) For himself, in the thirties, it merited three months imprisoned and being expelled from the university. Ferenc Erdei (1910-1971) – maybe the only one who was a sociologist among them – analysed the social structure of Hungary between the two world wars and he described a particular double structure – a class structure in marxiste terms and a traditional structure of status groups ("estate-like" groups in Erdei’s wording – 1976). This theory is kept on sociology students’ reading list until now, together with Erdei’s other works published on the Peasants (1938), the Hungarian town (1939), the Hungarian village (1940).\(^2\) Erdei did not idealise the village compared to the town, like

\(^2\) István Weis, director of the Village Federation, published a book under the same title – *Magyar falu* (Hungarian village) – seven years earlier (1931) and Prof. István Győrffy himself wrote a book with almost the same title – *Magyar falu, magyar ház* (Hungarian village, Hungarian house) – which suggests however a traditional ethnographical monography (1943).
some other authors in the thirties, he saw them linked together in a kind of symbiosis. It is true that he distinguished the Hungarian town as a special type to the towns that grew up following a Western model and the cosmopolitan metropolis of Budapest. Erdei has influenced sociology, but the rural research movement has had a wider impact. Since the thirties up to our days a cultural and sometimes political tension can be observed between the ideas brought upon by this movement and the ideas of urban intelligentsia, e.g. concerning the demographic decline of the population, and the attitude to right wing ideas. A sign of surviving ideas and attitudes over decades was that university students in the sixties became enthusiastic for replicate some rural research of the thirties and they did realise a summer project at one of the original sites. They are already the generation leaving the public scene slowly in our days: some of them as sociologists, others as politicians or writers. Long term historical effects could be realised through their activity. More direct impact of rural sociography came from face to face cooperation in ethnographic field work of young researchers with even younger colleagues. As a 27-29 year old young researcher, Erdei led already teams of students exploring the way of life of peasants in several villages. Some of them like István Márkus (1920-1997) became an important researcher of the Hungarian countryside, himself.

A lonely carrier is that of Gyula Rézler’s who got a degree in law but his first and main interest has remained sociology of industrial workers. He wrote his thesis on the history of workers of heavy industry and published two important volumes before 1945: A magyar nagyipari munkásság kialakulása 1867-1914 [Development of Hungarian labour in big industry 1867-1914]; Bevezetés a szociológiába [Introduction to sociology]. In 1943 he set up the Hungarian Institute of Labour Science and had directed it until 1945. During these years he began a huge survey (with a sample of 40000 planned – See Rézler, 1999) on industrial relations. Research and teaching went hand in hand for him – he delivered courses on sociology for students. In 1948, he felt the danger of an approaching dictatorship and left Hungary. He made a university carrier in the US and returned first for a short visit in 1969 only.

While sociology could not get in to university, prominent scholars like István Györffy and social history professor István Hajnal (1892-1956) had great influence among students. Many of those who become sociologists later frequented Hajnal’s courses enthusiastically – among them István Kemény (1925-2008) and László Cseh-Szombathy (1925-2007) who came from very different background and represent lines of continuity in the history of sociology in Hungary. As a historian Hajnal was deeply convinced of the importance of the events and continuity of everyday life. We could even say he was comparable to the French Annales circle, when treated the invention of the writing and of

---

3 He also influenced rural development policy after WWII and made a controversial political carrier, as minister in different communist governments between 1949 and 1956, and taking a positive role in the revolution of 1956 as well.

4 A village studied by Imre Kovács and his colleagues in 1929.

5 He got a CSc degree in sociology – equivalent to PhD in Hungary – in 1983.

6 The Faculty of Philosophy attempted to set up a chair of sociology halfhartedly and failed around 1930.

7 Cseh-Szombathy wrote his doctoral thesis on the history of the social science review Huszadik század (Twentieth century), in 1948.
the first machines. In 1942, István Dékány (1886-1965) was appointed to the first Chair of Social Science at the Péter Pázmány University. Before WWII, there was no real effort or not strong enough made to install an university chair of sociology. After WWII, in a new political situation, Sándor Szalai (1912-1983), politician social democrat, who got his degree in philosophy and psychology in Frankfurt-am-Main and Zurich, was appointed to head of the Chair of Social Sciences of the Pázmány Péter University (later ELTE), in 1946, but he cumulated several political and scientific job in the same time. Both Kemény and Cseh-Szombathy followed his seminar. It is true that Szalai had very little time to consolidate sociology at the university: although he had been promoted to a corresponding member of the Academy of Science in 1948, in 1950 he was arrested and tortured to prepare him for a show trial of espionage. Sociology became a “bourgeois pseudo-science” (following Soviet example) and Szalai was sentenced to life. He was freed and rehabilitated in 1956. He returned to sociology in the sixties only. In 1970 he became full member of HAS, he worked as an advisor to the president of the UNESCO and he led a large international survey on use of time in 12 countries (Szalai, 1972). Even then, the secret police did not let him out of its horizon and efficiently isolated him from his old friends and colleagues by denunciations. (Szalai and Szalai, 2012)

The “dark age” of the fifties

While sociology had been outlawed during the fifties, there were still people with strong interest in society. During the short time between the end of WWII and 1950 István Bibó’s name (1911-1979) cannot be overseen. Between 1946 and 1951 Bibó was a professor of constitutional law in Szeged. In 1945 and 1948 he wrote two seminal study on the conditions of democracy and on the Misery of small states in Central Europe. He is another one among those who used this short time to create works which have been influencing Hungarian social thought until now. During the fifties he withdrew himself from public life to a library, but accepted a post of state secretary in prime minister Imre Nagy’s revolutionary government in 1956. He was sentenced for life in 1958 and liberated in 1963 with general amnesty.

The communist dictatorship broke Szalai’s and Bibó’s carrier and their influence could appear only several decades later. The way of sociology has been barred until the sixties. There were however young people with newly born interest in sociology. Exactly in 1950 when sociology was banned from the university, a young student entered the Central Statistical Office (Hungarian abbr. KSH), to study the structure of society and the way of life of Hungarian families. Her name was Zsuzsa Kecskeméti, we know her today as Zsuzsa Ferge (1931 -). She hoped to find facts that prove the impact of family background on schooling. After her graduation at the University of Economics in 1953 she joined the KSH and had been employed until 1969. Although her superior, Ms. Aladárné Mód was the wife of a high ranking communist ideologist, Ms. Mód was

---

8 Hajnal’s work was explored only in the 1980s by professor László Lakatos who analysed Hajnal’s valuable contribution to the history of sociology in Hungary, particularly stressing his studies of 1933/1934 (Lakatos, 1982).

9 Failure as well as the particularity of sociology at the university during the war has been analysed by Veronika Szabari (2014, 2015).

10 As he formulated in an autobiography in 1956: „head of one of the Chairs of Philosophy (Social Science)“. (Szalai, 2012) It shows that social sciences were not sharply differentiated at that time in Hungary.
convinced that the Party needs to know the real condition of the society and she supported Ferge’s in dept analyses. Besides the impact of some important thinkers of the XXth century – like Hajnal, Bibó, Erdei as mentioned already – the professional standards of the Central Statistical Office has also been contributing to the continuity of scientific interest in social analyses.\footnote{Another example of its importance, originating from a former historical period, was Illyefalvy' huge volume on the workers' living conditions – in Hungarian and German. (Illyefalvy, 1930) Rudolf Andorka summed up the important role played by the KSH in sociology and economics during the fifties (Andorka, 1994).}

It also hosted people attracted by sociology. For László Cseh-Szombathy – who had to serve a decade as schoolteacher because of his noble ancestors and his father who was an acknowledged internist but involved in Kiszgazdapárt (Smallholders’ Party) – the entering to KSH in 1957 meant the first step towards a scientific carrier in sociology. During WWII he followed Hajnal’s courses at the Pázmány Péter University, and after the end of WWII he had an opportunity to study in Basel and Genf before joining Szalai’s seminar in Budapest. Cseh-Szombathy decided to become sociologist, and KSH offered the first opportunity to work in this field. His main interest was sociology of the family.

In 1963, the KSH started a microcensus and Zsuzsa Ferge directed the analyses of household data. As head of a department, she had the opportunity to chose fellows with similar interest and she invited István Kemény.

Kemény, after having participated in the antifascist movement during the WWII, entered university in 1945 to study pagagogy and psychology. He joined the People’s Colleges movement as young teacher and he made an empirical study on workers culture. Later, reflecting on his carrier in his lectures delivered at the University of Szeged in the early nineties, Kemény said that he had followed István Hajnal and István Bibó since the forties, just like other young researchers of the time like István Márkus. (Kemény, 2010:9-10) During the fifties he could not find an opportunity to continue sociological studies and worked as a history teacher in a secondary school. He played a role in the 1956 revolution and this activity merited him a two year prison sentence. After having been released in 1959, he worked as a translator and he returned to sociology. He studied Weber’s works mainly and wrote an introduction to the first Hungarian selection of Weber’s Economy and society (1967). He joined Ferge’s team and worked with her on a new sociological model of the Hungarian society. (See the project report: Mód et al., 1966)

For a short time only the institutions of sociology were lacking in Hungary, but the KSH nested many researchers for the future and shortly after the revolution, by the end of the strongest wave of the repression, a review titled Valóság (Reality) had been started already with sociological content mainly, in 1958.

\textit{The sixties: the birth (or rebirth) of sociology in Hungary}

Birth is a literary term for the developments of the sixties. In the reality sociology was not born, it was permitted, later even wanted to appear. What happened in fact was a change in the policy of the ruling Party: in 1950, the Stalinist guard led by Mátyás Rákosi blacklisted sociology as bourgeois ideology, but after the 1956 revolution (and its harsh
repression) Moscow permitted to the renamed Party under the new leadership of János Kádár to take a more human face and to normalise its relation to the intelligentsia. Némedi and Róbert (2002:437) mention that the hope of getting international reputation through the supporting of modern social science played a role in this turn, too. It was within the framework of this new policy that Solzhenytsine’s novel on the Goulag, One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich, was allowed to be published in Hungarian translation in 1963 – it was the only translation in the Soviet block – and institutions of sociology were permitted to be installed, too. By the end of the decade, the Party itself set up institutions of sociological research and training and hoped to use sociology for its own goals.

By 1963, three initiatives have been made to introduce sociology to Hungary. The most developed of them was the activity run in the KSH by Zsuzsa Ferge, István Kemény, László Cseh-Szombathy (since 1957) and Rudolf Andorka (1931-1997) who joined the former in 1964. Andorka’s father served as a diplomat in Horthy’s regime, therefore the family was labelled “class enemy” and relocated to the far countryside. Instead of starting his university studies Andorka had to accept manual jobs. He could start higher studies in 1956, but as a member of students’ armed group in the revolution he was imprisoned for a short term. He got his degree in law in 1963 only, and could join Ferge and Kemény in the KSH. In 1970, he took over Ferge’s post as head of the department for the study of social mobility and life styles. In these field of research he met Cseh-Szombathy who shared similar interest and had worked already at the KSH. They published several articles and books as co-authors. The microcensus of 1972 and 1982 was directed by Andorka already.

By the end of the sixties, the results of the first microcensus came out in the form of an official project report (1964) and Ferge’s doctoral thesis on stratification of the Hungarian society (1969). Ferge’s book dethroned the social model preached by the official ideology publicly and put forward a stratification model based and the characteristics of the work. It is only on the page 178 that the two models are almost directly and clearly compared to each other, showing that the official version is extremely weak predictor in ANOVA compared to the stratification model. At the same time this book opened up a new horizon to those interested in sociology with a wide overview of the stratification theories (half of the volume) unknown until then in Hungary.

Another initiative was also supported by the ruling Party: the establishing of a sociological research group – later institute – within the Hungarian Academy of Science (HAS), in 1964. The decision came out of an internal debate in the Party. Ferenc Erdei, who was a prominent scientist of the HAS at that time, acknowledged by the Party leadership, raised the idea of setting up this research group with András Hegedüs (1922-

---

12 The Hungarian Communist Party changed its name to Hungarian Workers’ Party when it united with the Social Democratic Party, and after the 1956 revolution it changed again – as a sign of renewal – to Hungarian Socialist Workers’ Party. Here I refer to it as the Party, simply.

13 Following the Stalinist tradition the socialist society consists of two classes: the ruling working class and the allied peasantry of cooperatives, plus one stratum, the progressive intelligentsia.

14 The new strata explain 16 and 26 percent of the individual income and household income respectively, Ferge puts in the main text, while in a footnote on the same page she adds that the class position explains only 2 percent. (Ferge, 1969:178)
1999) as head. The proposal had a double edge: it could make acceptable sociology for Party leaders by appointing Hegedüs, former prime minister in 1955-1956, and it offered a way towards sociology to Hegedüs. Hegedüs had felt attracted by sociology as a young student already: he read Gyula Rézler’s History of Hungarian industrial labour, and engaged in the survey that Rézler directed in the middle of the forties.\(^{15}\) After having served the ruling Party at the highest level as the youngest prime minister of Hungary, Hegedüs wanted to quit politics and return to sociology.\(^{16}\) When he spent two years in exile in the Soviet Union (having been one of the most hated politicians), he prepared himself for sociology studying Weber, Tönnies and other classics. He returned in 1958 and had worked in the KSH first. Erdei felt well that he was the man to run a new sociological group of the Hungarian Academy of Science. In 1965, Hegedüs was the first to publish a new – highly theoretical – model of social structure of Hungarian society.\(^{17}\) His model however stressed already the importance of the position in the distribution of labour, the nature of work and sectorial differences in the social structure, factors which became important in Ferge’s model too.

Iván Szelényi (1939 - ) also started his carrier at the Library of the KSH where he was employed after graduation in 1960. He got a Ford scholarship and studied one year in Berkeley, California. When he returned he moved to the Sociological Research Group of the HAS. Here he explored the problems of urban development in Hungary, particularly the social conditions in new housing estates which were planned to solve shortage in housing in rapidly growing cities. In the eighties and later, research in urban sociology was continued by Gábor Csanádi (1948 - ) and János Ladányi (1949 - ) who both graduated in economics at MKKE and having finished a survey in education analysed the relationship between spatial structure and social structure in Budapest, in several publications. (Ladányi – Csanádi, 1992)

A third line leading to institutionalisation of sociology and tolerated by the ruling Party is an initiative to introduce sociology to the university. It is started in 1963 at the Eötvös Loránd University (ELTE) by Tibor Huszár (1930 - ). After having studied in the People’s College movement, Huszár was selected and sent to the Soviet Union to study philosophy, pedagogy and logics. He graduated in 1953. Working in the communist youth movement he got involved in the Petőfi Kör (Petőfi Circle), an open forum of political debates, as vice-chair. Petőfi Kör was considered as a main actor preparing the 1956 revolution. Because of his role Huszár was not allowed to start a scientific carrier for several years after the revolution. Only in 1960 he could join the philosophy department of the ELTE. For a first action in view of starting sociology courses at the university he decided to publish a reader. At that time the most cautious choice was to take a reader which had already been published in Moscow.\(^{18}\) To launch sociology

\(^{15}\) After the German occupation in 1944 this work was interrupted by Hegedüs’ arrest for taking part in the resistance movement.

\(^{16}\) For his life and political responsibility see the interesting film-interview made shortly before Hegedüs’ death by his grandson, who grown up in Australia: Nagyapák és forradalmak [Grandfathers and revolutions] by Péter Hegedüs, 1999.

\(^{17}\) Erdei served as the publisher’s reader for this booklet. It was published in English in 1977.

\(^{18}\) The translation of a basic Howard S. Becker reader started in fact from a Russian translation published in Moscow, because no original example was available for a while. A few texts of this selection are still in use but most of them have been dropped already. (My personal information. – M. Cs.)
courses at the university proved to be the most difficult task because higher education was one of the most strictly controlled sectors of the society even in the time of tolerance. Sporadic courses – e.g. for philosophy majors – could be held only in the seventies. By the end of the sixties sociology and sociologists have already shown the critical side of sociology. Besides the criticism of the social structure, mobility became criticised as well. A highly sensitive subject, workers’ ways of defending themselves in industrial conflicts was overtly discussed in a project report by Csaba Makó and Lajos Héthy. Both of them were not simple Party members but had higher responsibilities: Héthy was an elected member of the Central Committee. This fact does not change the sociological value and importance of their research and report.

In 1968, sociologists of the Sociological Research Group of HAS and philosophers took a strong political position at an international forum against the suppressing of the Prague Spring by tanks. Although this action had no direct link to sociology, the fact that several participants were employed in the Sociological Research Group of the HAS, and that the director of the Group, András Hegedűs did also object the invasion of Czechoslovakia, made inevitable a reorganisation of the group and the dismissing of Hegedűs and several research fellows. In such atmosphere “higher education in sociology” was taken under direct control.

Direct control meant that György Aczél, the head of cultural policy within the Central Committe of the Party, entrusted Tibor Huszár with organizing a one year sociology course for selected young intellectuals in 1968-1969, not at the university but within an institute of the Party. Most of the participants had been chosen among the graduates in philosophy and in law. In 1969-1970 a second young group completed this postgraduate course. If we look at the professors of the programme we see Zsuzsa Ferge, Iván Szelényi, Kálmán Kulcsár (1928-2010), besides Huszár himself, all of them critics in their way the state socialist regime. Kulcsár, a lawyer, former judge who refused to collaborate in the repression of the 1956 revolution, introduced the sociology of law to the Faculty of Law of the ELTE during the seventies and eighties. Paradoxically, a bright new generation of autonomous thinkers came out of the school of the Party: Zsolt Papp (1944-1992) who turned to the sociology of values and identities, Tamás Kolosi (1942- ) who joined the research of social structure and mobility, Csaba Gombár (1939- ) who had been working in political science and political sociology, Ferenc Gazsó (1932- ) who’s main interest was in sociology of education and youth. Most of them were employed by the Institute of Social Science – formally a unit of the organisation of the Central Committee of the Hungarian Socialist Workers’ Party (its full abbreviation was: ISS of CC HSWP) – but some of them like Pál Léderer (1941 -), excellent in methodology and lifestyle research, and Pál Bánlaky (1937- ) who organised sociology courses and turned later to social policy, were taken to the ELTE University by Tibor Huszár who continued his efforts to build up a department of sociology there. He would like to take Papp and Gombár to the university, too, but the ISS did not let them go. Within the Institute of the

---

19 See Gombár, 2011.
20 Ferenc Gazsó had headed the research group for youth studies of the Party’s Institute of Social Science from 1970 for ten years. Later, he was appointed professor of the Marx Károly University of Economics until 1983 when he moved to the public administration as vice-minister of education charged with public education. He played a major role in the introduction of a new, liberal law on education, close to the British tradition, in 1985.
Party, life was liberal: library was rich of books and reviews published in Western countries and forbidden to the large public, and fellows with different political views might carry on entirely free debates without any repression. On the outer side of the door, however, this freedom was not allowed for research fellows.\(^{21}\)

By the end of the sixties the ruling Party modernised its policies. It decided to use scientific methods besides traditional internal reports to explore public opinion. In 1969 a new unit (directorate) within the Hungarian Radio and Television had been set up: the Tömegkommunikációs Kutatóközpont (abbr. TK – Research Centre of Mass Communication) headed by Tamás Szecskő a well known journalist, who just returned from a study tour in the US. He directed the institution from the beginning through reorganisations to the final abolition of it under the first democratic government in 1991.\(^{22}\) It got a high reputation because it was the first and unique institute in the Soviet block that imported disciplines like communication and mass communication which were developed in Western countries, and carried out systematic and scientific survey if public opinion and public thinking. (Terestyéni, 2009) The TK set up a monitoring system for the public opinion on radio and tv-programmes, and carried out in depth studies on the level and patterns of economic, political and historical knowledge of the population. The fact that parallel to the founding of TK the Party set up another similar research unit within the Ifjúsági Lapkiadó Vállalat (Youth Reviews Publishing Company) aimed at carrying on youth studies shows the decidedness of this turn in the politics. In the field of youth studies, Ildikó Szabó (1946- ) and György Csepeli (1946- ) had introduced to Hungary a new field of research: political socialisation. Szabó got later an opportunity to work with Annick Percheron in France, while Csepeli studied both in the Soviet Union and the United States. They tried to explore the origins of the national feeling in children, and both of them maintained their interest in the notion of nation and nationalism through their carrier. Csepeli moved to Huszár’s department at the ELTE in 1972 and taught social psychology.

**Decades of sociology**

The seventies and the eighties saw a sociological effervescence in Hungary. A number of new institutions were installed by every ministry as “background institutions”, functionally analogous to the think tanks used in the US and Western Europe. Established institutions run various surveys and new sociologists, having had no access to cathedras, took the opportunity to bring new lines of interest to the spectre of sociological research. Besides the institutes of the Hungarian Academy of Science and the Party, a university department at the ELTE and ministerial background institutes represented the bones of the new discipline.

There was a loose contact between them. E.g. Kemény, while employed by the Academy, continued his interest in workers’ conditions and published two empirical studies (1971a, 1971b with Gyula Kozák) in the ISS of the Party. Between 1969 and 1971 two important projects were completed under his direction in the Institute of Sociology of the HAS. The reports of both have remained unpublished for decades and spread Xeroxed illegally.\(^{23}\)

---

\(^{21}\) Gombár (2011) gives a lively description of the life in the institute.

\(^{22}\) Terestyéni (2009) summed up its history in an opening speech at the conference to the 40th anniversary of the foundation of the institute.

\(^{23}\) Exemplars of these manuscripts are accessible in Fővárosi Szabó Ervin Könyvtár (Szabó Ervin Municipal Library of Budapest).
One of them explored poverty in Hungary and the other explored the situation of the gypsy population. Since the limited circulation of Kemény’s report on poverty, even the words poverty and the poor became taboo.24 The picture given on the Gypsies’ living condition was so far below any expectation that the Party leadership could not let it come to light. In 1977 Kemény emigrated to France and worked first at the Maison des Sciences de l’Homme, and after 1981 at the École des Hautes études en sciences socials. He returned to Hungary as soon as he could, in 1990, and continued his research in the field of inequalities and particularly among Gypsies.

Kemény’s research projects contributed to Hungarian sociology not only by their results but by training new young sociologists, too. Around 1970 there was no developed infrastructure and institutional background to empirical studies. Kemény had to look where to get interviewers, field workers and he decided to turn to students in cultural studies and ethnography. While those who were selected by the ISS of the Party went through theoretical courses first and got an opportunity to a small empirical work at the end, Kemény’s young collaborators got some methodological-technical introduction first, than they had to assist Kemény on the field to learn how to do it. During this time discussions of the experience went on and the necessity of theoretical notions and insights emerged. The most important researchers of Gypsies25 like Gábor Havas (1944- ) and Ilona Liskó (1944-2008) came to sociology through this “Kemény-school”.

After the success of her stratification model, Ferge turned to sociology of education as a main factor of social mobility with a group of dynamic young researchers at the HAS, like Júlia Szalai who entered the Sociological Research Institute in 1973. This branch of sociology played an important role all along the seventies and the eighties. Ferge’s turn might be motivated partly by the fact that in the early sixties she met Pierre Bourdieu in France, and brought Bourdieu’s ideas to Hungary.26 Ferge – like Bourdieu – had an interest in education as the reproductive organ of the society and after their first contact, Bourdieu visited Hungary several times. Gazsó and some other researchers joined her in a nationwide project on vocational training27 that was launched jointly by the Sociological Institute of HAS and the Group of Youth Studies of the ISS of the Party.28 A division of labour was accepted that Ferge and colleagues studied teachers and masters while Gazsó’s group studied trainees. Ilona Liskó joined Gazsó’s group and bond herself for life to the research field of vocational trainees. She was imprinted by the Kemény-school: she was interested only in the living conditions of this youth and observed the training system itself as the central element determining the actual and future conditions. In this first project in this field, she closely collaborated with Mihály Csákó (1941- ) who was involved in the first steps of the sociology at the ELTE University in 1964 and after having been dismissed from the department of philosophy for political reasons went

24 By the end of the seventies Ferge imported from Western sociology the term objective relative deprivation with the aim to make possible public discussion of the problems of poverty. This term was acceptable to Party leadership.

25 It is thought to be „politically correct“ to use the term Rom instead of Gypsy, but most gypsies consider Rom as a subgroup of Gypsies and prefer to be called gypsy.

26 Ferge selected Bourdieu’s texts on the ideological function of the school into the first Hungarian reader in sociology of education that she edited in the early seventies with Judit Háber (Ferge–Háber, 1974).

27 In the seventies, 60% of adolescents were directed to vocational training in Hungary.

28 I know no link to the research project of Bourdieu’s institute on vocational training in France (see Grignon, 1971), the two are in fact simultaneous, however.
through the “short course” of the ISS. The project run by Ferge and Gazsó raised no political problem for the Party in spite of the criticism it formulated. When the director of the ISS informed Csákó that the final report on the project – written and edited by Liskó and Csákó – would not be published,²⁹ made it clear that the critical content did not matter, it was simply a political decision against him personally. Particular subsystems of the society could be criticised in empirical studies, but political acts were not tolerated. In another important survey, Gábor Csanádi and János Ladányi with Zsuzsa Gerő surveyed the primary schools in a district of Budapest and they unveiled that the organisational structure of the school can be used for social selection and discrimination. In 1983, they published a generalised theory on social selection in school. (Ladányi–Csanády, 1983)

The study of social structure and mobility remained a sensitive subject. Parallel to the problems raised by Kemény’s reports on poverty and the Gypsies, in 1974, Iván Szelényi completed a manuscript with his friend György Konrád³⁰ under the title Intellectuals on the Road to Class Power and sent it illegally abroad. Konrád and Szelényi were arrested, and proposed to leave Hungary. Szelényi accepted and lost his citizenship. Konrád remained in Hungary, like their book which was dug into the ground in a plastic bag and came out only in 1989 – but everybody knew about it. By 1989, Szelényi had already changed his view on intelligentsia and criticised his own work. He never gave up studying social structure and mobility: in exile, he made comparative studies of social structure in capitalist and socialist societies and explored historical continuity of some social groups. He also returned to Hungary as soon as he could – maintaining however his positions at other universities in the world. In 1990, he defended his thesis as Doctor of the Hungarian Academy of Science and soon he became academician.

Within the ISS of the Party, Kolosi revisited Ferge’s model in a more weberian way, completing it with variables of life style – based on a large survey (Kolosi, 1982:7). Results were published in a series of books edited by Tamás Kolosi and titled Rétegződés-modell vizsgálat (Study of a Stratification Model) I to IX.³¹ The main result of the project, the new model came out in the 3rd volume (Kolosi, 1984). Kolosi also reflected on the new phenomenon of the decade, called second economy by the economists István R. Gábor and Péter Galasi (1982). Kolosi elaborated an L-model, in which strata in the system of state redistribution appear on the vertical line and market based strata appear on the horizontal one. Iván Szelényi solved the same problem by using two triangles, partly overlapped: a larger one for the state run part of the system and a smaller one for the private forms of activity. The overlapping part expressed that wide group of people who were keeping a status in both economic system.

As sociology got citizenship new institutions mushroomed, in spite of many debates and conflicts: each ministry established its own institute from the mid-seventies on. Lajos Héthy became director of the Institute of Labour Studies which is still operating today. Gazsó moved from ISS to the new Oktatáskutató Intézet (Institute of Educational Research) and he directed it until he got appointed vice minister of education in 1984. Some fellows of the ISS followed Gazsó in this change – Ilona Liskó among them who maintained her interest focused on vocational training and educational inequalities. The

²⁹ The authors published it by chapters in different reviews, between 1978 and 1983.
³⁰ He is internationally known as a writer than sociologist, awarded with the highest awards in France, Germany and Hungary.
³¹ The first volume appeared in 1982: a collection of studies titled Theories and hypotheses (Kolosi, 1982).
new 1985 Law on Education permitted the teachers elect the head of the school and this change merited to be studied in two surveys (Andor–Liskó, 1991 and 1994) in collaboration with Mihály Andor (1944- ) a brilliant analyst of the Hungarian school system.32 (See: Andor, 1980) Andor worked first at the Népművelési Intézet (Institute for Culture), than at the Institute of Sociology of the HAS, and his carrier shows a third type besides the ISS courses (took over in the seventies by Huszár’s department) and Kemény’s field experience. The public appearance of sociology – Ferge, Héthy and Makó - by the end of the sixties, just at a turning point in economic policy of the Party which gave some freedom to managers (mainly in human resources management), produced quite a wave of demand of sociologists.33 Andor was one of those, how engaged to an industrial enterprise as sociologist with his new MA degree in philosophy, and learned the basics parallel to working as sociologist. He got his PhD later at the HAS and moved to the Sociological Research Institute.

Two smaller institutions were united into this new background institute of the Ministry of Education, too. So it became a real stronghold of educational research during the eighties and a whole generation of researchers grew up here who had been leading sociological research of education for the next two decades – with names like Péter Darvas (now a World Bank expert in Africa), Péter Lukács (turned to the research of educational policy), Gábor Halász (analyst of the system of education, he is now the representative of Hungary at the OECD), Péter Tibor Nagy (Doctor of Science of HAS, studies history of education and the distribution of education in society historically – besides that he is a tireless organiser of scientific community), Géza Sáska (he analyses educational policy decisions of the Hungarian governments in historical and comparative approach). They formed the basis to Tamás Kozma (1939 - ) to build successful series of books and a review (Educatio (R) – started in 1991)) as a director of the institute. Kozma took over the direction of the Institute in 1990 and had directed it for ten years. Another important research centre had been built to cover the subjects of rural development and agriculture – its name was Szövetkezeti Kutató Intézet (Cooperative Research Centre).

The KSH continued to offer a basis to social analyses. Andorka directed the 1972 and 1982 microcensus and focused personally on the trends in social mobility. (See Andorka, 1982) Although he left KSH in 1979 for chairing the sociology department of the Marx Károly University of Economics (MKKE), he maintained his interest in mobility research besides sociology of deviance and family.

Huszár got many bright young fellows to his university department who became professors and doctors of the HAS in the nineties and the early 2000s: Róbert Angelusz (1939-2010) who started his carrier in the TK with Róbert Tardos and made a bright and famous analysis of hidden opinion, Dénes Némedi (1942-2010), a historian of sociology who specialised in Durkheim, Péter Somlai (1941- ), a specialist in the sociology of the family and socialisation, Pál Léderer (1940- ) who passed through the course of the ISS in 1970 and largely contributed to develop qualitative methodology at the department. Endre Nagy (1941- ) another well known historian of sociology with philosophical background started his carrier in this department too, before moving to chair a younger
department of sociology at the Janus Pannonius University in Pécs. With little teaching work limited to selected audience in the seventies, the department started a large survey on intellectual professions like lawyers, doctors and engineers in 1973. The project continued until the end of the seventies.

In the middle of the eighties a new kind of institution was born due to Kolosi’s creative idea: TÁRKI (Social Research Institute) was established as a non-profit “joint venture” of four institutions: the Central Statistical Office, the Institute of Demography, the Eötvös Loránd University, and the Marx Károly University of Economics. The first service that TÁRKI offered was a databank: an archive which collected, stored and made accessible research data. It was a research centre as well. The spectre of the activity was enriched in the nineties by launching a for-profit branch and a special polling unit.

The first sociology MA programme started in the academic year 1978-1979 as a sub-programme at the Faculty of Liberal Arts of the Eötvös Loránd University (ELTE). This form gave the possibility of a second selection of students one year after the selection at the entrance of higher education. The main criterion was however excellence. Each candidate was able to prove some kind political activity, the importance of which is demonstrated by their further carrier. Many of the first students made scientific carrier and became research fellows and professors, some others made political carrier after the systemic turn of 1989, in different political parties – e.g. Bálint Magyar who explored social history of a rural area in three volumes after graduation, became a liberal minister of education in a socialist-liberal coalition government, while István Stumf who collaborated in a huge project on political socialisation in the ISS in the eighties, became cabinet minister in Viktor Orbán’s first cabinet, ten years later. Sociology has got a firm place in higher education for more than two decades. From the mid-eighties, the department of sociology of the MKKE hired young researchers who got their degree at the ELTE Institute of sociology already like Miklós Hadas who turned to gender subjects like male-ness, and György Lengyel who studied sociology after having graduated in economics and history. He interested mainly in industrial sociology. Zoltán Szántó got his degree as an economics teacher and studied sociology already at the Marx Károly University.

Summary
In Hungary, social thinkers and researchers had to reiterate their efforts to maintain and re-establish their institutions all along the twentieth century. Most frequently institutions were reviews and loose circles, groups. Humanities were acknowledges following German model and had a tradition at the universities, but new, social sciences like

34 It is highly characteristic to sociology without strong borders in Hungary, how Endre Nagy qualified his scientific interest: “I studied law and sociology, made my PhD in science of state and law, habilitated in the science of history and got my Doctor of the Academy degree in sociology – but my interest has been focused always in philosophy and letters.” (Endre Nagy’s homepage, http://mental.semmelweis.hu/hu/dr-nagy-endre-professzor-emeritus - Download: 29.01.2016 14:32)
35 Later TÁRKI’s activity and structure has been further diversified with several research institutes and an initiative in higher education.
36 It could be chosen after completing two semesters of another MA programme like philosophy or history, only.
sociology with their French, American, British background – and followed by many Jewish scholars, linked to the political left – found difficult to get rooted. It was particularly difficult to set up a chair of sociology at a university. When it almost succeeded in the middle of the forties, the communist dictatorship swept it out, and was very reluctant to let sociology studied in higher education.

However, we cannot talk about total discontinuity. Excepting the large part of the fifties threads of sociology can be followed: young researchers who were interested in sociology could find professors to follow at any time (look for Győrffy, Rézler, Hajnal, Bibó) – until they turned into such professors themselves helping the next generation. It is also true that was not necessarily a formal “professorship”, it gave a kind of continuity, however.

Another strong factor of continuity was the Central Statistical Office which has always nested social analysis although not been called sociological institute. It offered a possibility to work and survive to Andorka, Bibó, Cseh-Szombathy, Ferge, Kemény, those who taught the next generation again.

By 1990 sociology came through to higher education and two strongholds had been constructed at ELTE and MKKE. It was clear that it would not stop there and other universities will offer programmes in sociology, too. A further step of institutionalisation was that the department at ELTE contributed to the development of sociology by editing and publishing *Szociológiai Figyelő* (Sociologic Observer) which diffused foreign sociological literature in Hungarian translation, and the review *Szociológia* (started in 1972) with original communications. It was renamed to *Szociológiai Szemle* [Sociological Review] and taken over by the Hungarian Sociological Society after it was established in 1986.

An important fact is – not treated systematically in this chapter – that Hungarian sociologists have always had strong contacts with Western sociology. Excepting again Rákosi’s rule, there were opportunities to go abroad to study and meet leading sociologists in any field of research. Not only Bourdieu, but urban sociology in the US and Basil Bernstein’s ideas in Great-Britain and others came to Hungary without delay. It is also true that some sociologists were forced to go abroad – but even such measures could not stop sociology any more in Hungary, helped rather to build closer links internationally.

The fact that Hungarian sociology was embedded into the international sociology contributed to enrich it and diversify in every field of research. Not only social structure and mobility, but sociology of education and urbanism were present in the sixties already as well as industrial sociology. Sociology of rural development, of health and deviances joined them quickly. The variety of subjects brought with variety of methods. While survey remained the most frequented methodology – particularly as the HAS managed to get a medium category computer in 1972 –, many in depth interviews (e.g. with managers) and even ethnographic observation (e.g. in classrooms) were present in the tool-kit. Until Hungary had had no access to widespread analytical software like SPSS, Hungarian mathematicians developed a brand new software for data analysis. Later, SPSS spread over every institutions like fire.
The subject of this chapter is voluntarily closed at 1990. The political and economic turn in 1989-1990 brought a new era to sociology: former failures could turn into success and former successes into failures – it is an entirely different history. History remains continuous but it is appropriate to treat it separately.
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Political Theory In Hungary After the Regime Change

Abstract
The article offers an overview of the development political theory in Hungary in the past quarter of a century. It is written from a personal perspective, yet it is intended to be impartial and exhaustive. It follows a chronological order and puts the issue into a political and institutional context, with a special emphasis on the regime change that took place between 1988-90. Wherever necessary, the historical antecedents and intellectual traditions of contemporary Hungarian political theorising will be reflected on. Political theory itself will be discussed as being composed of three main branches, namely, empirical, analytical and normative theories. The overall conclusion will be that the predominantly liberal atmosphere of the 1990es was gradually replaced by a more conservative one, and that, strongly related to both the international tendencies and the domestic political developments, the so called agonistic interpretation of politics in general and of democracy in particular has become the mainstream approach in Hungarian political theory.
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1. Introduction

My purpose is to offer an overview of political theory in Hungary in the past quarter of a century. The country is relatively small and its language is rather forbidding to foreigners. However, opening a window on it in terms of political theory might be interesting not only in and for itself but also as a case study of the challenges political theory must face in communities that are both closed (to foreigners) and wholly integrated in the Western culture (as natives think), and that have been affected by profound historical changes. Although I do not think that political theory „should” either guide (and criticise) or track down (and explain) such political changes, it is a natural expectation that theoretical reflection turns out to have been affected by them and that especially during rapid changes and a loss of clear normative orientation, theories may be directly called for and in by those actively forming the political processes, emerging institutions and generally, the constitutional and legal framework of a country. I shall thus try to pay due attention to these interactions and the forms of mutual influence. However, my focal point will be the development of political theory as a (sub)discipline.

* I am grateful to the anonymous reviewers of the Journal as well as to Andras Kőrösenyi and Andras Lanczi for their helpful comments on earlier drafts of the article.
I shall follow a chronological order, beginning with the antecedents of the regime change in terms of political theory, turning to the long moment of the change itself, and then taking stock with the past two decades, reflecting on changes of the institutional and political context when and where it seems relevant. However, although my overview is meant to cover twenty-five-thirty years but wherever and inasmuch as it is necessary to reflect on traditions, these brief reflections will not be spared. Even though the regime change was indeed a dramatic turn in and for the freedom of thinking, talking, and writing, without external and internal(ised) constraints, making truly independent political thinking possible, a complete discontinuity, an absolutely new beginning would be a very counter-intuitive hypothesis. Concepts, problems, issues pertinent to „scientific socialism” were indeed rapidly replaced by those of democracy and of a free and sovereign polity, as I shall show, and of course there was no way back to the pre-war, elitist but constitutional authoritarianism colored with an old style liberalism and some sincere democratic developments. However, some parts of political theory, especially its normative and historical research areas, much as in any other Western commonwealth, are sensitive to their own traditions and I shall refer to them when and where necessary.

It is also necessary to remember that political theory, as any other field of science, is done in concrete academic and general institutional settings where it often has to compete for the resources, including not only money but students and prestige as well; and that political theory is especially vulnerable to misinterpretations and political abuse. Whenever it seems important, I shall reflect on these problems, too.

Let me add some methodological qualifications and disclaimers here. First, I do not intend to tell in what political theory consists, where its borders lie, whether it belongs to philosophy or to political science, whether it can be pursued in a purely formal way or always with reference to some historical, political, cultural, whatever context. I will use a classification that I hope is as uncontroversial as possible. This includes three classes: (i) the empirical, (ii) the analytic, and (iii) the normative approaches. Second, „in Hungary” means political theory being done within and for the political community of Hungary. Scholars of Hungarian origin but working in a different political culture will be covered only insofar as they have influenced the scholarship of their native country, that is, as any other relevant author from the international community. (Naturally, many of them have preserved a distinctive interest in their native country.) Thirdly, and finally, this overview is not objective in the sense of being supported by numbers and calculations. There are no exact data, say, of the kind impact factors are measured today. Building up such a background would require an immense research of which I am not capable now. Hence, the relevance of the overview is constrained. Its credibility stems from my personal involvement, experience, and the suggestions and recommendations of those who read the paper and that I have all taken into account when completing this overview.

2. Pre-Regime Change Antecedents

Needless to say that the official Marxism-Leninism, prevalent and obligatory in the Soviet countries, did not recognize the scientific or philosophical autonomy of any kind of political thinking. It was „scientific socialism,” taught at universities by special departments, that was meant to cover problems related to the political and institutional order and identified by the
party leadership, always according to the precepts of The Doctrine. Notwithstanding the prominence of the official doctrine, however, more independent thinking began relatively early in time, if not at those departments but in other institutions and within opposition circles.

First, from the late sixties onwards, leftist criticism of Marxism has slowly taken ground. Most critiques, especially those that directly challenged the political core of Marxism, were suppressed and published only either abroad or in a samisdat form. Some, especially those that attacked the economic doctrine of socialism, were sometimes tolerated, perhaps due to the general reforming atmosphere. Especially interesting was Tibor Liska’s case who argued openly for a kind of fully competitive, enterpreneurian economy, yet preserving fundamental equality in terms of opportunities to everybody, anticipating, in effect, a contemporary version of luck egalitarianism. Janos Kornai’s devastating critique of the socialist economy, with the conclusion that it was inherently inefficient and unsustainable, was technical enough to pass the censorship yet made a tremendous impact on political economics afterwards. Samisdat publications and books published by the emigration and other dissidents abroad could of course exert only a very limited impact on the intellectual life and found their way back to home and the legal sphere after the regime change.

Second, after Gorbatchev had launched the perestroika, party and government institutes began to consider widening the legitimacy basis of the regime along more democratic principles, though not by allowing a multi-party system but by finding other institutional ways to articulate, channel and integrate „genuine” (that is, not directly political, and hence considered being unsubversive) social interests. A new constitution was being discussed, if only in party and government offices. There was a demand for legal theorists but certain independent political scientist (not bound by party discipline) could also propose general political reforms. I suggest, therefore, that immediately prior to the regime change (the exact date of which is, of course, indeterminable) thinking in terms of legitimacy, democracy, the inherent plurality of interests, autonomy, the constitutional protection of the private sphere and individual rights had already been on the wake, and had made researching and teaching „scientific socialism” an obsolete business. Those deeply involved in the reform zeal did not make precise distinctions between the different compartments, responsibilities and competences of political theory. Democracy and its types were not discussed, only „democratisation.” There was much talk about interests, yet little about values. Grandiose schemes of institutional reform were put on table, that were quickly adjusted to „political realities,” yet seldom confronted with social reality and historical experiences. Long-forgotten and/or forbidden authors of the early twenties (such as Bukharin or Gramsci) were discovered but quickly forgotten again. Public discussions of reform were still seriously restricted. There was a dizzy and quickly changing atmosphere, a general excitement and expectation of new and new things to happen, which made a more time-consuming theoretical research practically impossible.

As a third source of political theory in Hungary I must name a single person. This was István Bibó, the greatest authority on the Left, yet for his moral standing in 1956 also held in high esteem by the Right. For as a member of the Imre Nagy Cabinet he was the only minister in Parliament on duty when the Soviets arrived. Later he was imprisoned for some years but essentially silenced for the remainder of his life.
Bibó, whose political and intellectual formation began in the pre-war era, and who joined the leftist-agrarian critics of the Horthy regime, did not develop a consistent political theory. Rather, he took up various issues in his oeuvre, many of which reflect on actual political problems yet always with a keen theoretical sense. vii Put together, they form a characteristically Bibóian way of thinking. The perhaps most significant component of it is a very strong pro-democratic cornerstone. His most frequently cited and today proverbial statement is that 'to be a democrat amounts to not being afraid' (originally he meant not fearing the opponent, yet many interpretations take this to allude to a general civic courage). His view of democracy was both progressivist and optimist, clearly influenced by the Enlightenment and generally, the various emancipation movements; but also conservative due to its concrete, particular, institutional approach. Bibó wrote his dissertation in legal theory, where he interpreted freedom strictly in terms of rights and norms. He held socialist-egalitarian views on capitalism (advocating collectivisation and redistribution of property), liberal views on the separation of state and social powers, and conservative-socialist views on social progress, guided revolution, and the need to reform society from above, by a strong elite. And he had an acute historical sense as well, interpreting the modern history of Hungary, but also of Central-Europe, including Germany, in terms of collective psychosis, surviving cultural and political patterns shaped by historical experiences – again, a typically conservative approach. His most famous categories by which he tried to explain many failures of modern Hungary are the predominance of, and perversive opposition between, „overstrained essence-visionaries” and „fake realists” in Hungarian politics. He condemned visionaries for being incapable of taking politics seriously and for ignoring practical issues and feasible solutions; and fake realists for being too much prepared for accepting immoral compromises and thereby enhancing general corruption. Despite being a leftist, he was also a staunch opponent of Marxism and its historical materialist doctrine.

It is no wonder that such an extremely motley version of normative and empirical political theory was both a source of inspiration to very different political tastes, and a way of thinking that as such could not be continued. What I take to be his greatest achievement for political theory and science is to show that it is possible to think of politics in its own terms, that is, not as a subfield of economics, moral philosophy, or philosophy of history. His works had provided a fertile ground for both normative and analytical political theory later.

The fourth source of political theory was the literature on national identity. This may appear somewhat odd from a contemporary Western eye, yet it also has Western counterparts, in fact, a very rich tradition and inspiration to Central and Eastern Europeans. Herder, Fichte; Barrès, Maurras; Ortega, Unamuno belong to the classics; Baudrillard, Scruton, A. Bloom are contemporary examples of thinking in terms of how a political community, a nation exists, what its characteristics are, what intellectual, moral, political influences shape its identity, how the democratic sovereign as an artificial person looks like as a natural entity. Much of this literature is written in essayistic and other literary forms, academic journals rarely publish such papers but often discuss them. But both analytical and normative political theory deals with such problems, too, though of course in more rigorously defined terms. The former discusses questions of loyalty, political obligation, national identity, cultural and political nations; whereas the latter is concerned with cosmopolitanism, republicanism, democratic patriotism and cultural/political/ethnic nationalism.
The specifically Central and Eastern European (including Russia) questions have ever been where „we belong to” and whether „we” have our own historical way to go or should/could, finally, join „the West.” Actually, Bibó himself was very much interested in this question, firmly believing that there have been serious derailments in the history of Central European nations but a return to the mainstream Western European history has always been possible. This was, essentially, the consensus among Hungarian conservatives and liberals of the 19th century. It was basically from the late 19th century on, influenced by German and French philosophy (see the names above), that some conservatives diverted from this consensus and began to believe in a more autonomous history of Hungary (hence the term „Hungarianness,” the content of which has ever been a subject of bitter political and literary debates). Radical liberals and socialists, however, became more and more doctrinaire in defending the supremacy of the West and were (and are) often called „alien-hearted” people by radical conservatives and nationalists.

Strangely but logically, the Kádár-regime could build on both traditions: its socialist principles and Marxist-Leninist doctrine committed it to the standard humanist-progressivist vision of mankind, whereas its loyalty to the Soviet Union helped certain rightist-conservative hostilities towards the West to survive. Its decline was marked by the resurgence of pro-Western tradition. Significantly for the emergent political theory, besides the Bibóian psycho-structural approach, historical non-Marxist structuralism also heavily influenced the discussion. It was especially the historian Jenő Szűcs’s short but very dense analysis of the „three historical regions of Europe” that was read widely. Szűcs, under the influence of Bibó, the Weberian pre-war social historian István Hajnal, and the French Annalists, introduced and used institutional and structural terms in explaining the logic of development in each region, including power, state, top-down and bottom-up social organising, separation of institutional competences, the organic evolution of differentiating private and public spheres, society and state (but not an independent economy) and so on. This was, in effect, a precious contribution to the vocabulary of an autonomous political theory as well.

Observers of contemporary Hungarian domestic politics may note that this ideological-normative aspect of political theory has become very strong again, with the current government and its head repeatedly expressing its/his reservations about Western values (actually, disvalues) and preferring certain (randomly selected) Eastern societies. The consensus about the supremacy of the Western-liberal model that was so strong prior and during the regime change is clearly over. This rhetorical, in some ways practical, and perhaps increasingly political turn toward the East has strong historical-ideological roots and hence deep reverberations in Hungarian society.

Fifthly and finally, the work of historians of ideas and persons cannot be underestimated, either. Classics of Hungarian liberals and conservatives of the 19th century had never been prohibited to read, though they had never been a robust part of university education. Total censorship was basically restricted to rightists authors of the 20th century, including not only straightforward fascists but also conservatives. Writings of other non-Marxist but leftist authors such as Oscar Jászi (a radical socialist, yet critic of Marxism) were published but selectively. From the mid-eighties, however, censorship was gradually eased and old-forgotten authors re-appeared both by their own right (new editions of old works) and as subjects of new monographs. There was an increasing awareness of the very rich and pluralist intellectual life of pre-war Hungary where various normative political conceptions were published and discussed.
3. Regime Change

Let me return first to the institutional background of political theory during the regime change. Unlike in East Germany, what happened in Hungary and also elsewhere in the former Eastern bloc was that the departments of “scientific socialism” were not dissolved but transformed into departments and institutes of political science, taught often by the same staff. This explains, from a sociological and psychological point of view, the initial mistrust towards political science within the educated elite and the new, emerging and victorious anticommunist parties and governments. It should also be added that the very early beginning of a highly combative political culture in Hungary made partisanship almost inevitable among political theorists as well: many of them were actively engaged in public debates, and became figures identified as either openly leftist or rightist. This has further contributed to the mistrust towards political theory (but also political science generally) as a serious kind of science by the political, intellectual and media elites.

Yet the more solid results and achievements of autonomous political thinking enumerated above helped political science and theory to take roots within the academic world. The first wave of analytical and normative theories and conceptions was overwhelmingly neo-Marxist, revisionist and post-Marxist/critical. The Polish political sociologist J. Wiatr, the Italian political philosopher A. Gramsci, as well as N. Poulantzas, E. Miliband, Th. Skocpol, S. Lukes, V. Bunce, A. Giddens, Ph. C. Schmitter, R. Dahrendorf, C. Offe and others quickly replaced the canonical classics of Marxism. On the purely normative level, J. Habermas’s influence was initially very robust. His books were translated and taught extensively. In empirical theory, it was mainly neocorporativism and elitism that belonged to this wave. Interestingly, on the one hand, while corporativism was once a markedly conservative idea, its new edition influenced mainly the leftist theory of the state. The markedly peaceful, elitist, consensual, negotiated nature of the Hungarian transition (in Rudolf Tőkés’ term, the negotiated revolution) looked like the continuation (or merely acceleration) of the reforms that began in the mid-eighties and with which the former technicist-pragmatist but decidedly leftist elite identified itself.

On the other hand, however, elitism that was once a characteristically leftist-critical theory, has been embraced and increasingly endorsed by many conservative essayists in Hungary. The reason is the negative evaluation of the same story: the „negotiated revolution” was not a revolution at all. The continuation thesis should indeed be taken seriously but this makes matters even worse. There was no regime change at all, only the facade was repainted. The Right has interpreted (first the far right, today the middle right, too) the change as a spurious and hypocritical one, with the old elite successfully preserving its power and influence, and hence a general normative-democratic legitimacy crisis was diagnosed and a radical, truly „anticommunist”-antielitist revolution has been called for. Whether it did happen in 2010 with the Fidesz winning the elections by a two-third majority, is a question for a political discourse.

Functionalism was also initially popular, though its very technical concepts and terms proved rather inefficient to wage such political wars. P. Bourdieu’s terminology (symbolic power, forms of capital) proved more useful and was duly exploited. Less directly critical of the new political elite and the new political order was the application of M. Foucault’s ideas and his conception of power to the interpretation of the history of modern Hungary and modernity in general.
Another major, though often neglected or underestimated feature of the regime change and its immediate aftermath was the incredibly short time of translating and publishing previously unknown classics, ancients and moderns alike. It should be noted first, however, that even during the Communist era, the older classics such as Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, Machiavelli, Hobbes, Locke, Bodin, Rousseau, Tocqueville, Mill, Kant were more or less available (sometimes in shortened editions). Others were partly translated (Augustine, Scholastics, Renaissance thinkers, Scottish enlightenment philosophers, Nietzsche). After 1989 a number of others such as Burke, Madison and other American Founders, Constant, Guizot, etc. were added, the shortened versions of other works were published fully, classic monographs (on Machiavelli, Hobbes, Locke, Montesquieu, etc. by Q. Skinner, R. Tuck, J. Dunn, J. Shklar, respectively) were translated, and the modern classics, from Carl Schmitt to Karl Popper, from Leo Strauss to M. Oakeshott, from I. Berlin to F. A. Hayek, from John Rawls to Charles Taylor, to name but a few, were also rapidly translated, introduced, explained, discussed and inserted into university curricula. Further, valuable selections of classic essays on liberalism and conservatism, communitarianism and nationalism, as well as encyclopedias and summaries of the history of political thought, were also added to the libraries.

Finally, there had been some relevant original scholarship done on classic authors even before the regime change. I do not only mean non-dogmatic Marx-research but the exploration of the anarchist tradition, the thinkers of the French enlightenment (Mária Ludassy), 17-18 century British political thinking (Lásló Kontler, Ferenc Horkay-Hörcher, Balázs Trencsényi): this research was especially strong because of the international success and influence of the late István Hont who began his career as a historian of ideas in Hungary and helped new generations of historians from Cambridge to find their route to the international arena. On further developments in the field of the history of political thought see below.

4. The Development of Political Theory After the Regime Change

The foundations of autonomous political thinking having been thus laid down by translations, summaries, reviews, discussions, interpretations and some original work during the early nineties, the later phase of the development of political theory can be characterised by the growing awareness of the relative independence of its distinct compartments. As I indicated in the introduction, without making very substantial methodological claims, I shall distinguish between three major subfields of political theory and track each within the Hungarian context.

4.1. Empirical theories

This title might appear as a contradiction in terms inasmuch as theory and empirical research are often sharply distinguished, though, of course, considered to be in need of one another. Theory is based on empirical findings and empirical research is guided by theory. The point is, however, that political science as social science has its own characteristic, time-honored, tradition-supported questions and issues that have become focal points of both empirical research and pure theorising. What I have in mind is (i) the theory of democracy (classical, deliberative, leader types); (ii) theories of accountability, representation, mandating; (iii) theories of leadership, governing, decision making; (iv) theories of international relations; (v) theories of institutions, parties, movements, political systems and the state on supranational,
national, subnational and local levels; (vi) discourse theory; (vii) theories of political sociology (recruitment of the political class, elite building and behaviour, voter behaviour, campaign studies, media and communication researches); (viii) formal models of voting and coalition forming; (ix) political economy; and (x) the contextualist school of the history of political thought and the study of political ideologies. As I said, these theories are rarely discussed in themselves but usually appear in empirical researches, contributing to the advancement of the respective subfield of political science. In this sense these theories may be considered as parts of the respective subfield and not part of political theory as a subfield of political science itself, with the possible exception of some purely theoretical, argumentative, or typological conceptions. However, these can perhaps be subsumed under another rubric (analytical and/or normative political theory). But such problems should not worry us here, since, to repeat, my purpose is largely taking stock with the output in the broadest possible sense. Let me thus expand on each subfield very briefly.

It may surprise a foreign reader to read that in an emerging democracy such as Hungary, with such an inspiring approach to democracy as Bibó’s, theorising about democracy does not really flourish.\textsuperscript{xv} Compared to the state of the art as represented by the leading international journals, there has been almost no discussion about deliberative democracy and generally, on the meaning and context of democracy. It was only after the millennium that the concept of leader democracy has stirred up some interest, not unrelated to the growing influence of Carl Schmitt (more on that later) and the no less spectacular rise of Viktor Orbán on the political Right that was partly mirrored by the strong personality of Ferenc Gyurcsány, the once-leader of the Socialist Party.\textsuperscript{xvi} Again, partly as a result of the decidedly combative nature of Hungarian domestic politics, the consensual theories of democracy have been largely neglected and the agonistic character of politics has been more widely accepted in political theory.

Problems of political representation and accountability, as well as of leadership and governing have become topics of systematic research only recently. There is an ongoing research, related to similar international efforts, to build, classify and analyse political-electoral promises, and even more recently, a leadership research has also been launched in the Institute of Political Science of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, that has gradually become the strongest foothold of academic political science.\textsuperscript{xvii} “Theories of international relations, again, have duly become parts of the university education, about independent research being done in this field I have got only scarce knowledge.

More well-developed is the area of party research, again, for reasons of its more direct political urgency. Parties are always keenly interested in their electorate and are willing to spend on such researches, hence a significant amount of data has been quickly assembled and developed ever since the first elections. The principal question is, as I think in every emerging democracy, to conceptualise and analyse the effects of voters’ preferences on the electoral system and the behaviour of the parties and vice versa.\textsuperscript{xviii}

Analysing the continuously changing institutional system (government institutions, independent institutions, local governments) and the no less rapidly changing arena of political movements requires constant attention. Keeping record of them is a heavy task and there remains little room and energy to formalise and theorise on them, although the lessons of international debates on models of government, governance and good governing have been adapted and discussed in Hungary, too.\textsuperscript{xix}

Discourse theorists, however, established themselves as a school quite early and have produced translations (e.g. works of Koselleck), valuable selections of essays and a remarkable amount of independent research. They are thus perhaps the most consciously
self-constructing school in political theory in Hungary. They must face the usual barrier to
the international arena, namely, the limited accessibility of Hungarian domestic politics to
foreigners which they study according to the precepts and ideas of discourse analysis.xx

Political sociology and its various subfields are, as far as I can judge, mostly done by
empirical researchers, except perhaps for network research which is supported and done by
young scholars with a keen theoretical sense. They have done invaluable work by building up
data bases (such as about the recruitment and career paths of politicians) and analysing them
according to the received standards.xxi The perhaps most interesting research results have
been to control for the elitist theories about the regime change: was that really only a
conversion of political capital into economic and social ones? How is the new capitalist
Hungarian economy organised? What role does foreign capital play in building up regional
and local networks?

Game theory and its various applications such as coalition forming and committee
election are still relatively rare, partly due to the regrettable gaps in academic teaching of
formal theories and models to political science students.

Studying political economy has had perhaps the strongest roots in empirical political
theory in Hungary. The perhaps most known examples are Károly Polanyi’s theory of
economic transformation and Kornai’s theory of shortage economy. In the field of
comparative system analysis, Mária Csanádi’s researches on the Hungarian, other East
European, and the Chinese state and party system have earned international attention.xxii

During the first years of the transition, Hungary looked an interesting and unique case and
some monographs and theories have been developed out of analysing it. There are other
internationally established scholars in this field.xxiii However, a generational gap evolved in
the nineties, due to some extent of talented economists having been absorbed rapidly by the
new market economy, and it is only very recently that theories of international political
economy have become subjects of study by young political economists.

I subsume the contextualist school of the history of political thinking to this chapter.
Scholars working on authors of the great Western canon have already been mentioned. As
far as the history of political thinking in Hungary is concerned, the first thing to note is the
lack of a solid philosophical tradition in which political philosophy could have been
embedded. Of course, right from the early 18th century there was a growing awareness of
the great French, German and English authors (especially Montesquieu, Rousseau, Herder,
Locke, Burke: generally those whose ideas could be cited and interpreted in defense of
public – and national – liberty against the Crown and the absolutist state). However, it was
only from the 1840ies that different political ideologies were distinguished and began their
career. No wonder that contextualism, that emphasises the historical embeddedness of a
given ideological, political position and considers it untieable from the historical context, is
the more persuasive position. Add to this the turbulences of history in Central Europe and
one can doubt that there is much sense in talking about coherent liberal or conservative
thinking in Hungary. Thus, given the huge differences of political, economic, social, and
cultural contexts of the 19th and 20th century and the lack of a philosophical background,
many historians of political thought reject the idea of diachronically coherent political
philosophical positions. The doyen of the historians of Hungarian political thinking, István
Schlett, emphasises further that political thinking is different from political philosophical
thinking: the latter may be missing, the former can still be robust and more relevant for
political science. It is the political discussions of the day, and the thinking of those who
actively shape politics, that is, of political actors that should be studied by scholars in the first
place.
Finally, and again somewhat strangely, the study of political ideologies as they appear in a contemporary pluralist society and democratic political order, is marginal, too.\textsuperscript{xxiv} Due to the spectacular rise of the extreme Right in the past few years, there is a growing interest in the meaning of radicalism, populism, extremism; and there is an increasing awareness of the importance of ideas and values as they appear in politics and influence politicians’ and voters’ choices, yet the bulk of the literature on political ideologies, worldviews, systems of ideas is either partisan or purely normative. Liberals try to cope with liberalism, conservatives with conservatism, socialists with socialism either critically (criticising the others), or defending them. I shall return to them. But there is precious little empirical research being done how these positions have evolved, changed, and are related to one another in the ongoing political and philosophical debates.\textsuperscript{xxv}

4.2. Analytical theories

This subfield of political theory is defined by analytical, conceptual, and phenomenological approaches to problems of politics that appear on a highly abstract level. Fundamental principles, values, and relations of politics are discussed here that in turn may and do inspire empirical research as well.

A classic problem discussed by analytical theorists was legitimacy. As I explained in the introduction, the Hungarian transition was characterised by the relative weakness of the democratic opposition that rejected the legitimacy of the Kádár-regime but had to admit that the Communists, and especially Kádár himself, could have easily won even a completely free elections as late as, say, the mid-eighties. This was indeed a perplexing problem and ever since the „negotiated revolution” of 1989 and the new constitution that was constructed step-by-step-wise and never legitimised for instance by a popular referendum, the legitimacy of the political order had been an open question.\textsuperscript{xxvi} Since the adoption of the Basic Law in 2011 that replaced the old constitution was also a unilateral action of the governing coalition, the problem of legitimacy of the constitution has not disappeared. Yet I must acknowledge that despite the urgency of the problem, Hungarian political theorists have shown relatively little attention to it, and if yes, more in the nineties.\textsuperscript{xxvii}

Trust, on the contrary, belongs today to the most widely discussed issues not only in political science but also economics and sociology. It is fashionable internationally as well, and well-supported by ongoing empirical research (comparative surveys). On the whole, the Hungarian society is considered to be low in general trust and strong in family trust. This is regarded as providing for a particularly unfriendly environment for both democracy, and especially consensus-oriented, democracy; and for market economy where competition and cooperation are considered to be equally important.

Sovereignty is usually discussed under the influence of Schmitt, once again, whereas power appears most frequently in its Foucauldian and Bourdieuan interpretation. Issues of human rights, authority, human dignity, political obligation and constitutionalism are mainly debated among legal philosophers.\textsuperscript{xxviii} Concepts of H. L. A. Hart, R. Dworkin, J. Raz and others have been introduced and constructively discussed more in legal journals and less in political ones. Classical natural right theories are even less known and cited.\textsuperscript{xxix} This is somewhat odd and regrettable because the Hungarian Constitutional Court has been one of the most active and powerful institutions of its kind, and developed a very robust interpretation of the old constitution influenced by concepts of natural right and human dignity. Its decisions and rulings formed the political landscape of Hungary substantially, this is why I consider the negligence of its philosophy by political theorists somewhat strange.
Lastly and perhaps most importantly, I take the study of *the political* as the basic relation or quality of any politically existing human community to be the number one problem of analytical political theory. Arguably, the two most significant conceptions of the problem of what political existence entails are those of Carl Schmitt and Hannah Arendt. Whereas Schmitt’s theory rests on enmity and agonism, Arendt’s idea is the opposite: in her view, to exist politically amounts to be able to act in concert, where no public enemy, or foe, is existentially or conceptually required or presupposed. On the whole, as far as I can see, and again probably related to the predominantly agonistic style and reality of Hungarian politics, Arendt’s influence has been smaller that Schmitt’s, though Arendt herself devoted an important essay to the Hungarian Revolution in 1956 that she regarded to be an important historical evidence for her theory.

Both Arendt’s and Schmitt’s most important works are available in Hungarian, with the regrettable lack of a translation of *The Human Condition*. Arendtians mostly comment on various aspects of her thinking but Schmitt’s concepts and ideas have inspired independent researches much like in other major Western countries. And similarly to the recent developments there, after the demise of Marxism or neo-Marxism as a common ground, it seems to me that Schmitt has become a remarkably popular author for both leftist (though not liberal) and rightist theorists. The state as the focal point of political theory has been definitely replaced by the political as the point of ultimate reference.

It does seem that Schmitt’s thinking has taken on a sort of an emancipatory function for political theory in general. Certain empirical theories that were discussed above (leader democracy, discourse analysis in the first place) also demonstrate the influence of Schmitt’s conception of the political. Also, as I guessed above, the very combative nature of Hungarian politics, with deep animosities and sometimes hostilities between left and right, may have done much to prepare the rise of Schmitt’s theory. Finally, I also think that his obsession with *the political* has got not only theoretical but methodological and sociological functions as well. It is not just the nature, boundaries, and meaning of politics but of political theory, too, that can exploit the notion. Schmitt helps political theorists to explain (but also to hide) what they do and who they are.

4.3. Normative theories

Normative political theory or political philosophy can also be done in a more analytical and in a more historical way. The former approach is strongly related to the analytical theories and focuses on problems, issues, concepts, phenomena that are identified as being in need of some action (promotion, defense, preservation, justification, prohibition, etc.) grounded in and guided by certain philosophical insights. The latter approach deals with solutions and answers developed or suggested by previous authors in relation to these issues, and usually presupposes a conception of a tradition in which they, that is, both the authors and their conceptions, make some coherent and actually meaningful sense. In a particular political community, this latter approach may itself be further specialised insofar as certain universal positions (liberalism, conservatism) may turn out to have special meanings within the particular political history of that community, or there may be particular ideological positions and their history that are not really compatible with any universal ideology (especially those related to national identity).

As far as I can tell, within analytical normative political theory the Hungarian landscape mirrors most of the positions well-known in the international arena, of course,
with a number of local characteristics and with considerable changes in terms of their influence and power over the past twenty years. Let me briefly take stock with them.

(i) Egalitarian-Kantian liberalism was relatively strong in the nineties, its institutional stronghold (still) being the Central European University. With the crisis of liberalism in Hungary after 1998 (when the Fidesz first won the elections), however, the characteristic issues of liberal philosophy – equality, justice, fairness – have practically disappeared from the wider academic discourse, human rights remaining perhaps the only topic that has preserved its prominence, again, mostly related to the activity of the Constitutional Court. Topics related to hate speech and generally to the freedom of speech were perhaps those that were both well-connected to the ongoing international debates and to the actual problems of the Hungarian polity. For otherwise liberal political philosophy, at least in my judgment, gradually lost its sensitivity towards the actual needs and concerns of the Hungarian society and became a somewhat barren and doctrinaire moral creed. Those interested in the most abstract levels of philosophical discussion chose to publish in English rather than in Hungarian.

(ii) Communitarianism is also present, though it is known mainly to political theorists. Some original interpretations and contributions of communitarianism have been produced, influenced by Charles Taylor and Alasdair MacIntyre and others. The call for a less individualistic political order has found some echo in the governing party that introduced the new Basic Law of the country in 2011. Without being able to support my claim with hard evidence, the sections of the Basic Law that promulgate basic rights and duties of citizens show clear signs of a communitarian position.

(iii) Libertarianism or classical liberalism, in Hungary mostly associated with Hayek and Mises, two Central European authors, was especially strong during the regime change. I still remember the influx of books by libertarian authors donated by various pro-market American organisations. Hayek, but not Mises, is accessible in Hungarian. Especially during the nineties, Michael Polanyi’s works were also extensively translated. He began his career as a natural scientist and changed later to philosophy of knowledge and science. His thinking is not straightforwardly political but his concepts of personal knowledge, tacit knowledge, the impossibility of planned economy are both original and reminiscent of both Oakeshott’s and Hayek’s thinking.

Strangely enough, well-known contemporary libertarians of Hungarian origin such as Thomas Szasz, Anthony de Jasay and Tibor Machan are virtually unheard of in Hungary. Since libertarianism is quite strongly rooted in economics and economic philosophy, I guess that its more profound and original reception would have required a more developed political economical background which was and is, however, still missing. Libertarianism is, thus, mostly represented by books, reviews, short notes, articles and it has, as I suppose it does in continental Europe elsewhere, a certain sectarian and doctrinaire ting. The recent economic crisis did much to further undermine the credibility of libertarianism, at least as it is interpreted by its critics, whereas libertarians who argue that the crisis resulted from state, rather than market, failures, are hardly heard.

(iv) Especially after 1998, the popularity of conservatism has been on the rise. As is well-known, conservatives are more reluctant to identify themselves as conservatives than liberals as liberals, because of the less ideological and systematic thinking of conservatism which is, therefore, usually a more personal philosophy than liberalism and is often more critical than constructive. In any case, Burkan-Oakeshottian thinking has become pretty influential even among the younger, highly educated generation. Roger Scruton’s personal involvement in Central European politics (he actively helped dissidents in the eighties and
has a good knowledge of Polish, Czech, Hungarian philosophy as well) made him a sort of intellectual celebrity in Hungary, too, with a number of his books having been translated. His championship of national states vis-a-vis the European Union has become especially welcome in the Right.

Because of his Hungarian origin and interest in Hungarian affairs, John Kekes’ influence is also notable. His more analytical and unhistorical approach to conservatism is truly unique in Hungary. Again, due to their Hungarian nativity, Thomas Molnar’s and especially John Lukacs’s traditional, somewhat religious-reactionary conservatism (which are different, of course, in many aspects) is well-known. Their books have also been translated; Lukacs is especially widely read.

The perhaps most profound Hungarian-born conservative thinker of the twentieth century is Aurel Kolnai. He also left the country very early. His thinking is perhaps the most pregnantly political philosophical and reflects both a highly autonomous intellectual development and a remarkably original approach to conservatism and a critique of utopian thinking. In his student years he was involved in the bourgeois radical movement and never ceased to be interested in Hungarian political history. His staunch anti-communism, born during the first Communist dictatorship in 1919, preceded his conversion to conservatism in the fourties that was accomplished during his stay in the US. His intellectual return to Hungary was, again, made possible by the regime change and some of his most important political philosophical works have been translated. He, too, has exerted some influence on the strengthening conservative political philosophy after the millenium.

Neoconservative thinking is, however, known mostly from second-hand sources and reviews. The exception is Leo Strauss whose conservatism is, of course, a debatable question. On the whole, it is arguable that the rise of the Right after 1998, and especially after 2002 that led to their landslide victory of the 2010 elections, was intellectually quite prepared at the Budapest universities where conservative thinking has exerted considerable influence on students interested in politics.

(v) Socialist-Marxist political philosophy was relatively strong during and after the regime change, as I explained earlier, but has almost disappeared in the past decade. Publications of socialist ideas and thinking was restricted to the journal Eszmélet. Here, again, the Hungarian origin of Istvan Meszaros has played a great role in making his magnum opus (Beyond Capital: Toward a Theory of Transition) attractive enough to be translated.

(vi) Other major positions such as republicanism or anarchism are, in the form of normative theories, practically unrepresented in Hungary. Worth mentioning are perhaps certain ultra-conservative circles, in certain ways similar to paleo-conservatism. By this term I mean those who criticise, even reject, democracy, favor strong monarchism and a more traditional, Platonist social order. One of their most respectable source of inspiration is Béla Hamvas, a truly unique thinker, who was a staunch opponent of Nazism/fascism, communism and liberalism alike. He did not, however, do proper political philosophy.

It is undeniable that the bulk of normative political theory is based on Anglo-Saxon sources as in many other political communities of the Western hemisphere. But as I have pointed out, Carl Schmitt and Jürgen Habermas, as well as German conservatism and liberalism are very much present in Hungarian political thinking. Quite recently, there has been a growing awareness of French (and French-speaking) normative political thinking as well, though mostly in the form of translations (R. Aron, B. de Jouvenel, C. Lefort, P. Manent, Ch. Mouffé).
Let me repeat a point made above: especially in a small and relatively closed, internationally hardly notable political community much depends on the few personal relations that tie it to the international discourses. Kekes, Molnar, J. Lukacs, Hont, partly due to their native interest in Hungary, and others like Scruton or Habermas who have shown some particular interest in the region, have usually exerted not only a personal but philosophically formative influence on Hungarian political philosophy. xxxviii

Historical normative political philosophy is more concerned with the historical continuity and discontinuity, coherence and identity of the various positions and their interpretations based on classical texts. It is here that national traditions, local forms of universal ideologies are especially important. And as I argued, the history of political thought, both of its more universal and local versions, was researched quite extensively even at the dawn of the regime change in Hungary. Interest in authors long forgotten or never really studied was especially intensive after censorship was abolished. But the dominant approach has been, as I explained, a contextualist one.

Others acknowledge the significance of the contexts and of the thinking of political actors, yet maintain that just because both philosophies (and its different versions) are very rich and universal, they can serve as reliable proxies for evaluating the various political philosophical positions that had developed in Hungary over the two centuries. Further, strategic and constructive political thinking cannot be done without normative concepts, without some historical vision and practical philosophical sense. In other words, it is not the persons, nor the theorists but the ideas that appear and disappear in the writings of political thinkers (yes, not only of professional philosophers, but also of politicians, public intellectuals, novelists) that can and ought to be studied as forming a meaningful tradition and style of thinking: a political self, so to speak.

Needless to say that those who favor a more contextual approach usually mistrust such a normative approach questions. But this debate is, once again, a different issue. Those who defend historical normative political philosophy (including myself) may also acknowledge that, for instance, 19th century liberalism, may no longer be relevant in and for actual Hungarian liberalism. Even less so because Lajos Kossuth’s national liberalism (of a Garibaldi-Mazzini-type) was very different from Count István Széchényi’s conservative-utilitarian liberalism; Baron József Eötvös’s Tocquevillean-Millian liberalism was different from Baron Zsigmond Kemény’s conservative-constitutional liberalism. However, the differences are still meaningful, and though many of the once-relevant emphases and issues (such as Hungary’s role within the Habsburg Empire) are really outdated, they have shaped public attitudes, political thinking, cultural preferences and sensibilities profoundly.

No wonder, of course, that it is especially conservatives who relish in researching their own tradition, believing that traditions themselves have authoritative power. In the 19th century, straightforward conservatism was at the margins, but many of its attitudinal-emotional aspects are discernible in the best writings of the greatest Hungarian novelists. Social conservatism as a political ideological conception and program was elaborated and published by János Asbóth in 1875 in opposition to the doctrinaire, laissez faire liberalism dominant in the second half of the 19th century. Somewhat later the so-called bourgeois radicals, a group of social constructivists began to criticise the liberal consensus from the opposite angle, namely, because they perceived it as not only politically corrupt but intellectually outdated and provincial. After the First World War, liberalism had almost no more real defenders. However, its constitutional-parliamentarian sensibilities, style, and unwritten norms were preserved in practice to a surprising extent, as I explained earlier.
German-French-Italian type of radical or revolutionary conservatism, corporatism, fascism had its Hungarian followers but remained more contained by the political elite. Exploring these different positions and others was an old debt of Hungarian historians of political thought and consumed much energy during the past two decades.

Thus, apart from Eötvös’s magnum opus published between 1851-54, it was only the 20th century that normative political theory in the strict sense became an autonomous subfield of political theory in Hungary, and distinguishable from the philosophically more inchoate thinking of novelists, politicians, social intellectuals. Given the historical circumstances and the philosophical underdevelopment of the intellectual life of the country, truly autonomous Hungarian political thought could not begin until the regime change in 1989. However, in my view it still makes sense to assemble the pieces of earlier, context-bound political thinking that can be concatenated in a way that does not make traditions (liberal, socialist, or conservative) appear to be wholly arbitrary constructions but implicit, tacit, half-conscious, yet solid and reliable sources of political orientation even today.

5. Concluding Remarks

Given the nature of this paper, any conclusion to be drawn from the overview can be only rather personal. But since this Issue is meant to be, as far as I understand, about memories, I think this provides me with some liberty to summarise the development of political theory in Hungary by choosing and pointing out those aspects that I deem to have been the most relevant ones.

The first point is that political theory did not begin in the regime change, it flourished before the war, though it was essentially suppressed during the Communist dictatorship. Much effort has been devoted to unearth these traditions, much of which turned out to be quite useless in the postcommunist world, yet perhaps paradoxically, contributed to the revival of some old, often outlandish debates on national identity, Hungarianness, and historical responsibilities. The second point is, again, a paradox: the negotiated, elitist character of the regime change initially supported a consensual interpretation of democracy in and by political theory, but it also provoked a harsh elitist critique of the transition which, in turn, made consensual approaches to democracy in political theory sound rather hollow. Thirdly, and in accord with this, the liberal, Western-type consensus about the nature of the new political order had to face increasingly strong criticisms raised by the Right. Hence, contrary to many Western patterns where liberalism is still a fighting force (for greater equality, justice, and rights), Hungarian liberal political philosophy found itself defending the existing order, whereas many conservatives became very critical of it, to the point of accepting theories usually held in high esteem in the Western Left. But since the millenium, liberalism has undoubtedly been on a decline, whereas conservatism, with its peculiar leftist concerns, has been on the rise. Topics and issues in political theory discussed in academic and public fora have reflected these changes. Fourthly, the influence of Carl Schmitt and his understanding of politics has grown ever since the late nineties. Political theorists seem to have found that Schmitt’s approach is a useful tool to entrench political science as an autonomous field among other social sciences. Further, his agonistic view of politics appeared to be more congenial to Hungarian realities than any other rival theory. This gives further reasons why a more moral (Kantian-Rawlsian liberal) approach to political thinking has lost ground to the more realist schools of it. But it must also be noted that Schmitt’s and the realists’ increasing influence on contemporary
political thinking is not restricted to Hungary. A growing number of articles and papers in international journals and reviews concerned with and discussing related issues testify to this. Fifthly, it must be stressed that an immense work of translations, commentaries, institution development has been done by political scientists and theorists. There has been, however, simply not enough resource to even touch upon serious issues such as legitimacy, types and processes of democracy, rule of law, separation of powers, sovereignty etc. to the required depth and degree. Finally, I would underline the importance of emigré Hungarians, the Lukács School, the Catholic-Conservative „School,” and many individual scholars, including some Western philosophers as well, who, by their works but often personally, have helped Hungarian political theory to be connected with the international community and who, perhaps inadvertently, gave orientation and guidance to a small but very busy community of scholars.

1 The first book I am aware of that inserts Hungary (as well as Poland and the Czech Republic) to a discussion of the history of political thought is Noel O’Sullivan in his *European Political Thought Since 1945* (London: Palgrave MacMillan, 2004). He discusses István Bibó, Aurel Kolnai and Michael Polányi – see on them later.

1 The character of the Horthy regime is itself a contested issue. It even became an actual issue of political debates after the regime change. Following the logic of politics, being pro or against the Horthy regime in terms of its historical achievements and crimes has become a major dividing line between the left and the right (this is similar to the Spanish debates about the Franco regime). My own view is summed up in the main text. Let me spell it out in some more detail here. The regime was indeed authoritarian from a 19th century liberal point of view, as were many European post-war regimes, however, it was more democratic then its predecessor, though still falling short of the Swiss, British, Scandinavian and French standards considerably. Again, despite its authoritarian tendencies, it preserved a substantial amount of liberal manners and procedures, especially the parliamentary control over the government, and resisted both the Nazi and Fascist „reform” movements quite efficiently. The unforgivable crime it committed was giving more and more room to antisemitism, introducing antisemitic laws and finally, under German pressure yet evidently not without significant internal support, eradicating the Jewish population in the countryside.


1 Some prominent examples: Ágnes Heller, Ferenc Fehér, György Márkus, (1983) *Dictatorship Over Needs*, New York: St Martin. The authors belong to the „Budapest School,” that is, the disciplines of György Lukács. On this see Andrew Arato, *The Budapest School and actually existing socialism*. Theory and Society 16 (1987): 593-619 János Kis, György Bence, *On Being a Marxist: A Hungarian View* (http://socialistregister.com/index.php/srv/article/view/5455/2354#U6p7W0Db4Sk); János Kis (1987), *Do We Have Human Rights?* (in Hungarian, Párizsi Magyar Füzetek Könyvei 11); Miklós Gáspár Tamás (1983), *The Eye and the Hand* (in Hungarian, Független Kiadó); and *Idola Tribus* (in Hungarian, Párizsi Magyar Füzetek Könyvei 12, 1989). These books were, at least in my memory, the first autonomous receptions of some contemporary Western political philosophical positions, liberalism, anarchism, and conservatism, respectively.

the lessons he drew from the failures of Central European peace treaties, was published in English and received favorable criticism: *The Paralysis of International Institutions and the Remedies*, Hassocks, Sussex: The Harvester Press, 1976. Another collection of his essays is forthcoming by the title *The Art of Peacemaking, Selected Political Essays*. (Tr. Péter Pásztor; ed and intr. Iván Zoltán Dénes; with a foreword by Adam Michnik). New Haven: Yale University Press, 2015. Iván Z. Dénes is probably the most authoritative interpreter of Bibó’s oeuvre.


1 To be more precise, after the end of WWII there was, again, a considerable output of independent political thinking in Hungary that was shut down in 1948.


1 The best known author in this field in Hungary is the prolific and polemical social theorist, now one of the judges of the Constitutional Court, Bela Pokol, a discipline of N. Luhmann. His thinking was also heavily influenced by J. Habermas’ theory of the public sphere. Being also well-versed in Gramsci’s and Bourdieu’s theories, he has developed a peculiar mixture of strong antiliberalism (criticising liberal democracy and the liberal establishment), anti-neoconservatism (criticising capitalism), without ever returning to a Marxist or socialist theory of society and economy.


1 See Jan Pakulska, Andras Körösényi, *Toward Leader Democracy*, London: Anthem Press, 2012. Besides this book, András Körösényi, the leading theorist of the topic, has published numerous articles on the concept in English and in Hungarian.

1 The institutional infrastructure of political science in Hungary is composed of the Institute of Political Science of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, with appr. 50 researchers (some of them part-time employed), ten university political science departments and institutions with appr. 120 professors (rough estimate), and four doctoral schools. There are other relevant departments, e.g. Public Policy, Regional Studies or International Relations Departments as well. Since Hungary preserved the Soviet system of the Academy supervising the different sciences and arts, the Political Science Committee, the members of which are elected by scholars holding a PhD, is considered the highest forum of political science. Finally, the Hungarian Association of Political Science is a broad umbrella civil organisation, having around 250 members.

1 Gábor Tóka and Zsolt Enyedi of the Central European University are perhaps the most frequently cited authors in this field.

1 Representative authors with chapters and articles in English and German are Attila Ágh, György Hajnal, György Jenei, Máté Szabó.

An outstanding representative of parliament and elite research is Gabriella Ilonszki, with a number of books available in English (For a recent book see her *Perceptions of the European Union in New Member States*. London: Routledge. 2010). Network theory applied to elite research is represented by Balázs Vedres who has published papers with David Stark (for a several award-winning piece see their article *Structural Folds: Generative Disruption in Overlapping Groups*, American Journal of Sociology, vol. 115, no. 4 (January 2010): 1150-1190. and with László Bruszt (see Bruszt, Stark, Vedres, *Rooted Transnational Politics: Integrating Foreign Ties and Civic Activism*, Theory and Society, Vol 35, No 3 (2006): 323-49; and by Károly Takács who also has a strong record of English papers on networks, trust, social theory.


Representatives of this research area with English papers are András Bozóki and András Körösényi. Political ideologies are also discussed in and by social theory. The boundaries are, of course, easy to cross. It is perhaps worth mentioning that one of the most influential discussions of conservatism in sociology was developed by Karl Mannheim, another Hungarian emigré.


Authors with English output on these questions include, among others, Mátyás Bódig, Tamás Győrfi, András Jakab, Zoltán Miklósi, Zoltán Szente, and myself.

Notable exceptions are János Frivaldszky and Péter Takács.

Two journals may be considered as having a predilection toward liberalism, broadly understood: *Beszélő* (a monthly review, first published in 1981 in a samisdat form, since 2013 only an online publication) and *Fundamentum*, a quarterly journal, with a strong emphasis on human rights. For shorter essays and discussions, two printed weeklies, *ÉS* and *Magyar Narancs* are the most widely known forums. The most influential liberal political philosophers are perhaps János Kis and Zoltán Miklósi.


Jasay’s book on the state was translated. Actually, Ayn Rand and Hans-Hermann Hoppe are also available in Hungarian.

The most influential conservative bi-monthly journal is the *Kommentár*. A more academic quarterly journal with a conservative mark is the *Századvég*, published online.

It would exceed the limits of this analysis to explore the influence of religion and religious thinking on political philosophy but it is safe to make a brief suggestion about the strikingly close connection between conservative thinking and Catholicism. Molnar, Kolnai, J. Lukacs, M. Polanyi were not only nominally Catholic (in fact, except for Molnar, the three others were partly or entirely of Jewish extraction!) but practising Catholics, with Kolnai and Polanyi converting as adults.

His chief interpretator is András Lánczi whose work has been strongly influenced by Strauss and who is the perhaps most widely known conservative political philosopher in Hungary.

The most known advocate of Marxism as a political philosophy in Hungary is Gáspár Miklós Tamás, a former dissident, first an anarcho-liberal, later an Oakeshottian conservative.
István Balogh is doing original research on Rawls, Habermas and Otfried Höffe. German conservatism is discussed extensively in András Karácsony’s books and papers.

In May 2013, Roger Scruton held a public lecture at the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, attended by the Prime Minister, too. In May 2014, Jürgen Habermas gave a talk at the Eötvös University (the PM wasn’t there), both lecture rooms were packed with students and scholars.

The Dominant Ideas of the Nineteenth Century and Their Impact on the State I-II., New York: Columbia University Press, 1996. The book(s) appeared first in German and later in Hungarian. In terms of coherence, conception and philosophical sense, this book is the greatest and consummate work of the dominant version of 19th century liberalism in Hungary. Tocqueville’s and Mill’s influence on Eötvös’ thinking is unmistakable.
In Hungary several names for several kinds of “(social) anthropological” studies exist. Ethnography (in Hungarian néprajz) covers the description of traditional villages, \textit{i.e.} traditional way of life of the peasants. The term goes back to Old Greek \textit{ethnos} with the meaning of a theoretical notion of the ‘spirit/essence of a people’. \textit{Folklór} and \textit{folklorisztika} stem from the well known English term \textit{“folk-lore”}, and deals with folk literature, folk music, folk dance, folk religion, rites and customs, etc. Today another vague but practical term “intangible cultural heritage” became popular. “Folklór” is the object-term, and “folklorisztika” (‘folkloristics’) is the meta-term, denoting the study of folklore. In Hungary ethnography and folklore research are closely connected one with the other: institutions, scholarly trends are interwoven between them. \textit{Anthropology}, on the other hand has been used also in Hungary, and today “cultural anthropology” figures in names of university curricula, research projects and series of publications – still in the fact “Hungarian cultural anthropology” is just a fashion word for ethnography (néprajz) – or it covers the study of far away peoples: living in Siberia, Viet-Nam, the Amazonas region etc. The Hungarian form \textit{kultúrális antropológia} in fact is not similar to the American term ‘cultural anthropology’, but it is a kind of \textit{social anthropology}. 

/For brevity’s sake, in the following I will use the three words as homogenous– if it does not cause misunderstanding./

In Hungary the three terms are used also in our days, more or less following a century long tradition – and in Hungary usually one can understand their actual meaning. But when “foreigners” just see those Hungarian terms– they often misinterpret their actual meaning.

(Later we will come back to the problems of terminology.)

There are several attempts to describe the history of ethnography and folklore in Hungary. I discuss here only four different works. Gyula Ortutay published a small book \textit{Magyar népismeret} (‘How we understand the Hungarian folk’) giving to the general public a pocket size information. He start s the story of ethnography by 18\textsuperscript{th} century emancipation and enlightenment ideas – and ends the story with actual peasant sociography and folklore research, including also his own. It has influenced the coming generations of research workers. Still it was not a full size history of connecter topics. About ten years later -- in order to sum up researches concerning the traditional lore in Hungary -- a newly organized research group (Néptudományi Intézet) has published between 1947 and 1949 twenty historical essays on various fields: \textit{e.g.} folk theatre,
children's games, folk art, folk costumes, traditional law, folk belief, folk music, etc. They were designed as chapters for a new planned handbook (A magyar népkutatás kézikönyve ‘Handbook of the Study of the Hungarian Folk’), which was finally never published. The papers gave detailed research history, mentioning the most important publications. But there are shortcomings in the publications. Some topics were not covered (folk poetry, folk dance, etc.). And some authors did not give theoretical remarks or historical characterization of their material.

In this respect there have been only two exceptions.

A classical philologist, Károly Marót in his essay (“A népköltészet elmélete és magyar problémái” – Theory of folk poetry and its problems - 1949) is explaining his views on “common” poetry (közköltészet), underlining its “sublogical” (and not “prelogical”) character. Marót was a lonely scholar, and some of his views were similar to the English “ritual school” of Ancient literatures, and by Lucien Lévy-Bruhl’s psychology too. Marót praises Ortutay’s “individual in community” studies (see later). And in the last page Marót briefly refers to Karl Marx. (It is about a not-central topic, but it is one of the very few early references to Marx from the pen of Hungarian folklorists.) Later Marót made a bricolage of his views and Stalinism – a sad attempt, without any lasting influence.

István Tálasi (in the second half of the 20th century leading ethnographer in Budapest) in his paper (“Néprajzi életünk kibontakozása” -- The outfolding of Hungarian ethnography - 1948) dates back the predecessors of Hungarian ethnography from the 18th century, as exemplified by the descriptions of the “Hungarian state” by Mátýás Bél, an encyclopaedist and statistician. As among Tálasi’s contemporaries, he accepts the views by Marót, and a mild “functionalism” of Béla Gunda (professor of ethnography at Debrecen university.

In Hungary, like in other East European states, 1949 was a year of Soviet style of turnover. The “new” “Socialist” ethnography in Hungary did lip service to the political power, but in fact neither independent Marxist—Leninist, nor even Stalinist school was not much productive in Hungary. If the turn the papers of A Magyar népkutatás kézikönyve, we can draw the answer: Hungarian folklorists and ethnographers at that time were interested in their well accepted topics, and not in their “socialist” theory or criticism. Only a generation later evolved the first attempts of outlining folk traditions as direct products of the entire society.

If there is any (tacit) debate about the achievements of one time period in the history of Hungarian ethnography – the “Stalinist” period is such a one. By the 1950s the social sciences and the universities were reorganized, following the Soviet system. Ethnography and folklore have saved their positions: or even developed. Research institutes were


39 See the bitter personal remarks by Tamás Hoffmann: Mindennapi történelem az ütközőzónában. Miskolc, 1904. Borsod—Abauj—Zemplén Megyei Múzeumi Igazgatóság, 7-12, about the difficulties of making „new trend” researches. (Which, however, started only by the 1970ies.) In my summary here I do not discuss Hoffmann’ papers and other monographs properly, but I say I fully appreciate his European horizons, and social approach. Also I find it so sad that I do not notice any influence of his works for his colleagues.
created, the number and the volume of publications increased. Museums were centralized and supported. New topics (worker’s lore, socialist transformation of the villages, criticism of earlier social theories etc.) were forced. (With dubious result.) Ethnography was from time to time accused ideologically as narodnic.\textsuperscript{40} Hungarian ethnography as a whole was not nationalistic or chauvinist, and did not follow the German völkisch “national socialism” either. However, in a debate on “the actual problems of Hungarian ethnography” the leading folklorist, Gyula Ortutay uttered the opinion that the majority of Hungarian ethnography and folklore stood in the past close to the common people, and was of democratic character. \textsuperscript{41} Ortutay suggested that his research method (studying talented story-tellers as creative individuals) was also heralded by Soviet folklorists (which was less than half-truth), and while collecting folklore in 1930s, Hungarian folklorists loudly declared the hopeless pauperism of the peasants in Hungary, crying for social and political reforms.

In the thirties the populist writers (népi írók) and empirical sociologists describing the villages (falukutatók) gave a dark picture of the village, essentially different than that of made by folklorists and ethnographers. They were calling for agrarian reforms – but did not argue for a socialist revolution. During the years of Stalinism in Hungary, populist writers were criticized as “narodniks”, and rural sociology was declared as a useless and socially blind way of social sciences.

After 1956, (more precisely after 1963) the slow liberalisation of the Kádár regime gradually rehabilitated the sociology, the populist writers, and to ethnography and folklore were given new research possibilities. Before 1966 majority of the ethnographers and folklorists worked in the Ethnographic Museum (Néprajzi Múzeum) and the Academic Folk Music Research Group (Népzenekutató csoport)\textsuperscript{42} – both in Budapest. Finally in 1966 the academic research group of ethnography (Néprajzi Kutatócsoport) was inaugurated. It works also today, with dozens of research workers: who formed a next generations of folklorists and ethnographers. Originally the main projects were to write multivolume handbooks: a five-volume lexicon of Hungarian Ethnography (Magyar Néprajzi Lexikon – published 1977—1982) and an eight (nine) volume handbook of Hungarian ethnography (Magyar Néprajz nyolc kötetben – published 1988-2011). Both are collective works, however in some volumes the significant writers were

\textsuperscript{40} A term from the history of Russian social democratic party: emphasizing the lore and culture of the common people, instead of social revolutionary tendency

\textsuperscript{41} See: Ortutay, Gyula: A magyar néprajztudomány elvi kérdései. Ethnographia 60 (1949) 1-24. Ortutay was an eminent folklorist, also already from the 1930s with strong ambitions in politics of culture. He was (1947-1950) minister of „religion and education” in a the left-coalition government, steaming through (after extremely turbulent parliament discussions) the secularisation of church schools in Hungary. His published papers between 1945 and 1956 have not been studied yet from the point of view of social science motivations. The into English translated volume of papers (Gyula Ortutay: Hungarian folklore. Essays. Budapest, 1972. Akadémiai Kiadó) does not give a glimpse into his “theoretical” papers.

\textsuperscript{42} It was founded between the two World Wars, and was directed by Béla Bartók and Zoltán Kodály. Its major task was to systematize and publish the most typical Hungarian folk music (together with the texts, description of the games and customs, etc.)
not working at the research group. Both multivolume products show a very traditional understanding of folklore and ethnography. Most of the authors paid little attention to theory, terminology, comparative research, etc. (Needless to say, there are only some drops of Marxism therein.) With more than one hundred participants in the collective volumes, terminological and methodological unity was minimal. Some chapters are missing, and the twenty years of publication made the work mosaic-like.

The leaders of the research and the chief editors of the handbooks belonged to the same generation. Born around 1910, became professional scholars in the 1940s, they were originated from not-upper class background – but not from peasant families. They participated in various intellectual circles, waiting for social and cultural reforms (e.g. of the schools) but only some of them went ideologically further than private “salon-socialism”. Their heart-breaking impression in 1940s was the “traditional” Hungarian peasant misery. In Communist Hungary they did not welcome the “socialist transformation” of the village, accepting however a somehow better organized Hungarian cooperatives or state agroindustry (kolhoz = termelőszövetkezet, szovhoz = állami gazdaság). This generation underwent several forms and degrees of the political and intellectual terror. And when from the 60ties they could coordinate positivist researches, they followed the maxim: beatus ille qui procul negotiis. 43

Important publications, international conferences in the 1960-70s in Hungary followed one after the other. Hungary was blooming as the favourite among the East European Socialist countries in the eyes of the West. Linda Dégh, Edit Fél, Tamás Hofer, later ethnomusicologists, then ethnochoreographers, as György Martin with his immense collection of Hungarian folk dances (also in Rumania) – serve even today as internationally accepted models for further researches.

(Another) “Golden age” of Hungarian ethnography and folklore happened between 1966 and 1999. In those years not by the mainstream ethnographers, rather linguists, philosophers, literary critics, sociologists reported and followed new paradigms: as communication theory, structuralism, semiotics, hermeneutics or even post-modernism. Young folklorists have suggested new methods, but not a compact school was created by them, and gradually the novelty of those “modernization” was fading.

The person, whose destiny was to describe the history of ethnography from a “contemporary” point of view, was László Kósa, key figure in Hungarian academic life. He studied ethnography, worked both at the Research group of the Academy and at Eötvös Loránd University, and became Member of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences (representing now “culture history”). He was asked (in 1985) to describe the history of ethnography in Hungary, for the eight-volume handbook. Because of the slow publication pace, Kósa published his manuscript separately (1989). 44 In more than 300

43 Being an old person myself, it is always tempting to record anecdotes. But -- I find characteristic, when Ortutay praised Tálasi on his anniversary, summarizing the merits, he was uttering the following statement from Ovid’s Tristia: Bene, bene xixit, qui bene latuit ‘those lived correctly, who was hiding, and did not expose themselves’ – referring with melancholy to his own restless political ambitions. Ortutay and Tálasi were not personal friends, but Ortutay considered Tálasi among his colleagues as the most honest one.

printed pages, with rich references and bibliography. Kósa gives a succinct sketch of Hungarian traditional culture, mentioning the forerunners from middle ages until the 19th century. He gives a proper research history from about 1817 on. According to him the years between 1817 and 1872 can be labelled as “the age of romanticism”. From 1872 to 1933 he calls the period as “age of positive ism”. A new chapter (“the ethnography as national study”) deals with the years 1933-1949. Finally another chapter covers the years between 1949-1980. The benefit of Kósa’s book is the correct reference to events, institutions and publications. (I may disagree too: personally do not think the romanticism lasted until 1872, or that 1933 was a turning point in research history. But several dating systems and terminology could be valid on their place.)

The most interesting part of the book is its last, the “contemporary” chapter. Here Kósa had to evaluate both Stalinist and Kádárist years. He was careful in avoiding both too positive and too negative evaluation. The year of publication (1989) was a fortunate one: the last year of the “ancient socialist regime”. By re-reading the book (after a quarter of century), we find that the book paints a positive picture of the 150 years of Hungarian ethnography. Kósa’s views are clear, and his criticism is sharp and actual at the same time. In the final chapter he mentions two shortcomings. Anthropology, in the proper sense of the term, did not develop in Hungary. And the Tálası school of ethnography (thematic volumes of agrarian history problems) is useless, and nowhere on the earth was productive. Kósa urges to follow the then new German and Scandinavian trends – but in fact Scandinavians praised the “detailed ethnography of the proper peasants” (i.e. a factual description of villages and its inhabitants) by Edit Fél and Tamás Hofer and they were not produced any similar work.

It is a particular case, that the Hungarian Ethnographic Society (Magyar Néprajzi Társaság – founded in 1889, as one of the oldest similar societies in Europe) has always been the central forum of Hungarian folklore and ethnography. Orientation papers, publications, conferences mark the whole history of the society. It was obvious that for its centennial year again Kósa was asked to write the history of the society. His book is a close-up story of the society, with its archontology. The system of periods and theoretical remarks are the same, as in the above-mentioned work. I find acceptable when in the first chapter (pages 7-9, 101-103) he deals also with the similar Hungarian societies and gives a European glimpse. Kósa gives good hints for further studying the archives of the society – which was not yet followed.

45 The most thoroughly studied Hungarian village was Átány in East-Central Hungary. Millions of fieldwork data, specimens of the whole material culture, etc., building today a special collection in the Museum of Ethnography in Budapest.


There exists an interesting annex to the aforesaid. Kósa published (in 2001) a second edition of his 1969 book. At the introduction to the notes (pages 149-250) he tells the history of the book: it was “self-censored”, and then “censored” by the director of the Gondolat publishers.

In fact in ethnography there were only few taboo-topics. The editors were always afraid of committing *harakiri* by publishing innovative papers. But the censorship was uneven, sometimes just vague. Very personal motivations and jealousy helped always the censors.

Mostly the publishers’ elite hated the “free” thinking of the authors, especially, if it was close to reform-Marxism, or could be interpreted as Zionist. The unquestionable Marxist philosopher, György Lukács for many years was in “official” circles “revisionist”. When I published an essay on his lifework (most in Hungary!) I was shy and the title of the paper was “Whether Georg Lukács is a philosopher of Marxism or revisionism?” With a question mark. Who has read the paper, could grasp the answer. I was not much proud of my cowardice, but some years later somebody has found my published text, and turned against me in an open debate: what shall be “now” my answer to that political problem? It happened already some years later, so I could reply: Lukács has had a long-long tradition of pre-Marxism ad Marxism in his works.

The new edition of Kósa’s book added only some remarks to the “historical” chapters, but the last chapter (dealing with the second half of 20th century) was somehow reshaped. For the time 1985—1989 Kósa in general accepts the status quo of Hungarian ethnography, declaring that it must reshape its preferences. In 2001 he is less optimistic. He mentions some (“Anglo-American”) anthropologists, who did fieldwork in Hungary. He says that “social ethnography” was gaining more importance. As for criticism or theoretical remarks, he comes back to Péter Niedermüller’s review: which calls for a total

---


49 I know that procedure well. Kósa was more lucky (or more inclining), because his work was finally published. I had to edit a volume of essays by Ortutay, and I wrote an analytic biography for the book. The same director asked me to rewrite my complete text, because it looked „like a true history – and was thus dehonesting! “ It was never published, and my manuscript „disappeared” too. See: Ortutay, Gyula: A nép művészete. Budapest, 1981. Gondolat Kiadó. (With a bibliography of his publications.)

50 With some noble exceptions. István Király never erased any of my sentences. Gyula Ortutay was very sensitive in anything connected with him. But he never censored politically my texts. He helped much the “narodnic” colleagues in his institute. He disliked any modern trend in science and art. But he came and opened our structuralist conferences as well. And, leaving as quickly as possible, said to me at the entrance door: “Was I mild and nice enough?” He wrote once that the structuralism of Lévi-Strauss is continuation of his (Ortutay’s !) fieldwork in Szabolcs county...

51 My paper „Anthropology in the works of the young Marx” was never published in *Magyar Filozófiai Szemle* -- „because of some ill connotations with the actual Arab—Israeli war”! On the other hand my more critical paper about Engels and the prehistory was published without any changes in my test: Engels és az őstörténet. *Ethnographia* 82/2 (1971) 169-187.—and also in German: Friedrich Engels und die Frühgeschichte. *Acta Ethnographica* 21/3-4 (1972) 353-375. Thanks to Tibor Bodrogi, the ethnologist.
turn towards “anthropology” – and Kósa finds it as groundless. The years elapsed between 1985 and 2001 made their marks too on the new book. A subchapter in the first edition was entitled “Turnabout of the sciences in 1949”. In 2001 it reads “the attempt to build up the hegemony of Marxism”.

Kósa’s research history in both books is reliable and based upon facts, but he was unable to characterise the 20th century ethnography, its major theoretical attempts, or separate the shorter time periods, or name the methods of the coming new generations. International comparison was suggested – but not conducted. Even in the second edition not a post 1989 ideology was prevalent. Kósa complaints that no deep-going discussion was made concerning his books. It is sadly true. But we could repeat the same of the *Magyar Néprajzi Lexikon, Magyar Néprajz nyolc kötetben* etc. Often one’s impression is that those many-volumes works were not read at all by some of our colleagues. At the Chair of Folklore of Eötvös Loránd university, we published three editions of a university handbook of the Hungarian folklore. (The latest was *A magyar folklóre – Budapest, 1998*, Osiris Kiadó.) 659 pages, a general bibliography, with comparative references are on the pages 68-148, and each chapter has specific bibliography with, totalling more than 1000 references. In 2005 we published the first volume of a chrestomathy of Hungarian folklore publications (*Magyar folklóre szövegyűjtemény*, Budapest, Osiris Kiadó, 845 pages.) It covers for the theory important or by their method interesting studies from 1846 to the year 2000. It contains also classical texts of Hungarian ballad or folk song texts, etc. I never found any trace for its use by the colleagues.

During Stalinism and to a considerable degree during Kádárism too: scientific discussions, criticism and theoretical debates were often proclaimed or forced. But it was parody. The “official voice” was always victorious. The “academic” dissertations were submitted to an open discussion, just with mimeographed theses, but not yet with a printed work. (As it was the rule in elder university tradition.)

The debate often went from the actual question to ideology over. During the debate of my dissertation (“On aesthetics of folklore”, Budapest, 1972, with as official opponents two academicians: Gyula Ortutay and the philosopher József Szigeti) soon went on compromising problems. In my book I stated that folklore is the culture of the “oppressed class”, exploited by the ruling class. They asked me, if we are able to collect folklore from common people – does it mean that we do not live in socialist society, when the “ruling class” is per definitionem oppressing the capitalists, landlords, the clergy etc. I could answer that in order to describe the socialist Hungary as a class society, my task was only to describe the “class character” of the folklore.

---

52 I may refer here to an another, more personal, and typical case. In Budapest between 1970 and 1995 a 19-volumes lexicon of world literature was published: Király, István – Szerdahelyi, István (eds.): *Világirodalmi Lexikon*. Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó. I was responsible for the folklore entries (and for some other topics). A few years ago I was asked to republish my entries in a separate volume. Voigt, Vilmos: *A folklorisztika alapfogalmai. Szócikkek*. (Budapest, 2014. Equinter and Argumentum, 519 pages). After spectacular (financial) difficulties, finally the book appeared. I do not know of similar work (also in abroad): a single author tries to describe the ‘basic notions’ of folklore (of course, mostly of folk literature). Being the publication of the world literature, my point of view was comparative. Another bonus might be that one author presents there one system of terms and data. I do not want to repeat, what I feel about its use among my colleagues, either in 19 volumes, or in my own sample.
When Kósa mentions the lack of theoretical discussions, he might remember his own exams. To write a dissertation on furniture or black pottery was not “dangerous” – while, anything, which aimed theory and method, was sharply criticized – mostly by elder colleagues or colleagues in ruling position. But even this rule was not so simple. I remember the dispute of Péter Szőke’s dissertation, “the music of the birds”. (See his book: “A madárhang mint biológiai zene” – Budapest, 1967), where the “materialists” and “idealists” heavily fought against: whether the birds could utter in singing communication forms similar to human music? The debate was not on acoustic patterns, but on epistemology.

For some of us there was another fence against debates and criticism. As a young devil I started to read French structuralism. And on research history of anthropology and on Marxism as well. With one of my tentative papers I knocked the door of György Lukács, asking for his opinion and advices. In a ritual form, after the third phone call, he invited me to his home, and commented my writing. After some actual remarks in fact it was a lecture about Claude Lévi-Strauss’ *Anthropologie structurale* (of course, volume one, and probably in German translation). To my great astonishment, he knew the book pretty well (perhaps as the only person in Hungary). Lukács was very critical, repeating the then well known phrase: “structuralism is the last bastion constructed by the bourgeois before the victory of Marxism”.

To discuss folklore or anthropology with the Hungarian Lukács-school was not favored then. Hungarian neo-Marxist philosophers, as György Márkus, and his colleagues György Bence and János Kis wrote articles on magic, and anthropology of work and language – rejecting there structuralism as such. The philosopher György Márkus used the term “Anthropology” in a neo-Marxian way – without impact on Hungarian ethnography.\(^5\)

When one regrets the missing of “theoretical discussion” in Hungarian folklore and anthropology, he might blame the intransigent position of his colleagues. Not only Kósa, but the Hungarian ethnographers never absorbed those new theories: neither neo-Marxism, nor structuralism.\(^4\) And when the Budapest school of Lukács, and in general the neo-Marxism, was persecuted, no person with ethical values should criticize the Lukácsists openly.

All those are but not reason for excuse of the missing of theoretical debates in Hungarian social sciences. In the last thirty years there have been all possibilities open for free debates. Even the monthly *BUKSZ* (a imitation of *New York Book Review*) was initiated, offering several times topics to be discussed. The same can be stated about the quarterly *Replika*. As far as I remember – all the “comments” ended with mixed acceptance. The editors of the journals offered topics for fresh debate, but the majority of

---


\(^4\) It is anecdotic that Bence and Kis wrote a devastating critics on linguistic structuralism (in journal *Kritika* 1969, nos. 9–10) being one of the last of their publications in Hungary. The Communist Party expelled them from the scholarly *fori*, and afterwards no honest person dared to turn against them. When later we offered a possibility for re-publishing their article again – they rejected the possibility. See the remarks in my book on history of semiotics: Voigt, Vilmos: Bevezetés a szemiotikába. Budapest, 2008. Loisir Kiadó, 214-215.
the participants instead of developing the possibility, defended only their own old way of thinking. Or they said, what was heralded as a brand-new import-ware (as e.g. the necessity of “historical turn” in ethnography) had already happened dozens of years ago in Hungary.\(^5\)

Before commenting the actual situation of criticism in social sciences we go back to evaluate the already existing research histories of Hungarian folklore and ethnography.

After all – it is not extraordinary that the only book-length survey of Hungarian ethnography in a foreign language was written by Michael Sozan, a young deceased Hungarian—American. He left Hungary in 1956, and earned degrees as anthropologist in the United States. He conducted extensive fieldwork in a Hungarian village, in Burgenland, Austria, and, later, another village in Northwest-Hungary: a typical (and hitherto the only one) book describing the contemporary village in veins of American cultural anthropology: from old stone age to new kolkhoz age.\(^6\) Thanks to state research exchange program between US and Hungary he spent a year (1969-1970) as guest-fellow of Ethnographic Research Group of Academy of Sciences. There he got impressions about the “official” and “unofficial” history of Hungarian ethnography. The direct source of most of the information was Tamás Hofer, but Sozan as an individual was able to drive through his own visions. His book: The History of Hungarian Ethnography (Washington, 1979. University Press of America, vi, 437 p., with footnotes, index of names, a bibliography with more than 700 items) deals with the history of Hungarian ethnographic studies from the origin of European ethnography to contemporary situation in Hungary. It is a monograph, with close analysis of the facts. Of course there are some factual shortcomings, and misinterpreting simple facts. And I wonder, whether an average “American” reader, non-familiar with the cultural and political history of Hungary, can understand all the strange topics in the book. The book sometimes is too close to the Hungarian studies. It is more important that the book is full with clever remarks, beforehand unnoticed contacts, and is based on hundreds of carefully collected and referred facts. Sozan characterizes nearly all important Hungarian folklorists and ethnographers, who are mentioned also in research history by others. Sozan’s view is comparative, which makes even the statements he borrowed from other colleagues – functioning in different context.

It is “typical” that some of Sozan’s Hungarian colleagues disliked him after the publication of the book, because of the antinationalistic attitude of the author. E.g. (p. 148) Sozan mentions that in 1889 the official name of the central organ was “Ethnographic Society in Hungary” (Magyarországi Néprajzi Társaság), having at least dozen “sections” for the minorities; but after its reshaping (1895) the new name was “Hungarian Ethnographic Society” (Magyar Néprajzi Társaság); without “ethnic”


\(^6\) I do not list here the fieldworks in Hungarian villages by other „international” scholars. It would be a veritable project to summarize them.
sections. According to Sozan it was a sign of nationalism. He does not say that all ethnographers were advocates for nationalism, but within the Ethnographic Society a group can be labeled as “Hungary = little Europe”, was confronted with another group of the “Magyarites” (p. 147.). Sozan does not equate the mainstream ethnography in Hungary with “racism” or “chauvinism”, but he quoted from Hungarian ethnographic publications those well known slogans as: “thousand years old Hungarian state” versus the minorities “never being able to form an independent state” – Hungarian “overpower in culture” (kultúrfölény). To actual readers of my essay it is unnecessary to repeat: those slogans were virulent not only between the two World Wars (nonetheless they are frequented in today’s mass communication.)

Another controversy with Sozan was about the possible use of “social/cultural anthropology” in Hungary. Sozan urged for that instead of factualism of the ethnographers, a theoretically based “cultural anthropology” will be needed. He said that waste majority of research workers in Hungary not participate in long-term fieldwork. Sozan is thus blinded by the half-truth in both cases. Social anthropology and ethnography function into two different directions – and the one is not better than the other. For example an ethnographer--curator spending 40 years in a tiny local museum does not need to settle down in a neighboring village, in order to gain first-hand information about the area. If we want to make an exhibition about “types of construction of peasant houses in Hungary”, we simply cannot have to organize a years’ long fieldwork in 2000 villages! Human life is too short for that!

Sozan is critical also concerning the lack of interest for theory. It is true, but it is definitely not only a Hungarian phenomenon. The leading modern German ethnographer (who went over the “empirische Kulturwissenschaft”, later simply “Kulturologie”) Hermann Bausinger is similarly rejects the Theoriefeindlichkeit in his own country -- whereas others find just too much theory in the German Volkskunde.

Sozan’s book has more merits than faults. As for criticism I may say just two remarks. The book is still too close to the Hungarian circumstances. I could have preferred a concise book from the point of view of social anthropology. Secondly the book is descriptive and reporting: not theoretical or critical. It is bound to the practical system of ethnography and folklore in Hungary. In one word: what the Hungarian colleagues found “too much” in the book – I find “to little”. It is a pity that very few persons know the book, and only some have read it in fact. (It is a rarity both in the United States and in Hungary.) It could not reach its original task: by showing a mirror to change the ethnography in Hungary. Almost 40 years elapsed since its publication. Since then very much changed in Hungry. E.g. cultural anthropology (often only so-to-say “cultural anthropology”) has many prophets, students and publications. For them the

---

57 In order to illustrate, how difficult is to measure the differences between the 1889 and 1895 versions, I could add that the second version is closer to ethnography proper, while the first was a „general store”, offering folklore-folk psychology, material ethnography, physical anthropology, palaeoethnology, graphics as well. The change cannot be explained by any manifestation of nationalism etc.

book is an important assigned reading: a report from the last years of traditional ethnography and folklore in Hungary.

The latest attempt in describing research history of Hungarian ethnography and folklore is inseparable from the Research Institute (Néprajzi Intézet) at the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, and its handbook (Magyar Néprajz nyolc kötetben). The task of writing a handbook is as old, as folklore or ethnographic research in Hungary; in all plans there were empty places left for research history – not as an independent publication, or even without proper theoretical considerations beforehand. When the academic institute was finally established (1963--1966--1967, different years, according to some bureaucratic decisions), from the beginning its main project was to publish a multivolume “New Hungarian Ethnography”, referring to the older, four-volume handbook: A magyarság néprajza (“Ethnography of the Hungarians” - 1933-1937, also in two later reprints with minor additions). There were differences between the plans and the final sections of the published work, and research history was not dealt separately in either version. When the Néptudományi Intézet published the twenty papers (see above …) it was not clear, whether there will be a concise research history volume or not. In the following years -- in spite of Stalinist culture planning, not favorable for ethnography -- from time to time more or less elaborated proposals were made for an “introduction” book, with research history, and explain the terms. (Mainly the “new ones”. And when the Academic Institute finally was created, its project number one was the multi-volume handbook. Following the earlier four-volume handbook, two volumes each were scheduled for folklore and material culture, and, because of constant criticism that the earlier handbook did not pay attention to social culture (it is not the same as “social anthropology”, or village sociology) – a fifth volume was added. There was mentioned a “sixth” volume too, but from time to time following different topical intentions. At the end of 1960s it became clear, that the handbook will not be written during the coming years. With some “refinement” it was accepted that a lexicon will replace the handbook. Thus the five volumes of Magyar Néprajzi Lexikon before and after 1977 was the official work of the majority of research workers in the institute.59 They made smooth the editorial work. But a considerable amount of the entries were written by folklorists and ethnographers outside of the institute (and in fact unpaid). Research history occurs in the volumes statistically in sufficient percent – but they are uneven, often plain or vague. And they are about persons, institutions, publications – and only occasionally about theory. And such theoretical entries were written by different authors – and their views often did not fit together. If one reads my entry on komikum (‘comedy, Vol:3:249-250), there is no entry on tragikum (‘tragedy’). The definitions of nép (‘people, folk’ are of zigzacz character.

By about the time finishing the lexicon (1976) an enquete was made for planning seriously a six volume handbook. The sixth volume was scheduled to include the “neighboring sciences”, research history and a historical synopsis of the Hungarian peasant culture. The plan was made for 5 years (1976-1980), with was illusion. Soon became evident, that six volumes will be too much for the contributors, but too little for a

59 Originally it was planned only in two volumes, but the number of suggested entries flow over the editorial dams.) Still today it is world-wide the largest encyclopaedia of one people’s ethnography and folklore.
thorough description. Two more volumes have been added. Only the three (!) folklore volumes appeared somehow in time (1988—1990). Then -- mainly because of the financial crisis of the publisher (Akadémiai Kiadó) -- the typical “ethnographic” volumes were delayed. Finally the “first volume” (Táj, nép, történelem – “Landscape, people, history”) was edited. Because of practical reason the “first” volume was divided into two books: the second one was the “historical overview”, and the volume 1.1 contained the theoretical introduction and research history.

This functions as the actual research history, and by the importance of the handbook, today it is the “official” one.

It was Attila Paládi-Kovács (for a long time deputy director and later director of the academic institute, university professor of material culture at Eötvös Loránd university, and since a long time the only ethnographer as full member of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. And he was editor-in-chief of several volumes of the handbook. The first volume presents explicitly his views of research history.

In general the separate volumes usually have an introduction, giving the characterization of the research preferences of each. Often the descriptive chapters have also a short historical and theoretical introduction. Thus in the eight volumes we find already about hundred miniatures of research history. And they may correspond to three levels of research history: close -- medium-size -- general.

Volume I. 1. (1080 pages, index of place names, 200 illustrations, 114 color pictures, 38 maps, 285 drawings) is a bulky volume, published by the end of 2011. The first three chapters deal with theory and research history, altogether on 210 printed pages, not making a challenge in size for Kósa’s or Sozan’s books. The present construction of the work was finalized by the 2000s. At that time Paládi-Kovács asked the university professors of ethnography, folklore, and culture history in Budapest, for writing the research histories. László Kósa was first selected as author for the entire chapter, but he said, he has other urgent works to deal with. Thus finally in 2002 Paládi-Kovács took over the history of ethnography chapter, and he offered me to describe the history of folkloristics in Hungary. We (persons not working at the institute) got then only some years for submitting the texts of the chapters, that is the reason why I was unable to meet the deadlines. The manuscript I submitted to director Paládi-Kovács is accessible now (by inv. number 3493) in the archives of the academic institute. My other trouble was that

60 In the versatile history of the handbook this topic underwent the most spectacular changes. There was presented in various „synopsis”, with discussions – and without decisions. For a while a synopsis made by Tamás Hoffmann and me served as the „summary” for one separate book, under the supervision by István Tálas. For several years I repeated to say that for a „historical overview” I can but work concerning the Hungarian folklore, if the „material culture” part is being shaped. Unfortunately it never happened. But meanwhile I wrote several quasi-chapters, waiting for any time for a positive decision. See three volumes of collection of my papers: Voigt, Vilmos: Világnak kezdetétől fogva. Budapest, 2000. Universitas Könyvkiadó. – A folkőről a folklorizmusig. Budaest, 2001. Universitas Könyvkiadó – Magyar, magyarországi és nemzetközi. Budapest, 2004. Universitas Kiadó. A completed index of names is to be found at the end of the third volume. The subtitle of all the three books is: „Történeti folklorisztikai tanulmányok” (Studies in historical folklore). I am very thankful for the opportunity of thinking in them about the questions of “historical folklore”, historicity, etc.
I wanted to give a methodological introduction to the chapter, but it was disqualified as too long for the volume.

I find satisfactory, that the actual writers had about eight years for the writing time, and all of them work in the same institute, warranting a unified treatment and free personal access to discussions, and to institute’s library, being able to order the new books (also from abroad).

After a intimate history of making the volume I.1. (on pages 5-9) by Paládi-Kovács, he wrote a theoretical introduction (pages 11-37), which was focusing terms and topics as “the scope of ethnography”, the notions of the “people, folk” (nép), culture and local cultures, folk culture and popular culture material culture, folklore and folkloristics, the understanding of time in ethnography, cultural heritage, tradition, oral tradition, national culture and folk tradition. The author quotes not only Hungarian publications, and tries to involve modern works. In this way the important topics are presented, and in the other parts of the volume there is more room for descriptive research history. If we scrutinize the subtitles: there is no system between the terms – which is understandable in a multi-author summary. If the leading ethnographer makes clear the terms – it must not be same as his own system of thinking – but it should reflect the general acceptance of them in all the eight volumes of the handbook. The definitions and examples are clear and succinct.

The next chapter A magyar etnográfia tudománytörténete (“research history of Hungarian ethnography” on pages 39-125) was carefully divided into dozen of topical sections. It is repeating the generally accepted historical stratification in Hungary, sometimes correcting it. After the part “the forerunners” follows “romanticism and the time of the reforms (1822-1849)”, then “retardation and postromanticism 1850-1872”. “Evolutionism and constructing of “material ethnography (1889-1919)” and “material ethnography, ancient history, folk art (1920-1934)” are two pillars for the common Hungarian ethnography. “Ethnography of national science (1933-1937)” is described as a golden age of the researches. Institutions and their directors are carefully enumerated. Paládi-Kovács brings the study of “material culture” between 1949 and 1990. And the then coming years are labeled in cautious way only by year: “1990 on”.

The historical stratification is not far from the previous books (Kósa, Soran) as well. It seems to me that after two centuries the historical “milestones of ethnography in Hungary” became generally accepted. Sometimes political events, in other times important works in ethnography mark the boundaries of the sections. Theoretical issues do not occur in the headings.

The separate part of the book A magyar folklorisztika tudománytörténete “research history of Hungarian folkloristics” (on pages 127- 212, somewhat shorter than the “ethnography” chapter) is divided into six parts and written by six folklorists working at the institute. They follow the traditional time division – but, amazingly, some of them are marked by somewhat different years. Can you imagine that in such a close society, as of the Hungarian folklorists and ethnographers the end of one period was either the year 1919 or 1920? In the book for ethnography of the same age was marked as the time period 1889-1919, and for folklore it was 1890-1920, or when the ethnography has 1932 –1949 as a time unit, in folklore the parallel years figured as 1920-1945. The editors were aware of the differences, and we find (with comments) other time-slots in various parts of the book, but the editor of on the volume should have “unified” the years!
Both for the descriptive parts, the names and the bibliography could not be limitless. Still I think a wider horizon would have been better. The “new” history of literature in Hungary offered many up-to-date possibilities for historical understanding of Hungarian folk poetry. Apocryphal prayers, spells, incantations and magic texts published by Zsuzsanna Erdélyi and Éva Pócs have opened new ways to historical folklore in Hungary. Here and there, in the research history there are references to them, with praising sentences – but just the importance and novelty of those studies is not clear from the descriptions. Imola Küllős has already published three volumes of “written popular songs” (közköltészet) from the 18th century, often with comparative remarks (see her collected papers: Közköltészet és népköltészet. A XVII-XIX századi magyar világi költészet összehasonlító műfaj-, szüszé és motívumtörténeti vizsgálata. (Common poetry and folk poetry. Studies in vernacular songs in Hungary from 17th to 19th centuries. Comparative analysis of genres, sujets and motifs) – Budapest, 2004. It was a discovery of common poetry generations before, as it was thought about it before. Gyula Paczolay’s European Proverbs ... (Veszprém 1997) was quoted, but his more than twenty papers of treatment of Hungarian proverbs in old sources – are missing. I could continue the enumeration of omissions. Today it is late to lament – but a careful discussion about the “semi-final” form of the chapters in due time could have helped the reliability of the references.

I could think there are two different solution of the periodisation task: following the political turning years for the whole society -- or events directly referring to the main scholarly activities of ethnographers and folklorists. (Needless to say, I rather preferred for the I.1. volume the first alternative – and the second one for the other volumes of the handbook.) The impressive bibliography at the end of the volume (pages 893-1002, more than 3000 items) is also divided according to the several chapters. Perhaps by the final edition it looked more practical, but I could rather suggested one general and unified bibliography. At the moment the publications of Gyula Ortutay or Tamás Hofer can be found in three different bibliographies. My impression is, that many works closed to research history were omitted there. In bibliographies everybody looks after the own publications. I did the same, and I simply do not understand, how (e.g.) my booklet A magyar ősvalláskutatás kérdései (“Problems of the research of Hungarian Ancient religion” – Budapest, 2003. 107 pages) escaped the attention of the authors – since it is from the first page to the last, just research history. Above I referred to my “historical folklore“ books too. None of those is mentioned in the bibliographies. I could not think but that they escaped the attention too. I do not find it as hostile, or negligence -- I am only afraid that young generations do not read the publications, outside of their particular preoccupation. Finally there were some statements concerning the “Hormayr-school” (page 139), but neither the old, nor the recent publications about that topic were known for the author. More serious lack is that the international publications are very rare, even in case they have translated into Hungarian. Years ago we published volumes of the writings of Hermann Bausinger and P. G. Bogatyrev – in Hungarian translation. No sign that the authors ever used them. I find that kind of omissions typical, and not as personal bleak-out.

61 It is the more curious fact, since there exists a list of his papers: Varia Bibliographica Paczolay Gyula 70 éves (Budapest, 2000. Európai Folklór Intézet).
Bright star in contemporary Hungarian historical philology is the excellent *Magyar Művelődéstörténeti Lexikon* (Lexicon of Hungarian Culture History, ed.-in-chief: Kőszeghy, Péter, published in Budapest, 2003-2014 in 14 volumes, the last one is the “index” to the whole work.) It is a gold-mine for historical folklorists, with up-to-date international bibliography. … yet I do not find its traces in handbook volume I.1.

It is a maxim for good book reviews: not to deal with questions not included in the publication, but concentrate on what is in the book!

After the critical remarks I have to appreciate the book as a whole. It was necessary to write a research history for the handbook. Its historical periodisation imitated the common tradition. It characterizes the continuity and change of social situation. Its style is informative and without emotions. The data are reliable and checked through. However I should have presented the treatment of the key terms in a more precise way. There are only sometimes short biographies of the most important ethnographers and folklorists. It could be added very easily. From a scarcely references to István Györffy, Béla Gunda, Sándor Bálint or Gyula Ortu tay and others we can not fully understand their lifework. In several parts of the book institutions (as the Museum of Hungarian Ethnography) and publications (as *Magyar Népköltési Gyűjtemény*) are described: but there is either no “complete” evaluation of them. If we look for “international” bibliography, to the first glance the number of references is satisfactory. But a closer review show, that it is often only a polite gesture, and we do not learn, what the purpose of mentioning it was. (E.g. on page 175 “an international catalogue of motives of folk literature”(*nemzetközi népköltési motívumkatalógus*) was mentioned, but without direct quotation. I could not find in the volume I.1. the reference to the international folktale type index by Antti Aarne and Stith Thompson, nor its updated version by Hans-Jörg Uther. Perhaps the *Motif-Index* by Stith Thompson was in the mind of the author. But this six –volume book is not mentioned too. The “new” *Enzyklopädie des Märchens* (14 volumes, complete) is missing too. Its predecessor, *Handwörterbuch des deutschen Märchens* (unfinished, 2 volumes 1930—1940) appears on page 916. I can only forget this kind of “international” orientation.

The double first volume of the handbook follows the frame of the entire set. It is appropriate that it does not use terms, which are not mentioned in the volumes. The evaluation of methods and persons is the same as it was in the volumes.

In case of all the mentioned research histories the problem existence of cultural anthropology in Hungary was questioned, Volume VIII. of the handbook (*Társadalom “Society”* Budapest, 2000, edited by Mihály Sárkány and Miklós Szilágyi) was definitely not a product of Cultural (more properly: Social) anthropology. Attila Paládi-Kovács, who finally organized the volume, and himself wrote important parts of it, has carefully balanced the study of “historical” and “contemporary” peasants. It was not simply to be “ethnographical correct” in dealing with the years of Hapsburg Monarchy, Bougeois revolution, Hungarian Commune (1919), the years between the two World Wars. But it was much more difficult to describe the life of the peasants under the Stalinism, and later Kádárism. Finally the book has reliable information as regards the 150 years, but was made for a “grey book”, not stressing the social controversies (not to speak of “class struggles” etc.). Mihály Sárkány, one of the early social anthropologists in Hungary, wrote the introductory part, i.e. the research history. His erudite paper has only few and international remarks on social anthropology proper.
Thus it remained the inaccessed task of I.1. volume to bind or solve the ties with cultural anthropology.

Paládi-Kovács in the introduction to the volume uses the term “cultural anthropology” (and “social anthropology”), while discussing the various interpretations of the term “culture”. There the only Hungarian person he quoted, was the ethnologist Tibor Bodrogi (who borrowed the term from A. R. Radcliffe-Brown).

To sum up: neither the handbook, nor its research historical treatment helped the breakthrough of cultural anthropology in Hungary. Paládi-Kovács, describing the university teaching of ethnography, also mentions that in some Hungarian universities recently the term “cultural anthropology” became official during the last twenty years in Hungary – but he does not describe the circumstances, or the reason for that.

The history of cultural anthropology in Hungary is a short one and a long one as well.

From the 19th century the terms ethnographia and ethnologia were coined in also in Hungary. The first was a descriptive, the second a nomothetic term. The German-speaking countries frequented a dichotomy between Volkskunde and Völkerkunde -- the first was similar to the Hungarian néprajz, the second one referred to fieldwork in overseas. Étnológia in Hungary had similar bifurcations. After World War II the term etnológia was the official name for “Völkerkunde” in Hungary. In university Curriculum of néprajz at Eötvös Loránd University in Budapest László Vajda was reading courses in “ethnicity” (until 1956, when he left Hungary). Later in four semesters we offered lectures on anthropology of Africa, America, Asia, Australia and Oceania. The coordinator was Tibor Bodrogi, in close cooperation with Lajos Boglár. The teaching of ethnology belonged to the Char of Folklore (Folklór Tanszék). Thus, when I became the Head of the Chair, I offered to Hungarian “ethnologists” to develop it. Bodrogi and mainly Boglár were outlining the cultural anthropology project, together with Mihály Sárkány, László Borsányi, Csaba Ecsedy, Géza Kézdi Nagy and others. (Folklorists, ethnographers, sociologists and scholars from other social sciences supporterd it.) There were one-and-half, later two) teaching positions at the Chair of folklore, reserved for ethnologists.

From 1990 ethnology became fully independent from ethnography and folklore, and the new name was “Program in Cultural Anthropology”. Today they work diligently, with very many students at the Faculty of Social Sciences of Eötvös Loránd University (and the material ethnography and folklore teaching continuously is situated at the Faculty of Philosophy of the same university). In short, the actual unit of Cultural Anthropology has 27 years. Its architect was Lajos Boglár, and Tamás Hofer often held there regular lectures too.

Later the chairs of “néprajz” in Debrecen, Pécs, Miskolc added the term “cultural anthropology” to their title. When anthropological program in Miskolc university was opened, from the beginning they expressed the importance of “visual anthropology”.

I summarized the story in order to make it clear, why I shall not deal with research history of the of cultural anthropology in Hungary. It would need an entire description.

---

The same criticism was against Hungarian Ethnography and Folklore the lack of theory and method in most of their productions. I think, the accusation was never completely true, and between n 1850 and 2010 the situation has been more or less the same. There were always some Hungarian scholars, who had an eye on theory and method, and they usually with contacts of international trends. Evolutionism, comparative and historical philology, French sociology, psychoanalysis, later Marxism—Stalinism (stress on the second word), communication theory, structuralism, semiotics were introduced to Hungary too. Not only for folklorists (and in very limited amount for ethnographers) – also among linguists, literary scholars, historians. V. Y. Propp, Cl. Lévi-Strauss, A. J. Greimas, Yu. M. Lotman and others were soon and well accepted. But there was no direct impact of them upon the ethnography and folklore is Hungary. If in a “Handbook” of about 10,000 printed pages, there is no separate chapter on theory and method, and the direct treatment of those occurs in less than 10 pages (!) – it is correct mirroring as given in the handbook. As far as I know, there are two internationally accepted “research schools” originated from Hungarian folklore research.

In the 1930s Gyula Ortutay started to collect and publish folk tales of talented storytellers. He called its tudy of the “individual” in folklore. The way of registering folklore followed the same principle in Hungary at least for 40 years. Ortutay himself, and later his pupil, Linda Dégh made the practice of the “Ortutay school/ Budapest school/Hungarian school “ internationally accepted. Its facts are mentioned in the descriptive chapters in the handbook.

The term “Ethnosemiotics” was coined in 1970 by four authors: A. J. Greimas in Paris, Yu. S. Stepanov in Moscow, and – independently of one from the other, two folklorists : Mihály Hoppál and Vilmos Voigt in Budapest. Soon the ethnographer Imre Gráfik used the same notion. “Ethnosemiotics” in Hungary covers: (1) semiotic studies of folklore and ethnography, (2) folklore and ethnography studied from the point of view of the system of signs (semiotics). Since then there is only Hungary, where such research is going on, and its international acceptance is thanks to “Hungarian contacts”.

63 For current information see MAKAT (Magyar Kulturális Antropológia Társaság “Hungarian Cultural Anthropological Association), founded in Budapest, 1996/1997. From 2007 on organizes yearly conferences. In 2015 it was celebration 25th anniversary “Celebration Anthropology”.


Hungarian folk music, and later folk dance monographs are praised worldwide. But here I can not deal with that topic.

As for ethnography, Edit Fél and Tamás Hofer studied extensively a village, Átány (See above.) It is often mentioned in Europe and in the handbook. Folk dance and folk music studies from Hungary play important role in international scholarship. If we want to sum up, what we have learnt from the latest history of Hungarian folklore and ethnography, we can point to 4 questions.

1 It was absolutely justified to publish those chapters. In spite of the different authors the way of describing was all the same: representing the traditional way both in classification and evaluation.

2 It was a lucky coincidence that the volume I.1. followed the descriptive ones, and was written by about 2000-2010. Thus it was a retrospective portrait of the “earlier” phase of Hungarian ethnography and folklore. In Hungary in the life of social sciences the new political order (by after 1989) created a transitory age, with reshaping research preferences. To describe it in the handbook it was not necessary, since in the other volumes there was no evaluation of the changing of Hungarian society. For the authors of the folklore chapters there was the necessary distance – not from the past, but from the future after 1989.

3 What happened after 1989 different from the previous ages? I explained how cultural anthropology became independent and virulent in Hungary. Today the monopoly of Budapest or Hungary in general as against other research centers is evident. Rumania the number of ethnographers and folklorists is increasing, often they publish more than in Hungary proper. There research trends are evolving today. It should be described in an independent research history. Unfortunately in Novi Sad, Subotica or Komarno there work only some devoted scholars, but with enormous results, constant conferences and publications. In Forum Research Institute József Liszka and L. Juhász Ilona keep very close contacts with Slovak and German colleagues.66

In Rumania Just from the memorable events in 1989 the first twelve years’ researches in social sciences and culture were summarized, with one chapter about ethnography.67 Afterwards there was a conference of discussion about the book, with contributions also from Hungary.68 Both authors just mentioned the research group of “

---

66 A Fórum Kisebbségkutató Intézet Etnológiai Központja.


68 Mohay, Tamás: Adatok és szempontok a romániai magyar néprajzi kutatás tizenkét évéhez (Further data and views on twelve years of Hungarian ethnography (and folklore) in Rumania. Vol. III. of the above mentioned work, 38-64, (with further 300 references) 35-64.
anthropology of communication” (Kommunikációs Antropológiai Munkacsoport), and did not describe the differences and similarities with “tradition” researches. There is a continuation or report: for the years 2002-2013. 69

If we see the years of publications, can understand, why the handbook referred so shortly about the actual development of Hungarian folklore and ethnography abroad.

4. The handbook does not include minority ethnography in and from Hungary. It is a different topic, but it has always been a part of folklore and ethnography studies in Hungary. Also it is reply to the debate concerning of Hungarian “supremacy” attacks. (See above.) Without a detailed argumentation I mention only that from 1989 until today the Magyar Néprajzi Társaság has launched a series of yearbooks: Volkskunde der ungarländischen Nationalization – A magyarországi nemzetiségek néprajza. The Slovak and German volume editors were very diligent, the other were the less, or only collected papers for the possible volumes from time to time. The leading example is the “tüchtig” series: Beiträge zur Volkskunde der Ungarndeutschen (the latest issue: 30 (2015), the next one is at the printers). About 10,000 printed pages about traditional life of German peasants in Hungary is unparalleled in today’s ethnography in Europe.

Alas, Armenian, Greek, Bulgarian minorities were dealt sporadically.

In Hungary Gypsy lore and Jewish folklore are cherished topics, with hundreds of scholars and more publications. There are research history sketches about them, but I do not quote them now, because of lack of space. 70

On the other hand Hungarian immigrants (mostly to the United States and Canada) were often mentioned by Hungarian politicians – but were not studied in the proper way, and already from the end of 19th century. In the last half century fieldwork was conducted, and publications appeared. But we still need a summary of Hungarian emigrant’s lore to be done.

It is constantly failing in Hungarian publications the direct references to Hungarian folklorists and ethnographers, especially if their works are published abroad. Géza Róheim, Georges Devereux, Veronika Karády Görög are known in Hungary, but there is few response to their innovative thinking. In other cases the studies published far away from Hungary do not know the necessary amount of Hungarian data.

I promised to myself not write more than 30 pages. So I mention here in telegraph style, that “folk religion” (and not only “folk belief”) studies had enormous development in the last 40 years. One third of folklore or/ethnography publications, conferences mark that line. The eight-volumes handbook gave some references, or even dealing with the life of the members of smaller churches. But it was not shown as independent or important topic. “New religions” and “myths” spread today in Hungary two. There is no word about them in the research history.

---


70 It must not be without mentioning the life work of the Director of Rabbinic Seminar in Budapest, Sándor Alexander/ Scheiber and the fine Gypsy poet Károly Bari, with his books and dozen CD-boxes of genuine Gypsy lore, collected by him.
*And now: the rabbit from the high hat -- studying the studying of folklore and ethnography lead us closer to understand Hungarian folklife and folklore,

All the above mentioned retrospective facts it is obvious that Hungarian folklore and ethnography until now survived all the social changes, and is continuing its work. The research histories equally stress the traditionalism of Hungarian ethnography. It is positive, that it is not polarized by schools or terms. But it is not positive that it does not meet the challenges of our age. As a whole and in general it remained positivist and descriptive. Its impact is not too important upon the social politics in Hungary.

In a more accurate way in epistemology there is a difference between “research history” and history of a (social) science. The first is empirical and factual, the second is more theoretical a perspective. Because of my sources do not separate the two terms – I could not make a difference either. But – as I see – as regards Hungarian folklore and ethnography: the sum of such both “histories” will the next to same.
Introduction

To sketch the development of a scientific field in a given country, one can give the exact definition of the subject, outline the possible interpretative frameworks of the scientific field’s taking shape and development, describe the institutionalization of the science, the changes in these institutional conditions (e.g. the foundation of scientific societies, research institutes, university departments or the launching of journals, yearbooks, etc.), and the most important directions of research, the main topics and research projects, the activities of the field’s prominent figures. The role of the determinant theories and doctrines has to be also dealt with similarly to the practical issues of the scientific development. As demography – at least in part – can be regarded as one of the applied social sciences, in such a summary the complex interaction of ideas, theories, scientific research and population policies should be discussed in detail. Naturally, in a short overview we have to be satisfied with a compromise, first of all the focus will be on the second part of the 20th century and the last fifteen years, and instead of a deeper analysis of the above-mentioned factors a simple survey of theoretical frameworks, ideas, population policies, institutions, research projects and results will follow here. Necessarily, the approach and the selection of ideas, themes, authors are quite subjective, although there are important works which this attempt could utilize. It is also important that demography and population studies in a broader sense are often differentiated but in this summary the latter, more inclusive definition is used.

First of all, I have to mention the works of Attila Melegh concerning the interpretative framework and ideological background of (not only Hungarian) demography (Melegh 2002, 2006, 2014), and those of Tamás Faragó concerning the development of historical demography in Hungary (Faragó 2013, 2016), furthermore some articles summarising the situation of demographic research in Hungary (Klinger 1995, Csernák 1995) and a voluminous dictionary on Hungarian statistical science and population studies (Rózsa 2014). Jacques Dupâquier’s work is a very useful and inspiring overview on 20th century demography (Dupâquier 1999).

Demography or formal demography intends to measure and explore demographic development and the relations among demographic phenomena whereas population studies aim at better understanding
Frameworks of interpretation

Demography is a social science that deals with the size and structure of human populations, their changes over time by analysing demographic phenomena (fertility, nuptiality, mortality, migration). These can be discussed by examining demographic events (births, marriages, divorces, deaths, moves in space, etc.). Although the states were interested in the size and composition of populations living on their territory and so the demographic development of a given period was also important for them, the science of demography in a modern sense began taking shape from the 17th century onwards. Administrative and scientific interest was becoming more and more pronounced not entirely independently of each other. States’, churches’ and scientists’ intentions got more and more connected, which brought significant results about. The increasing attention paid to demographic issues appeared in part in the growing amount of sources produced by the governments (we have to think of different enumerations of the populations and first of all of population censuses and vital statistics), and in part in the development of the tools and methods of demographic analysis (the use of rates or the elaboration of first life tables, etc.). The development of demography can be described by the activities of a series of scientists working on the field in the 17–18th centuries (“the fathers of demography”: Graunt, Halley, Süssmilch, Malthus and others). All these can be linked to the intention of the governments to increase the power and capacity of states, in other words it resulted from the development of the modern state (the absolutism or “the enlightened absolutism” – particularly in the semi-periphery or periphery of Europe). The means of this political intention were statistical cognition and the taking shape of the science of statistics. Although quite clear political aspects stood in the background, the rulers, governments and their ideologists argued that the increase of power and effectiveness was common interest since it promoted the “common good” (bonum commune) (Őri 2003a 100). Demography in this respect was a typical product of enlightenment, and together with statistics it has remained an important tool of power so far. The connection between power as a user of statistics and demographic data and scientific research has probably remained more direct than in the case of other social sciences (Greenhalgh 1996. 30). Demographers have been more or less aware of this fact since the time of Süssmilch or Malthus or the creators of the first population statistics, although their position and views differed from one another. Therefore, the use of them in a broader context, taking economic, social, cultural and biological factors into account (see e.g. Multilingual Demographic Dictionary, 3.).

73 According to the Multilingual Demographic Dictionary (3) demography is “The scientific study of human populations, primarily with respect to their size, their structure and their development.” Or another, more detailed definition: “Demography is a science the subject of which is the examination of human populations, it discusses their size, structure, major characteristics by using primarily quantitative methods” (Chesnais 1992, 4).

demography for political purposes, the intention of influencing demographic development for the sake of some common cause is quite obvious. For instance, demographic research can provide governments with knowledge necessary for decision making on the one hand, while the analysis of population policy is a coherent part of demographic science on the other hand. Consequently, the interpretative framework of demography has not been unanimous so far, data collection and analysis without any reflection on ideological background, accepting the role of demography as a tool of power and regarding it as a useful means to identify “positive” or “negative” demographic processes and to influence them on behalf of the populations concerned, or forming extremely negative and pessimistic view on the role of the science in modernity were all characteristic points of views in the last decades. Whereas the two first cases appear to have been and are much more common, and demography cannot be considered an outstandingly reflexive field of science (Greenhalgh 1996. 32), recently many authors emphasize that population statistics, censuses, the use of those sources, and demographic analysis itself not simply demonstrate social conditions but also play an important role in constructing them. Demographic observation and analysis often classify people according to specific ideological and political aspects, construct social groups, social and ethnic identities, represent populations according to characteristic configurations, identify problems to be resolved and offer solutions, legitimate political intervention. Population statistics and demography make the mass of people measurable (i.e. population), and political control over them possible. In this way, demography can be considered an important source of power for modern states, the study of demographic ideologies, theories, the background and intensions of research, the utilization of results, population policies is not only an important field of social history reflecting on the development of modern states, but also helps demographic research itself by reflecting on the development and use of sources, etc.

Focusing on the demographic research in Hungary, we can draw the conclusion that reflexion on the development of population studies, attempts of interpreting the taking shape and altering focus of demographic research cannot be regarded as very common. Most of the researchers avoid the topic and concentrate on demographic analysis itself. Historians dealing with 18-19th century mostly touch the topic of demographic science with respect to the development of population enumerations and censuses (Kosáry 1983, H. Balázs 1989a,b, etc.). The problem of population policy is only a marginal one in their point of view as compared to the questions of church or education policy, and they more or less use the argumentation of the studied period when describing the birth of demographic science: it is considered a useful means to modify some “unfavourable” demographic processes in order to promote “bonum commune”. The framework of interpretation is the enlightened absolutism, where the increasing intervention of governments is not considered the control of states over subjects, the intention to form them useful subjects and citizens, to regulate their private life for the sake of the community (or the power itself) but an intervention on behalf of the

---

community which in part resulted from inner moral incentives.\textsuperscript{76} Others focusing much better on the development of demography describe a more detailed picture and demonstrate the intention of political control behind establishing population statistics and inciting the analysis of statistical sources (Dányi 1961, 1993, Őri 2002, 2003a, b). Attila Melegh was the first researcher in Hungary who utilized Foucault’s view on demography as a framework of interpretation around the millennium (Melegh 2000, 2002, 2006, 2014). Michel Foucault introduced the concept of biopolitics which emerged in the 18\textsuperscript{th} century as a new technique of power. The development of population statistics and the science of demography was a coherent part of this new form of power, which intended to control human populations not only in political but in physical or biological terms too. The goal of registration and classifying people was to explore and influence the biological characteristics of human populations (fertility, health status, mortality), and their marriage customs or spatial mobility. By the help of biopolitics modern states try to control and regulate the changes and composition of human populations in which statistical observation and demographic analysis played a very basic role.\textsuperscript{77} In 18–19\textsuperscript{th} century Hungary biopolitics as an interpretative framework can be used with respect to laws regulating the population’s spatial mobility, or the status of different groups considered marginal (Jews, Gypsies, beggars), or the categories used by different enumerations (Status or Conscriptiones Animarum, 18–19\textsuperscript{th} century population censuses) differentiating between “useful” and “useless” citizens on the basis of their efficiency in population reproduction or performance in the world of labour.\textsuperscript{78}

As we have seen, with regard to the genealogy of demography reflexive or critical points of views can be found in some cases, although this attitude cannot be considered general or very common. Concerning other themes, this reflexive approach can be found in some Marxist analyses of the development of demographic theories and ideas or dealing with the history of population and family policies (Dányi 1962, Dányi – Monigl 1986, 1988) but the analytic and critical attitude was directed primarily towards “bourgeois” authors and ideas (first of all Malthus and some of his Hungarian followers were the main targets). Beside that, the theory of demographic transition drew particular attention. Some authors dealt with the question as a whole by discussing the theoretic problems related to the transition (Andorka 1978, Dányi 1991a, Szentgáli 1991, Dányi 2000, Melegh – Őri 2003), while others focused on the practical difficulties of setting limits to the transitional process (Valkovics 1982, Szentgáli 1991, Dányi 2000). The characteristics of the demographic transition in Hungary were also discussed many times by stressing the heterogeneity of fertility in the pre-transitional period, the fact of early

\textsuperscript{76} See Kosáry (1983. 602–603) concerning public health policy, as a tool of lengthening human life span which is a clear sign of modern ethos according to many authors (Burguière 1974, Livi Bacci 1992). A more detailed summary of all this: Őri 2003a 97–114.


\textsuperscript{78} Concerning population censuses see: Őri 2003a 99–114, Őri 2002. 48–53; regarding 18th century laws on Jews, Gypsies and beggars or vagrants see: Őri 2006. 1108–1112, about the 19th century Hungarian demographer, József Körösy’s views on poverty and his suggestions relating to poor relief and workhouses see: Őri 2006. 1106, 1110–1114., about the whole question in the 19th century see: Gyáni 2002. 187–188.
birth control, and the gradual spread of fertility decrease the consequence of which was a relatively low fertility in international comparison in the 19th century as well as in the 20th century, and a low rate of decrease in the classical period of transition (1880–1910). But mortality was also high and began to decline relatively late (after the 1870s), and decreasing mortality did not precede everywhere the fall of fertility. All these resulted in a relatively low rate of population growth (between 1870 and 1980 the population probably doubled on the territory of the present-day country). In this way, by revealing the local characteristics of demographic transition Hungarian historians and demographers markedly criticised the “classical” transitional model. Interestingly enough, the theory of second demographic transition did not incite such kind of criticism: demographers often use it as interpretative framework of analyses referring to the demographic development of the last two decades without any reflexion (Melegh – Őri 2003).

**Ideological background and population policies**

Although the motives and the causes in the background could be different, in Hungary the most important element of the ideas related to population and population policies as well has been pro-natalism since the 18th century. In other words, attention was and is paid first of all to population growth, and it was considered its central problem how an appropriate level of fertility could be reached in order to ensure the increase of population or an even higher rate of increase. Beside pro-natalist point of view other approaches emerged only temporarily and with much less emphasize (Miltényi 1996, 476).

In the 18th century when Hungary was a part of the Habsburg empire ideologist and government alike considered population growth an inevitable means of increasing the power and military capacity of the empire and populacionism was the characteristic feature of thinking about population issues (Dányi 1961, 1993, Őri 2003a). The basic goal of the state was to ensure the growth of population in order to increase the number of tax-paying subjects or those who were capable of military service. Beside the pure increase of population, the aspects of the composition of population also appeared already in the second part of the 18th century, in part in the works of Joseph Sonnenfels who was the main ideologist in this respect, in part on the census questionnaires created in the period concerned (Dányi 1962, 1993, Őri 2003a 99–114). All the enumeration system created in the 1760 and 1770s was intended to separate “useful” and “useless” parts of the population (peasants, serfs, and all those producing on the one hand, and priests, migrants, vagrants, beggars on the other who were considered “unfertile” either in a demographic or economic respect). “Population policy” was based on these ideas where the main goal of government was to increase the “useful” part of the population. In order to reach this goal, emigration was prohibited or was linked to special permission, immigration was controlled and the enter of those was supported who had enough sources to settle down (not considering here the centrally organized policy of settling foreign labour force into the country). At the same time, enumerations were used for exploring the inner migratory movements of the population, the trends and direct causes

---

of population development (the changes in population size, the number of births, deaths and marriages, that of immigrants and emigrants), and on the basis of this knowledge different suggestions were elaborated to influence demographic phenomena (for instance by regulating marriages) or to make the system of enumerations more perfect in this respect (Őri 2003a, 99–114). Thus the main element was populacionism (increasing the size of population) but not at any rate, to ensure the appropriate balance of population growth and that of productive population or foods also appeared to be important. Later on, from the 1780s these respects were more and more left out of consideration, and pure military ones were stressed instead of them as it can be observed by examining the new census system (the “population census of Joseph II: Őri 2002, 2003b).

In the larger part of the 19th century much less attention was paid to population issues than earlier. The whole problem was regarded as more significant after 1867, the compromise between Austria and Hungary when the Hungarian part of the empire got the possibility for creating independent institutions (the establishment of a Hungarian Statistical Office which organized independently population censuses from 1869 onwards), and this made the emergence of some national interests possible. From this time up to WWI the former populacionist approach was completed by a nationalist element in a political entity where the bigger part of the population was not of Hungarian nationality. Population growth remained the main goal but population’s ethnic composition mattered even more (Dányi – Monigl 1986. 347, Miltényi 1996. 477). A considerable emigration to America, decreasing fertility observable in the period at least in some regions, unfavourable level of mortality together with the fact that the share of ethnic Hungarians did not reach the half of the total population gave some basis to this approach. Although other views also existed, for instance the liberal principle of not intervening in demographic development or Malthusianism at least partly represented by some economists, worries about population loss or the decreasing share and significance of Hungarians dominated the discusses on population prior to WWI.

In the mid-war period former discusses related to differential population growth and the necessity of a pro-natalist population policy further prevailed. At the same time, the whole context had considerably changed: after the war the country lost the two third part of her territory, demographic transition and first of all fertility decline became observable, in some regions the so-called single child system prevailed and the crisis especially deep in the agrarian sector from the end of the 1920s made these problems even more serious. The fear of population loss, or losing the country’s national character, the anxiety of modernity where peasantry of Hungarian origin represented the uncorrupted part of the population in contrast to those of “foreign” identity (German immigrants or Jews) or to urban population (partly also identified by the two mentioned groups) determined the discussion on population. In this context fertility decrease which was an obvious sign and sine qua non of modern social, economic and cultural development according to the theorists of demographic transition was the consequence of a corrupted national feeling and a starting point of the final decline of the nation. On the one hand, statisticians (Alajos Kovács, Miklós Móricz, Károly Schneller), sociologists (Ferenc Erdei, Imre Kovács), the so-called “populist” writers (János Kodolányi, Gyula Illyés), clergymen (Lajos Fülep, Géza Kiss), medical practitioners (János Hídvégi)

---

80 See about these: Melegh 2002, 25–29.
demonstrated and discussed the problem of the South Danubian single child system focusing on moral causes or the system of large estates which suffocated the region’s small-holders and enforced them to radically control their reproduction. One part of the authors stressed moral causes and clearly linked birth control to Hungarian ethnicity and Calvinist denominational groups talking about some kind of “collective suicide” of the Hungarian population. On the other hand, the eugenic approach also appeared in the period, aiming at raising the “quality” of the population. During WWII the common points of these two approaches (the identification of the par excellence “aliens” in the population of the country by the help of culturally based classification or openly racist discrimination) was strengthened and reached each other. It resulted in the discrimination, deportation and genocide of the Jews and Gypsies during the war, and the deportation of a considerable part of the German ethnic group after the war.

Population policy of the period appeared to be ambiguous: while it did not succeed in raising the level of fertility, high mortality decreased considerably from the 1920s onwards, principally due to establishing the institutions of public health-care system and the spread of vaccination. Therefore, infant and child mortality decreased continually together with communicable diseases being driven back (Dányi – Monigl 1986, 350). Pro-natalist policy first of all aimed at aiding the childbearing of the middle classes (family allowance to public servants from 1912 onwards, from 1937 onwards not only to those who had at least three children but those with one or two children, marriage loan for young couples: Dányi – Monigl 1986, 349). Thus – although the governments used to some extent the moral approach and argumentation of the above-mentioned intellectual discourses – their political practice was rather different from that since the target group of the pro-natalist policy was the middle-class opposite which the populist writers preferred the peasantry as the representative of the “real ethnic character”.

After 1945 the pro-natalist character of the discourses on population and the practice of population policy remained although its context had entirely altered again. First the intention of counter-balancing the war losses, later on prior to 1956 the preparations for a new war together with the lack of “baby boom” after the war formed this kind of approach. After 1956 the record low fertility of the country and the anxieties of population loss and ageing were the main motives of pro-natalism. In addition, it was supported by the rising level of mortality from the 1960s onwards and the perpetual population decrease, which began in 1981. Under these circumstances pro-natalism prevailed both in discourses and practice but its form changed a lot during the period concerned. In the first phase before 1956 population policy meant a very intolerant and violent pro-natalism characterised well by the ban of abortion and the stigmatization of those decreasing fertility or using birth control (Melegh 2002, 30–31). After that this direct and violent intervention was driven back and different indirect means were used to increase childbearing where incitation was stressed instead of repression. Another important aspect is that at the beginning higher fertility and rising number of births were the main goal without any differentiation but later on from the 1970s some neo-Malthusian elements and a sort of selective pro-natalism directed towards middle-classes or those with higher income emerged in population policy (Miltényi 1996, 478, Melegh 2002, 30). At the same time, a common feature of the whole period is that the prevailing

official discourse was dominated by modernization but it had also a competitive character as opposed to that of the “West” (Meleg 2002, 30). The other point was that according to the Marxist ideology population problems did not exist in themselves but only linked to given economic and political systems. Thus their existence was officially denied and ignored, the discussion about them counted some kind of oppositional behaviour (Miltényi 1996, 479). Regarding all those things, the possibilities of a public discourse on population issues (the level of fertility or abortions, the rising level of mortality from the middle of the 1960s, etc.) were strongly limited. Still from the 1960s onwards, the discussion on low fertility, and the high rate of abortions emerged again initiated by writers (Gyula Illyés, László Németh, etc.). Here population loss, a basically negative attitude towards life and the extinction of the nation were the main arguments for a pro-natalist intervention.

On this basis the long lasting elements of Hungarian family policy took shape from the 1960s onwards. On the one hand, there were some considerable success regarding public health care, the establishment and development of institutions, decreasing general level of mortality until the 1960s, the perpetually declining infant mortality or the improving reproductive health of women, the decreasing rate of abortions. On the other hand, a very generous system of family benefits was established the basic elements of which have remained so far. Beside special benefits for young couples to get an own apartment and loans under very favourable conditions, the raising and extending of family allowance, the setting up of childcare allowance (GYES in 1967 which meant a fix sum for mothers from the birth of their child up to his or her 3rd birthday) and that of childcare benefit (GYED in 1985 which meant a support received in the percentage of the former income up to the age of two of the children) were the most specific elements of the system. These means made for mothers possible to stay at home with their children for an extremely long period in international comparison. All these measures resulted in temporarily rising birth numbers in the 1970s and the stop of declining fertility in the 1980s, but completed (cohort) fertility did not reached the level necessary for the replacement of the population and the consequence was a continuous decrease of population from 1981 onwards (Miltényi 1996, 478–479).

After 1990, the change of the regime the basically moral approach to population issues survived among right-wing politicians and social scientists. Pro-natalism remained a basic element of that point of view but the aspects of population quality, the necessity of a differentiated population or family policy, the “social exclusion” of the lower classes were more and more determined on ethno-cultural basis (Meleg 2002, 34) or pro-natalism mixed by anti-natalism, anxieties for the well-fare system which is utilized by these lower classes with high fertility worsening the quality of the nation (first of all Roma population) has become well observable. Urban or liberal discourses were opposed first of all to pro-natalist intervention when regarding low fertility as an element of modern demographic behaviour (Meleg 1999, Meleg 2002, 33). But the basic

82 About this see the responses given by Hungarian intellectuals to the inquiry of the Hungarian Demographic Research Institute concerning the demographic situation and future of the country (Meleg 1999: the responses and the comments of the editor of this special issue).

The competitive and anti-western character in the arguments of the right-wing thinkers has also remained to some extent. They worry about the loss of national character and cultural identity, although the
characteristics of the family policy have survived the regime change even if its details and conditions have been perpetually changing since then. The stress sometimes is laid on the system of family allowances enjoyed evenly by all families independently of their income, or in other times on an extended tax relief more favourable for those with higher income. But the whole system permits an extremely long stay at home for mothers (up to the age of three of their children) and it can be regarded as quite generous as compared to the financial possibilities of the country. By contrast, fertility did not stop declining until the millennium, and it has been stagnating at a very low level since then.\textsuperscript{83}

\textit{Institutional conditions of demographic research}

Although the history of the science of demography has been strongly linked to that of statistics, and the discussion of demographic questions has been connected to the teaching of statistics at the universities, prior to WWII only the Hungarian Central Statistical Office (HCSO, established in 1867) dealt with professional demographic research. The Office itself produced the most important sources of population statistics and demography: it organized and carried out population censuses in every ten years, and has elaborated and published their material since 1869.\textsuperscript{84} The Statistical Office also collected data on vital events (births, deaths, marriages later on divorces and migrations), then it has systematized and unified data collection and storage for a long time. In addition, the Office organized several sorts of representative surveys of demographic character, for instance micro-censuses, surveys on the health status of the population or on fertility, family planning, etc., especially in the last fifty years (Klinger 1995, 254). Demographic data have been published in the different book series of the Office since the beginnings: in the ordinarily published volumes of the censuses or vital statistics, or in the annual volumes of Demographic Yearbook (\textit{Demográfiai Évkönyv}) since 1955.

demographic future of the country is a central topic for them, they refuse immigration (except for ethnic Hungarians from the neighbouring countries) as a solution for population decrease and ageing as being afraid of cultural changes and ethnic conflicts. From this point of view Western Europe is a negative example with serious problems caused by immigrant populations, a situation is to be avoided by any means.

\textsuperscript{83} A detailed summary of the family policy for the last two decades is Makay 2015.

\textsuperscript{84} It has a very important consequence: on the hand Hungarian statistics are considered of excellent quality regarding their content and exactness alike, on the other hand all individual material of the past censuses and vital statistics have systematically been destroyed. (There are only some important exceptions: the census material of some counties and towns prior to 1880, one part of the census material of Budapest from 1941, or the material of the 25 percent sample of the censuses 1970 and 1990, etc.). As for publications, only those data have been published at aggregate level (mostly by county, sometimes by settlement) which appeared to be interesting in the given period. The aggregated data of the censuses from 1880 onwards related to all settlements of the country have remained as an archive material in the National Archive. As a consequence, historical demographic research based on individual data and using modern multivariate statistical methods has much poorer opportunities in Hungary than in many other European countries.
Demographic data have also been analysed at the Statistical Office, first of all we have to emphasize the role of two units belonging to the Office: prior to WWII Budapest’s Statistical Office and after that up to the middle of the 1980s the research group for studying historical statistics within the HCSO’s Library. Both of them were the most important centres of historical demography in the given periods. Results of demographic research were published in the journals of the Hungarian Statistical Society which also belonged to the Office from 1923 onwards: in the Hungarian Statistical Review (Magyar Statisztikai Szemle) and the Journal de la Société Hongroise de Statistique published in French in the pre-war period.

The next important step of institutionalization was the foundation of the journal Demográfia in 1958. Annually four or three issues have been published in Hungarian so far, most of the papers focus on Hungarian demographic development but the articles of many well-known scholars of the international demographic science can also be found in journal. From 2003 onwards special issues have also been published in English, since 2007 one issue per year.

In 1962 the Hungarian Academy of Sciences established its Demographic Committee in order to organize and coordinate demographic research and to contribute to the dissemination of scientific results of the field. After that in the same year the establishing of the Hungarian Demographic Research Group was decided under the supervision of the Demographic Committee of the Academy and within the structure of the Statistical Office, which later on, in 1968 became a professionally independent Research Institute (HDRI), which however remained under the supervision of HCSO and the Demographic Committee of the Academy. Thus HDRI is one of the oldest independent research institutes of Europe, and the only one in Hungary that concentrates exclusively on demographic research. With the foundation of a professional journal, the Committee of the Academy and an independent research institution the institutionalisation of the research field has been accomplished but some considerable characteristics have remained so far. First the establishing of the above mentioned institutions was clearly linked to the perception of the demographic situation (first of all record low fertility in those years) which took place at the beginning of the 1960s. Demographic data were stored at HCSO and demographic problems were considered very sensitive in political terms, therefore it appeared to be reasonable to launch a new institution under the strict supervision of HCSO. Although the activity of HDRI was in

85 Founded in 1922.

86 The review published monthly is existing even now, (Statisztikai Szemle from 1948), it doesn’t focus only on demography, but it is significant in this respect too. Since 1997 an extra issue in English has annually been published (Hungarian Statistical Review).


88 See: http://demografia.hu/en/publicationsonline/index.php/demografiaenglishedition. English edition is not a simple selection of the other issues in Hungarian but an independent one first of all focusing on comparative studies on demography of Central and Eastern Europe.
theory independent of HCSO in professional terms, its first director between 1963 and 1977 was by no chance Egon Szabady (1917–1999), also the vice-president of HCSO and that of the Academic Committee at the same time. Szabady was an excellent organizer who chose prominent demographers as his colleagues often with no respect to their political reliability, but himself was quite reliable in this respect and must be considered a key figure of demographic research both in HDRI and HCSO in the 1960s and 1970s (Rózsa 2014, 645–647). In this way HDRI (together with HCSO’s Library for instance: Faragó 2013) was at the same time a politically strongly controlled place and some kind of political asylum where several excellent scholars could work on demographic research. Circumstances changed a lot in the next two decades, after 1989 the strict political control has been lifted, but HDRI as the centre of demographic research in Hungary has remained in the organization of Statistical Office. In this respect the institutional conditions of demography must be regarded as exceptional because on other scientific fields research is carried out by the institutes of the Academy of Sciences or by university departments.

Naturally, demography is taught at several universities, and it was so in the past too. But an independent department of demography has not been established so far. Demography appeared and appears at gradual level at some universities, particularly at the faculties of law in the framework of teaching statistics, or at the faculties of sociology, geography and medicines. These are mostly introductory courses taught for one or two semesters, thus one cannot earn a degree in demography. All those working on demographic research were not demographers originally but mainly sociologists, geographers, economists, historians, biologists, etc. Therefore, the substitution of the research field and the future of demographic science was and is always incidental. Since demography has not been included into the whole educational process at any university, there are hardly some students choosing demographic themes when working on their dissertations. Prior to the 1990s Statistical Office and HDRI could form good demographers from economists and sociologists who began working there but this capacity has weakened a lot since then. Everybody seems to be interested in demographic problems, but demographic research and professional views on population issues drew and draw a little attention, do not appear to reach decision makers or affect the public opinion. In the last couple of years some small changes took place that may give some hope in this respect. Beside Demográfiia and some other series of publications HDRI has issued the “Demographic Portrait of Hungary” in every third year which aims at the broader well-educated audience and being on-line accessible may be suitable for the purposes of gradual education of demography. The other development in the teaching of demography which may affect the future of demographic research is the foundation of a Doctoral School of Demography and Sociology at the University of Pécs at the Department of Sociology of the Faculty of Humanities (from 2013 onwards) where one can earn a PhD degree in demography.

Demographic research: prominent figures, projects and results

89 Three volumes have been published so far (in 2009, 2012, 2015). All of them have been translated in English (Monostori – Őri – S. Molnár – Spéder 2010, Őri – Spéder 2012, Monostori – Őri – Spéder 2015).
In spite of the above mentioned problems in the education of demography, a long series of the names of outstanding scholars should be listed here in order to demonstrate the development of demographic science in Hungary. Most of them came from another research field, and from the last third of the 19th century their activity was mostly linked to the Statistical Office. Before the foundation of HCSO demographers were generally amateurs or experts of other sciences interested in population development and collecting information on the country’s demographic conditions. In the 18th century the authors of the first descriptions of the country (mostly based on information collected when travelling or by their extended correspondence) rarely used quantitative statistical data in their works. Of them the names of Mátyás Bél (1684–1749) and Márton Schwartner (1759–1823) have to be mentioned in this short summary. The latter one already utilized statistical data too, thus together with István Hatvani (1718–1786) can be regarded as the first representatives of political arithmetics in Hungary. In the 19th century among many others András Fáy (1786–1864) continued their work when constructing the first life table in Hungary while Elek Fényes (1807–1876) described the demographic conditions of Hungary partly on the basis of data collected by himself. Károly Keleti (1833–1892) was not only the first president of HCSO but had an extended scientific activity too, with respect to demography his works analysing the census data from 1869 and 1880 can be considered significant.

József Kőrösy (1844–1906), the first president of the Statistical Office of the Capital was the first internationally well-known demographer in Hungary. He was interested in the demographic and health conditions of the rapidly growing metropolis, concentrating on mortality, public health, housing conditions, poverty, the spread of communicable diseases, etc. Beside organizing and directing data collection he published a great amount of books and articles, he was an active member of the international scientific life and participant of the international statistical congresses of the period. He developed the method of standardization to eliminate biases resulted from the different age composition of populations to be compared.

In the first decades of the 20th century and in the mid-war period Gusztáv Thirring (1861–1941)’s research on historical demography was of great importance. He was interested first of all in 18–19th century population history of Hungary, and made a considerable amount of historical sources available for researchers revealing the genesis and development of these sources at the same time. His work of basic significance in this respect deals with the population census of Joseph II (1784–1787), it was the first publication of the surviving data of the census together with the basic archive documents relating to the census published in the original (German and Latin) language (Thirring 1938). His son, Lajos Thirring (1899–1983) worked as the demographer and census expert of the HCSO, besides taught demography at different universities, so he inspired many demographers in the next period, after WWII, at the HCSO and in other places as well.

---

90 A detailed description of the development of statistics in Hungary can be found in Rózsa 2014, 13–38.

91 Some of his work available not only in Hungarian: Kőrösy 1876–77, 1885, 1889, 1894, 1895, 1897.

92 Naturally, this short description takes only some of the demographers of the period into account, those whose works and role seems to be long lasting and acceptable even now. This list of names is by no
After the war and prior to 1956, the reorganization of the scientific life, the reveal of war losses were the most important task and demographic research was limited and strictly controlled by political aspects. After 1956 the institutionalization of demography followed the path which we have already talked about. In this respect HCSO played a decisive role both in terms of controlling and promoting or inciting demographic research. The Statistical Office provided researcher with data suitable for demographic research, organized representative surveys beside censuses and vital statistics, made training in demography possible and made international relationships and cooperation available for demographers but all those in a strictly controlled way. Despite the shortcomings in demographic education shown here earlier, HCSO as demographic workshop with long traditions was able to provide statisticians working on the field with the appropriate knowledge, ensure them the opportunity of publishing their research results, having scholarships abroad or jobs at the different organizations of UN, particularly in Africa, Latin America or in the Near East in the 1960s and 1970s.

Strictly regarding HCSO, we talked about the organizing role of Egon Szabady. But beside him, a long series of excellent demographers worked at the Office. Some of them after starting their carrier at the HCSO have obtained a prominent reputation as demographer abroad. We have to mention in this respect György Acsádi (1924–2012), and Pál Demény (1932). Acsádi worked at the HCSO between 1952 and 1972, he was principally interested in the problems of mortality and ageing, working together with professor János Nemeshéri took part in the development of the method of paleodemography (Acsádi – Nemeskéri 1970). Later on he turned towards the questions of fertility, birth control and family planning, after 1972 lived in the USA, worked as demographer in Nigeria and dealt with the demographic problems of Africa, South America or Asia (Rózsa 2014, 44–45). Pál Demény studied demography at the University of Princeton, is the founding editor-in-chief of the journal Population and Development Review, was professor at several American universities and demographer expert and director at the UN’s Population Council’s Demographic Division. He deals with the problems of population policy, and is interested in global demographic development and Europe’s demographic future at the same time. His works of basic importance are about the estimation of demographic variables on the basis of incomplete data (e.g. for the past or the third world) by constructing life tables by the help of model tables. These works have become basic handbooks in demography (Coale – Demény 1966, 1967).

Others worked at HCSO while spent shorter or longer time in Africa, Latin America or Asia as the demographer experts of UN organizations. György Vukovich (1929–2007), who was the president of the HCSO between 1990 and 1995, dealt with all

---

93 John Hajnal (1924–2008), one of the mostly quoted social scientists was also of Hungarian origin, but spent almost his all life in the UK.
important problems of demography. András Klinger (1930–2015) worked at HCSO as a census expert and organizer and published on fertility, mortality, ageing, etc. Péter Józan (1935) and Ferenc Kamarás (1943) also spent their carrier at HCSO and contributed to the research of mortality and fertility in Hungary.

Two key figures of Hungarian sociology of the period were also connected to the HCSO and dealt with demographic problems at least in part during their carrier. Rudolf Andorka (1931–1997) worked at the Office from 1962 up to 1984 and in the field of demography his contribution is well-known and considerable in international comparison too. He applied the method of family reconstitution on the basis of historical parish record data when studying the problem of birth control in Hungary and succeeded in proving the fact of early birth control (end of the 18th century, first part of the 19th century) in the southern part of the country in the well-known region of single-child system (Andorka 1971, 1998). He also used the household typology of Peter Laslett, and together with Tamás Faragó, provided historical family and household research with Hungarian data (Andorka – Faragó 1983). It was extremely interesting that according to their result, in Hungary the occurrence of large and complex households (multiple family households by Laslett’s terminology) was linked to early birth control and so both questions have got a new perspective by turning the focus towards local ecosystems and inheritance customs instead of ethno-cultural character. Andorka’s book on fertility has become a basic handbook at many universities in the world (Andorka 1978). László Cseh-Szombathy (1925–2007) also spent a longer time at HCSO (till 1975) and contributed to the questions of marriage, divorce and family.

Another important workshop within HCSO concentrating on historical research was the Historical Statistical Research Group of HCSO Library (1954–1985). The members of the Group dealt not only with historical demography but their contribution was the most considerable in this field. The Library’s director, Dezső Dányi (1921–2000) concentrated on the revealing and publishing the most important demographic sources of the 18th century (Dányi – Dávid 1960, Dányi 1993), and was interested in the problems of demographic transition (Dányi 1977, 1991a, b, c). In this respect, the volume published in 1991 was the result of a longer effort to better understand the characteristics of the Hungarian transition the specialities of which we have already talked about (Dányi 1991d). Tamás Faragó, although dealt with every important demographic problem, first of all contributed to the studies on family and household structure and marriage customs in Hungary (Andorka – Faragó 1983, Faragó 1977, 1985, 1998, 2000, 2003, 2006). The social historian Gyula Benda integrated the method and results of family reconstitution into local studies enriching historical demography and micro-level social history as well (Benda 2008).

After the establishment of Demographic Research Institute in 1963 it has become the centre of demographic research in Hungary and this position has not changed so far. Demographic research was carried many times commonly by the Institute and the experts of the HCSO, and especially for the 1960s and 1970s it would have been difficult to separate the activities of the two institutions. The work of Vukovich, Klinger, Andorka and others was linked to that of the researchers of HDRI by many files. Regarding HDRI,

the physical anthropologist János Nemeskéri (1914–1989) must be mentioned on the first place, who developed the method of paleo-demography (the method where the construction of a life table is based on human skeletons) and his contribution is inevitable in the field of human biology and biodemography (Acsádi – Nemeskéri 1970). Kálmán Tekse (1932–1978) dealt with the problems of the spatial distribution of the population, then, beside the problem of demographic transition (Tekse 1969), with fertility and infant mortality problems in Africa and Latin America (Tekse 1968, 1970). József Tamásy (1919–1987) concentrated on the questions of family and household structure (Tamásy 1968). Károly Miltényi’s (1930) research field is family policy and economic and social aspects of demographic development. Emil Valkovics (1930–2000) was a distinguished demographer all over the world. He contributed to economic demography (Valkovics 1976), then turned towards mortality research and dealt with mathematical methods of demographic analysis. He was an excellent expert of using demographic models, table methods, was the mostly known and esteemed mathematical demographer in Hungary, the author of a basic manual of demographic analysis (Valkovics 2001). László Hablicsek (1953–2010) was mathematician, demographer who dealt with the methods of mathematical demography, population projections, mortality, ageing, and contributed to the problems of demographic transition too (Hablicsek 1995).

Concerning research projects, we have to mention the longitudinal fertility studies of long tradition at HCSO. Longitudinal marriage surveys have been carried out for nearly fifty years (since 1966) on the basis of samples of marrying couples, where couples have been interviewed in every three years (marriage cohorts of 1966, 1974, 1982 and 1991 – Klinger 1995, 258). At the same time, the 25% sample of census 1970 with complete female reproductive histories the individual material of which has survived till now made and makes possible to study fertility much deeper than at any time earlier, or provide also historical demographers with exceptional retrospective sources to analyse fertility decline in the birth cohorts born after 1900. Similarly, from 1970 onwards the population movement data (births, deaths, marriages and migrations) at settlement level are available digitalized at the HCSO which makes possible to analyse the basic demographic phenomena in a very rich geographic, social or cultural context. The problem of abortions was also studied for a longer time together with still births and spontaneous abortions. Similarly, a cohort study was carried out where a sample of those born in 1970 was followed concentrating on the relationship between the weight at birth and physical development, health status and intelligence (Klinger 1995, 259). It is important to mention that from the 1960s onwards life tables have been calculated for each year, which makes the study of mortality differences by spatial units or socio-professional status possible. At HDRI detailed examination of the physical and health status of the conscripted was carried out (Nemeskéri – Juhász 1982), and the attitudes of the population towards marriage, family life and childbearing were also examined several times together with births out-of-wedlock (S. Molnár 1982, Pongrác 1983, 1987, Pongrácz – S. Molnár 1991, 1993, S. Molnár – Pongrácz – Kamarás – Hablicsek 1998).

Until the regime change (1989) this model of demographic research controlled but also supported by HCSO gave better opportunities to carry out relatively expensive

---

95 Similarly to Vukovich, Klinger, Acsádi, Tekse, Tamásy and Miltényi also worked as UN experts in developing countries.
research projects as compared to university departments or academic research institutions. Beside the above mentioned projects, we have to mention here some books and series representing this favourable position and demonstrating the results. In the 1960s the basic handbook of demography has been written (Szabady 1965), which can be considered very useful even now if we take its chapters on methodology into account. The research group of the HCSO Library also published several series of periodicals surviving for shorter or longer time in the 1960s and 1970s with a lot of articles of great importance on historical demography. As a result of the collaboration of the Library, National Archive or HDRI, some basic handbooks and source publications were also issued in that period: the volume with the settlement level data of the Josephin census (Dányi – Dávid 1960), the book surveying the most important sources of historical demography (Kovacsics 1957), or the summary of the knowledge on the population history of the country (Kovacsics 1963). A decade long research on demographic transition resulted in the above mentioned volume (Dányi 1991d) summarising the experiences of family reconstitution studies, population estimations and macro level examinations of fertility decline in 19th and 20th century Hungary. Similarly, the demographic summary of the mid-war period was also prepared (Acsádi – Klinger 1965), whereas Rudolf Andorka wrote the Hungarian handbook of the family reconstitution method (Andorka 1988). All numbers of births, deaths and marriages of all settlements (parishes) of present-day Hungary were published for the period 1828–1900 (Klinger et al 1972–1984) and those of births and deaths for the period 1901–1969 (Klinger 1969).

After 1989 the financial conditions of scientific research became poorer which referred to HCSO and HDRI alike. At both institutions considerable reductions were made concerning the budget and staff as well. The number of researchers at HDRI was well above twenty before 1989, it was reduced to ten by 1994 (Csernák 1995, 289). The institute managed to survive only by the help of Hungarian and international research projects in that period, and this situation – although the project incomes of HDRI have been growing – has not basically changed since then. Similarly, after the financial and personal restrictions Statistical Office has turned more and more towards the fulfilment of its basic task, that is to say concentrates on data production instead of demographic analysis. At the same time, the relatively better financial and material situation of HDRI has not changed as compared for example to university departments. In contrast to this ambiguous situation, considerable results were born in this period too, which we cannot list here. Instead of that, we mention three volumes which may make the work done at the two institutions sensible. On the one hand a newer handbook of demography has been issued (Klinger 1996) as a result of the common effort of the demographers of HDRI and HCSO.66 On the other, a volume of a common Dutch–Hungarian research on ageing has also been published (Beets – Mlitenyi 2000). At the same time, the researchers of the HDRI gave a summary of the demographic situation of the country in a book written in English (Tóth – Valkovics 1996). Naturally, the fact that the institutions and the series of publications (among others the journal Demográfia) managed to survive the 1990s and the first years of the new century must also be considered an important success.

66 It was prepared as a textbook for the post-gradual course of demography held at the Faculty of Law of Budapest University (ELTE).
After the millennium the situation of HDRI has changed somewhat, and some successful data collection and database building projects ensured the continuous participation of its researchers in international projects, conferences, and the international relationships and reputation of the institution reached the level, at which it was in the 1960s and 1970s. A basic step in this respect was the participation of HDRI in the Generations and Gender Programme (GGP). “GGP includes a longitudinal panel survey (GGS) and a contextual comparative database and aims at analysing the causes and consequences of present-day demographic changes in Europe. Since 2009 the EU supports establishing a research infrastructure for GGP and the further development of the programme. Together with ten other European institutes, the HDRI also participates in this project.”

The collaboration aims at data-base building according to a unified form, and comparative analysis of fertility, partnership, entering adulthood, economic activity and intergenerational relationship. The Hungarian part of the GGS is the *Turning Points of Life Course* program. This is a longitudinal panel survey with four waves (2001, 2004, 2008, 2012) at the beginning of which 16,000 individuals were interviewed and followed up in time. It means that the researchers of HDRI can study demographic issues in an exceptionally rich context and can join the main stream of demographic research (dynamic, longitudinal analyses based on individual micro data). The above mentioned volumes of *Demographic Portrait* (Monostori S. – Óri – S. Molnár – Spéder 2009, Óri – Spéder 2012, Monostori – Óri – Spéder 2015) are partly based on traditional sources of demography (censuses, vital statistics), partly on the results gained from the *Turning Points of Life Course* survey. But HDRI participated in other important international projects in the last decade or at present (fertility: REPRO, ageing: MAGGIE, migration: FEEMAGE and SEEMIG, mortality: INEQCITY, intergenerational transfers: AGÉNTA, family and partnership: FAMILYPLATFORM, historical demography: MOSAIC, EHPS-Net). HDRI also takes part in a great European collaboration of the most important research institutions aiming at the dissemination of demographic knowledge (Population Europe). We consider quite obvious success the organization of European Population Conference by HDRI in Budapest in 2014 (the demographic conference of the European Association for Population Studies, the most important one in Europe). The other above mentioned step forward is the launching of the Demographic Doctoral School at the University of Pécs. At the same time, a new generation of researchers appeared in the last some years, some doctoral dissertations and other publications show their capability of using the newest techniques in demographic analysis.

**Conclusions**

97 http://www.demografia.hu/en/ggp


99 See: www.demografia.hu/en

Although the situation of demographic science in Hungary must be considered special in some respect, on this research field there were and are significant results and contributions to Hungarian and international scientific life as well. These special conditions consist of the missing education of demography at the Hungarian universities which is a great problem with respect to the substitution of the research field. Another speciality is the role of the Statistical Office in demographic research which makes it centralized, it was carried out by HCSO and HDRI in the past and mainly by HDRI at present. Naturally, this fact does not exclude that other important individual efforts and results emerged but HDRI is the only institution which exclusively deals with demographic research even now. By contrast, Hungarian demographers were in the main stream research at the end of the 19th century, and in the 1960s and 1970s as well, and HDRI’s participation in international research may also be considered significant and successful. The establishment of the Demographic Doctoral School as a newest development regarding demographic education may give better opportunities for scientific substitution too.
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APPLIED SOCIAL DISCIPLINES
Ferenc GYURIS

Fractures and redispositions: Hungarian geography from nation-building to communism and globalization

Introduction

Geography has had a turbulent history in Hungary since its establishment in the 1870s. It played a crucial role in nation-building after the Austro-Hungarian Compromise of 1867, including the justification of Hungarian imperial aspirations over the Balkans. After WWI as well as the immense territorial losses and national trauma resulting from the 1920 Trianon Peace Treaty, geographers intensively took part in the process of creating a wide array of arguments to provide scientific justification for reestablishing the pre-1920 boundaries, a key political project of the nationalist-conservative elite.

Then, after WWII, the discipline was subject to massive Sovietization. This included a thorough reorganization, reconceptualization and radical changes in the scientific staff. Especially the human geography part, now focusing on material production and renamed ‘economic geography’, became dominated by descriptive empiricism. Initially, it was strongly permeated by Stalinist ideology, which was later gradually substituted by a quantitative-oriented mathematised technocratic approach in service of the modernist program of ‘actually existing socialism’. After the transition in 1989–90, continuities with the former period often proved more accentuated than ruptures. The last decade, however, has brought about an important demographic shift in academia, growing internationalization of the discipline, and major challenges through post-crisis austerity.

The aim of my paper is to reveal how these changes have influenced the institutional framework and the very notion of geography as well as the way the discipline is being practiced, and how the links between the discipline and political power have been changing in this process. My main focus is the last roughly seven decades, with its ruptures resulting from changes in the entire social, economic and political context in which geography as science was being practiced, and also the continuities over politically turbulent periods, which usually attract less attention in related studies.

In fact, after the first several decades, when geographers were conscious in taking a holistic approach and investigating nature and society together, physical and social strands of the discipline were hugely separated after the Communist turn. Moreover, their links in actual research practice have remained rather moderate since then. Therefore, I will mainly focus on the human geography part in this paper, yet with references to other domains of the discipline as well.

Hungarian geography before 1945: The historical heritage

The political shift after World War II and the emergence of the Communist dictatorship resulted in thorough changes in Hungarian academic life from the late 1940s onwards.
Geography was no exception, yet, its Sovietization and its development over the decades of Communism and post-Communism cannot be understood without considering the specific position the discipline had in the academic and political field before 1945.

In international scope, the 19th and early 20th centuries witnessed the heyday of geography as ‘unquestionably the queen of all imperial sciences’ (Richards 1993, 13). The discipline proved utmost efficient in fabricating forceful arguments for colonization. A key argument with utmost importance was presenting the ‘tropics’, which we can regard here synonymous to the main scene of the colonial enterprise, as hopelessly uncivilized, immoral and even pathological (in terms of both health and mentality) (Livingstone 2002). The claimed link between these negative attributes was established through a main concept of then geography, namely environmental determinism. This suggested tropical climatic conditions to be a direct reason for native peoples’ claimed immorality and their profound lack of the values of the Enlightenment, which was sketched up as a necessarily self-conserving situation for the relatively static nature of climate (Livingstone 2011). Hence, the conquest and unscrupulous exploitation of the colonies could be presented as a ‘mission civilisatrice’ (civilizing mission), where Europeans were doing their noble duty while bringing the ‘light of civilization and humanity’ to ‘barbarian’, ‘cruel’ and ‘savage’ people (Bullard 2000, Butlin 2009, Conklin 1997, van der Velde 1995). Besides, geography was expected to provide useful knowledge on how colonizers can organise their settlements and colonial life under environmental circumstances profoundly different to those in Europe. Last but not least, the vast corpus of maps, books, photographs and other materials produced by geography was expected to inform European citizens about the superiority of the colonizer and thus to strengthen national identity (Livingstone 2002).

Geography, including mapmaking, also played a key role in gaining and processing relevant strategic information about potential enemies and allies, and, therefore, got intertwined with intelligence (Heffernan 1996, Krasznai 2003). The discipline, together with history, was also considered the most efficient medium of letting citizens internalize the territorial aspirations of the state and national identity (Heffernan 2001, Schröder 2002).

This fixation with imperialism and nationalism opened the floor for a mushrooming of geographical societies over the entire continent (Paris: 1821; Berlin: 1828; London: 1830). Another outcome was the growth of geography departments at universities, and the increasing role geographical science gained in public school curricula (Heffernan 2009). The academic position as well as social and political reputation of the discipline kept improving during World War I and the following peace treaties. The winners of the devastating conflict considered cultivating geography as a major reason for successfully meeting their territorial goals, while for the losers the negligence of geographical studies seemed a terrible mistake and a main obstacle for fulfilling their territorial claims.

Hungarian geography was strongly embedded in this international context, and propelled by a diverse set of political aspirations since its institutionalization after the Austro-Hungarian Compromise of 1867. The first geography department was established at the University of Pest as early as 1870. Two years later, the Magyar Földrajzi Társaság [Hungarian Geographical Society] (MFT) was formed independently from the Österreichische Geographische Gesellschaft [Austrian Geographical Society] (ÖGG),
which had been established in Vienna in 1856. In 1873, the MFT launched its journal *Földrajzi Közlemények* [Geographical Review]. Over the coming decades, further university departments of geography opened their doors in Kolozsvár (now Cluj-Napoca in Romania) (1874), Debrecen (1914), and Pozsony (now Bratislava in Slovakia) (1918).

Similar to its foreign counterparts, Hungarian geography paid much attention to remote lands. In 1877, the MFT launched a three-year-expedition to Central, East, and South Asia, and in 1887–89 it organized another one to East African regions today belonging to Tanzania and Kenya. Later on, especially in the 1900s and 1910s, expeditions were sent to several countries in the Balkan Peninsula. These projects were propelled not simply by a rapidly increasing demand from the ‘learned’ public for adventurous stories, but also by geopolitical aspirations. The 1887–89 East Africa expedition was expected to prepare the establishment of a small Hungarian colony, an enterprise ultimately remaining unfulfilled, while expeditions over the Balkans had to assess the expansion of Hungary’s political and economic sphere of influence. Geography as discipline was heavily involved in these projects (Hajdú 2007).

Domestic research topics attracted less attention from Hungarian geographers at the time, and academic works on Hungary produced in foreign languages were also scarce. Furthermore, Hungarian geographers proved less efficient than their counterparts in neighboring countries in mobilizing international networks of political supporters among intellectuals of the Triple Entente. In the light of the country losing the war, Hungarian geographers made desperate attempts in 1918 to make up this disadvantage. The most remarkable initiative was that of Count Pál Teleki, a descendant of one of the most influential noble families in Hungary and Chief Secretary of the Hungarian Geographical Society since 1911 (Fodor 2006), urging in October 1918 that a peace preparation committee should be established. After some turbulent months, the Béke-előkészítő Iroda [Peace Preparation Bureau] was officially organized in August 1919, preparing maps and statistical descriptions, even in French and English, to articulate the Hungarian position at the peace negotiations, with Pál Teleki as one of the chief delegates from Hungary. In fact, the new national boundaries had crystallized during discussions held between the victorious powers as early as January 1919 (Romsics 2010), so the delegation had basically no effect on the outcome of the peace conference.

The 1920 Trianon Peace Treaty, however, not only resulted in huge territorial losses for Hungary, but opened a new epoch for geography where the discipline, together with other ‘magyarságtudományok’ [Hungarian Studies], gained massive political support from the nationalist-conservative regime and a privileged position in academic life. A hallmark of this was Teleki’s serving both as the chief geographer of the peace preparations, postwar Prime Minister (1920–21 and 1939–41), Minister of Foreign Affairs (1920–21), and Minister of Religion and Education (1938–39). To compensate for what was regarded an insufficient geographical substantiation of Hungarian political goals at the peace negotiations and to prepare for an expected new international round of political negotiations about territorial revision, new geography departments and geographical research institutes were set up. In 1926 Teleki established the Államtudományi Intézet [Institute of Political Sciences], whose objective was to produce and evaluate up-to-date statistical information from the neighboring countries in order to justify revisionist goals. Meanwhile, the 1924 secondary school reforms and the new
elementary school curriculum in 1925 put a substantial emphasis on geography and homeland studies (Győri and Gyuris 2012).

Considerable efforts were also made to popularize geographical arguments against the new national boundaries. This drive began as early as November 1918, when Teleki played an important role in organizing the Magyarország Területi Épségének Védelmi Ligája [League for Protecting the Territorial Integrity of Hungary] or Területvédelmi Liga [League for Protecting Territory] (TEVÉL) (Hajdú 2000). The renowned physical geographer Lajos Lóczy, a former president of the Hungarian Geographical Society (1891–93 and 1905–14), was elected its first president (Fodor 2006). The League also gained massive support from MFT (Hajdú 2000), and contributed significantly to the dissemination of geopolitical propaganda both in Hungary and abroad. Hence, although the League was dissolved after the ratification of the Trianon Peace Treaty (Hajdú 2000), it played a crucial role in introducing geographical arguments for territorial revision into the public revisionary discourse, which itself became, and in the entire interwar period remained, highly geographical (Győri 2011, Győri and Gyuris 2012). In sum, geography as a discipline gained a privileged position in Hungary after World War I, and it was now expected to actively contribute to justifying revisionary goals.

In light of Hungary regaining the southern part of Czechoslovakia in 1938 and the northern part of Transylvania in 1940 due to the Vienna Awards (with the support of Germany and Italy), Hungarian geographers considered their efforts resulting in the expected political goals. Therefore, the reputation of the discipline reached its peak by 1940. In 1941, however, Pál Teleki, who as Prime Minister signed a ‘Treaty of Eternal Friendship’ with Yugoslavia the year before, committed suicide when German troops were allowed to invade Yugoslavia through Hungary. Even in the coming years, Hungarian geographers, being firm in keeping their national-conservative conviction, took a highly critical stance toward Nazi German geopolitics as well as Fascist movements, which posed a major threat in their eyes to continuing territorial revision (Győri and Gyuris 2012). Teleki and his close disciples, for example, mainly followed the Vidalian tradition, which was initially invented by the French geographer Paul Vidal de la Blache at the beginning of the 20th century. This turned its attention to landscapes as specific outcomes of human-environment relations, and rejected the idea of geographical determinism, which claimed that social issues would be determined by physical factors, and was still quite widespread in international geographies in the interwar period (Livingstone 2002).

**The Sovietization of Hungarian geography**

After the devastating World War II, which Hungary finished on the side of the Axis, the country became a part of the Soviet occupation zone. This resulted in a thorough reorganization of science. Geography was especially strongly affected. Given that the new Communist approach to history identified the aim of territorial revision as the main reason for Hungary entering the war on the side of the Axis, a step regarded as unavoidable in this interpretation, Hungarian Studies in general and geography in particular were judged now ‘guilty science’. Hence, their prominent personalities as well as their basic notions and even their vocabulary were to be get rid of, while their institutions were also subjected to thorough reorganization or dissolution. As Győri
(2011) and Györi and Gyuris (2012, 2015) underscore, all four geographers being a member of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences were expelled. Leading geographers of the interwar period as well as their most influential disciples were mostly pushed to the periphery of academic life or forced to radically change their scientific focus. The Államtudományi Intézet, which became Teleki Pál Tudományos Intézet [Teleki Pál Scientific Institute] after its founder’s death, began to decline due to increasing political pressure. In 1948 it was renamed to Kelet-európai Tudományos Intézet [East European Scientific Institute], and then dissolved in 1949 (Romsics 2013). The Hungarian Geographical Society was also suspended the same year and its journal Földrajzi Közlemények [Geographical Review] was stopped.

The society was reorganized in 1952 and the Geographical Review was also relaunched the year after, but in novel form and along expectations of the Communist regime. As new flagship of the discipline the Földrajztudományi Kutatóintézet [Geographical Research Institute] was established in 1951 at the Hungarian Academy of Sciences on the basis of its former Földrajzi Könyv- és Térképtár [Geographical Library and Map Collection] (Győri and Gyuris 2015). Its new journal Földrajzi Értesítő [Geographical Bulletin], launched in 1950, became the first-rank publication platform of the discipline. This institutional change was in line with the Soviet concept of science, allocating the task of genuine scientific research predominantly to the Academy of Sciences and its research institutes, whereas universities had to focus on the education of professionals and vocational training (Aczél 1980, Péteri 1998, Győri and Gyuris 2012).

In order to free itself from its ‘bourgeois’ and ‘reactionary’ character, Hungarian geography was expected to adopt the theoretical and methodical framework of its Soviet counterpart. Soviet geography was continuously called ‘Marxist’ by its representatives, although it was rather founded on a ‘Marxist-Leninist’ conceptual basis and was to a great extent Stalinized from the 1930s onwards. This meant on the first place the emphasis put on applied research. In fact, Lenin’s main aim was after the October revolution and the civic war to revitalize the country’s economy and to transform it from a small-peasant economy through extensive electrification and large-scale industrialization (Lenin 1966). To his eyes, the successful realization of this goal and related actual projects such as the GOELRO or Gosudarstvennaya Komissiya pa ElektrifikatsiiRossii [State Commission for Electrification of Russia] necessitated the establishment of economic and spatial planning. As the work involved numerous Russian geographers, these projects played a key role in the formation of Soviet-style ‘Marxist’ geography (Radó 1957).

In fact, establishment of theoretical matters lagged far behind practical work in Soviet geography. Yet, its Marxist-Leninist (and, later, Stalinist) ideology soon resulted in crystallizing of some basic notions. The firm economic orientation of the Marxist ideology claiming that the economy forms the basis for political superstructure and Stalin’s concept about the different speed and regularities of natural and social development meant Marxist-Leninist geographers denied the ‘bourgeois’ concept of a unified geography, blaming it for ‘trying to expand the effect and validity of natural rules to human society’ (Radó 1962, 227), in order to provide ‘scientific’ substantiation for imperial and colonial politics of then capitalist great powers (Dobrov 1952). Hence, Soviet geography distinguished two strands of geography, namely physical geography (a natural science investigating regularities in the development of geographical
environment) and *economic geography* (a social science focusing on the rules determining the spatial allocation of population and production) (Gerasimov 1959). Although it was emphasized that such a differentiation was not a discrete but a dialectical relation of the two means, Marxist-Leninist geographers frequently ignored this point in order to avoid any risks of being judged ‘determinist’, thus, ‘bourgeois’ and ‘reactionary’. In consequence, cooperation between physical and economic geography became extremely weak by the 1950s.

In accordance with trends in the Soviet Union, Hungarian geography had to actively contribute to the realization of the regime’s grandiose goals. Physical geography, after identifying and understanding the rules behind processes in the geographical environment, had to transform nature in relation to the needs of the society. Economic geography was responsible for rational allocation of the population and production in space (Abella 1956). As concrete projects, the discipline had to contribute to the development of Hungarian urban and rural systems, to establishing a scientifically justified regional division of the country (‘rayonization’) in service of spatial economic planning, and the transformation of nature in order to improve agricultural production. The political leadership had high expectations. As Ernő Gerő, the right-hand person of the then Communist leader Rákosi Mátyás, stressed, the regime was aimed to ‘change the socioeconomic map of our country’ (Gerő 1950a, 576).

Geography also played a significant role in political propaganda, especially in primary and secondary school education. Pupils were expected to use theoretical knowledge in the solution of practical issues. Geographically relevant questions of economic planning, e.g. the introduction of new crops and the optimal spatial allocation of the forces of production, had a dominant role in the curriculum (Korzsov 1955, Simon 1955, Udvarihegyi and Gőcsei 1973). In the meantime, richly-illustrated books such as *A szovjet nép átalakítja a természetet* [The Soviet People Transform Nature] (1951) or *A sztálini korszak nagy építkezései* [Great Constructions of the Stalinist era] (1951), each containing Soviet researchers’ articles of popular science in translation, were released to libraries throughout the country.

Literature of popular science had the task to underscore that ‘the leading role of science of the Soviet Union is becoming increasingly clear’ (Magyar Természettudományi Társulat 1952, 23). Thus, books in geographical topics were also to inform the masses about the ‘achievements’ of the Communist regime and to indoctrinate them with corresponding ideology. The same was true for publications reporting on the goals of the economic plans, where maps were used extensively for propagandistic reasons. Marxist-Leninist geography was thus not only contributing to practical projects, but was also a tool for propagating official ideology. It functioned as an organic element of the Stalinist ‘mind industry’, and was aimed at ‘selling’ ‘the existing order’ (Enzensberger 1975, 72).

A firm consequence of the Sovietization of Hungarian geography was cutting most foreign links of the discipline that formerly was very active in adopting and utilizing the notions of especially French and German, but also British and American geographers. The discipline now followed the instructions of Ernő Gerő, claiming that ‘We have all reasons to weigh up and critically review what we receive from the West … and to deny automatically regarding it as the highest level of science’ since the USSR ‘has caught up with the most developed ones in the field of industries, agriculture, culture, arts and
science as well.’ (Gerő 1950b, 345–346). Hence, Soviet science and Soviet geography were the new examples to follow.

The implications of this international reorientation are closely mirrored by reviews and articles in Hungarian geographical journals, e.g. in the issues of Földrajzi Közlemények. In fact, this was not the only Hungarian journal concerning geographical questions, therefore it cannot perfectly represent the entire discipline, but it remained significant after the advent of Communism, even when it had a rival in Földrajzi Értesítő, the journal of the newly-established Geographical Research Institute of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences.

A total of 1,077 pages of reviews were published in Földrajzi Közlemények between 1918 and 1944, 48.1% of which referred to non-Hungarian literature. Reviewed foreign literature was obviously dominated by works in German (59.1% of all reviewed foreign literature), followed by French (12.6%) and English ones (11.2%) (Győri 2001). For the communist period, analysis of the 73 reviews published in the journal between 1953 and 1959 reveal some major changes (Appendix 1). Reviews of books from foreign authors, or at least with the contribution of foreign co-authors, added up only slightly more than one-third (37.0%) of all reviews. From that, eight texts (29.6% of all reviews of foreign books) arrived from Soviet authors and eight from Germans (including both West and East Germans). For reviews of French scholars’ works the same value was five (18.5%) and only two (7.4%) for Anglophones. Given that scientists from ‘friendly socialist countries’ outside the USSR, like Bulgaria and Czechoslovakia, also contributed with two reviews, geographers from the Communist Bloc took a considerable, although far not exclusive, stake.

The Sovietization of Hungarian geography is even more apparent in examining the distribution of articles by nationality of author. Less than 6% of the 3,994 pages of articles published in Földrajzi Közlemények between 1953 and 1959 were written by foreign authors. In the 1950s a total of 253 pages was published in the journal from foreign researchers or international teams, of which total 228 were written by Soviet geographers. A further ten pages were the result of a Hungarian-Polish cooperation, while the West was represented by eleven pages in only one article under the title “Geomorphology and Marxist thinking”, written by the French tropical geomorphologist Jean Tricart. British and American and German articles were totally absent.

The decades of post-Stalinist communism

Following the thorough reconfiguration of Hungarian geography along Stalinist principles after the Communist turn in 1948, the discipline underwent further changes after the turn of the 1950s and 1960s. One major reason for that was a gradual shift in the entire domain of science in the Communist Bloc and the Soviet Union itself. After Stalin’s death, some key academics cautiously but clearly gave voice to that Soviet science, contrary to former claims of the cruel generalissimus, fell short of its Western, mainly US, counterparts in many aspects. The first such warnings came from nuclear physicists, who as constructors of the nuclear and hydrogen bombs had the ear of party leaders (Ivanov 2002). While the representatives of other disciplines slowly began to air similar views, the new first secretary Nikita Khruschev supported that Soviet scientists gain access to and copy some politically not sensitive state-of-the-art Western
knowledge. After he was removed in 1964, Leonid Brezhnev also urged for a ‘scientific-
technological revolution’ and the widespread utilization of politically not sensitive sorts
of Western knowledge (Hoffmann 1978). Geography was no exception.

For mainstream U.S. geography, the 1950s witnessed the emergence of a brand
new epistemology. The new approach, nowadays usually named ‘positivistic geography’,
denied interwar human geographies, which many young American geographers regarded
as too descriptive, unable to make predictions and aid decision-making. Instead, the new
geography turned to extensively mobilizing quantitative data and applying sophisticated
methods of mathematics and statistical analysis in order to reveal spatial patterns with
‘universal’ relevance and law-like regularities (Barnes and Farish 2006, Barnes 2008).
There was a similar way of seeing behind ‘regional science’, a new discipline established
by the U.S. economist Walter Isard, which had the aim to quantitatively investigate the
spatial economy, reveal its underlying patterns and laws, and make mathematical models
(Barnes 2004, Isard 2003).

Although mathematical analysis was exiled from Soviet geography in the Stalinist
period for being ‘formalist’, thus ending up in hiding ‘the content and the process behind
form’ and naturalizing the basic ‘contradictions of capitalism’ (Markos 1955, 362),
around 1960 it suddenly gained legitimacy again with leading Soviet geographers making
claims about how Marx and Lenin emphasized the utmost importance of mathematics in
scientific work in general (e.g. Saushkin 1971). As two American authors underscored in
the U.S. translation journal *Soviet Geography* monitoring a diverse set of Soviet
publication forums for new developments, whereas mathematical articles were nearly
non-existent in Soviet geography journals in 1960, they made up roughly 15% of all
papers in 1968 (Jensen and Karaska 1969). Besides, a considerable amount of seminal
works in positivistic geography and regional science became accessible for Soviet
geographers, especially since many were translated into Russian in order to overcome the
language barrier. These developments enabled Hungarian scholars as well to get access to
top-notch Western works either in original, or in translated Russian edition (for a list of
such works see Gyuris 2014, 197). In fact, the post-Stalinist political leadership was not
in favor of copying every sort of Western knowledge. Instead, it expected scholars to
copy those parts of Western science that seemed politically ‘neutral’ and thus ‘objectively
valid’, and possible to be mobilized in service of a Communist regime as well. Yet, since
Western positivistic geographies and regional science consciously turned to mathematics,
their formulas, equations and curves were relatively easy to be taken as ‘value-free’ and
’applicable’ in the Communist context.

These changes coincided with that the Communist regime, which was
reestablished after the 1956 anti-Soviet Revolution under the leadership of János Kádár,
initiated a number of economic reforms during the 1960s, partly to increase the standard
of material well-being in Hungary, since in the eyes of the new leadership the permanent
shortage of basic goods and the strikingly low material standard of living in the Stalinist
period was a major reason for the revolution. After the first reform steps, which had the
support of Khruschev as well, in 1968 a more comprehensive reform package, the ‘New
Economic Mechanism’ was launched to open the floor for a moderate and ‘controllable’
form of liberalization. These initiatives badly needed the application of up-to-date
economic and spatial planning and mathematical modelling. Positivistic geography and
regional science could well find their place under such circumstances.
The major ‘centers of calculation’ (Latour 1987) for these new streams were mainly not at universities, but, in accordance with the Soviet model of science and research, in research institutes of the Academy of Sciences and the Országos Tervhivatal [National Planning Bureau], especially its Tervgazdasági Intézet [Institute of Economic Planning]. Moreover, only a part of the mostly young researchers getting involved in these new approaches was geographer by education and scholarly identity, while many of them arrived from the domain of economics and planning. The new streams brought into being new institutions and publication platforms as well. The journal Területi Statisztika [Regional Statistics] at the Központi Statisztikai Hivatal [Central Statistical Office] or KSH, which was launched in 1951 as Statisztikai Értesítő [Statistical Bulletin], renamed in 1956 to Megyei és Városi Statisztikai Értesítő [County and Urban Statistical Bulletin] before gaining its current name in 1968, gradually developed from a collection of official reviews to a scientific journal, providing space for a great number of regional science papers from the 1960s onwards (Dusek 2010). In 1984 the Centre for Regional Studies was established at the Academy, followed by the Committee on Regional Studies at the Academy of Sciences in 1986 (Rechnitzer 2009). Its journal Tér és Társadalom [Space and Society], launched in 1987, soon became an important multidisciplinary publishing platform for Hungarian scholars investigating the spatiality of society.

These new epistemologies in and around human geography provided some moderate opportunities for international networking with, and mobility to, even beyond the ‘Iron Curtain’. Three years after that the international Regional Science Association, holding its first conference in 1954 in Detroit, penetrated into the Communist Bloc with its first Eastern European meeting in Cracow, Poland, in 1965, the second such event took place in Budapest in 1968 (Isard 2003). (Although, as Boyce [2004] points out, several scholars from the ‘West’ boycotted the conference since it took place just a few days after the Warsaw Pact invasion of Czechoslovakia.) For human geography, the International Geographical Union (IGU) also held a regional conference in Budapest in 1971, and, yet few, human geographers managed to spend a semester or an academic year in the Western Bloc, e.g. the United States, with scholarships provided by the Ford Foundation or the American Council of Learned Societies (ACLS) (Probáld 1995, 2002; also cf. Bockman and Eyal 2002). Some Western links also came into being due to a moderate number of Hungarian geographers implementing the social geography of the Vienna-Munich school (Wien-Münchener Schule der Sozialgeographie) (Timár 2006), which had a strong interest in microscale social issues, especially in urban contexts, intensively applied sociology-related qualitative methods, and became a major stream in German-speaking geography (Weichhart 2008). These improvements enabled a sort of knowledge flow from capitalist countries to Hungary and the other way round as well.

However, the general framework of academic research, scholarly work and university education did not change considerably, what proved a massive obstacle to a thorough conceptual shift in human geography or a grade of internationalization Hungarian sociology or economics managed to achieve in these decades, not to speak about politically less sensitive ‘hard’ sciences. A remarkable imprint of this was the huge divide between the number of Doctor of Sciences (DSc) degrees awarded to geographers, including both physical and human (‘economic’) geographers, compared to representatives of earth and mineral scientists (Figure 1). Although the gap was slowly narrowing from 1:5.3 in 1962 to 1:2.0 in 1981 and 1:1.7 in 1986, the lag of geography
behind earth sciences proved a permanent feature of academic life in the communist period. Geography as a discipline also had a much more ‘exclusive’ academic hierarchy with considerably limited career mobility for those at lower levels, where the ratio of DSc to CSc was changing between only 1:8 to 1:6.3 in the communist era, whereas for earth and mineral scientists the same value was fluctuating between 1:2 and 1:3.

For demographic patterns, the average age of newly awarded Candidates of Science was remarkably stable (41.2 years). (The only exception was the 1950s with 47.0 years, mainly because it was awarded in the first years after its introduction in 1952 to several more experienced scholars, who were judged not to deserve the DSc degree yet.) Gender patterns were gradually changing, however. Although the circle of candidates remained highly genderized in general, the share of women candidates still increased a lot from zero (!) in the 1950s to one-eighth and one-seventh in the next two decades, and to almost one-quarter in 1980s (Figure 2). Remarkably there was no permanent bias in terms of physical and human (‘economic’) geography topics. The ratio of the two was constantly remaining in the interval from 2:3 to 3:2, with more physical geography topics in the 1950s and 1980s, and less in the 1960s and 1970s.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DSc, Geography</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSc, Earth and mineral sciences</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSc, Geography</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSc, Earth and mineral sciences</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSc/CSc, Geography</td>
<td>1:8.0</td>
<td>1:8.7</td>
<td>1:7.4</td>
<td>1:6.0</td>
<td>1:7.3</td>
<td>1:6.6</td>
<td>1:6.3</td>
<td>1:4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSc/CSc, Earth and mineral sciences</td>
<td>1:2.0</td>
<td>1:2.0</td>
<td>1:2.0</td>
<td>1:2.1</td>
<td>1:2.1</td>
<td>1:2.7</td>
<td>1:2.9</td>
<td>1:2.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 1** Doctor of Sciences (DSc) and Candidate of Sciences (CSc) degrees in geography and earth and mineral sciences (1962–1991). Own calculation based on volumes of the *Akadémiai Almanach* [Almanach of the Academy]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newly awarded Candidate of Sciences (CSc) degrees</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male (%)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>87.2</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>76.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female (%)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average age of awardees while receiving the degree</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(years)</td>
<td>Physical geography topics</td>
<td>Human (‘economic’) geography topics</td>
<td>Physical geography topics (%)</td>
<td>Human (‘economic’) geography topics (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>53.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2 Newly awarded Candidate of Sciences (CSc) degrees in geography by gender, age of awardees, and topics (1952–1991). Own calculation based on volumes of the Akadémiai Almanach [Almanach of the Academy]

Slightly but actually improving conditions for international communication with Western scholars also became manifest in the scientometrics of Hungarian publications in geography after the 1950s. In fact, statistics on reviews in Földrajzi Közlemények indicate not a linear change over the next decades, but two subsequent phases. In the 1960s the annual number of reviews of books with foreign authors or co-authors increased radically from 3.9 to 6.8, and their share of all reviews grew from 37.0% to 54.0%, whereas the distribution of reviewed works by nationality of the author(s) did not change radically. The share of Soviet books decreased (from 29.6% to 20.6%) and that of volumes with German and British and U.S. authors increased a bit (from 29.6% to 33.8% and from 7.4% to 11.8%, respectively), but this is far from a deep shift. Thereafter, the annual number of reviews dropped in the 1970s and 1980s (3.7 and 4.1) to close of the 1950s (3.9), while the share of Anglophone books from roughly one-ninth (11.8%) to more than one quarter (27.0% and 26.8%). As the numbers indicate, the main concomitant of this process was not the decline of Soviet or German-related reviews, but that of French books (from around one-sixth to 5.4% and 2.4%).

Data on research articles published from foreign authors also reveal a sort of two-phase development. While papers from Soviet authors made up 90.1% of all studies not written (solely) by Hungarians, this value radically dropped to only 11.8% in the 1960s. Yet, general trends kept mirroring similar geographical orientation as the overwhelming majority of the articles were still written by experts of the Communist Bloc (81.7%). Although Soviet-authored articles totaled only thirty-one pages in this decade, Földrajzi Közlemények included Polish material (58 pages), Bulgarian (31), Czechoslovakian (31) and Romanian (20) authors, and all the German publications (43 pages from German authors and a further 14 pages in German-Hungarian collaboration) were written by researchers from the German Democratic Republic. Moreover, articles in English remained absent. The capitalist world was represented by three French articles (13 pages), one Italian (13) and one Belgian (5). The stable orientation of the journal towards ‘friendly’ socialist countries thus remained. The 1970s proved much similar with 78.3% of all foreign articles received from socialist countries. Then the 1980s brought forth a thorough scientific change with the proportion of Western scientists’ publications increasing to 48.7%, now only a bit below researchers from socialist countries (51.3%).

Ruptures and continuities after the transition

The general political, social and economic changes in Hungary in 1989–1990 created new circumstances for scientific research and higher education in many terms. For geography, this became especially apparent in shifting education programs. Until the
early 1990s, studying geography at university or college level meant attending teacher education programs, where geography was one of the usually two majors. In 1992, however, geography was introduced as a separate education program on its own right, with the aim to educate scholars and professionals (e.g. for spatial planning and development). One year later the first geography PhD programs were launched (Probáld 2002), what hallmarked the gradual transition from the Soviet-style ‘candidate of science’ (CSc) system to Western academic models.

In many cases, however, changes were merely virtual or superficial. As Timár (2006) underscores, economic geography departments, the name of which referred to the Marxist-Leninist notion of regarding the economy, i.e. material production, as the basis for the entire social life, were now rapidly renamed to ‘Department of Social and Economic (or Economic and Social) Geography’, without significant changes in the actual curricula and the way geography as science was being practiced.

Major epistemologies in, and views about the objective of, human geography also mirrored strong path-dependence after four decades of the Communist regime. In the 1990s and even around the early 2000s human geography mainly embraced three ‘streams’ in Hungary (and in other post-Communist countries of the regions too). The first one was a semi-neutralized version of Marxist-Leninist geography, now free from explicit political ‘loadedness’ and Communist propaganda, but similar topics and notions of research. Its main focus was still a highly descriptive enumeration of the geographical location of ‘forces of (material) production’ such as mineral resources, agricultural raw materials, and labor force.

A second approach was regional science, extensively processing quantitative data by the use of mathematical and statistical methods, and building models and making predictions in service of spatial planning. Although planning quickly turned from a mystified buzzword in the Communist regime to a ‘scapegoat’ in eyes of many politicians as well as broad strata of the public for malfunctions of the socialist economy (see Bockman 2011), this did not last for very long. As Hungary took the path towards joining the European Union, what finally happened in 2004, the community-level redistribution of financial resources through a large-scale planning regime generated demand for expertise in, and rehabilitated the notion of, spatial planning. This opened the floor for awarding the first ‘doctor of sciences’ (DSc) titles in regional science (from 1995 onwards), launching the first PhD program in regional science in 1997 (Rechnitzer 2009), founding the Magyar Regionális Tudományi Társaság [Hungarian Regional Science Association] in 2002, and even renaming the Department of Regional Geography at Eötvös Loránd University in Budapest to Department of Regional Science in 2007.

Such changes in terminology indicate that the leading representatives of Hungarian regional science identify themselves not inside but outside geography. In fact, the Committee on Regional Science at the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, which was launched in 1986 in the Section of Earth Sciences (Section Nr. 10), moved to the Section of Economics and Law (Section Nr. 9) in 1999 (Rechnitzer 2009), whereas geography remained in Section Nr. 10.

Representatives of a third strategy tried to excavate interwar and early postwar traditions, which were either exiled from geography during Sovietization, or pushed to the periphery. Several scholars paid increasing attention to the Vidalian approach so influential before the Communist turn. This was a reaction to several issues, including the
economic determinist approach of Marxist-Leninist geographies and the resulting strict separation of physical and human issues, which led to that studies on interactions between human society and physical environment were becoming scarce. Bringing back the notion of ‘landscape’ also mirrored an attempt to break with the extremely branch-oriented approach of Marxist-Leninist geography, and also to pay more attention to other regions of the world, because geographical research in the Communist period was massively dominated by a narrow focus on the geography of Hungary, what seemed a hugely outdated approach in light of the world ‘opening up’ around 1990 (Probáld 1995). Many research topics reemerged, too, including political and ethnic geographies. These were banned after 1948, but events like the political democratization in Hungary and East Central Europe (with free elections and the competition of manifold political parties emerging as geographically relevant research subjects), the situation of Hungarian communities in neighboring countries, and severe ethnic conflicts in some successor states of Yugoslavia clearly underscored their relevance. Yet, scholars in many cases rather brought back the topics to the geographical discourse, not their actual approach, what resulted in that related works often were rather positivistic and descriptive (Timár 2006).

As an interesting contradiction, the fall of the ‘Iron Curtain’ and the end of the Communist regime did not automatically mean increasing internationalization, nor a radical shift in institutional structures and staffing policies in Hungarian geography. Mainstream Western scholars often seemed to handle East and Central Europe as the ‘provincial Other’ of Western Europe (Stenning and Hörschelmann 2008), where academic people are using outfashioned concepts and methods and are thus necessarily failing to produce any scientific findings either new or relevant for Western science. This attitude was especially strong in human geography for all the hard heritage the discipline had in Hungary (and in nearby countries as well).

Moreover, the relatively few Western geographers who came to Hungary to make new networks and promote cooperation, usually failed for finding no significant interest in meaningful collaboration beyond a few friendly discussions. The academic system in post-Communist countries was still strongly influenced by path-dependence and less rewarded international publications, projects or conference papers. This was accompanied by a linguistic barrier, since most scholars did not have the chance before 1990 to make longer scientific visits to democratic countries, so that they were less motivated to adequately learn and practice Western languages (Gyuris, forthcoming). Such difficulties proved especially hard in human geography, where globally leading publication platforms are even more concentrated in Anglophone countries than in ‘natural’ sciences (Paasi 2005, 2015). Furthermore, continuous austerities in years of the transitional crisis hugely eroded the financial resources allotted by the state to research institutes and universities, what posed growing material obstacles for international knowledge exchange, including personal mobility. On the other hand, Hungarian geographers who were open to join international projects, often found themselves in highly asymmetric division of labor, where their main function was to provide cheap scientific labor without gaining equal admiration with their Western colleagues (Timár 2004).

A speaking imprint of such contradictions is the changing structure of reviews in the journal Földrajzi Közlemények. Whereas in the decades of the Communist
dictatorship 3.7 to 6.8 foreign works (with foreign authors or co-authors) were reviewed yearly on average, the same value was only 1.2 in the 1990s and 0.5 (!) between 2000 and 2009. Although one has to consider that reviewers did not get any fee for their work after the mid-1980s\(^{101}\), the number of reviews of books by Hungarian authors did not decline compared to the Communist period. (Corresponding values in the 1990s and 2000s, 7.0 and 7.9 respectively, were somewhat smaller than in the 1980s, but higher than in the 1950s, 60s and 70s.) Declining financial support from the state, however, meant that up-to-date Western literature became very difficult to access for research institutes and universities, and the number of scholars having the opportunity to read and review them dropped. Likewise, papers from foreign authors were even more scarce after the transition than ever before since 1953. Between 1990 and 2003, non-Hungarian scholars contributed only 4.6% to the total length of articles, indicating a 50% fall after the 1980s and a roughly one-third decline compared to the whole of the Communist period.

Geography faced challenges not only with regard to international communication, but also in terms of social penetration. Geography lessons in primary and secondary schools play a key role in the discipline’s visibility outside the domain of academic life. Education reforms gradually eroded Geography’s position in school curricula as early as the 1960s, 70s and 80s, and the transition did not stop, but in general even accelerated this process (Probáld 1999). Declining financial resources to scientific work and the eroding purchase power of most social strata, both outcomes of the transitional crisis, rapidly undermined the prospects of popular science publications, a domain where geography was rather successful in the preceding decades.

Yet, the post-transition period was not a homogeneous one, not even from the perspective of geography. After the second half of the 2000s several new factors have shaped the discipline. A new generation of young scholars entered the academia, whose scientific ‘socialization’ took place after 1990, for many of them even after the turn of the millennium. For this, decreasingly genderized, generation (Table 3) the hegemony of English language in international science, ‘precarious’ financial schemes and employment patterns characteristic to the neoliberal age, permanent competition for research funding (increasingly provided by private and non-governmental actors, often outside Hungary), and taking a post-positivistic approach more constitute an ‘ordinary’ framework than a ‘heterotopy’, which is a typical perspective of senior scholars who got used to a radically different notion of science and the academia. The global crisis just accelerated these trends, since it resulted in severe austerity measures in Hungary and other East Central European countries as well, which further eroded state funding, traditionally the dominant pillar of academic funding in the region, to a level where it often falls short from covering the costs of the most basic requirements for the adequate functioning of scientific research and higher education. Yet, since 2008–2010 the annual number of newly defended PhDs as well as the share of those investigating human geographical issues has been decreasing, what presumably reflects both demographic trends in an aging society and further declining financial attractiveness of the academic career relative to jobs most private companies, and even public administration, provides to highly educated labor force.

\(^{101}\) I am grateful for this information to Ferenc Probáld, professor emeritus at Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, former head of the Department of Regional Geography from 1990 to 1994.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Newly defended PhDs</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All earth sciences</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human geography</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of human</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>37.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>geography (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 3** Newly awarded PhDs in earth sciences by topic and gender (2008–2016). Own calculation based on [www.doktori.hu](http://www.doktori.hu) (official website of the Országos Doktori Tanács [Hungarian Doctoral Council])

These changes brought forth new trends in how geography is being practiced. Scholars’ publication activities get increasingly optimized for globally pervasive scientometric measures, which are more and more dominating international as well as national regimes of scientific funding. A speaking example is the remarkable increase in the number of authors per article. For *Földrajzi Közlemények*, this value went up from what was typical over the preceding half a century (around 1.0 to 1.3) to nearly 2.0 in the 2010s (Figure 4). The need for increasing internationalization also resulted in that the journal of the Academy’s Geographical Research Institute, *Földrajzi Értesítő*, shifted in 2009 to publishing English language articles and was renamed to Hungarian Geographical Bulletin. In addition, the Central Statistical Office, while keeping its *Területi Statisztika*, launched in 2011 the English-language journal *Regional Statistics*, in 2014 increasing the annual number of issues from one to two. The discipline’s visibility has also increased through the geographical society’s popular science magazine *A Földgömb* [The Globe], which started in 1999, and witnessed rapidly increasing numbers of readers during the late 2000s. (The title goes back to the journal the society was publishing under the same name in the interwar period from 1929 until the last winter of WWII.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authors per article</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 4** The number of authors per article in the *Földrajzi Közlemények* (1953–2016). Own calculation\(^{102}\)

\(^{102}\) Values are including regular research articles, commentaries and editorials, whereas excluding book reviews, conference reports, as well as reports about the personal and financial issues and events of the geographical society.
Conclusion

Institutionalized Hungarian geography emerged in the 19th-century heyday of imperial sciences in Europe, which played a crucial role in nation-building and the justification of colonization. After Hungary’s huge territorial losses resulting from the Trianon Peace Treaty in 1920, geography gained massive political support from the interwar nationalist-conservative regime and a privileged position in academic life as a major representative of ‘Hungarian Studies’. Since territorial revision became the main goal of the political elite, new departments and institutes of geography were set up and school curricula put a substantial emphasis on the discipline.

Although Hungarian geography consciously kept distance from Nazi German geopolitics as well as Fascist movements even during WWII, after the communist turn in 1948 it was soon judged ‘guilty science’. Thorough changes in the academia swept away most of the prominent representatives of the discipline as well as its basic notions, and led to the thorough reorganization or dissolution of its institutions. In order to meet the expectations of the new Stalinist leadership, Hungarian geography had to get rid of its ‘bourgeois’ and ‘reactionary’ features and adopt the theoretical and methodical framework of its Soviet counterpart. The emphasis was put on applied research, active contribution to the realization of the regime’s grandiose plans and the dissemination of political propaganda. Physical and ‘economic’ geography (with ‘economic’ comprehending all social issues now) were separated, and international links of the discipline were turned towards the Soviet Union.

Yet, Soviet science underwent considerable changes after Stalin’s death in 1953, opening the floor for adopting certain forms of state-of-the-art Western knowledge. Although mathematical analysis was exiled from Soviet geography in the Stalinist period, it suddenly gained legitimacy again in the 1960s. Top-notch seminal works of U.S. ‘positivistic’ or ‘quantitative’ geography and regional science were translated into Russian as their highly mathematized content could easily be taken as ‘value-free’, ‘objective’, and thus ‘applicable’ in the communist context. These novel approaches found their way to Hungarian geography as well, especially after the economic reforms of the 1960s, which were reliant on spatial planning and mathematical modelling. New epistemologies brought into being new academic institutions and publication platforms, and enabled some knowledge exchange with the Western world, which publication patterns also reflected to some extent. Geography, however, did not manage to considerably improve its position in the scientific hierarchy, which was rather weak compared to earth sciences.

The general political, social and economic changes in Hungary in 1989–1990 created new circumstances for science and academia. Separate education programs of geography were launched and PhD schools were established. Changes in the content, however, were merely virtual and superficial in most cases. Actual curricula, major epistemologies and the way geography as science was being practiced did not alter a lot for a long time. A semi-neutralized form of Marxist-Leninist geography could survive. Positivistic geography and regional science, together with the very notion of spatial planning, gained new justification in the European Union with its massive institutional
framework of redistribution. Attempts to excavate interwar and early postwar traditions in order to break with the communist heritage often brought back relevant topics to the geographical discourse, but usually not their actual approach, and often resulted in firm positivism and descriptive works. The othering of East Central Europe by many Western scholars on the one hand, and path-dependence and financial austerities in the region on the other hand, hindered a firm improvement of international collaboration and led to that reviews of foreign works and articles written or co-written by foreign authors became scarcer than ever before since the 1950s. The position of geography in primary and secondary education also tended to decline.

Since the late 2000s a new generation of young scholars has entered the academia. Many obstacles for international cooperation are becoming weaker, publication patterns are getting increasingly similar to the globalized Western models, post-positivistic approaches are attracting more and more attention, and geography as popular science is also finding new possibilities, while it is facing more ‘precarious’ funding schemes and career opportunities and more severe competition for resources than ever.

Appendix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of books reviewed</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Hungarian authors only</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From foreign (co-)authors</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Including:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soviet</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British, Canadian, U.S.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of books from foreign (co-)authors (%)</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution of books with foreign (co-)authors by nationality (%):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soviet</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British, Canadian, U.S.</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of books reviewed per</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 1 Total and annual number of books reviewed in Földrajzi Közlemények and their distribution by nationality of authors by decades (1953–2016). Own calculation

| From Hungarian authors only | 6.5 | 5.8 | 4.8 | 8.7 | 7.0 | 7.9 | 9.3 |
| From foreign (co-)authors  | 3.9 | 6.8 | 3.7 | 4.1 | 1.2 | 0.5 | 1.3 |
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István Polonyi

SEVENTY YEARS ECONOMICS IN HUNGARY  
A Personal Review

A gazdaságtudomány 70 éve Magyarországon  
Szubjektív review a magyar gazdaságtudomány két emberöltőjéről

Ebben az írásban arra vállalkozunk, hogy felvázoljuk a magyar gazdaságtudomány fejlődésének utóbbi hetven évét, a negyvenes évek végétől napjainkig.

Az alcím azért ír szubjektív review-ról, mert az államszociálizmus időszakában nincsenek igazi jelzőkarók, amelyek eligazítanának arról, hogy kit is tekinthetünk méltó tudónak. A kommunista hatalomátvétel mindenre kiterjedt, az egyetemekre és az akadámiára is. A gazdaságtudományban a tagrevízió után a Magyar Tudományos Akadémiára éppúgy csak megbízható elvtársak veszik fel egymást, mint ahogy az egyetemekre is csak ilyenek kapnak oktatási jogot, amin nem is lehet csodálkozni, hiszen ez az egyik legkényesebb terület úgy az ideológia, mint a társadalom átalakításában. Tehát a kinevezések, a kiadott könyvek, a külföldi utak és az akadémiai tagság semmit sem mér, legfeljebb a rendszerhűséget, a megbízhatóságot. A korról írónak marad az írások, a nekrológok kritikai és szubjektív megítélése. Ráadásul, miután a rendszerváltás során nem történt hasonló tagrevízió – hiszen „nem tetszettünk forradalmat csinálni”103 - sem az egyetemeken, sem az akadémián, így az idős „elvtársak” sokáig meghatározták a rendszerváltás utáni tudományt is.

Az időszakot három részkorszakra tagolva fogjuk megközelíteni.

Az első az ötvenes évektől a rendszerváltást megelőző időszakig tartó korszak, amely a szovjet modell átvételétől a hatvanas évek végén induló gazdasági reform

103 Antall József, a rendszerváltás után az első demokratikusan megválasztott miniszterelnök elhíresült mondása, miszerint „Tetszettek volna forradalmat csinálni”. Antall reálpolitikusként hangsúlyozta ezt, arra utalva, hogy a teljes tudományos, gazdasági, politikai, és média elitet csak forradalom útján lehetséges leváltani, s ezt egy demokratikus kormány nem teheti meg. http://www.antalljozsef.hu/idezet_9
bukásáig, és a visszarendeződésig tart, s a kommunista káderek és a mellettük mégis kifejlődő néhány közgazdasági gondolkodó korszaka.

- A második a rendszerváltás körüli időszak, a reformközgazdászok világa.
- A harmadik pedig a rendszerváltás után folyatódó, újraformálódó magyar gazdaságtudomány korszaka.


I. Az ötvenes évektől a nyolcvanas évekig

Az ötvenes évek és azt követő évtizedek gazdaságtudományának formálódását három részben mutatjuk be: először a magyar gazdaságtudomány legfontosabb intézményeit és azok vezetőit tekintjük át, a Közgazdaságtudományi Egyetemtől a vezető folyóiratot (a Közgazdasági Szemlé) át a Közgazdaságtudományi Intézet és a Tervhivatalig. Ezt követi a koroskák kiemelt kőközgazdaszainak és munkáiknak áttekintése, majd néhány intézményi változás és személyiség bemutatása a rendszerváltás előttől.

a.) Az intézmények szovjetiség

Az 1948-as fordulat – amikor Magyarországon kizárólagosan és véglegessé vált a kommunista párt uralma – a gazdaságtudományban, illetve annak intézményeiben is fordulatot hozott.

Az 1948-as „elsőpró jellegű változásokat igen gyorsan vitték végbe. A közgazdaságtudományban a legkönnyebb feladat az emberek eltávolítása és a csekély számú működő intézmény bezárása volt. A Magyar Tudományos Akadémia 1949-ben esett át az „átszervezésen”. Minden rendes vagy levelező tagsággal rendelkező közgazdász tagja elvesztette címét és pozícióját. Ugyanez történt meg a csaknem összes közgazdaságtani egyetemi tanárral, akiket megfőszották tanszéki kivételt és előadói

104 Igyekeztünk elkerülni a wikipedia.org használatát a névtelenség miatt, (bár nem mindig sikerült).
engedélyüktől (*venia legendi*) is. Sokuk sorsa még rosszabbra fordult az ötvenes évek elején, mert formális vagy informális úton szakmai foglalkozási tilalmat érvényesítettek velük szemben (...). Számos tudós kutatót és oktatót beváltottak vagy videiké kényezetlakshelyre kitelepítettek. Az egyetemeken és más felsőoktatási intézményekben a közgazdaságtani tanszékek helyébe a „marxizmus-leninizmus” vagy a marxista politikai gazdaságtan tanszékek léptek. Oktatóikat a kommunista párt (...) aktiv tagjaiból toborozták.”(Szamuely – Csaba 1998)


Majd 1953-ban (Karl Marx halálának 70. évfordulója alkalmából) az egyetem Marx Károly Közgazdaságtudományi Egyetem elnevezéssel folytatja működését, a Népköztársaság Élnöki tanácsa határozata alapján.

1955-ben minisztérentanácsi határozat hozta létre az Egyetem Ipari Karát, ahol ipari, a Kereskedelmi Karát ahol bel- és külkereskedelmi illetve az Általános Közgazdasági Karát, ahol általános közgazdasági és pénzügyi közgazdasági szakos közgazdászokat képeztek.


Az egyetemek szovjet típusú átalakításának további következménye volt a kutatásnak és a tudományos minősítésnek az egyetemekről történő leválasztása. 1951-ben törvényerőjű rendelet írja elő, hogy „a tudományos utánpótlás tervszerű biztosításának első lépéseit a Sзovjetunió élenjáró tudományos képeképzésének példájára” a kezdő kutatók részére a tudományok kandidátusa fokozat kerül bevezetésre, mivel „az eddigi (régi rendszerű doktori, magántanári) fokozatok nem segítik elő kellőképpen tudományos életünk általános színvonalának emelését”. A rendelet előírja, hogy a tudományok doktora, és a tudományok kandidátusa fokozatok odaitélésére az Akadémián Tudományos Minősítő Bizottságot kell felállítani. A jogszabály azt is rögzíti, hogy a régi címek birtokosa a tudományos munkásságát a TMB. kérelmekre felülvizsgálja, hogy megkaphatják-e a tudományok doktora fokozatot, illetőleg a kandidátusi fokozatot. A rendelet leszögezi: „a régi rendszerű doktori címhez semmiféle állás elnyerése nem köthető, és e cím az illetmények vagy az előléptetés terén előnyt nem jelenthet.”

Ezzel lényegében a tudományos elitcsere megtörténik, és az akadémiai intézetek feladata lett a gazdaságtudományban is. 1954-ben alakul meg a Magyar Tudományos Akadémia nevének a tudományos minősítés központosítója lett és egyben kádikválasztássá vált.

A kutatás az egyetemeken megszűnt, és az akadémiai intézetek feladata lett a gazdaságtudományban is. 1954-ben alakul meg a Magyar Tudományos Akadémia nevén a tudományos minősítés központosítója lett és egyben kádikválasztássá vált.

alatt a Közgazdaságtudományi Intézet. Az Intézet létrehozásának célja, mint az alapító határozat írja az, hogy „segítse elő a gazdaságpolitika tudományos megalapozását, vizsgálja a szocialista építés során felvetődő kapcsolatait, a tervezés és a gazdaság-irányítási rendszer alapvető módszertani problémáit, a szocialista országok gazdasági együttműködésével kapcsolatos kérdéseket, valamint a kapitalista gazdaság új fejlődési jelenségeit. Tanulmányozza és elemezzze mind a polgári, mind a marxista közgazdasági elméletek fejlődését.”

Első igazgatója 1954-ben Friss István (1903-1978) lett, s maradt nyugdíjazásig, 1974-ig. Friss inkább kommunista káder szakember volt mint tudós.


A 48-as fordulat gazdaságtudományi hatásának másik szembenője volt, hogy a közgazdasági szakma lapját (amit a Magyar Közgazdasági Társaság adott ki) megszüntetik, s helyette Magyar-Szovjet Közgazdasági Szemle néven jelenik meg új folyóirat (amelyet a Magyar-Szovjet Művelődési Társaság Közgazdasági Szakosztálya és a Magyar-Szovjet Kereskedelmi Kamara jegyez, mint kiadó). A szerkesztőbizottságának elnöke: Csejkey Ernő, a Magyar Nemzeti Bank elnöke, társelnökök: Farkas Ferenc, Háy László, Vajda Imre, majd 1949-től a szerkesztőbizottság elnöke Háy László (aki megbízható moszkvita kommunista káder szakember) lett és megszűnt a társelnöki pozíció. (Csató 2004.) A Magyar-Szovjet Közgazdasági Szemle hasábajain jórész szovjet szerzők munkáival, vagy magyar szerzők szovjet példát elemző írásaival találkozhatunk.

1954 júliusában Berei Andor a kommunista párt Központi Vezetőségének tagja javasolta a Magyar–Szovjet Közgazdasági Szemle megszüntetését és egy új szakfolyóirat elindítását mivel a „közgazdaságtudomány hazai elmaradottságának egyik kifejezője, hogy a közgazdaságtudománynak – szemben más tudományágakkal – nincs önálló és megfelelő elméleti folyóirata.” A javaslat szerint „az új közgazdaságtudományi folyóirat megindítása feleslegessé teszi a Magyar–Szovjet Közgazdasági Szemlé.” A Szovjet–Magyar Közgazdasági Szemle megszüntetése „természetesen” a Szovjetunió nagykövéténék, Andropovnak a beleegyezésével történt. (Csató 2004.)

A Közgazdasági Szemle 1954 októberében indul újra. A bevezető írás tudatja „a Közgazdasági Szemle nem csupán a közgazdasági írások új forúma, hanem egyszersmind

106 A Minisztertanács 1949-ben létesítette az első Közgazdaságtudományi Intézetet, mint a 49-es rendelet írja: „a marxista-leninista alapon álló közgazdasági tudományok művelésére és a tervezzadlódéssal kapcsolatos elméleti kérdések kidolgozására” Ezt váltotta 54-ben az MTA neve alatt létesített intézet.

108 Lásd: http://www.nevpont.hu/view/4668
109 http://www.parlament.hu/kepviselo/elet/n009.htm

1947-ben alakul meg – s ez is a szovjet minta átvételét célozta - az Országos Tervhivatal (OT). A feladatát részletesen szabályozó minisztertanácsi rendelet szerint az OT hatáskörébe tartozik a népgazdasági terv kidolgozása, végrehajtásának ellenőrzése, a végrehajtással kapcsolatos egységes nyilvántartási rendszer szabályozása, továbbá a műszaki fejlesztés és a minőségi termelés terveinek kidolgozása és a tervek végrehajtásának ellenőrzése, valamint a tervszerű anyaggazdálkodás biztosítása. Mindezek felett az árak hatósági megállapítása is az OT feladata.


112 https://www.ksh.hu/mult_torteneti_kronologia
113 https://www.ksh.hu/mult_ksh_elnokei illetve http://nevpont.hu/view/8457
Végül is az ötvenes évek közepéig a magyar gazdaságtudomány a szovjet intézményrendszer-modelljének és ideológiájának átvételéről szól. Az intézmények vezető személyiségei (szándékosan kerülöm a tudós kifejezést) nagyrészt a Moszkvából hazatért kommunisták, vagy a hazai kommunista mozgalom megbízható káderei voltak, akik a párt- és állami vezetés, a felsőoktatás valamint a kutatóintézet között mozogva végzik ideológia-átformáló, ellenőrző feladatukat. És ez lényegében a rendszerváltásig nagyjából így is maradt.


114 http://1956.mti.hu/Pages/WiW.aspx?id=2
http://mek.oszk.hu/00300/00355/html/ABC03975/04216.htm
116 http://mult-kor.hu/cikk.php?id=10036
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előadóként vagy panelviták vezetőjeként vett részt. 1991-től a brüsszeli székhelyű Európai Gazdasági Együttműködés Ligájában a magyar tagozat elnökeként dolgozott.

Nyugdíjba vonulásától, 1984-től a Bécsi Tudományegyetem Gazdaságpolitikai Tanszékének tiszteletbeli professzoraként vezetett szemináriumot.” (Halm 2005). Több könyve jelent meg a rendszerváltás időszakában és azt követően is.

Az 1968-as reform pozitív eredménye Szamuley és Csaba szerint, hogy (1) megvalósult a tervutasításai nélküli tervgazdálkodás, ami a magyar reformnak a többi kelet-európai országokéitől eltérő specifikuma volt, (2) a termelőeszköz-kereskedelemben való áttérés, és (3) a gazdaság töbotszektorúságának, pluralizmusának megvalósulása. Viszont következetlen volt a külső és a belső piac összekapcsolása, s ez a bukáshoz vezető hiányossága volt a reformnak, mint az is hogy: (1) szigorúan a gazdaság szférájára korlátozódott, mégsem járt együtt a gazdaságpolitika céljainak a felülvizsgálatával, (2) de a beruházási döntések és finanszírozásuk a központi szerveknél maradtak. (3) Nem nyúlt hozzá a gazdasági és politikai intézményrendszerhez, (4) s a hivatalos ideológia változatlan maradt. (Szamuley - Csaba 1998)


A reform vezető személyiségeit menesztik. 1974-ben Nyers Rezsőt és Aczél Györgyöt felmentik kommunista pártbeli vezető tisztségükből; Ajtai Miklóst és Fehér Lajost miniszterelnökök-helyetteseket pedig nyugdíjazzák. Majd 1975-ben Fock Jenőt is nyugdíjazzák, s Lázár György lesz a miniszterelnök, s vele eljön a magyar pangás időszaka.

b.) A közgazdasági gondolkodók

Tulajdonképpen meglepő, hogy a fentebb bemutatott viszonyok között kialakulhatott a gazdaságtudományi gondolkodásnak a (vulgár)marxista politikai gazdaságtani fővonaltól többé-kevésbé független vonulata.

Mégis az ötvenes évek közepéhez igen fontos időszak abban a tekintetben is, hogy ekkor indul el annak a három ideális nézet között, akik a rendszerváltás előtti időszaknak – sőt részben – az azt követő időszaknak is – a legkiemelkedőbb hazai gazdaságtan tudósai. Ők: Jánossy Ferenc, Bródy András és Kornai János.

Jánossy Ferenc
Jánossy Ferenc (1914-1997) testvéreivel (akik közül Lajos később neves atomfizikus lesz) apja 1920-as halála után nevelőapukkal, Lukács Györggyel (a nemzetközileg is

117 Csurka (aki ekkor nemzeti ellenzéki és még nem szélső jobboldali író) mondja, hogy az Illyés Gyula által írt szellemének túlságosan optimista költői kép, „ma a pangás megbízhatóbban jellemzi életünket”. (Csurka 1986)

Alapvető kutatási területe a gazdasági teljesítmény és a gazdasági fejlettség mérése, valamint a gazdasági fejlődési trendek és azok törvényszerűségének elemzése.

„Jánossy Ferenc a hatvanas években közreadott két könyvével … [(Jánossy 1963), ill. (Jánossy 1966)] … és a nagy vihart kavart kvázi-cikkel119 (...) előbb a hazai közgazdász szakma, majd a marxista kutatók, újbaloldali egyetemi oktatók, közírók nemzetközi hálója érdeklődésének középpontjába került. Könyveit, cikkeit akkortájt a társadalmi-gazdasági fejlődés kérdései iránt érdeklődő laikus közönség is olvasta, itthon és külföldön egyaránt.” (Bródy 2002)

„Kidolgozva a gazdasági fejlettség mérésének új, pontos és jól ellenőrizhető módját, Jánossy szabatos leírását adta a növekedés mértékének. Ez volt első emlékezetes teljesítménye és a gazdasági mérés kérdéseit tárgyaló könyve, amelyben rendbe rakt a világ országainak valóságos rangsorát (Jánossy, 1963). Lehetetlenné tette a további ábrándozást és ködevést, legalábbis az akkori politika és politikusok számára.” (Bródy 2002)


Jánossy könyvében megvizsgálta az egyes országok második világháború utáni helyreállítási periódusait, és azt az akkoriban úttörő megállapítást tette, hogy a helyreállítási időszak „nem akkor ér véget, amikor a termelés ismét eléri a háború előtti szintet, hanem csak (...) akkor, amikor a termelés volumene újból megfelel a gazdasági

118 http://nevpont.hu/view/10524

fejlődés trendvonalának.” (Jánossy 1966:9) Utána pedig olyan pályán halad, mintha egyáltalán nem is lett volna háború. (Tarján 2000)

„Jánossy könyve első részében, amely a háború utáni helyreállítási periódus empirikus és leíró része, (…) különös hangsúlyt fektet az úgynevezett gazdasági csodákrá, amelyeket a második világháborút után Japán, NSZK és Olaszország élt át. Elmélete alapján (a hatvanas évek elején) minden bizonnyal a világon egyedül és elsőként megjósolta a (hetvenes évek elejére elérkező) háború utáni konjunktúra végét.” (Tarján 2000)

„Jánossy könyve második részében – amely az elméleti-magyarazó rész – abból a tényből, hogy a helyreállítás csak (…) addig a pontig tart, amíg a gazdasági fejlődés újból el nem éri trendvonalát vagy más szóval: egybeesik azzal, mintha nem is lett volna háború (…), levonja azt a következtetést, hogy ’a gazdasági fejlődés folyamatában feltétlenül léteznie kell valamilyen olyan döntő jelentőségű tényezőnek, amely csorobátlanul túlélő a háborút.’ ” Bebizonyítja, hogy „ez a stabil tényező maga az emberiség; nem az egyes ember, aki százezrével esik áldozatul a háborúnak, hanem az emberi társadalom, a maga teljességében, minden tapasztalatával, tudásával, ismeretével együtt. (…) A munkaerő, a termelőerők lényegében hordozója, a háború folyamán ugyan számszerűen csökken, de struktúrája, fejlettsége nemesak fennmarad, hanem az szakadatlanul tovább is fejlődik. (...) Ebből a tényből pedig objektíven következik, hogy a trendvonal a háború folyamán és azt követően történül tovább emelkedik. Ez a következtetés viszont már implicate tartalmazza azt a feltételezést, hogy a trendvonal meredekessé végző soron a munkaerő fejlődésétől függ.” (Tarján 2000)

Jánossy szerint a hosszú távú növekedési rátát, a trendvonal emelkedését a szakmastruktúra változásainak belső törvényszerűségei hordozzák magukban. A szakmastruktúra azokat a konkrét tevékenységeket, tevékenységfajtákat jelenti, amelyekhez az emberek legjobban értenek, elvégzésére leginkább alkalmasak. A foglalkozási struktúra azt jelenti, hogy az emberek ténylegesen mit csinálnak, függetlenül attól, hogy mihez értenek legjobban. A munkahelystruktúra pedig a termelési eszközök által adott munkahelyeket jelenti. Ennek a három struktúrának együtt kell mozognia.

A szakmastruktúra alakításában alapvető szerepe van az oktatásnak, a képzésnek. Ha a munkaerő szakmai és képzettségi összetétele nem tart lépést az ország egészének fejlődésével, akkor ez a strukturális lemaradás fekete erővé válhat. (Holló 1974)

Mint Tarján rámutat a szakmastruktúra koncepciójával Jánoosy lényegében rátalált a humán tőke fogalmára (Tarján 2000), (jól lehet nem ismerte annak irodalmát, teoritiját). Ősszegzésként két dolgot lehetne kiemelni Jánoosyval kapcsolatban.

Az egyik gondolatot Bauer Tamás fogalmazta meg: a „nagyon sokak által ismert Liska Tibor és a legeredetibb magyar közgazdászok közé tartozó Jánoosy Ferenc egész munkásságukban távol tartották magukat a hivatalos magyar tudományos élettől. Nem dolgoztak hivatalos kutatóhelyen, nem vettek részt a tudományos minősítésben, nem voltak tagjai tudományos testületekben, de a teljesítményük a magyar tudomány számára sokkal jelentősebb volt, mint sok mindenkié, aki akadémikus volt, aki osztályelnök volt, aki hasonló pozíciókat töltött be.”

A másik, amit Antal Judit ír: „Jánossy Ferencnek, mint mérnök szakképzettségű tudósnak – Bekker Zsuzsát idézve – ’nem volt szüksége a kortárs teljesítményekre’, Marx

120Bauer Tamás parlamenti napirenden kívüli felszólalása 1996.12.04
http://www.parlament.hu/naplo35/234/2340068.htm
A tőkéjén kívül nem volt járatos a közgazdasági elmélet alapműveiben. (...) A marxi gazdaságelméletből kiindulva azonban Jánossy önállóan alkotja meg saját nyelvezetet, valamint azt a gazdasági modellrendszert, amelynek következtetéseine egyrészt gyökeresen ellentmondanak a marxi ideológiának, másrészt összhangban vannak a 20. századi mainstream közgazdaságtan eredményeivel”. (Antal 2002)

Kicsit sarkosabban fogalmazva, Jánossy egész életében mérnök, gazdaságtudományi szakértő és marxista maradt, mindamellett azonban figyelemre méltót alkotott a gazdaságtudományban.

Bródy András


1945-55 között egy nagyvállalat vezető statisztikusa. 1955 végén kapcsolat megkerülésével a Kozgazdaságtudományi Intézetbe, ahol nyugdíjasáig dolgozik (Zalai 2010).


A 60-as évek mechanizmusreform munkálataibain nem vesz részt. A közgazdasági egyetemre se hívják tanítani (majd csak 1999-ben avatják diszdoktorrá). Viszont

---


Bródy ugyan nem kapott katedrát a budapesti közgazdasági egyetemen, de annak tehetséggondozó szakkolégiumában tartott kurzusokat. 1977-ben Keyness-kurzust, 1979-ben Kalecki ciklus- és növekedésméletéről tartott kurzust tartott. Bródy a teljes angolszász szakirodalmat készségszinten kezelt, a keynesi modelleket, sőt magukat a modelljezőket is ismerte. (Király 2011)

 „Egész életét ez kísérte végig: növekedés és ciklus (...) A ciklusok izgatták, vajon miért jönnek létre, milyen hosszan tartanak, vajon a Kondratiev-ciklus hosszútávú hatása a meghatározó, vagy a rövid üzleti ciklusok ingadozása.” (Király 2011)

Bródy a marxista közgazdaságtan matematikai közgazdasága volt, és bár ismerte, de nem jutott el a neoklasszikus közgazdaságtan elfogadásáig. Mint Kovács János Mátyás írja (Kovács 2016) – Bródy hitt abban, hogy „a munkaidőkalkuláció alapuló kollektivistika gazdaság lehetséges”.

Wassily Leontief szerint „Bródy András hozzájárulása a tudományhoz nem egyéb, mint a Kelet és Nyugat közgazdaságtudományi áramlatainak kreatív, bizonyos mértékig dialektikus kombinációja.” (Bekker 1999)

Kornai János


Kornai János kétségtelenül az elmúlt hetven év legismertebb és legjelentősebb magyarországi közgazdásza. „A XX. század utolsó negyedében rajta kívül nem volt más magyar társadalomtudós, aki hozzá fogható hírnévre tett volna szert, ő volt az egyetlen, akit nemcsak alkalmilag, még kevésbé egzotikus kelet-európaiként tartottak számon, hanem azok között, akik a tudomány történetébe fontos eredeti művekkel írták be a nevüket.” (Kende 2005)

„Kornai János (…) hozta létre a szocialista rendszer új politikai gazdaságtanát. Kornai elmélete a szocialista rendszerről nem az általános egyensúlyelmélet alkalmazása empirikus problémákra, hanem új elméleti paradigma megfogalmazása. (…) A szocialista rendszerről kidolgozott elmélet új módon integrálja a szocialista gazdaságról szóló diszkurzust a közgazdaságtanba, egyszerre újítja meg ennek a diszkurzusnak az elméletét és empirikus vizsgálati eredményeit. Ezért lett Kornai János a legnagyobb nemzetközi ismertéssel és elismertséggel rendelkező magyar közgazdász.” (Gedeon 2013).

„A gazdasági vezetés túlzott központosítása, Kornai János kandidátusi értekezése tette meg az új elmélet irányában az első lépéseket azzal, hogy a tervezés normatív és ideológikus elméletének rárogoza helyett a központi tervezés valóságos működését vizsgálta. Már ebben a könyvben megjelenik a szerzőnek az empirikus vizsgálatokban gyökerező fejtegetései a tervezés belső érdekellentéteiről, alkufolyamairól. A későbbi munkáiban ez a korai elemzés a vertikális tervalku kategóriájában és vizsgálatában hasznosult.”(Gedeon 2013) A diszsertáció alapján készült könyv (Kornai 1957) angolul (Kornai 1958) is megjelenik, s pozitív visszhangot kelt.

„Kornai János első kísérlete az elméleti és az empirikus kutatás szintézisére az Anti-equilibrium (Kornai 1971) volt”, ami 1967 és 1971 között született meg. (Gedeon 2013) „A könyv megírása, fogadtatása, a körülvette lezajlott vita legfontosabb eredménye, hogy a marxizmussal való szakítása után Kornai egyre pontosabban tisztáztat viszonyát a helyette választott elméleti rendszerhez, jobban látta erősségeit és korlátait.” (Muraközy 2005)

Kornai tovább tud haladni az Anti-equilibriumban kidolgozott új szintézisével, amely szembeállítja a többletgazdaságot (nyomást) és a hiánygazdaságot (szívást), a vevők és az eladók piaci rezsimjéi között. „A hiány és A szocialista rendszer [című könyvek] elméleti újdonsága éppen ez: a hiánygazdaság és a szocialista rendszer, a többletgazdaság és a kapitalista rendszer elméleti egymásra vonatkoztatása. A szocialista rendszer hiánygazdasági magyarázata új elméleti paradigma (…) A hiány és A szocialista rendszer szerzője azt a hipotézist állította fel, hogy minden hiánygazdaság szocialista gazdaság és minden szocialista gazdaság hiánygazdaság. Ebből az következik, hogy a szocialista intézmények és a hiánygazdaság közötti viszony nem külsődleges, hanem belső összefüggéseket rejt, a kutatás feladata pedig éppen az, hogy ezeket a belső kapcsolatokat feltárja.” (Gedeon 2013)

A hiány 1980-ban jelenik meg magyarul (Kornai 1980a) és angolul (Kornai 1980b), majd francia (Kornai 1984), lengyel és kínai nyelven is kiadják.

„A hiány” minden jelentősége ellenére a szocialista rendszer elemzésének csak egy részét fogta át. Fontos állomás volt az úton, de bővíteni kellett az elemzés körét. (…) Az új szintetizáló mű ’A szocialista rendszer’ (Kornai 1993), ami 1993-ban jelenik meg. Megjelenik többek között angolul (Kornai 1992), németül (Kornai 1995) és franciául (Kornai 1996) is. „Három szempontból is 35 év szellemi életéjéjét összefoglaló munkának tekintetjük A szocialista rendszert. Először is tartalmilag. Kornai a témában szintetizálásra törekedett, a szocializmus politikai gazdaságtanát kívánta megírni. Másodszor, az intellektuális fejlődés, a szellemi iskolák, irányzatok kritikus áttekintése, állandó szembeállításra a valósággal ekkorára már világossá tette Kornai számára, hogy honnan, mit fogad el, és mit nem (…) Harmadszor teljes felfedezésektől és a rendszerben való tárgyalásmódját egyszerűsíthetjük. A könyv széleskörű nemzetközi elismerést keltett, bár sokak szerint túl későn született meg, hiszen tárgya, a szocialista rendszer összeomlott mire megszületett a könyv.” (Kornai 2005a)

A rendszerváltás után már a fentiekhez hasonló korszakos munkát nem alkotott. Megjelentette „rendhagyó önleletrajzát” (Kornai 2005), ami személyes életéjéja mellett, munkáinak és szellemel, tudományos fejlődésének bemutatása is. Megjelentette továbbá egy tanulmánykötetet (Kornai 2007), amely nyolc esszét tartalmaz, mint a címe is mutatja a szocializmusról, a kapitalizmusról, a demokráciáról és a rendszerváltásról, azaz
lényegében a szocialista és a kapitalista rendszer összehasonlítása és elemzése tárgyában. Mint Greskovits Béla fogalmaz (Greskovits 2009) könyvismertetőjé végén: úgy látom, hogy a térségünk elsőrangú politikai gazdaságtani elemzőjének új kötete a következő évekre jökora feladatot hagyott mind magának a szerzőnek, mind követőinek és tanítványainak.

Éz a mondat is arra utal, hogy Kornai személye és munkássága egyáltalán nem ellentmondásmentes. Kovács János Mátéy ás így ír erről: „Kornai után szabadon terjedt a vélekedés a mainstream állítólagos módszertani naivitásáról, a szabadpiac iránti túlzott vonzalmáról és a racionalitás-posztulátum erőltetéséről. (...) Kornai, az Econometric Society tagja (1976-ban elnöke) a neoklasszikus közgazdaságtanon köszörülő a nyelvét, majd ebéd közben arra biztatja az intézeti fiatalokat, hogy mihamarabb sajátítsák el azt.” (Kovács 2016)

Egy – azóta elhunyt – történész, Laczkó Miklós így foglalta össze Kornai jelentőségét: „joggal kivívott hírnevével, tehetséges tanítványaival, a vele vitázók vagy egyet nem értők számára is magas mércét állító jelenlétével nagymértékben járult hozzá ahhoz, hogy a néhány komoly szakember szakértője nekünk maradjon, az egészségben azonban régóta már a Horthy-rendszerben is elmaradott magyar közgazdaságtudomány újra, a réginél magasabb színvonalon 'eurozálódjék’”. (Laczkó 2005)

Kornai ezekben az években nem a közgazdasági fővonal képviselője. Lényegében ő a szocializmus politikai gazdaságtanának művelője. Mint Kovács idézi Kornait: „fél lábbal benne vagyok a főáramban, fél lábbal pedig kinn.” (Kovács 2016)

c.) Néhány intézményvezető és további említésre érdemes közgazdásh a rendszerváltás előtt


A másik figyelemreméltó gazdaságtudományi esemény, hogy 1970 szeptemberében 103 elsőéves hallgató megkezdte tanulmányait a MKKE pécsi kihelyezett nappali tagozatán. Ebből 1975-ben létrejön a Pécsi Tudományegyetemen a közgazdaságtudományi kar 124

Érdemes áttekinteni a budapesti közgazdaságtudományi egyetem rektorait is. Az egyetem rektorai lényegében a rendszerváltásig alapvetően megbízható káderet lettek, s csak ezt követő szempont volt, hogy elismert tudós legyen az illető. Bár azért volt néhány kivétel.

Ilyen kivétel volt Pach Zsigmond Pál, aki 1963-67 között volt a MKKE rektora.


Öt Szabó Kálmán követi a rektori székhelyében 1968-73 között. Szabó Kálmán (1921-2001) a baloldali diákmozgalmak vezetését és a kommunista párt, és a tervhivatal apparátusát megjárt káder szakember126 volt.


---

124 http://ktk.pte.hu/karunkrol/tortenet
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Berend T Iván kétségtelenül nemzetközileg elismert gazdaságtörténész. Ugyanakkor az államszocialista időszakban felívelő politikai pályafutását sokan a szemére vetik. Ő emlékiratában azt írja, hogy az értelmiségnek a szocializmusban nehéz döntést kellett hozni: 1. Vagy marad elszigetlen, a tudományos munkára koncentrálva, kizárva a politikát a személyes életéből, 2. vagy vállalja az ellenzéki szerepet, s bírálja, leleplezi a rendszert, és elfogadja a megkülönböztetést és a kirekesztést, 3. vagy az establishmenten belül marad és dolgozik az ország megreformálásán, a jogi lehetőségeken belül bírálja a rezsimet, és próbál változtatni belülről. Nyilván ő a harmadikat választotta, többekkel ellentében.

Amikor saját szerepét jellemzi, azt írja, hogy lehetett dolgozni a reformokon, söt bírálni a rendszert, kivéve bizonyos tabukat. Természetesen ez azt jelentette, hogy a reformereknek komoly kompromisszumokat kellett kötni. Az olyan emberek, mint ő segítettek erodálni a kommunista rendszert. Persze ezzel alighanem önmaga presztízsét is erodálta, de úgy tűnik ez nem törte derékba nemzetközi pályafutását.


Jánossy, Bródy és Kornai mellett jelentősebb magyar gazdaságtudományi szereplőként még Erdős Pétert, Liska Tibort és Tardos Márton szokták megemlíteni a hetvenes évek elejének magyar közgazdaszai közül. Liska Tiborról és Tardos Mártonról később lesz szó. Itt Erdősre térünk röviden ki. Továbbá Ránki Györgyre, aki nem közgazdász, hanem...
(gazdaság)történész, de igen jelentős tudós. És kitérünk Mátyás Antalra is, meglehetősen ellentmondásos szerepe miatt.


Ránki György a magyar gazdaságtörténekek egyik kiemelkedő kutatója volt.


Mátyás Antalra is ki kell röviden térni sajátos szerepe miatt.

Mátyás Antal (1923-2016) a budapesti Közgazdaságtudományi Egyetemen 1950-ben diplomázott. Ezt követően az MTA Közgazdaságtudományi Intézetének tudományos...
Mátyás Antal munkássága igen ellentmondásos. Egyesek szerint „Mátyás Antal tudományos és oktatói tevékenységének kiemelkedő és rendkívüli hatása elsősorban abban áll, hogy a hazai közgazdászok egymást követő több nemzedékét ő vezette be a modern nyugati közgazdaságtan terminológiájába, elméleti és módszertani ismeretanyagába, valamint újabb és újabb eredményeibe – azok részletekbe menő, elmélyült, komparatív és kritikai feldolgozása alapján. E tevékenységét jóval a rendszerváltás előtt, már az 1950-es években megkezdte, (...) Mátyás Antal merte vállalni, hogy utat nyisson az oktatásban azoknak a közgazdasági iskoláknak, elméleteknek és módszertani eljárásoknak, amelyek túlmutatnak a marxista közgazdaságtanon, sőt az egyes korokban divatossá vált irányzatokon is.”

Más vélemények szerint viszont „Az ideológiaiág ellenséges környezetben az igazi tudomány magvait elhintő elmélettörténet-professzor mítosza azonban nagyon távol áll a tényleges korabeli helyzettől. (...) Azok az elmélettörténeti kurzusok, amelyeken Mátyás saját, A modern polgári közgazdaságtan történet című, először 1973-ban kiadott könyvét okatta, elvi lehetőséget valóban teremthettek volna arra, hogy a modern közgazdaságtan paradigmájáról valami összefoglalót, szemléleti alapvetést adjanak, (...) E tárgy keretében persze (...) a marxista kritikai értékelés semmiképpen sem volt mellőzhető. Nem mintha Mátyás maga ezt nyúgynak érezte volna, hiszen törekvései céljára éppen a politikai gazdaságtan szemszögéből vett kritikai értékelésben látja (...) Az a mód, ahogy a polgári közgazdaságtan oktatásának egészét a saját személye köré szervezte, arra enged következtetni, hogy a legenda s a (...) neki tulajdonított, a modern elmélet alapjait a PG mellé csempésző szerepet nem is ambicionált, pontosabban nem ezt ambicionálta. Ha ezt ambicionálja, biztosan megengedte volna, hogy a modern polgári elmélet oktatásához más is hozzáférjen, tankönyvet írjon és taníthassa azt. Nem állt volna ellen körömszakadást át, hogy a külföldön standardnak számító egyetemi tankönyvek ereiből többet lefordítsanak. (...) [A rendszerváltás után] E téren csak annyi történt, hogy Mátyás Antal könyvének újabb és újabb kiadásaiból a marxista kritika már kimaradt, az általa feldolgozott anyag pedig bővült, itt-ott párhuzamatos megismételve az elméleti alapvetésként máshol már tanított modeleket” (Pete 2002).


---


A rendszerváltás szele ide vagy oda, az MTA Közgazdaságtudományi Intézet élén Sipos Aladár (1927-2005) személyében egy megbízható elvtárs, és politikai gazdaságtan tanár áll egészen 1990-ig.


Az ötvenes évektől a rendszerváltásig a magyar gazdaságtudományt úgy jellemezhetjük, hogy a vulgármarxizmustól viszonylag hamar kilábalt, és lényegében két fejlődési irányban mozdult el.

Az első csoportra az jellemző, amit Pete Péter ír. „A rendszerváltás előtti közgazdasági egyetemen a nevét meghazudtolóan közgazdaságtant mint olyant egyáltalán nem tanítottak, (...) Elméleti alapvetésként marxista politikai gazdaságtant tanítottak, és alapvető gazdasági és társadalmi törvényzési érzékelést váltóban nem is türtek volna meg mást, különösen „apolgetikus burzsoa áltudományokat” nem. Ám ha valaki nem az alapvető társadalmi viszonyok magyarázataként, hanem a racionális gazdálkodás, termelésszervezés egyszerű technikai segédkezıként tálalta őket, vagyis óvakodott az ideológia saját területének tekintet „mély” összefüggésektől, akkor nem útközöző halakba. Így azután a hetvenes–nyolcvanas évek diákjai döntésemélet, operációkutatás, gazdaságmatematika, vállalati gazdaságtan, ipargazdaságtan és hasonló ágúnak oktatását, szétszórt és számos modelljével, alapvető gyakorlati, és eredményével találkozhattak. Mindezt perszre nem pótolta a szisztematikus gazdaságelméleti kurzus hiányát, hiszen Svájc volt a helyszín, hogy valaha valaki is elárulta volna nekik: egy egységes paradigma, azonos elveken működő gondolatrendszert egymással összefüggő darabjait tanulják. Ezzel egyébként rendszerint előadóik sem voltak tiszttából.” (Pete 2002)

A második csoportra pedig az jellemző, amit Kovács János Máté úgy ír, mint akik nem akartak letérni „egy hepehupás és egyre szűkülő különütről, mely sok helyütt büszkén provinciális, népszerűnek kikövezve.”

A többség az első csoportba tartozott, s csak kevesek tehetőségéből tellett a második irányra.

Ugyanakkor az intézményvezetők az utolsó pillanatig ideológiai megviselésre szükséges volt, mert az ő szerepét volt a változások szellemét a palackban visszatartani.

**II. Reformközgazdászok**

Bauer Tamás és Soós Károly Attila kutatásai lényegében a rendszerváltást megelőző reformviták előhírői.


És Antal László fent említett munkájával el is érkeztünk a reformközgazdászok derékhadához, és ahhoz a tanulmányhoz, amelyik a magyar rendszerváltás egyik előfutára volt, nevezetesen a „Fordulat és reform” című írás (Antal et al 1987). Az írás annak megállapításával kezdődik, hogy „a magyar gazdaság igen súlyos helyzetben van. Az ismétlődő erőszakos ellenére sem sikerült a gazdaságot konszolidálni...” Majd később benn szereplői, hogy „ebben a helyzetben az egyetlen

---
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perspektívát nyújtó megoldás egy radikális fordulat a gazdaságpolitikában és a gazdaságirányítás rendszerében egyaránt.” Az írás első része, amelynek címe: „Egy korszak vége”, megállapítja, hogy a piac hiányában „a merev előírások részleges liberalizálása sem eredményez gazdasági fellendülést, hanem az egyensúly megbomlásához vezet”. Ezt a következő fejezet azzal tovább, hogy leszögezi: „a kulcskérdés most az, tudunk-e a versenyszektorban a piac dominanciáján alapuló (...) valóságos szocialista piacgazdaságot teremteni, a piac átfogó szabályozó szerepére ráépülő, azzal harmonizáló tervezést létrehozni.” Az ezután következő „A reform új szakaszának feltételei” című rész „Az átfogó reform jellemzői” című fejezet követi, amely annak lezögezésével kezdődik, hogy „megérett az idő egy átfogó, radikális, demokratizáló és decentralizáló piaci reforma.” Ezután jön „A pénzügyi irányítás szerepe a reformfolyamatban” című fejezet, amely megállapítja, hogy az adminisztratív korlátozást felváltó monetáris restrikció lehet az egyik, a költségvetési politika és az adóreform a másik irányon az árfolyampolitika és az importliberalizálás a harmadik alapvető eszköz a gazdasági folyamatok hatékonyan szabályozó piac létrejöttéhez. Továbbá a tervezésnek „a kormány gazdasági csúcsminisztériuma és a jegybank közötti folyamatos együttműködésben kialakuló pénzügyi tervezéssé kell válnia.” A következő „Az egységes piac kiépítése, piacerősítés, a társadalmi tulajdon új formái” című rész annak hangsúlyozásával kezdődik, hogy „a pénzügyi rendszer átrendezése mellett a gazdasági reform másik kulsterülete a tulajdonok, illetve a tulajdonlás rendszerének az átalakítása.” Az anyag által felvázolt új tulajdonosítási forma lényegében egy szocialista részvényső tulajdonos rendszer. Mindezek mellett „szervezeti decentralizációt” is szükségesnek tart az anyag. A tanulmány utolsó előtti részének címe: „A gazdasági reform politikai és társadalmi feltételei”. Ennek egyik eleme „képviseleti rendszerünk reformja.” Ami lényegében a szabad választások és a többarátszerzés bevezetését szorgalmazza némileg virágnyelven. Emellett „a kormánynak egységes program alapján kellene működnie, amelynek végrehajtásáért az országgyűlésnek felelős”, ami a kommunista párt irányításának megszüntetését jelenti. Az anyag azt is hangsúlyozza, hogy „a reform alapja a társadalmi nyilvánosság”, aminek kifejtése, ugyan óvatosan körüli, de a sajtószabadságot jelenti. Az utolsó rész a reform bevezetésének ütemét írja le.

A cikk végén pedig fel van sorolva 59 név, akik az alaplanulmány elkészítésében közreműködtek.

A Fordulat és reform több vonatkozásban (pl. a tulajdon esetében) nem volt igazán határozott, de mint Szamuely és Csaba rámutat (Szamuely-Csaba 1998) a társadalmi reform és a sajtószabadság tekintetében radikálisan új témát vetett fel a korábbi reformokhoz viszonyítva. Ami végül is kormányprogram lett az a Németh-kormány a piacgazdasági modellt teljeskörűen vállaló reformtervezete, amelyben „a magántulajdon egyenjogúsítása, a kereskedelem és az összes termelési tényező piacának felszabadítása szerepel. Megfogalmazódott a korábbi bürokratikus szertartás központi elemét jelentő éves tervezés felszámolása.” (Szamuely – Csaba 1998)

Mindezek ellenére a „Fordulat és reform” a magyar rendszerváltás legendás dokumentumává vált. Szerkesztőinek mindegyike, de a szerzők túlnyomó többsége is egy új nemzedék képviselője volt, akik már a háború után, sőt sokan az ötvenes években születtek, és – ha csak kritikai előadásban is, de – már ismérték a valódi közgazdaságtant is, nem csak a marxista politikai gazdaságú.
A tanulmányt szerkesztőként ötten jegyezték:

* Antal László kandidátus, a Pénzügykutatási intézet igazgatóhelyettes;
* Bokros Lajos kandidátus, a Pénzügykutatási intézet tudományos osztályvezetője;
* Csillag István kandidátus, a Pénzügykutatási intézet tudományos munkatársa;
* Lengyel László kandidátus, a Pénzügykutatási intézet tudományos munkatársa; és
* Matolcsy György, a Pénzügykutatási intézet tudományos munkatársa.
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A „Fordulat és reform” tanulmány öt szerkesztőjéből három – Bokros, Csillag és Matolcsy, mint ahogy a korábban említett Bauer és Soós is - a rendszerváltást követően politikusok lettek és különböző kormányokban szerepet is vállaltak, lényegében a tudományos pályát elhagyták, vagy legalább is a politikum mögé szorították. Lengyel nyilvánvalóan tudatosan maradt kívül a politikai szerepvállaláson. Aligha véletlen, hogy
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a felsoroltak között Lengyel László munkássága a legnagyobb, legszélesebb körű, bár inkább politológiai irányultságú.

A reformközgazdászok nem kis része tehát inkább a reformmal foglalkozott, mint a közgazdaságtannal.

**III. A rendszerváltás után**

A hazai gazdaságtudomány rendszerváltás utáni értékelését valamennyire könnyíti a szakmai értékelő elemekről lehulló pártideológia kényszer, de nyilvánvalóan nehezíti a rálátás idejének rövidsége és a szerző űhatatlanul meglévő elfogultságai. Az áttekintést ítélekezéke kezdjük.

A rendszerváltást követően a kommunista párt hatalmának összeomlása után, beleszólásának és irányításának megszőnésével az intézményvezetők választásában az intézményi autonomia érvényesül.


Andorka kutatási területe a társadalmi rétegződés és mobilitás, a gyermekszám társadalmi tényezői, ill. a népesség szaporodásának társadalmi összefüggésével. Nagyrészt az ő tevékenysége révén váltak ismertté itthon és külföldre a magyar mobilitási folyamat alapvető tényei, ill. kohorszerezésével alapvetően új eredményeket ért el a társadalmi mobilitás történeti tendenciáinak felkutatása terén. Iskoleremlőt egyénisége rendkívül jelentős szerepet játszott a szociológiai tudomány hazai elismertetésében, népszerűsítésében és egy új szociológus generáció képzésében. Igen nagy számú könyvet írt, amelyek közül számosat a mai napig használnak a szociológia oktatásában.

Szelényi Iván írja megemlékezésében (Szelényi 1997) Andorkáról: „Hangyaszorgalommal dolgozott, s három évtizeden keresztül ontotta magából a publikációkat. Nemcsak a magyar szociológiában, hanem a magyar társadalomtudományban sem ismerek senkit, aki ennyi területen dolgozott, ilyen sokat publikált volna.” (Szelényi 1997)

A KSH-ba kerülve bekapszolódott a magyar szociológia akkori legrangosabb, a nemzetközi szociológiában is példaértékűnek tartott vizsgálat sorozatába, a társadalmi rétegződés és mobilitás kutatásába (az első ilyen felmérése 1962-ben került sor). Az 1972-es és 1982-es társadalmi rétegződés és mobilitás vizsgálatát már Andorka irányította. (Szelényi 1997)

Szelényi szerint „Nehéz a szociológiának vagy a demográfiaiaknak olyan területét megnevezni, amelynek a bibliográfiájából hiányozna Andorka Rudolf neve. Publikált a deviancia, főként az alkoholis turnus kérdéseiről, figyelmet keltette az abortussal és általában a népmozgalmi statisztikával kapcsolatos írásai, írt gazdaságszociológiáról, családról, életmódokról, idomérlegről, választói magatartásról, szegénységéről, de még vallásszociológiáról is. Ő alkotta meg a szociológia legkorszerűbb magyar nyelvű egyetemi tankönyvét is – annak legutolsó változatát már nagybetegen írta meg. E szerteágazó munkásságán belül a legrangosabb, megítélésem szerint, a társadalmi mobilitással kapcsolatos tevékenysége. Ha gazdag és hosszú adatbázison ki kellene emelnem a legfontosabb művet, akkor az az 1982-ben megjelent A társadalmi mobilitás változásai Magyarországon című monográfiája lenne. Andorka rétegződéssel és mobilitással foglalkozó műveit egyébként a nemzetközi szociológiai irodalom is számon tartja és nagyra értékelő. (...) Andorka munkássága, a magyar társadalom második világháború utáni szerkezsváltozásairól a legnagyobb pontossággal beszámoló adatai azért kellett oly nagy figyelmet, mert első alkalommal jelezték nagy adatbázison, hogy az államssocializmus társadalmi különbségek megszüntetésére, a mobilitás gyorsulására, a rétegek közötti iskolai végzettségbeli különbségek kiegyenlítésére irányuló törekvései nem voltak különösebben sikeresek.”(Szelényi 1997)

Később azt is hozzáfűzi Szelényi, hogy Andorka „az empirikus szociológia, a politikai-ideológiai értéktíleteket és a társadalmi tények objektív leírást egymástól a leghatározottabban elválasztó társadalomtudomány úttörője volt. A hetvenes évek végétől a nyolcvanas évek elejétől ... elmulhatatlan érdemeket szerzett abban, hogy a szociológiából objektív, a módszertani fegyelem szigorú szabályait követő tudomány legyen” (Szelényi 1997).

A közgazdasági egyetem rektori – mint az egész magyar felsőoktatásban – hol neves tudósok, hol inkább menedzser indítatású egyetemi tanárok.
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2000. január 1-jén az intézmény neve Budapesti Közgazdaságtudományi és Államigazgatási Egyetemre (BKAЕ) változik, miután az Államigazgatási Főiskolával egyesítik.


2014-ben összesen 39 egyetemi kar, főiskola vagy főiskolai kar hirdetett meg a gazdaságtudományi képzési területéhez sorolt alapképzést.

A rendszerváltást követő fontos fejlemény a felsőoktatásban, hogy a tudományos minősítés az 1993. évi felsőoktatási törvény nyomán visszakerül az egyetemekre. A tudományok kandidátusa tudományos minősítés és a Tudományos Minősítő Bizottság megszűnik. Viszont a tudományok doktora minősítés nem szűnik meg, csak átkeresztelik MTA doktorára, és elvileg minősítés helyett cím lesz. Az egyetlen tudományos minősítés nyugati mintára a PhD lesz, gyakorlatilag azonban az MTA doktora cím továbbra is tudományos minősítésként funkcionál (ráadásul annak megszerzésével havi illetmény jár).

A PhD képzés az egyetemekre kerül, és doktori iskolákban történik. Egyetemi kar gyakorlatilag csak akkor létesíthető, ha van doktori iskolája. Így nem csoda, hogy 2016-ban összesen 18 gazdaságtudományi doktori iskola működött. (10 gazdálkodás és szervezéstudományban, 6 közgazdaságtudományban és 2 regionális tudományokban). Az nem igazán meglepő hogy a 18 gazdaságtudományi doktori iskolából 4 a Budapest Corvinus Egyetemen működött, s az sem hogy további 2 a Pécsi Tudományegyetemen, de az talán némi csodálkozásra ad okot, hogy a Szent István Egyetemen (ami leánykori – azaz rendszerváltás előtti - nevén Gödöllői Agrártudományi Egyetem) is kettő van. A gazdaságtudományi képzést folytató karok mintegy harmada az agrárképzésből menekülve keveredett a gazdaságtudományi képzés területére (ezeket nevezi a rossznév „gumicsizmás közgazdászképzésnek”).

A korábbiakban volt róla szó, hogy 1973-tól 1986-ig Zsarnóczai Sándor a Közgazdasági Szemle sorrendben harmadik főszerkesztője. Őt Szabó Katalin követi, aki 1986-2010-ig töltötte be a Szemle főszerkesztői pozícióját.


A rendszerváltás után feltűnt közgazdász nemzedék legmarkánsabb és leginkább elismerésre méltó teljesítményű képviselője Csaba László.


Kutatási területe: a gazdasági rendszerek működése és átalakulása, az integráció, különösen az európai integráció, valamint a fejlődés gazdaságtan szélesebb összefüggéseit. 155
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kialakult elemzésekkel való szintetizálására, és ennek alapján az átalakulás tapasztalatainak és tanulságainak elméleti igényű általánosítására.”


2006-ban Csaba újabb kötettel jelentkezett (Csaba 2006), amelynek „fókuszában az EU 2005 során kibontakozott válsága és az erre adott válaszok állnak. Elemzési szempontja az, hogy az EU mennyiben és milyen feltételek mellett (lehet) képes a globális kihívásoknak megfelelni, továbbá hogy mi magyarázhatja azt, hogy az EU intézményi válsága ellenére számos kis tagállama továbbra is rendületesen fejlődik, például a balti államok, Írország és Finnország is. Ezzel szemben több nagy állam is a földrészünkön átsöprő populizmus áldozatává vált, ahol a kormányzati hiány kiszorítja a magánberuházásokat, és így a növekedés tartós lassulása tapasztalható. Ez a helyzet a visegrádi államoknál is, méghozzá jóval azért, hogy az EU-15 színvonalát. A szerző a gazdasági siker és kudarc egységes elemzésére az új intézményi közgazdaságtan keretét alkalmazza. Kiemeli a kiegyensúlyozott főnntartató államháztartás központi szerepét a tartós növekedést megalapozó tényezők közül.”

2009-ben magyar kiadónál angolul kiadott könyve (Csaba 2009) lényegében tanulmányfűzér, ahol az egyes fejezetek önállóan is olvashatóak, de amelyek a szerző szándéka szerint mégis egységet alkotnak, és a részterületek vizsgálata szinergikus hatású. A célja – mint írja a szerző - „a közösségi választások, intézmények, politikai lehetőségek, a társadalmi visszacsatolás endogenizálása, az új politikai gazdaságtan évtizedes tradícióival és a politikai reformok politikai gazdaságtanával párhuzamosan.” A könyvben mindvégig kiemelt figyelmet kap a közgazdasági elméletek alkalmazása, elsősorban Európában és Európára. (Halmai 2010)

Csaba László munkásságáról könyveinek áttekintésével igyekeztünk képet nyújtani, annál is inkább, mivel ő írta, hogy „A társadalomtudományok számára az alapvető publikációs forma a könyv.” (Csaba – Szentes - Zalai 2014) Munkássága messze kiemelkedik a rendszerváltást követő hazai közgazdászok közül. Ugyanakkor szembetűnő, hogy a mainstreamtől való távolságtartás ugyanúgy tetten érthető írásaiban, mint a nagy elődökknél, Bródyknál, Kornainál.

Természetesen számos további nevet is lehetne említeni a rendszerváltást követő magyar gazdaságtudományból.

Pete Péter nevét azért érdemes kiemelni, mert ő volt a hazai közgazdászképzés megújításának egyik harcosa (mert a közgazdaságtudományi egyetemen persze számos képzés reform történt, de valódi elmozdulás csak sokára jött létre).


Pete Péter kutatási területe a makroönkōmōnia. Legismertebb könyve (Pete 1996) az első olyan magyar nyelvű tankönyv, amely a makroönkōmōnia monetáris vonatkozásait és a pénzelméletet egyaránt megfelelő szinten tárgyalja.
A közgazdaszképzéssel kapcsolatos megszólalása a 2006-ban kirobbant vita során hangzott el. (A vita a közgazdasági egyetemen nyilvánosságra hozott mikorökonómia tananyag kapcsán kerekedett, de azon jóval túlmutatott.) Pete az anyagról írt „A közgazdasági felsőoktatás sanyarú állapotáról és ennek okairól” című cikkeben (Pete 2006) azt hangoztatja, hogy a rendszerváltással a társadalomtudományi elméleteket tanító karoknak sokkal radikálisabb változásnak kellett volna bekövetkeznie, ha az oktatás követte volna a gazdasági-politikai változásoknak a sebességét. Hozzáteszi, hogy miközben „a korábban burzsoá áltudományos apológiájában kritizált gazdaság- és társadalommagyarázatok” egyik napról a másikra a piacgazdaság működéseinek analapelvét leíró pozitív világképpé avanzálták, azon közben a társadalomtudományi képzésére szakosodott oktatógárda személyi állománya e pálfordulás közben lényegileg nem változott, „pusztán a kihalás és nyugdíjazás szokásos ütemében módosul.” (Pete 2006.)

Majd így folytatja: „A gazdaságelméletként nálunk korábban kötelező politikai gazdaságtan és az Amerikában, Ázsiában és Nyugat-Európában közgazdaságtan (economics) néven futó standard közgazdasági alapvetés között ugyanis sokkal nagyobb a távolság, mint a marxista és a "burzsóá-polgári" társadalomelméletek között úgy általában. Ezért e téren nem lehetett a módszertan és a vizsgálat tárgya változatlanul tartásával, pusztán az értékrendezését és a vizsgálati tárgyának megfelelően tudományos hatályát kellett (volna) megtanulni. Cikkeim legfontosabb állítása az, hogy ezt a leckét a közgazdasági elméleti képzésben részt vevő hazai oktatók nagyobb része nem tanulta meg. (...) Magyarországon az alapszintű közgazdaságtan-tanszokok oktatónak zöme a közgazdasági elméleti főáramot semmilyen szinten sem műveli, csak jól-rosszul bevezető szinten tanítja.” (Pete 2006.)

Írta ezt Pete Péter 2006-ban a rendszerváltás után másfél évtizeddel.

Pete a vita után távozott a közgazdaságtudományi egyetemről, s az Eötvös Loránd Tudományegyetemen alapított Közgazdaságtudományi Tanszéket és elemző közgazdaságtan képzést, olyan külső óraadókkal többek között, mint Kertesi Gábor, Király Júlia, Kovács János Mátyás, Kolló János, Laki Mihály és számos fiatal kutató, akik már valóban közgazdaságtan tanultak és művelnek.


Antal után). Bekker haláláig számos tudományos közleményével járult hozzá a tudományterülete fejlődéséhez.
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A rendszerváltást követő időszak lezárásaként érdemes Kovács János Mátyás gondolatait idézni (Kovács 1996), ahogyan szerinte a rendszerváltást követő hazai gazdaságtudomány két nagy tábora egymást jellemzi.


A másik tábor szerint: „Még mindig az exreformerek uralják a közgazdasági kultúrát. Mint egykoron, természetesen szoros szimbiózisban a politikával: ott székelnek a különféle tanácsadó, szerkesztő, akadémiai, egyetemi bizottságokban, ahol állami pénzeket és hivatali címeket osztogatnak. Reformerekből transzfomerekké nevezték ki magukat valamely szociálisztikus zászló (leginkább a »szociális piacgazdaság«) oltalmában, de új gondolatok már nem bántják őket. Továbbra is imádják a Nagy Programokat, az általános kijelentéseket, a nagy ívű kísérleteket (mások előre). Eszményképek, a verbális politökonómia örvén a hajdani polgazd spekulatív érvelésmódját tartják életben. Intézményi ötleteik pontatlanok és ellenőrizhetetlenek. Maszatolnak, már régóta nem művelik magukat. Pragmatizmusba oltott provincializmus.”

Tegyük hozzá, hogy ezt Kovács János Mátyás 1996-ban írta.

Kérdés hogy hogyan van ez ma, húsz év múlva?

Kovács tulajdonképpen meg is válaszolja ezt a kérdést, amikor arra felel, hogy hová tart a magyar gazdaságtudomány: „Amennyiben nem Cambridge és Chicago a mércé, hanem Athen és Helsink, de mondhatnénk Limát és Kairót is, úgy érzem, bármint fáj is, közelgünk a normálishoz.” (Kovács 1996)

Befejezésül

A magyar gazdaságtudomány elmúlt hetven évének meghatározó egyéniségei két generációhoz sorolhatók.

Az első generáció tagjai a múlt század tízes, húszas éveiben születettek, akik nézeteit a vulgármarxizmus határozza meg, s akik közül azok tudtak tudományosan kiemelkedni, akik valóban ismerték Marx munkáit, és vagy annak elvein tudtak haladni, vagy ha nem is tudtak rajta túllépni, megtalálták a maguk félő marxista, félő mainstream útját.
A második generáció a negyvenes, ötvenes években születettek, akik az előző generációtól tanulták a gazdaságtudományt, ami lényegében egy „civilizált(abb)” marxista politikai gazdaságtan volt. Annyit tanultak a valódi közgazdaságtanból, amennyit oktatóik a marxista politikai gazdaságtan fejlesztésére átvettek, vagy amennyit a „polgári közgazdaságtan” bírálatáktól tanítottak. Közülük azok emelkedtek ki, akik szorgalmuk, szerencséjük vagy kapcsolataik révén megszerzett külföldi szakirodalmak tanulmányozásával, és/vagy külföldi tanulmányok nyomán elsajátították a közgazdasági fővonal ismereteit is. Ők lettek a reformközgazdászok, akiket azonban nagyobb részben elszállították, magával sodort a politika, így jó részük tudományos teljesítménye megotorpant. Akik tudományos pályán maradtak nagyrészt az intézményi közgazdaságtan felé húzódtak (mivel ez viszonylag közel áll az általuk tanult politikai gazdaságtanhoz). Néhányan megtanulták a közgazdasági fővonal abc-jét, de ők kisebbségben vannak. Tudományosan azok tudtak kiemelkedni, akik megtalálták azt a témát, amelyikben újszerűt tudtak alkotni, s ez az általuk leginkább ismert államszocializmus, és annak bukása, az államszocializmusból a piaći gazdaságba való átmenet tanulmányozása volt.

A harmadik generáció – akiket írásunk már nem érint – a nyolcvanas, kilencvenes években születettek nemzedéke. Ők már nem politikai gazdaságtant és polgári közgazdaságtan kritikát tanultak, hanem mikro- és makroökonómiát, és elmélettörténetet, így, hogy attól a korábbi nemzedéktől, aki ezt úgy ahogy önszorgalomból ha megtanulta. Mindenesetre előttük már nyitva állt a korszerű szakirodalom és a világ. Persze van itt néhány középső nemzedék. Például a hatvanas években születettek, akik még a marxizmus szellemében tanultak, bár az már inkább csak marxizálás volt, és sok mindent tanultak a nyugati tudományos fővonalból, bár az igen hektikus és felületes volt. Ennek a nemzedéknak a tudományos nézetei meglehetősen „rugalmassak”, a szükséglet szerint forgathatók, s a tudományban vetett hitük cínikus. Most a 2010-es években éppen ők adják a magyar politikai elit derékhadát.


A magyar gazdaságtudomány lassan halad a megújulás felé.
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In the middle of the 20th century the discipline of psychology could be still regarded as a “newborn” science, the separate fields of which had their roots in different traditions (such as the 19th century German experimental psychology or the neurological/psychiatric practice). As the renowned German psychologist Hermann Ebbinghaus once remarked, “Psychology has a long past, but a short history”. quoted by Pléh, 2000, 24)

Each tradition followed its own scientific model: experimental psychology was built upon a natural science, physiological approach; psychotherapeutic activities and psychoanalysis were based on a predominantly medical model. For this reason, it is problematic to describe the history of psychology through the discourses of a linear and continuous progression (see Harris, 2009), and especially by a single and concentrated storyline. Such storyline would create the illusion that the different fields of psychology share the same scientific premises and ideologies. Therefore, what mainstream studies (such as Roback and Schultz, cited by Harris, 2009) acknowledge as the “real” history of psychology is a reduction of complex cultural, historical-political and scientific effects to intellectual and abstract elements (Harris, 2009). However, critical studies revealed (Foucault, 2006; Kovai, 2014; Rose, 1996) that the different fields of psychology, psychiatry, and other psycho-studies – known as “psy-sciences” (Rose, 1998) – became tools of society’s disciplinary mechanisms, hence satisfying political and societal needs, too. Studies on the history of Hungarian psycho-sciences have shown how historical events of the 20th century left their marks on this discipline (Erős, 2015; Kovai, 2014; Máriási, 2016; Pléh, 1996; Szokolszky, 2014).

This article focuses on the institutional history of Hungarian psychology after 1945 considering institutions as surfaces or bodies on which history, professional relations, and scientific achievements left their marks. We claim that the institutional history reveals the role and function of psychology in particular periods of time, and this approach should be personalized through integrating and understanding the influences of professional actors, as suggested by Gergen (1997) in claiming that scientific knowledge is constructed through relationships. We focus on three periods of time with an eye on the most important and influential domains and institutions of Hungarian psychology from the perspective of the emergence of an academic discipline in the given political contexts. Therefore, fields such as industrial psychology, clinical psychology, and other applied...
areas are not included here. Our purpose is to give a broader overview of the dominating scenes and professional discourses of Hungarian psychology after WW2. We are not discussing here in details the history of Hungarian psychoanalysis which has its own specific course. However, in that time it was more linked to medicine and psychiatry, than academic psychology. It is enough to say here that despite terrible losses, the Hungarian Psychoanalytical Association survived the Nazi period and the Holocaust. The Association maintained a tradition strongly linked to Sándor Ferenczi, the original founder of the association in 1913. However, Ferenczi died in 1933, a few members of the Association, like Michael Bálint and Géza Róheim managed to leave the country before 1939, while others were killed by German Nazis or their Hungarian allies. The small surviving group of psychoanalysts resumed their activities in 1945, hoping that psychoanalysis had a future in the new society. However, in a few years’ time, the Hungarian political, intellectual, and cultural climate changed dramatically. Ideological and political attacks against psychoanalysis became more and more frequent and harsh. The Hungarian Psychoanalytical Association declared its own dissolution in early 1949 – just in time to prevent the immediate and unavoidable administrative ban which was directed not only and not particularly against the Psychoanalytic Association as such, but against all non-governmental organizations and private associations that still existed in the country. Nevertheless, a few psychoanalysts continued their therapeutic activities clandestinely. After 1956 psychoanalysis was permitted again in a restricted way, and the Psychoanalytic Association was only re-established in 1988 (see Erős, 2012).

We first discuss the most important professional actors and most important scientific fields that are characteristic to the post-war era; secondly, we highlight the effects and targets of political oppression between 1948 and 1958; and thirdly, we explore the reinstating of psychology as a discipline, a process that extended to the mid-seventies. The historiography of Hungarian psychology has hardly produced any comprehensive works yet, our article is a draft suggestion for such an enterprise. Apart from one comprehensive monography discussing the applied fields of psychology within the political context (Kovai, 2014), there are few articles investigating the history of Hungarian psychology, most of which take a narrower perspective (Bodor, Pléh, Lányi, 1998; Hunyady 2006a, 2006b; Pataki, 1977, 2002; Pléh, 1998a, 1998b, 1998c; Szokolszky, 2014). For Kovai (2014) provides a broader view of the history of Hungarian psychology and its societal influences, as well as she incorporates several primary sources into the research, we quite heavily rely on her work. Another important source for our analysis is a volume edited by István Dancs (1977) for the 75th anniversary of the Institute of Psychology of the Hungarian Academics of Sciences. The book contains selected reports and documents from the directors and researchers, and official committees of the Institute, compiled together with the intention to present the history of the establishment. We also rely on interviews with psychologists who can be considered as representatives of a particular era of the history of Hungarian psychology, mainly after 1960. The interviews were conducted by the first author of this chapter172. The interviews offer an important supplement to the official history of psychology (Gegesi Kiss, 1961; Pataki, 1977; Koncz & Pataki, 1993) that were mainly told by the leading characters of the discipline.

172 The interviews were conducted as materials for the dissertation of the first author, entitled „The self-image of the Hungarian psychology in the second half of the 20th century“.
Phase 1 between 1945 and 1948: Birth of a new elite?

1945, the end of WW2 was an important turning point in Hungarian history which directly affected psycho-studies as well. In the first few years after the war a radical reorganization of the political and cultural field took place, full with democratic hopes. During the years of transition, psycho-studies supported the societal transformation and actual political decisions (Kovai, 2014). In the short transitional period between 1945 and 1948, only a few fields of psychology had been institutionalized: state interventions and regulations mostly focused on pedagogy, childhood studies, and national education (Kovai, 2014). However, even in these fields psychological expertise was used for selection for jobs in the public sector where an impeccable political past, and worker or peasant roots were required. The results of childhood studies and pedagogy had been used as scientific tools to establish a professional educational system that played a crucial role in the socialist-communist reorganization and management of the society (Kovai, 2014). As the institutionalizing process was incomplete, personal initiatives had a serious impact in the field. Therefore, we introduce the work of psychologists who were less dependent on the existing establishments, yet they played a crucial role in the education of future psychologists influencing their scientific approach.

Those psychologists, who established stronger bonds with the former right wing regime and pro-German groups, fled the country or had been marginalized. The communist regime created its own elite and its own establishments. Ferenc Mérei and the National Pedagogical Institution under his leadership is a good example for this process that we will discuss later in this chapter. Yet, there were representatives and psychological establishments from the previous historical era that, for a while at least, could retain their scientific position.

Institute of Child Psychology after WW2

The Institute of Child Psychology was founded in 1902 by the eminent experimental psychologist and psychiatrist Pál Ranschburg (1870-1945). Since 1929 the institute was under the direction of János Schnell (1893-1973), originally a psychiatrist. Under his direction, the institute, officially known as the Royal Hungarian Institute of Child Psychology, Educational and Vocational Guidance, became a center for applied psychology as well: providing child psychotherapy, career counseling, diagnostic activities, and carrying out developmental research. Furthermore, other, non-psychological activities were also conducted there, pediatric services, speech correction, and physiotherapy (Dancs, 1977). The institution was a unique example in Hungary for a professional and applied psychological center satisfying different aims. The institutional model was built upon modern Western trends in psychology that had just discovered the principal role of childhood in the management of a healthy society. As Pál Ranschburg pointed it out in 1924, while psychological expertise was more involved in the construction of the “economy of the United States and the German Empire” and career guidance in different professions, the Child Psychology Institute happened to be the only establishment occupying this role in Hungary (Dancs, 1977). The institution aimed at establishing wider relationships with several childcare institutions such as “parents’ schools”, orphanages, juvenile’s court, etc. In 1946 it was renamed as the National Institute for Child Psychology, and in 1947 it received the rank of a scientific institution offering academic positions and salaries to its employees. By 1948 the institute had 15 units all over the country that focused on special abilities, learning skills, and
competences (Kovai, 2014). Soon after these exceptionally optimistic years, Schnell was replaced by Imre Molnár, an industrial psychologist who held this position for nearly 20 years. Reports and documents with the intention to tell the history of the Institute did not mention the reasons of this change, while the replacement of the previous director had been thoroughly documented (Dancs, 1977). Therefore, it remains unexplained why Schnell left the Institute in a time when such personal changes were often politically motivated.

_Harkai Schiller - Psychology at universities_

The ambitious and talented experimental psychologist Pál Harkai Schiller (1908–1949), 173 emigrated to the United States in 1947, sensing the growing political tension. He was highly influential as the head of the psychology laboratory at Pázmány University in Budapest during the Horthy-era. His function was to guarantee ideological “neutrality” or at least the lack of suspicious ideologies – e.g. Freudianism, Marxism – in the official psychological establishments. In 1933 he founded an institute of aptitude testing within the Hungarian Army and another one within the Hungarian Railways Company (Szokolszky, 2014) to examine psychological aptitudes of the newly enrolled soldiers and to provide career counseling and competence tests to those who returned from the front line (Kovai, 2014). From 1945 he established and directed a department of public opinion research at the Hungarian Radio and he simultaneously gave lectures at the universities in Cluj Napoca (Romania) and in Budapest (Kovai, 2014). This department was one of the forerunners of applied social psychology in Hungary.

In 1936 Harkai Schiller received a position at the Pázmány University in Budapest as a lecturer (Privatdozent) (Szokolszky, 2014). He organized the Psychological Institute at the university officially belonging to the Philosophy Seminar (Hunyady, 2006b). In 1947, after he left Hungary his position remained unattended. Dezső Hildebrand Várkonyi, the founder of the oldest psychological institute of Hungary at the University of Szeged (Szokolszky, 2014) briefly occupied his position, but Lajos Kardos became the head of the institute soon afterwards (Hunyady, 2006a) and remained in this position until 1971. At that time students could enroll in a psychology major as a discipline of liberal arts.

_The Szondi seminars_

Another key figure on the Hungarian psychological scene was Leopold Szondi (1893–1986). Szondi studied medicine but being of Jewish origin, he could not aspire for a university post (Benedek, 1991). He set up a private practice in his apartment in Budapest. In 1927 he became a lecturer at the Special Education Teachers’ Training College where he established a psychological laboratory,. . His home became a salon or

173 The wife of Pál Harkai Schiller, was a daughter of Béla Imrédy, a far-right Hungarian prime minister between May 1938 and February 1939, who was executed as a war criminal in 1946. Harkai’s uncle was Kuno Klebelsberg (Hunyady, 2006b), an influential educational minister in the 1920’s and 1930’s who implemented general reforms in the educational system.

174 As a representative of the Hungarian depth psychology he is renowned for his experimental instinct diagnostics and diagnostic procedure, the Szondi-test. It is a nonverbal, projective personality test using photographs of criminals and psychopaths. According to his influential instinct theory, personal choices are determined by the “familial unconscious” which the test can identify, and through the so-called “fate analysis” the family unconscious is subject to change.
some kind of a seminar where students were introduced to modern theories and scientific approaches that they were not taught about in university courses, such as endocrinology, typology, genetics, psychopathology, and criminal psychology. In his laboratory, simply referred to as the “Laboratory” or Szondi-laboratory, he carried out research based on contemporary genetic theories with the college students and volunteering future psychologists.

As the consequence of the anti-Jewish laws introduced from 1938, Szondi was dismissed from his college position, but continued to work in his home until 1944. He and his family members were deported to a concentration camp in the summer of 1944. The Szondis, along with the group of prominent Hungarian Jews transported to Bergen-Belsen, were liberated after a few months, and were allowed to go to Switzerland. Szondi settled in Zurich, founded his own institute there, and never returned to Hungary. Almost everyone of that period who became a professional psychologist in Hungary later, originally attended his seminars and joined his laboratory. He became an informal “gurut” for many followers, called as “Szondi’s pupils” (Benedek, 1991).

The rise and fall of the new elite: Mérei

The most influential psychologist of the transitional era was Ferenc Mérei (1909-1986). He became a devoted left socialist at a very young age. He had practically no chance of making a university carrier in Hungary as the *numerus clausus* law limited the number of Jewish people in higher education. Therefore, in 1928 he went to study in Paris, where he took courses in economics, psychology, sociology, anthropology and other social sciences at Sorbonne University. One of his Parisian masters was Henri Wallon, the famous developmental psychologist and Marxist thinker. He also attended Jean Piaget’s lectures. After his return to Hungary in the mid-1930s he started to work as a psychologist and lecturer at the Institute of Child Psychology, mostly in the field of professional guidance and counseling. He was also a pupil and an enthusiastic follower of Leopold Szondi. After his dismissal from the Institute of Child Psychology for being a Jew, he found a job at the outpatient department of the National Jewish Patronage Association helping orphans (Kovai, 2014). During the Second World War, Mérei was drafted into the Hungarian Army as a Jewish serviceman. His unit was sent to the Russian front where survival chances in the labor service were much smaller than for a soldier in any ordinary armed unit. Eventually he managed to escape from his squadron in 1944 and joined the Soviet forces as a volunteer, returning to Hungary a year later in a Soviet officer’s uniform. He worked, for a short time, as an editor of the Hungarian version of a Red Army newspaper. Between 1945 and 1949 he held various key positions in the public education system. One of his main assignments was to assist the modernization and reorganization of Hungary’s educational system, e.g. to establish a unified primary school system. At the same time, he became one of the spiritual and ideological leaders of a radical leftist avant-garde youth movement called NÉKOSZ: the movement of “people’s colleges”, aimed at recruiting and educating a new generation of intelligentsia mostly from the children of poor provincial families.

The Municipal Pedagogical Institute led by Mérei became an important place on the psychological platform. With Mérei on the board the institute which was formerly called psychological laboratory of the Pedagogical Seminar became an influential establishment carrying out empirical research and vocational guidance. They conducted laboratory and survey research in the fields of pedagogical, educational, developmental, and social
psychology. Mérei advocated a discipline called “pedology,” the complex (biological, psychological, sociological, and anthropological) study of the child which was very popular in the Soviet Union in the 1920s and 1930s.\(^\text{175}\) His colleagues were mainly Szondi’s disciples who received their salary from the state unlike in Szondi’s-laboratory where their work was unpaid, (Kovai, 2014).

Mérei’s most important early work was in fact a simple experiment, conducted with kindergarten children and published in 1947\(^\text{176}\). He elaborated this concept to describe the effects of *togetherness*, jointly lived experiences in small children’s groups, that is when a fragment, a single gesture, a signal may elicit the emotional vividness and depth of the original experience. Allusion, for Mérei, is a semiotic way to remind us of our group belonging. Mérei’s experiment, as he explicitly states it, was intended to be a “model experiment”, that is a simple, reduced, and transparent setting which can “model” the more complicated and more obscure social processes. The question that he addressed in this work was “how it had been possible to influence millions of people to support human massacres in the heart of Europe”?

Communism considered the public educational system as one of its principal strategic bases, (Kovai, 2014), and psychological expertise played an important role in it even in 1948 when Stalinization became more and more obvious. A new apparatus called National Pedagogical Institute was founded to provide the pedagogical bases of the broad public educational reform. Unsurprisingly, Mérei was appointed head of this influential establishment. In its two years of existence the institution performed high level activities with the best psychological experts at that time, such as pedagogical, educational, and sociological research, producing professional materials for cultural politics, supervision of the contents of textbooks, elaboration of general methodological concepts of pedagogy, pedagogical propagation, and exchanges of international experiences (Kovai, 2014). Mérei marked the institution’s mission and political position by criticizing the pedagogical programs of the previous two years blaming them for elitism, and, in particular, for “bourgeois” influences that resulted in the failure of general and broad

---

\(^{175}\) On the Soviet discussions on pedology see Etkind 1997, 259-285.

\(^{176}\) The experiment can be summarized as follows: after a period of togetherness of a group of children who had been playing together freely, the experimenter introduced an older child to the group, a “leader” with strong social dominance. The “leader” who attempted to change the group’s well established play and traditions, failed to achieve that through direct “dictatorial” means. He or she had to assert his/her influence in an “indirect way”, that is only through conforming to the established norms and customs of the groups. For Mérei, the experiment proved the prevalence of a “jointly lived communality of experience”, the resistance potential of the group which is stronger than each of its individual members. Inspired by the psycho-dramatist Jacob Moreno, he argued that in a small group or, as he called it, on the micro-sociological level – the “social” and the “psychological” inseparably mold together. On this phenomenological level the group has its own subjectivity, and the group is held together through jointly lived and shared subjective experiences that are mostly unconscious or remain preconscious, settled down on the periphery of the consciousness. The social unconscious finds its expression through shared fantasies, images, dreams, and, first of all, language, that is allusions which Mérei considers the “mother tongue” of shared experiences (Mérei, 1969).
social change. Consequently, the new public educational plans should strictly prevent “psychologism” that filtered through the recent movements turning away from real questions (Kovai, 2014). In December 1948, Mérei prepared an argumentative text for the Communist Party on “the ideological debate on the pedagogical platform” which resulted in a party resolution that distinguished two hostile directions in Hungarian pedagogy: the clerical, conservative on the one hand, and the bourgeois, liberal on the other. According to Mérei, the bourgeois, liberal distortion is connected to the psychoanalytic influences that should therefore be excluded. Psychoanalysis was considered an individualistic approach that underestimated the significance of social mechanisms and determinations in human life and development. However, Mérei expressed an increasing self criticism in accordance with the communist party’s practices, through profoundly dismantling his own previous works, and admitting his mistakes in integrating Western pedology into the activity of the institute. However, his efforts proved to be futile. In 1950 the National Pedagogical Institute was closed down (Kovai, 2014). Following a Communist party resolution against pedology which condemned it as a “bourgeois pseudo-science” (duplicating exactly the Soviet excommunication of pedology in 1936), he was dismissed from all positions in public service. NÉKOSZ, the aforementioned youth organization had already been banned the previous year. Mérei was basically sent into a professional exile and was unable to get official employment, so he was compelled to make his living by temporary jobs, especially translations.

**Phase 2 between 1948 and 1958: Interruption of initiatives and oppression**

The accusations of psychology as a “bourgeois” science resulted in the systematic oppression of psychological knowledge. Certain fields such as psychoanalysis, children or developmental psychology, psychometrics, and pedology were considered as fields supporting reactionary ideologies (Kovai, 2014). “The Mérei case” could be regarded as a show trial in the platform of psycho-studies: by getting rid of Mérei and imprisoning him between 1958-1963 for his involvement in the resistance of the revolution of 1956 (Litván, 2006), a seemingly loyal and ambitious communist party member, the party demonstrated that psychology is not considered useful any more in “building socialism”. From another perspective it would seem plausible to regard his case as a symbol of the total oppression of psychology in the 1950s under the Stalinist style regime of Mátyás Rákosi. This is especially the case considering that Mérei played a rather complex and conflicting role because of his political involvement (K. Horváth, 2011). From this time several establishments of psychology were simply wiped off the map: the Municipal Psychological Institute was abolished, psychology education at Pázmány University and at the Special Education Teacher Training College was merged into pedagogical curricula, private initiatives and associations had already disappeared (Kovai, 2014). The discipline’s journal, *Magyar Pszichológiai Szemle* (Hungarian Psychological Review) ceased to be published from 1947 until 1961 which means that psychologists were almost unable to present their studies for over a decade. The Hungarian Psychological Association originally founded in 1928, was also suspended in 1948 and re-organized only in 1960.

**The Institute for Child Psychology in suspense**

In 1949, documents signed by Imre Molnár, the director of the Institute of Child Psychology also signaled a growing political pressure. The director expressed his interest in establishing professional relations with well known Soviet psychologists of the era,
among others with Boris Teplov, Boris Ananiev, to learn about their scientific activities, methods, new publications, and books. Further reports described the annual projects of the institute as conforming to the needs of socialist propaganda: research should concentrate on the character formation of children, and on the Marxist moral and ideological education. According to Molnár, earlier research activities should be revised for their lack of scientific methods. The institution assigned its task to propagate further education of working class and rural children. Nevertheless, a general tendency to satisfy politically motivated pedagogical needs could be identified (Dancs, 1977). This effort cannot simply be interpreted as a mere sympathy toward the communist regime. In the early 1950’s different fields and representatives of psychology became the ‘enemies’ of the system and labeled as representatives of bourgeois science making Molnár’s attempts rather “heroic”, he was desperately trying to defend the institution from the political threats.

Some historians of the field, for example Pataki (1977) challenge the pervasiveness of political oppression by pointing out that the main institution – seen also as the symbol of the Hungarian psychological discipline – the Institute for Child Psychology maintained its position throughout the 1950’s. Another official pillar, the psychology department at the Budapest University 177 (ELTE) also continued to exist. According to Pataki, it would be a mistake to project our actual image of psychology as a unified science and a well-regulated professional system onto the past, and to believe that these norms already existed in the ’50s. Notwithstanding, we argue that the oppression was general and pervasive, even though certain fields of psychology happened to be ideologically more suspicious to the regime than others (like psychoanalysis versus animal psychology), hence overtly rejected. Still, the opportunities of the psychological organizations were definitely limited and/or depended on personal favors from influential political figures which consequently created a fearful atmosphere and politicized professional relationships (Barkóczi, 2013; Erős, 2014; Hunyady, 2014; Járó, 2015, Pléh, 2015).

Limited existence at universities

Notably, in an interview, Ilona Barkóczi reported that she was approached as a psychology student in 1947-1948 by a party agitator to leave her psychology studies and to choose a different specialty (Bodor et al., 1998). Different sources confirmed that Lajos Kardos (1899-1985), head of the Psychology Department from 1947 to 1971, himself an apolitical character was fully aware of the threats coming from the political power (Barkóczi, 2013; Bodor et al., 1998; Hunyady, 2006a). Drawing conclusions from the experiences of some more exposed psychologists, such as Mérei, he followed the strategy to strictly do animal experiments, and integrate Pavlovianism in his work (Hunyady, 2014). He also prevented his colleague, Barkóczi to do human experiments, for they can be attacked on an ideological basis (Barkóczi, 2013). In the early 1950’s the psychology unit at the ELTE University had two members: Kardos and Barkóczi, following their third colleague accepted a scholarship to China, and dropped his career in psychology. Psychology at that time did not exist as an independent major providing professional training and diploma. Yet students studying liberal arts and pedagogy had to take psychology courses.

177 Formerly Péter Pázmány University (until 1950)
Meanwhile Hungary’s second psychology department in Szeged (Attila József, formerly Francis Joseph University) went into almost complete nonexistence. Szokolszky reports (2014), that in the ‘50s even to publicly mention Várkonyi Hildebrand’s name was forbidden at the university. His colleagues also faced complete isolation, and were also considered as “reactionary” for their religious background. Nonetheless, similarly to the psychology unit in Budapest, they continued to provide psychology courses for students in pedagogy.

Taking roots in the academic system

Although the Institute for Child Psychology in Budapest maintained its position, official reports and letters written by the director, Imre Molnár (Dancs, 1977) highlight the threat of the early fifties that suddenly changed his tone as he was trying to subordinate the institute’s objectives to the party propaganda. In 1954, another threat arrived when further questions in connection with the institute’s repositioning were raised and debates started about the integrating the institution into the Hungarian Academy of Sciences (HAS). This integration offered the opportunity for the institute to join the scientific mainstream, but – as the only institute to exclusively represent psychology (Dancs, 1977) –, the change affected psychology as a discipline. The question was whether the institution would occupy an inferior status in relation to pedagogy, as part of an academic system which supports mostly “pragmatist”, pedagogically oriented research (Dancs, 1977), or becomes an independent unit, devoted primarily to basic research in psychology. Therefore, the autonomous scientific status of psychology was at stake by the integration into the academic system. Imre Molnár wrote a request to the so-called “Pavlov Committee” (a group for promoting psycho-physiological research) of the Academy, and to László Mátrai, professor of philosophy – at that time the secretary of the 2nd division of HAS – to defend the institute from a fusion with pedagogical sciences. The resolution of the Committee was made soon after the request, according to Pléh (2015) “in one day”. The official documents of the decision came out within a month (Dancs, 1977). Finally, in 1955, under the name of Institute of Child Psychology of the HAS, the establishment was integrated into the network of academic research institutes. Although some of the applied and counseling services of the Institute were maintained until the 1970’s, they were gradually removed from the Institute’s scope of duties. As the Pavlov Committee outlined the institute’s main fields of research, it consisted of the study of the “normal developmental processes of the superior nervous activity” (Dancs, 1977, p. 51). That is, the out-patient services dealing with pathological cases fitted no longer into the institute’s scope of duties.

Phase 3 between 1958 and mid-1970’s: Promise of Rising

By the end of 1950’s the political atmosphere had fundamentally changed. After the death of Stalin fundamental reforms had started (Szokolszky, 2014; Kovai, 2014), and as Etkind (2012) reports, “[p]sychology was fully institutionalized as an independent academic discipline in post-Stalin’s Russia” (p. 23). The 21st congress of the Soviet Communist Party discussed the role of psychology in the “glorious program of building the communist society” (Szmirnov, 1960). Hence this period that extended to the early ‘70’s is generally referred to as the reinstating ( Máriási, 2016) or re-institutionalization (Kovai, 2014) of psychology in Hungary, or a gradual comeback (Bodor et al., 1998, Szokolszky, 2014). This process was clearly facilitated by political decisions ( Máriási, 2016). Besides the political changes, there were other signs of changes. Already in 1955,
Pál Gegesi Kiss, an influential pediatrician, who by occupying leading positions in several committees supported the reinstating of psychology. He urged a re-discussion of psychology’s matter. Gegesi Kiss seemed to be the right man to support the rehabilitation of psychology for two reasons: firstly, he was professor of pediatrics at the Medical University of Budapest, he had a high prestige profession at that time, and secondly, he was not only member of several official committees – such as the Psychological Committee of the HAS and the chief editor of Hungarian Psychological Review – but he could be considered as a trustable character in the eyes of the party too (Máriási, 2016). The first issue of the re-launching of the review started with his article commenting and greeting the recent achievements of the re-establishing psychology. However, Gegesi Kiss did not refer to the reasons of the previous annihilation of the discipline, but only mentioned the future by highlighting the scientific need to support psychology (Gegesi Kiss, 1960).

Koncz and Pataki (1993) explain that the frequent professional debates of the time were the results of the sudden “renaissance” in the professional community of psychologists, that was intensified by the continuous ideological pressure. They also point out that a main characteristic of professional life was dividedness. Professional and scientific critique was replaced by ideologically motivated attacks, people striving for high scientific standards were often pushed aside. Certain fields such as social psychology178 and depth psychology were naturally more sensitive to ideological influences (Koncz & Pataki, 1993) while others like “clinical psychologists were all apolitical” (Erős, 2014, p. 11.). Pléh (1998) describes the hidden political implications and values of research in a period when a central force preferred, as he puts it, a “special symbolic system”. According to him, classical (Pavlovian) conditioning provided a passive image of human beings, as opposed to instrumental (Skinnerian) conditioning which can be closely related to the Western world view of people who are driven by motivations and active exploration. Similarly, in social psychology, spontaneous, emotionally based group formation stood against the formal, top-down model of group formation (Pléh, 1998). The symbolic dichotomy described by Pléh seems rather convincing at a first glance, however we argue that the scientific-political positions were more heterogeneous. Ibolya Vári-Szilágyi’s article (1974) on the relationship between theory and empirical research can be interpreted as a statement against ideologically forced research. Her article was welcomed by psychologists with different political and disciplinary backgrounds. However, unlike the earlier debates about pedology and psychoanalysis, ideological critics in the ‘60s and ‘70s were now located within the disciplinary boundaries of psychology and not between different professions or political forums. The legitimate existence of the discipline was no longer at stake in these debates, but rather the role and aim of science in society, and in particular in a socialist society (Máriási, 2016) and the relevant attitude of the scholar. Comments and reactions on Vári-Szilágyi’s article reflect the efforts of scholars to set the boundaries of the discipline supporting an autonomous psychology which cannot be subordinated to exterior and direct political orders. As a result of these tensions an unlucky dichotomy occurred: psychology was defined either as a “neutral, autonomous” discipline, not far from the American pragmatist tradition, or a

178 Pataki’s book published in 1969 entitled Roads and cross-roads in social psychology was an example of this ideological dependency.
visionary, politically determined one – i.e. Marxist. With the softening of the regime these arguments lost their relevance as *psychology could no longer represent itself as a building tool of society* (Máriási, 2016).

Political decisions affected positions, new establishments, and structural changes as well. Research at the Institute of Psychology of the HAS satisfied not only scientific aims and trends, but the recommendations of the agitation and propaganda division of the Hungarian Socialist Workers’ Party (Dancs, 1977). Ideological implications can be identified in the Institute’s research projects because, as it was declared, all research had to be conducted in a Marxist-Leninist frame (Dancs, 1977).

Ferenc Mérei, despite his background in social psychology was not allowed to work at the university as a lecturer, but in 1963 after his release from the prison where he was kept for 5 years, he got a position at the National Institute of Nervous and Mental Diseases (“Lipót”), the country’s main psychiatric establishment. Although he was a politically exposed figure who was kept away of public activities, he was quite free to conduct fundamental research in clinical psychology and psycho-diagnostics (e.g. application of Rohrschach-test) together with his colleagues at “Lipót”. Meanwhile he was aware of constantly being followed, he was not limited in his clinical psychological work (Szakács, 2015). His placement shows that certain establishments were politically more exposed than others. Those who occupied high-rank representative positions –such as Gegesi Kiss - had to be politically reliable. In some cases it meant a “neutral”, apolitical attitude, like in the case of Kardos (Barkóczi, 2013). In other cases, it meant a clear political commitment such as being trained at a Soviet university, or communist party membership.

*Reforming psychology at the university*

In 1963 reforms were introduced in the teaching of psychology at the ELTE. The new model met the expectations of modern scientific trends. According to the new model of ‘trifurcation’ in the first two years students studied basic psychological subjects regardless of their specialization, and in the last three years, they could specialize in three directions: clinical, work, and pedagogical psychology (Barkóczi, 2013). Nevertheless, political pressure to apply Soviet psychological studies was still present, balancing out Western dominance, but the control was clearly not as straightforward as during the fifties. Soviet psychological literature of that era consisted of a few distinguished works (e.g. the work of Alexandr Lurija, Lev Vygotsky, Alexei Leontiev), but most others were of mediocre quality. The comprehensive textbook of the Soviet psychologist, S. Rubinstein was used as a basic oeuvre at that time, and it remained frequently cited for a while (Bodor et al., 1998). Pavlov’s theories as the official communist scientific standard gradually lost this status according to the citation indices in the period between 1958 and 1975. Other Soviet authors, such as Anatoliy Smirnov, Natalia Menchinskaya, and Daniil Elkonin could only gain temporary reputation in scientific references (Bodor et al., 1998).

In the ’60’s, psychoanalysis was not yet welcomed at the university scene. For example, a guest lecturer from the academic Institute of Psychology, Dr. Magda Marton was denounced ( Hunyady, 1996) by one of her students for teaching non-Marxist personality theories, including psychoanalysis. As Csaba Pléh (2015) describes it in an interview, instead of overtly dismissing her, the party “recommended” to Kardos that “he might reconsider Marton’s assignment” at the university.
Grand projects at the Institute of Psychology

In 1965 the Institute of Child Psychology faced another turning point, as a result of a profound re-organization it received a new name as the Institute of Psychology of the HAS. In the 1960’s and 1970’s the discipline had a series of opportunities to establish new forums of psychology, such as journals, an association, international networks etc. These were optimistic and grand projects that were later labelled by some scholars, such as Pataki (2014) as utopist and irrational as it later turned out. These aspirations created the impression that psychology would play a crucial role ‘in building the communist society’, finally meeting the expectations of the communist regime. On a more concrete level, the image and scale of the Institute of Psychology grew larger than its potentials and later it became clear that the Institute could not satisfy those monumental needs. Instead it can pursue research on the basis of a basic experimental model. Consequently the applied activities were gradually detached from the Institute, and from 1965 it was primary to focus on basic research (Dancs, 1977). As documents highlight, in 1965 the institutional structure reflected an oversized system compared to its human and material resources. Eight departments were founded, but only five could eventually function as a well set-up, stable system. The Philosophy and Social Psychology Group that joined the Institute in 1967 became an independent department in 1971 (Dancs, 1977). The early 1970’s brought more changes to the Institute accommodating to a more reasonable set-up. Clinical and work psychology units with their applied profiles were removed, and joined with other applied psychological establishments. Only a narrow part of clinical psychological research remained within the Institute that focused on abnormal behavior without direct applications to therapeutic use. Also in this period, in the early 1970’s psycho-physiological research became more dominant (Dancs, 1977).

Since its transformation the Institute of Psychology of the HAS fulfilled a representative role in the Hungarian scientific life, therefore, its directors had to be approved politically. The first head of the Institute after the academic admission was Lajos Bartha, a former army officer who graduated in the USSR. He filled this position from 1962 to 1970. He was followed by György Ádám, professor of physiology at ELTE, a competent and highly influential figure. When he was elected as the rector of ELTE in 1972, the neurologist Imre Tomka succeeded him for a short interval 1973-1975, followed by Ferenc Pataki (1928-2015) who filled the position for almost two decades, from 1976 to 1993.

Grounding of social psychology

Social psychology had limited possibility to evolve in the fifties along with other social sciences and humanities, such as philosophy and sociology, nor did it really exist as a separate research field before, with the exception of some early initiatives of Pál Schiller, Ferenc Mérei, and the sociologist Sándor Szalai (Hunyady, 2014). In the 1960s it first became possible to offer social psychology courses at university, and in 1966 a social psychology group was founded at the Institute of Psychology of HAS, with Ferenc Pataki as its head. Ferenc Pataki also had a long relationship with the communist party but lost his credits and was dismissed from the party for his involvement in the scientific debates before the revolution of 1956 (Járó, 2015). With the consolidation of the Kádár-regime and the support of György Aczél, a Communist party politician who directed the cultural and scientific politics, and strongly influenced the psychological establishments, Pataki was put forward (Hunyady, 2014; Járó, 2015; Pléh, 2015). As Erős reports (2014) Pataki
came to be “the man of the era”: he represented the figure of the cultural politics of the late Kádár-era. Yet as his past was not considered spotless, a second social psychological department was founded in the Institute led by László Garai who aimed to establish a “genuinely Marxist” social psychology. His assignment can be regarded as a sophisticated political decision to create a well-balanced system in the Institute (Járó, 2015; Pléh, 2015). Although Pataki never rejoined the communist party after 1956 he could still protect the Institute from ideological attacks and from political expectations (Erős, 2014). He had a principal role in stimulating scientific progress, introducing recent social psychological theories, participating in the publication of textbooks, and edited volumes in social psychology (Erős, 2014; Hunyady, 2014; Járó, 2015). These achievements were part of a wider tendency to catch up with international scientific standards (Koncz & Pataki, 1993), not just within the Institute but also at the university (Barkóczi, 2013).

Summary
This article outlines the history of the institutionalization process of psychology in Hungary after 1945 until the mid-1970’s, until the period when psychology became a legitimate science, and became a solid part of the academic research and education system. We demonstrated that the history of Hungarian psychology cannot be presented in a straight, continuously evolving narrative, and not only because of the constant interruptions of historical-political events, but also because different political systems preferred different psychological fields and knowledges. The complex and changing patterns of politicization through certain periods were indicated on three domains: on personal relations and career paths, on scientific fields, and on institutional histories. In the first phase between 1945 and1948 selected fields of psychology, such as childhood studies and educational psychology were in the center of political interest. This was the period when psychology had a visible role in the societal reforms, which can be traced by the appearance of new institutions such as the Municipal Pedagogical Institute and National Pedagogical Institute that also functioned as research centers. We also recorded how already existing psychological establishments – the Institute of Child Psychology, psychology departments at universities – intended to set up progressive models in a time when the discipline did not have strong roots in the scientific system. By introducing Leopold Szondi, Pál Harkai Schiller, and Ferenc Mérei, we demonstrated three distinct and outstanding career paths that all made great impacts on the institutionalizing process, and on the education of future generations of psychologists. Although both Szondi and Mérei sought official platforms for their work (i.e., academic careers), their activities were limited for political reasons.

In the second phase between 1948 and 1958, we described the growing political oppression, and its ambivalent evaluation. This was a period when professional forums, such as the Hungarian Psychological Association and Hungarian Psychological Review were suspended and the future of some important establishments was at stake. In the meantime, either cautious, apolitical (e.g. Kardos) or politically loyal (e.g. Gegesi Kiss) attitudes proved to be adaptive.

The third, post-Stalinist phase starting from 1958 until the mid-’70s provided gradually increasing possibilities to reform and to restart the professional domains. This revival meant more than the continuation of previous initiatives or the increasing activity of already existing establishments. A new, scientifically coordinated and controlled system
was built, in other words, a systematic institutionalization of Hungarian psychology began.

In sum, we revealed that from the third phase politicization mostly took a softer, often indirect shape, and had a decreasing effect on the professional field, yet remained present throughout its post-war history. By the recollection of the history of psychology through the history of institutions, personal career paths, political influence, and conflicted political-professional positions, we provide an overall framework in which the complex history of Hungarian psychology can be explained. Although we presented some missing links, like the remembrance of the reinstating, the history of psychology in Hungary needs to be further evaluated and investigated in order to provide continuity of traditions and a consciousness of the past to new generations of psychologists, instead of the continuation of unaware and therefore impending professional habits.
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CLASSICAL ACADEMIC DISCIPLINES
From “Pre-Marxism” to “Post-Marxism”
The institutional system of Hungarian philosophy after 1945

Institutions, in a tighter sense, as we know, are institutes: organisations formed for a community purpose. The institutions of Hungarian philosophy, in this tighter sense, are the university departments of philosophy, the philosophy institutions of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, philosophy companies or philosophy journals. But in a wider sense, these institutions are the areas, where the philosophical sphere manifests. The philosophical sphere is a structure of connections: the mutual relationship between the philosopher creating the work of art, the created philosophical work and the audience interested in philosophical works. A functioning philosophical sphere assumes the audience’s need for philosophical works – and thus the creation of such works with regard to such need. Philosophical institutions in a wider sense are forms creating and operating such philosophical sphere. Thus, if we look at Hungarian philosophy with a sociological approach, which is similar to the examinations of the now developing “sociology of philosophical knowledge” (Kusch 2000, Gracia 2000) by way of the “strong program” of the Anglo Saxon knowledge sociology, we can say that the institutional system of Hungarian philosophical science was built in three phases: in the middle of the 17th century, in the end of the 18th century and in the first part of the 19th century as well as in the end and turn of the century (Perecz 2004).

In the middle of the 17th century, János Apáczai Csere published the first philosophical work in Hungarian. Magyar Encyclopediá (Hungarian Encyclopaedia), published in Utrecht in 1655, was actually a textbook: it summarized the science of its age for the purpose of use in schools. Its outstanding significance from the aspect of the history of culture and philosophy is rooted in its language: it was the first to present the ideas of the era in Hungarian, explaining the essence of the concepts of Descartes. The venture remained unsuccessful: our scientific language did not grow due to this experiment, as this book was not followed by a new work on philosophy in Hungarian for a century.

The philosophical renaissance of the end of the 18th and the beginning of the 19th century was related to the reception of contemporary German idealism, which was about two disputes, the Kant and Hegel disputes, lasting for about a half century. The earlier, Kant dispute was primarily a sectarian conflict, while the latter Hegel dispute was the national revival of the Era of Romanticism. Both disputes were characterized by the lack of an autonomous forum of philosophy: the reception of philosophical thoughts had no independent sphere in this age, thus acceptance was determined by other dimensions –
primarily by morality and politics. Nevertheless the significance of the disputes was based on the institutionalization of Hungarian philosophy: it was the first time that philosophy was themed independently within the whole of culture, and Hungarian philosophical terminology further solidified.

The establishment of the civil Hungarian philosophical institutional system was achieved by the turn of the century. (Hell–Lendvai–Perecz 2000. 13–34.) By way of this process, philosophy gained its own place within the intellectual sphere, the infrastructure of philosophy was solidified and the language of philosophy was modernized. The developing institutional system was built on three elements: academic and university science, the Hungarian Philosophical Association as well as the plural structure of journals.

The developing institutional system continued to operate with certain changes even between the two world wars. The institutional frames of philosophy were determined by three factors even directly prior to the eras we are about to discuss. (Perecz 2001) First is the official institutional structure: on one hand, the activity of the selected members of the second class of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences founded in 1825 and on the other hand the structure of university philosophy departments. After the First World War, there were four universities of arts and sciences: in Budapest, Debrecen, Szeged and Pécs. The one in Budapest was Pázmány Péter University – as the successor of the university of Nagyszombat (Trnava, Slovakia), which moved to Buda in the end of the 18th century, and then to Pest –, the one in Debrecen was Tisza István University, founded in the 1910’s, Franz Joseph University in Szeged, as the successor of the University of Kolozsvár (Cluj-Napoca, Romania) detached after the World War and Elizabeth University as the successor of the University of Bratislava. The second pillar of the institutional system is the Hungarian Philosophical Association, which is a significant player of the philosophical sphere with its 500 members, public series of debates and publishing of spirited books and journals. Finally, the third pillar is the plural structure of journals, in the very core of which is the oldest Hungarian periodical, Athenaeum, which was founded in 1891 and published by the Association, as well as Minerva, which was launched in 1922 for the promotion of the school of the history of the ideas of the era.

The more focused subject of this study is the institutional system of philosophy in the era after 1945. The philosophical sphere of this long period of almost three-quarters of a century is well known to have been filled with edgy caesuras: the reconstruction period subsequent to the collapse of the Second World War, by way of the communist takeover, was followed by the era of the monopoly and hegemony of Soviet Marxism – constituting the legitimating ideology of the structure –, which was then followed by a stage of reviving pluralism – after the consolidation, loosening, dissolution and then collapse of the system (Hell–Lendvai–Perecz 2001. 11–27.). Thus the story of Hungarian philosophy in the second part of the 20th century and the first one and a half decade of the 21st century did not form an organic unity: it comprised of three very separate periods. Thus in our summary of the scope of philosophical sphere, we make a separate reference to the years of coalition after the end of the war, and the decades of communism and then post-communism.

The years of coalition
The first period had two very recognizable characters: on one hand, the elements of continuity related to the previous period were still valid, and on the other hand, the signs of the next era were more and more dominant. With regard to the scope of philosophical sphere, there was no change: the operation of philosophical science was continued in the old paths. The most important aspiration of the significant players was to restart the previous institutional system. The previous institutional system had had three pillars: academic-university science, the operation of the Philosophical Association and the plural structure of journals. With the German occupation in 1944, and then the siege ended the operation of all three, and the primary task of the new beginning after the war was to restart them. In the renewed university structure, the education of philosophy was continued in an orderly manner, and in the academic institutional system restarted with Gyula Kornis, philosopher, chairman, philosophy studies had the same role as before. The Philosophical Association recommenced its activity chaired by Gyula Moór, legal philosopher, and the most significant voice of Hungarian philosophical science, the journal of the Association, Athenaeum was published, edited by Lajos Prohászka, cultural philosopher. The momentum of the restart was only hindered by the lack of financial and infrastructural conditions and personnel losses. Due to the circumstances after the war, the publication of philosophical books significantly declined in comparison with the level even during the war, and philosophical journals were only published again at a later stage. Several significant philosophers of the previous period died: Tibor Joó, historian of ideas was killed by a splinter, József Révay, cultural philosopher was killed in a communist terror attack in the mayhem right after the war, and several others – just as Béla Brandenstein, the Chairman, and Sándor Kibédi Varga, the one-time secretary of the Philosophy Association emigrated to the West.

While the form of the institutional system was left unchanged, several changes were made to its content. New trends emerged and became influential after the almost exclusively German orientation of the period between the two World Wars: the most important of all was French existentialism and Marxism. Existentialism, as we know, had attracted attention and gained acceptance previously: the Philosophical Association had a debate on existential philosophy and Heidegger’s studies, and the periodical of the Association made frequent references to the works of existentialists. However, instead of the previously almost exclusively German trend, this time the French course was in the centre of attention. In the reception in line with international and European trends, French existentialism became the followed trend of the era: it became the adequate expression of the generations surviving the horrors of the war. The typical fact of the liveliness of the reception manifesting mostly in informative studies was that in 1947–1948 three Sartre volumes were published: a Descartes selection on freedom, a brochure discussing the humanism of existentialism and a polemical essay on Jew issues.

While the reception of French existentialism meant the acceptance of a philosophical trend, the reception of Marxism was inseparably linked to the acceptance of philosophy and ideology. Marxism even at this time was not one of the many philosophies: it was the legitimate ideology of a more and more significant political trend. Previously, Marxism had not been one of the specifically represented trends of Hungarian philosophy: the relatively spirited interest of the turn and the beginning of the century was followed by an obvious decline between the two wars – also due to direct
political and ideological reasons. This reception however did not focus on the whole of Marxist traditions, but on Marxism-Leninism, “Soviet Marxism” constituting the conceptual foundation of the communist structure. Therefore, Marxist studies did not primarily publish philosophical works, but propaganda papers: translated brochures of mostly Soviet authors and polemical essays of Hungarian communists returned from the Soviet Union. György Lukács played a special role in the Marxist reception, having a beneficial effect on the professional standard, and thus an adverse effect on the disputes. Returning home from his emigration to the Soviet Union, he immediately joined both the scientific institutional system and direct ideological fights: he was appointed the professor of the University of Budapest, and elected academic, was also assigned the editorship of Fórum (Forum), the periodical of communist ideology, and co-opted a member of parliament. With his publications published one after another, and his frequent public appearances, he became the determining ideologist of the Communist Party, the number one person of the communist debate made with „civil intellectuals” and the communist influence and win of the public. With his international publicity, special authority, extraordinary erudition and special ability for debate, he was able to increase the attraction of Marxism even in the circumstances of plural conceptual competition. His works at this time: polemical essays researching ideological antecedents of the fascist ideology, studies proving the contemporary crisis of “civil philosophy”, essays aiming at the re-evaluation of the traditions of Hungarian literary history and ideological history, studies pointing out the dialectic relations between ideology and literature predicted the long-term perspective of communism and a longer democratic transition. However, with their shrill-voiced attacks and vehement critiques, they objectively promoted the liquidation of ideological plurality, the maintenance of which was subjectively attempted. The period of “coalition years” proved to be only a historic moment. “People’s democratic transition” announced by the communists during a few short years only became a thing of the past: by way of the faster and faster pace of events, total seizure and exercise of power took place. The civil institutional system of Hungarian philosophy was terminated, and the conditions of philosophical life were significantly transformed.

The decades of communism

The institutional system built by way of the communist takeover was determined by the needs of the ideology of the party-state and Marxism-Leninism. Thus, philosophy, in the new circumstances was in a much more different situation: on one hand, the value of its role was significantly raised, and on the other hand it lost its scientific character and plurality. Both the rise of the value of its role as well as the loss of its scientific character and plurality can be linked to the same factor: the fact that philosophy was transformed to the legitimating ideology of political power. Because, as we know, communism is an ideocratic structure: legitimacy of political power is created by the monopolistic ideology. The communist structure contrasts the “formal” democracy of bourgeoisie with the “content” democracy of socialism: proving its very own legitimacy, it does not refer to the formal procedures of democracy, but its own specific content objectives and values. Content objectives and values are held together by the prevailing ideology, and are realized by the decisions of the ruling party. The relation between the ideology and the party resulted in a double legitimating structure: ideology verified the leading role of
the party and the leaders of the party defined the content of the ideology. Communist ideology represented a very specific version of ideologies: there was no intention of objection against the concealment of “class interest”, it did not relate to free competition with alternative ideologies, and the requirement of the coherence of world view was not enforced. Instead of the concealment of “class interest”, it only highlighted the single class interest, the one which represented the interests of the proletariat representing the totality of human kind, and supported the rule of the party; instead of the competition of ideologies, it aimed at exclusivity, excluding and destroying all possible alternative world views; and the requirement of its coherence regarding world views was destroyed by way of the possibility of public criticism. Philosophy serving legitimating ideology thus is actually a particular set of dogmas. Its teachings qualifying itself as scientific and condemning all alternatives as unscientific makes a constant reference to the views which Marx and Engels as well as Lenin and Stalin left behind, in practice, however it changes with the unprincipled pragmatism correlating with the tactically changing interpretation of the party. In accordance with a traditional approach, it has two components: dialectic materialism and historic materialism – while the former offers a connected cosmology and natural philosophy, the latter provides history philosophy providing theological explanation of history. The basis of dialectic materialism includes the determination of material and the list of its modes of existence, the thesis of world unity and the enumeration of the laws of dialectics, reflecting theory of cognition, and the study of the objectivity of truth; historical materialism means the doctrine of the relation of the economic-social basis and the political-cultural structures and the introduction of different social forms of consciousness.

However, in the story of the period covering almost four decades of the era, there were significantly different periods, especially separated from one another, and determining the role of philosophy. From the legitimacy need of the structure, there was a fundamental and rather clear difference between, on one hand, the Stalinist period prior to 1956 and the post-Stalinist period after 1956. The Stalinist period built totalitarian dictatorship: it created an ideocratic absolutism, which ideologized and polarized all social spheres, and affected private life too. The “post-Stalinist” period created a more and more authoritarian dictatorship: it created suppression, which was realized in a paternalist manner, which gradually eased and then ended the ideological-political pressure, and consciously pacified private life. Thus the ideological pressure, which was quite strong at first, weighing on philosophy and the trade of philosophers started to slowly weaken, and then by the last one – one and a half decade, it completely vanished.

In the history of the communist era – similarly to the whole of intellectual life and the disciplines other sociology sciences – philosophy, with more or less differences, also followed the further dividing changes of political and ideological life, even within the two large periods. In the first period between 1949 and 1953, the autonomy of philosophy was totally destroyed: as the direct tool of communist propaganda, it became the part of ideological offensive, providing direct support for the management of intellectual life, the destruction of traditional sociological disciplines and the attacks against different alternative concepts. In the following reform period between 1953 and 1956, following the general trend of ideological easing, some changes were introduced: critical mentality was strengthened, the scope of referenced traditions was widened and professional standards were raised. In the period after the suppression of the revolution, between 1956
and 1963, with a little delay, but following the universal trend, repression was introduced to this area as well: a so-called “antirevisionist” campaign was launched, and an offensive was begun against anti-dogmatic and critical thinkers and endeavours. From the middle of the sixties, by way of the evolution of the consolidation of the system after 1963, in line with the consecutive periods of the reform (1968) and the counter reform (1973), philosophy first gained an increasing autonomy, and then by way of administrative measures, its development was halted and as the system disintegrated and fell apart in the seventies-eighties, it was freed from ideological constraints.

An existing philosophical life was developed within the scope of the operation of the institutional system founded by way of the communist takeover, at an extremely low standard and in a totally ideologized form. The institutions formed for the exercise and promotion of dialectic and historic materialism resulted in a form of operation, which was built on a common theme, using a specific language and covering a unified audience. Nevertheless, significant achievements could mostly be realized outside or on the margin of the institutional system: an example for the former one is the civil thinkers losing all of their institutional positions with the communist regime – like Béla Hamvas, writer-essayist working on the creation of new sacral metaphysics and István Bibó, a political thinker experimenting with the harmonization of communism and liberalism (Perecz 2005a) –, and an example for the latter is the group of theoreticians of critical Marxists of the „revisionist” György Lukács and the Lukács-students.

In order to exercise and promote “Soviet Marxism”, which – theoretically serving as the living guide of public interest, but actually justifying the rule of the party – played a significant role subsequent to the communist takeover, but lacked scientific character, terminated pluralism, and operated as a kind of state religion in day to day life, the previous “civil” philosophical system obviously had to be terminated and new institutions had to be put in place. A part and one of the most significant elements of this was the reorganisation of the Hungarian Academy of Science in 1949. The representatives of civil intellectual tradition were forced back from academic science – according to the official expression, they were qualified as “consulting members” -, and only Marxist – perhaps Marxizing “progressive thinkers” – were let play any roles. Besides György Lukács, who was more and more pushed into the background in the sphere of philosophy, Béla Fogarasi and more so László Rudas got more and more significant roles. In the structure of academic research institutes, as the central institute of philosophical researches, Philosophy Institution had been planned since the beginning of the fifties, however – to make sure that Lukács could not settle down there – it was founded only in 1957. The topical problems of Marxist ideological growth were the highlighted research topics of the institution, which first was led by Béla Fogarasi and József Szigeti and then by Ferenc Tőkei and József Lukács, and finally by László Sziklai, from researches on religious criticism to the study of socialist lifestyle and awareness. Following the Soviet pattern, the structure of academic doctoral and candidate degrees was established and the institution of postgraduate degree structure leading to the same was institutionalized. During the easing processes subsequent to 1953 and 1963, there were significant scientific results within this scope of academic science. The leading philosophers of the era at the Academy were: first László Mátrai and József Szigeti, then Miklós Almási, Éva Ancsel, István Hermann, József Lukács, György Poszler and Ferenc Tőkei. A significant turn happened in 1965 at György Lukács’ official 80th birthday celebration, and the
Hungarian publication of the work called *Az esztétikum sajátossága* (Specifics of aesthetics); and even more so, when in 1967, in parallel with the restoration of Lukács’ membership in the party, Ágnes Heller defended her academic-doctoral thesis.

Huge transformations took place in the institutional system of universities. First of all, universities were renamed. The University of Budapest was named Eötvös Lóránd University (ELTE), the one in Debrecen was named Kossuth Lajos University (KLTE), and the one in Pécs was named Janos Pannonius University (JPTE). In Szeged, in 1944 and 1945 Franz Joseph University was merged into Horthy Miklós University, which had remained there, and then was renamed after Attila József. (In Cluj – Kolozsvár – next to the local, Roman Babes University, an independent Hungarian university, Bolyai University was founded, and they were merged in 1959 under the name Babeș-Bolyai University). Theology departments were separated from the universities and were operated as religious academies. The plural system of philosophical education was dissolved from 1949: the education of philosophy professors was exclusively taken over first by the Lenin Institute, which was established for this very purpose and then in 1957, by the university of Budapest. In secondary schools, the education of the introduction to philosophy providing basic knowledge on psychology and logics was terminated: instead, the education of dialectic and historic materialism was begun on one hand, in the propaganda and retraining structure built on mostly party schools and partially open universities and on the other hand as the part of Marxism-Leninism, which was introduced to university and college education as general and obligatory. The measures made philosophical knowledge and information a public matter, and when by way of the easing, ideological control was loosened, many places had more free initiatives and new endeavours. The totally dogmatic subject called “Világnézetünk alapjai” (“The basics of our world view”) taught in secondary schools was replaced by a form of philosophical education, which allowed for some pluralism. At the philosophy department of the University of Budapest, behind the scenes of “Dialectic and historic materialism”, the rate of free philosophic education was increasing: the group of university departments founded in 1973 by the name “Marxism-Leninism Departments” had some role in this.

The structure of the publication of books and periodicals was also significantly changed. Book publishing had only one channel, and censorship manifesting in the form of censoring modern and contemporary civil authors and a selective transformation of philosophy history canon started to operate. The majority of published “philosophy” works were far from academic science, and were more like publications of brochure literature both with regard to argumentation and terminology. The published authors of philosophy history traditions were selected almost exclusively from materialist or at least rationalist representatives of “advanced traditions”, and possible different examples – just as the publication of the entire life-work of Spinoza and almost all of Hegel’s life-work within the series of the “Filozófiai Írók Tára” (“Library of Writers in Philosophy”) – were mostly regarded as rare exceptions; for this Spinoza has to be apologized as “grand materialist” philosopher, and Hegel as the “pioneer” of Marxist and even Leninist dialecticism. The plural structure of journals was terminated, and philosophy papers terminated their activity. With this termination, Hungarian philosophical science was left without a forum for a whole decade: attempts for replacement were made in 1952 and 1957, when *Filozófiai évkönyvek* (Philosophy year books) were published, and in 1956, when *Filozófiai Értesítő* (Philosophy Gazette) was published. By way of the first easing
steps and slight reform attempts, two new periodicals were introduced: in 1957, *Magyar Filozófiai Szemle (Hungarian Philosophical Review)* founded as the official gazette of academic science and in 1961, *Világosság (Light)*, the theme of which was originally religious criticism. *Magyar Filozófiai Szemle (Hungarian Philosophical Review)*, after its introduction, became the gazette of dogmatic academic Marxism, but from the sixties, it published more and more articles of alternative voice, and finally from the eighties – however implicitly – put an end to the requirements of the Marxist hegemony. *Világosság (Light)* quickly gave up its beginning aufclerism, and with its reform spirit and cultural philosophy profile from the sixties, became one of the major forums of the Christian-Marxist dialogue, and introduced several talented authors. By the end of the era, significant changes happened in the field of book publishing as well: mostly in the “Gondolatok” (“Thoughts”) series of Gondolat Kiadó (Thought Publishing House) a series of classic and modern works were published, which were essential for staying informed.

Three ideological “disputes” (or rather ideological campaigns), which determined the era, represented the most obviously the operation of the philosophical sphere of the long era – with the changes of ideological trends, and the waves of anti-dogmatic and dogmatic attempts – the first Lukács dispute of the end of the forties, the second Lukács dispute of the end of the fifties and the so-called “philosopher lawsuit” against Lukács’ students in the beginning of the seventies. The first Lukács dispute was the series of events of the formation of Stalinist ideological structure, the second one was the beginning of actually the re-Stalinisation of the post-Stalinist structure and the third one was the paradigmatic series of events of the ending of the reform processes. In all three cases, the person of the main characters was significant. Lukács, as we know, was the most outstanding theoretician of Marxism, even by international standards, and as such he was the most significant ideologist and most significant critic of the so-called “existing socialism”. His decision made as a young adult in favour of communism was at the same time both existential and social: choosing communism, he hoped for his own existential redemption as well as the community and social redemption of the world – such direct relation between existential and social always goes along with the irresistible temptation of totalitarianism. This is how the *par excellence* philosopher of revolutionary Leninism became a thinker both legitimating and judging Stalinism. By the attenuation of the revolutionary wave after the First World War, by the end of the twenties, he gave up his own radical philosophy and made peace with the Stalinist reality: he stood personally by the party, politically by the Stalinist trend, and from the aspect of history philosophy, by “the socialism, which realistically existed”.

While, however, he was justifying the system, he was also judging it at the same time, contrasting his own principles with it. He managed to stay within the movement, while keeping his own conceptual and strategic direction: requirements, which could not be met without conflicts, since from the viewpoint of the party line, which changed from time to time, one’s own direction sometimes seemed acceptable, and was sometimes qualified unacceptable. When it seemed acceptable, Lukács’ role was almost like that of an official ideologist, and when it was qualified unacceptable, he was subject to judgements, which could only be survived with serious self-criticism. And the judgements, as the two “disputes” represented followed one another periodically, in accordance with the changing party line. The main characters of the third “dispute”, those accused in the so-called “philosopher lawsuit”
were Lukács’ students, and the students’ students. (Hell–Lendvai–Perecz 2002) Their gathering started in the theme of the “renaissance of Marxism”, announced by Lukács: they started the work with the program of the destruction of Marxism-Leninism, which stiffened into something we could call a Byzantine state religion, and the intent to revive the critical-emancipationist message included in the original Marxist tradition. However, the plan proved to be an illusion, as the thinkers of the group arrived to the deconstruction, and not the renaissance of Marxism. An important station of this process was the “philosopher lawsuit”, the administrative party measure, which was in line with the general “counter-reform” of the era, implemented against those promoting views of social criticism.

The first Lukács dispute burst out because of the philosopher’s newly published article and lecture collection; however, soon it expanded into an offensive against the whole of his cultural philosophical view. The leaders of the attack were the prominent representatives of the Stalinist institutional system in the making: the propagator of the orthodox “materialist world view”, László Rudas, and the ideological leader of the communist party leadership, József Révai. The judgement established a link between Lukács’ previous and newer “wrong” views: constructing a “right-wing revisionist” view, it realized continuity between the so-called “Hegelian idealism” of Történelem és osztálytudat (History and Class Consciousness), the alleged right-wing deviation of the “labourer and peasant dictatorship” of the Blum-tézisek (Blum theses) in the end of the twenties and the alleged revisionist concept of the “people’s democratic transition”. Lukács, the leading ideologist and literature politician of the transition was accused of dangerously “backward” ideological-cultural opinions, the interpretation of the people’s democracy as the maintenance of capitalist economic structure and the negligence of the values of Soviet culture. First, the accused tried formal self-judgement, and then – qualifying his understanding overlooking the “quick pace” of the transition as a “mistake with serious consequences” – exercised self-criticism with regard to content: he drew back from public life, had less frequent political-ideological appearances and paid his respect to the Soviet cultural results. By the way, the gravely threatening attack obviously targeted the adjustment of ideological life to the monolith political structure, which was set up by the turning point: it ended all kinds of “deviations” and formed a unified structure for the official interpretation of Marxism-Leninism.

In the second Lukács dispute beginning in 1958, a comprehensive attack was launched against the entirety of his philosophical understanding. The thinker, who played a leading role in the ideological dissolution preceding the revolution in 1956 and became minister in the second government of Imre Nagy – publicly celebrated in the philosophers’ dispute of the Petőfi kör (Petőfi Circle) -, returning home from his Romanian deportation after the fall, could have had a role in official philosophy – at the sacrifice of a profession of allegiance separating himself from the “counter-revolution”. According to the original plans, he could have participated in the editing of the new Magyar Filozófiai Szemle (Hungarian Philosophical Review), and even his aesthetic propaedeutics providing categorical analysis of artistic oddity, which had been submitted to the printing house, would have been published. However, attacks were soon launched against him: his ideas were judged in opinion papers, party documents and institutional sessions. The hunt, put in an international dimension, led by his former friend, Béla Fogarasi, and his former student, József Szigeti, which mobilized Soviet and East
German participants – constructing a unified idealist philosophy with a view of his political and literary ideas qualified as harmful – branded the thinker as “one of the most influential exponent of international philosophical revisionism”. The attack obviously followed the direct political aspects of the power of re-Stalinization, which was in panic from the “revisionism” of the free Marxist thinking. The thinker, whose party membership was suspended, though he vigorously requested his return several times, had nothing to lose, thus he expressly refused to exercise self-criticism. With the evolution of consolidation, his position actually changed: the philosopher, who became a member of the party again in 1967, slowly became a determining theorist of the socialist reform process and a representative of the official ideology of the system.

The “philosopher lawsuit” of 1973 was a typical product of the stopping of the reform and the development of the “counter-reform”. The years of re-Stalinization right after the suppression of the revolution in 1956 were followed by a period of de-Stalinization from the middle of the 1960’s, based on which a consolidation course unfolded, which attempted to perform an internal reform of the system. As an important element of the process, as a part of the compromise between the party and the intellectual class, Lukács’ intellectual legacy was included into the contemporary corps of Marxism, and the operation of the critical Marxist group of the Lukács students was allowed. Nevertheless, the developing compromise appeared to be fragile: after Lukács died in 1971, and with the radicalisation of the viewpoints of the students, it soon ended. With the entry of the armies of the Warsaw Pact into Czechoslovakia and the halt of the Hungarian reform process, the anti-Marxist classification of the Budapest School of the Lukács students and an administrative step against their views became inevitable. The procedure, which later was called “philosopher lawsuit”, performed this: these seven Marxist thinkers were faced with exclusion from the party on a very personal basis, dismissal from workplace and publication prohibition. By way of the measures, a part of those concerned identifying with each other went into an external emigration – Ágnes Heller, György Márkus, Mária Márkus, and another part went into an inner exile – György Bence, András Hegedűs, János Kis, Mihály Vajda – and public radical and critical thinking became impossible for quite a while.

The decades of “post-communism”

Hungarian philosophy after 1989 was characterised by two things in comparison with the previous period: one was the philosophical institutional system and the sharp discontinuity with regard to philosophical sphere, and the other was the strong continuity in the performance of the philosophical elite. (Perecz 2000; 2005b; Laczkó 2012)

Therefore, comparing to the whole of the communist period and the operation of the communist institutional system, huge changes took place obviously. Soviet Marxism, which first benefited from monopoly and then gradually from hegemony – the orthodox “dialectic and historic materialist” trend – disappeared without a trace: and the followers of the great Western trends, arguing with each other, entered the philosophical sphere, the structure of which was becoming pluralist. The official philosophy legitimating political power – and in return, receiving its own legitimacy from the political power: this time, the different philosophical trends had to create their own tighter professional and wider cultural legitimacy. The institutional system recreating Soviet Marxism collapsed and the
philosophical life, which was formed on the basis of the institutional system, came to an end: both with regard to philosophical institutions and philosophical life, different conditions came about. Keeping in mind the performances of the philosophical elite in the previous one, one and a half decades, transformation was almost unnoticeable. The phenomenon was obviously closely related to the termination of the ideocratic character of the communist system and the easing of the ideological pressure on philosophy as a profession. The mentioned “philosopher lawsuit” caused measurable damages, though in this character it was more like the rear-guard fight of dogmatism and seemed as the last such intervention. From the second part of the seventies and eighties, ideology-free professional activity became exclusive in the most significant philosophy workshops, and leading philosophical performances – which were, without exception, born in the fields of the history of philosophy, logics, science and language philosophy – unfolded under the influence of contemporary Western tendencies. Thus by the last decade of communism the dominance of Marxism-Leninism became merely apparent: the dominant philosophy is publicly beyond criticism, and has no real effect. The significance of the transformation from this aspect was not more than that the Western trends – analytic, postmodern and phenomenological-hermeneutic approaches – could at this time be freely public.

With regard to the philosophical sphere of this third period, let us remember again academic philosophy work, university education, social activities and the tendency of the publishing of journals and books.

The – standard, corresponding and external – philosophy members of the Academy at this point were Miklós Almási, István Fehér M., Ágnes Heller, János Kelemen, György Márkus, István Mészáros, Kristóf Nyíri and Mihály Vajda: out of them five were Lukács students and three were the representatives of the University of Budapest. The Institute of Philosophy, which is still operating as a part of the institutional network of the Academy, experienced political changes and the development of the new conditions of philosophical sphere as the research institute qualified as the number one workshop of the equal Christian-Marxist dialogue, which got rid of the constraints of required ideological researches. Its previous activity, besides traditionally rich researches on philosophy of history, resulted in performances worth mentioning especially in two areas: philosophy of religion and history of religion and – thanks to the Lukács-Arhívum (Lukács Archives), operating as an individual unit of the Institute and then the Library of the Academy, which was considered an outstanding information and publication centre – in the Lukács researches. The directors of the Institute in succession were: Miklós Gáspár Tamás, Kristóf Nyíri, Gábor Borbély, János Boros and Ferenc Hörcher.

Huge changes took place in higher education. The compulsory “ideological” school subject character of philosophy was gone: this led to the total termination of philosophy courses in smaller institutions, and a significant reduction of the number of philosophy classes in larger institutions – partially with philosophical propedeutical, and partially with applied philosophical themes adjusted to the profile of the given institution. The education of philosophers radically changed. Previously, only the University of Budapest could provide a degree on philosophy, but today there is independent philosophy education in four other institutions besides the one in Budapest: in the universities of Debrecen, Miskolc, Szeged and Pécs. Out of the five institutions, the one in Budapest is still the most significant: the representatives of both Anglo-Saxon analytic
and continental, phenomenological, hermeneutic trends teach here. The institution of Debrecen consciously does not aim at extensive completeness: the intensive education of certain disciplines, thinkers and works, highlighting the development of the ability of philosophizing. The education in Miskolc is built on the teaching of more traditional knowledge and the more detailed determination of the taught fields of knowledge. The education provided by the department in Szeged experiments with the harmonization of historic and systemic teaching. The education in Pécs definitely follows Anglo-Saxon patterns. All five institutions provide PhD education as well; and the PhD school on philosophy of science and science history of the Budapest University of Technology joins the group of doctor of philosophy (PhD) education as the sixth member. The effect of the processes, which could be labelled as beneficial, were suspended by the introduction of the two-level education in 2006 – separating BSc and MSc levels; consequently the philosophy department at an undergraduate level lost its independence, and it became a part of the so-called faculty of “free humanities”.

The Hungarian Philosophical Association, the operation of which became impossible and thus dissolved, was reformed as the scientific and professional society of the protection of the interests of Hungarian philosophers in 1987, in the late years of communism. According to its statutes, its objective is to promote scientific philosophy, contribute to the development of philosophical culture and contribute to the cooperation of the members of the Hungarian philosophical sphere. Throughout the years, the association, which was chaired, in succession, by Ferenc Tőkei, Tamás Nyíri, Kristóf Nyíri, Csaba Pléh, Béla Bacsó, János Weiss and Zoltán Gyenge became a dominant institution of the Hungarian philosophical sphere. The number of its members exceeded four hundred, and the number of its annual events – lectures, debates, conferences – reached thirty. Besides the annual gala events, with the participation of foreign presenters, which were considered as outstanding events, the majority of social life happened in the individual department; out of which five operated at this time: the departments of the history of philosophy of the Antiquity and Middle Ages, ethics, religious philosophy, phenomenology and hermeneutics. The presenters of the association at the gala events were the key players of contemporary philosophy, amongst others from Derrida to Habermas, from Hintikka to Searle, from Dennet to Swinburne and from Manfred Frank to Albrecht Wellmer. As the most important venture of the association, from 2002, it started organizing annual conferences and publishing a series of studies by the title “Lábjegyzetek Platónhoz” (“Footnotes to Plato”). Besides the association of a history of a century, several other civil philosophical organizations were formed in this era. Polányi Mihály Liberal Philosophical Society, formed in 1990, aims at the maintenance of liberal philosophical traditions, the German-Hungarian Society of Philosophy, having been in operation since 1993 works on bringing the two philosophical spheres together with the organization of conferences, and the Hungarian Phenomenology Society of a history of a decade engages in announcement of courses and publication of periodicals. Besides these, the activities of the Hungarian Society for Patristic Studies, the Hungarian Kierkegaard Society, the Hungarian Wittgenstein Society, the Hungarian Dasein Analytics Association and the Applied Philosophy Society are also worth mentioning.

Publication of journals and books was fundamentally renewed. The essence of the changes was the pluralisation of publication structures and the total termination of the
aspects of censorship. In the developing multi-channelled structure, it was possible to freely form and reform canons, and ideological-political aspects were gone: thus everything and everyone was publishable depending on entrepreneurial drive and finances. With regard to periodicals, more than a dozen expressly philosophy themed periodicals were published, the majority of which, in the meantime, unfortunately went out of business. *Athenaeum*, which included mostly thematic translation arrangements, published mostly hermeneutic and aesthetic studies.

*Existentia* of Szeged, which was party in German and English, paid particular attention to the respect of the tradition of “philosophia perennis”. *Gond* of Debrecen published postmodern and hermeneutic essays; and *Vulgo*, which also was from Debrecen, included thematic translation arrangements and rich review columns. With regard to certain studies, the *Pro Philosophia Füzetek (Pro Philosophy Pamphlets)*, experimenting with bilingualism, disclosed history and cultural philosophy essays, and then was transformed into a yearbook. *Polanyiana* was the gazette of the Polányi Mihály Liberal Philosophical Society, *Aspeto* was published by the Hungarian Phenomenological Society, *Különbség (Difference)* was the periodical of the philosophy students of Szeged, and *Elpis* was the periodical of the philosophy students of the University of Budapest. *Kellék (Props)*, which was edited partly in Szeged, Kolozsvár and Nagyvárad paid attention to both the reception of contemporary trends and the respect of Hungarian traditions.

As for book publishing, plenty of philosophy works were published. Besides the publishers, which had been specialised in philosophy previously, dozens of other publishers appeared, which also focused especially on philosophy. Some of the most significant of them were Áron (Aron), which published contemporary Hungarian works, *Atlantisz* (Atlantis), which published translations as well as original works, *Akadémiai* (Academic), which restated the “Filozófiai Írók Tára” (“Library of Writers in Philosophy”) of long tradition, *Jelenkor* (Present Age) which published the “Dianoia” series excelling in the translation of contemporary French and American philosophy, *L’Harmattan*, which published translations of classic and contemporary philosophical works and the works of contemporary Hungarian authors, Osiris Publisher, which along with the journal *Gond* published “Horror Metaphysicae”, covering extremely rich philosophical topics, as well as T-Twins, which published the works of contemporary Hungarian authors and the classics of the history of philosophy, but is unfortunately already shut down. This work of the publishers made up for several decades of lag in a quick pace: by way of the published works, Hungarian readers could get access to significant trends and thinkers of European philosophy canon – from those pre-Socrates to deconstruction, from Parmenides to Derrida, which or who were or could not be published in the preceding decades for this or that reason. The reception of Nietzsche, Heidegger and Foucault reflected in book publishing, and in general, the publication of postmodern works seemed especially significant, obviously displaying researcher and reader interest.

By way of the developments of the last quarter of a century of the long period since 1945, two lessons can be learnt. Due to the institutional and tendency renewal, on one hand, there is an obvious philosophical renaissance: philosophy seemed to become an important area of Hungarian intellectual life – in a way which was unprecedented in the previous periods of Hungarian history of thinking. Nevertheless, philosophical
The Renaissance showed its own limitations as well: the character of the traditionally “unphilosophical” or even “anti-philosophical” Hungarian culture did not fundamentally change. All this is well presented in the harmonized political-ideological and legal series of attacks, which was launched by the right-wing government in the beginning of 2011 against the most significant representatives of Hungarian philosophy. The campaign threatening those protesting against the build up of a system based on authority held accusations – clinging onto invented excuses and fabricating obvious lies – against philosophy competitions arbitrarily connected to one another. However the attack legally proved to be totally baseless, the scandal could manage to criminalize the political opponents of the government. (Perecz 2011) The moral of the case expressly reminiscent of the “philosopher lawsuit” four decades prior was that the actors of the hunt did not accidentally select philosophers as their enemies, and that the campaign was by no means accidentally executed with the apathetic disinterest of the public and the demonstrative indifference of the representatives of the related branches of science. In all this, the basically “anti-philosophical” character of Hungarian culture is presented: that is that the wider cultural embedded nature of philosophy into the Hungarian culture still today has considerable deficiencies. (Perecz 2014)

Despite the institutional system and important results of Hungarian philosophy in the past quarter century, Hungarian culture is noticeably not able to transform philosophy to an area of equal rank with other human sciences of Hungarian culture.
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Attila PÓK

Historical Scholarship in Hungary 1945-2016

Does a turning point in political history have an immediate impact on all aspects of life? This question is especially difficult to answer if applied for culture in the broadest possible sense of the word, including scientific research. Politicians can certainly close all universities and research facilities from one day to another, can fire all professors and appoint new ones but if traditions of the field are not respected, neither new institutions nor new appointees will be in a position to start a new era in any field. To what extent was this the case with historical scholarship in Hungary after World War Two? What are the continuities and discontinuities in this discipline that played a very important role in the overall cultural-intellectual life of post World War One Hungary? This essay is an attempt at pointing out the main tendencies in the formation of the Hungarian historical profession from 1945 to the present in terms of issues, most influential personalities and institutions. It is trying to put the topic into an international European context and the context of the non-professional uses of history in Hungary.

The Making of Modern Historical Writing in Hungary

As in many other countries the professionalization of writing history in Hungary is closely connected to the shaping of national identities and the making of modern state administration. Not exclusively but primarily the states created institutions of higher education, archives and museums that served as the institutional bases of historical scholarship and the intellectual driving force was the search for the historical components of national identities.

The first institution of historical scholarship in Hungary was connected to the Hungarian Academy of Sciences (created by a private initiative in 1825) with a focus on the cultivation of the Hungarian language. Its Historical Commission (founded 1854) supported numerous source publications. The Hungarian Historical Association (founded in 1867) was also a civil organization, its journal Századok (Centuries) has ever since been the most important review of Hungarian historical scholarship. In the aftermath of World War the defeated country that lost two thirds of its former territory attached great significance to historical arguments in the political struggle for the recovery of its pre-war territory. During the quarter of a century after World War One in addition to the Academy and the Hungarian Historical Association the National Archives and a few departments of four universities were further centres of historical research in the country. According to an estimate in 1928 23 people could be described as full time historians in Hungary. The central organization of the guild, the Hungarian Historical Association
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was headed for extended periods by two of the most prestigious public intellectuals of the 25 years after World War One, Kuno Klebelsberg and Bálint Hóman, both Ministers of Culture and Education from 1922 to 1932 and 1932 to 1942 respectively (with a short interruption from May 14, 1938 to February 6, 1939). Culture in general, within that historical research in particular, received generous funding during the administrations of both ministers. At least a dozen Hungarian historians were very active in the international community of historians, these leading personalities were in line with the main tendencies of European historical scholarship: Geistesgeschichte, sociologically motivated cultural history even Volkstumkunde had creative practitioners.  

*The Communist Takeover*

Hungary’s defeat on Germany’s side in World War Two brought about a substantial rupture in historical scholarship as well. Hóman got a life sentence from a people’s court for his leading political role in the Horthy regime in 1946 and died in prison in 1951. Communists returning from a long exile in the USSR were to take over the leading positions of the profession but the transition was relatively soft. For example up to 1948-49 the dean of the Philosophical Faculty of Eötvös Loránd University in Budapest, the leaders of the Hungarian Historical Association, the editor of its review, holders of important chairs of history were members of the ‘old guard’ and one of the most influential historians of the interwar period worked as Hungary’s ambassador to Moscow from 1945 to 1948. The politically motivated transformation of the main research topics, institutions and personnel of the profession driven by communists was first manifested in the preparation of new history schoolbooks. They were based on a work by Aladár Mód, a communist teacher of Latin and Hungarian (1908-1973) under the symbolic title *400 év küzdelem az önálló Magyarországgért* (400 Years of Struggle for an Independent Hungary) that summarized one of the guiding principles of the official communist interpretation of the main course of Hungarian history: a continuous fight for independence against Turks, Habsburgs, Germans, until the Soviet liberation of the country brought about complete self-determination in 1945. The other key component of this interpretation was *class struggle* fought between the evil exploiters and the exploited working people running throughout the centuries. The relationship between national aspirations and class consciousness, however, was a most contested issue during the whole period of communist rule. In every historical situation the ‘reactionary’ and ‘progressive’ views, social groups and personalities had to be clearly defined and counterposed. ‘Real progress’ was represented by those historical personalities who were able to combine the struggle for the emancipation of ‘oppressed working classes’ with the fight for national independence. The ‘Front of Historians’ was overseen in their various qualities by four personalities, two of them former exiles in the USSR (Erzsébet Andics, József Révai), the two others illegal communists (Aladár Mód, Erik Molnár) supported by some extremely radical young communists in their late twenties as Gusztáv
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180 In English the standard history of Hungarian historical scholarship up to the present day: VARDY. The most recent comprehensive survey: ROMSICS 2011. See also ROMSICS 2006.
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Heckenast, Péter Hanák or György Spira. Historians just as much as ‘progressive intellectuals’ in any other field were expected to work on the basis of shorter and longer term plans.

One could define the year 1949 as a critical juncture in the history of Hungarian historical scholarship when Erzsébet Andics took over the presidency of the Hungarian Historical Association and the Institute of History (originally created in 1941 as part of a larger scholarly institution, the Pál Teleki Institute) was also put under the control of reliable communist personalities. Political and ideological ‘reliability’ motivated changes in the teaching staff of the three universities and the two newly created teachers’ training colleges. The level of higher education sank substantially, quality research was more the privilege of research institutes. In spite of the unveiled political aim of expecting historians to prove the historical legitimacy of the communist regime, the reorganized institutions produced not only dry, simplifying brochures with clear political messages but valuable scholarly works as well. Mutatis mutandis, as in the aftermath of World War One, historians were financially, morally and politically encouraged to produce works that in a scholarly way served political interests. Historical arguments refuting Hungary’s dismemberment were to help the country’s recovery after World War One, the emancipation of ‘working classes’ and Hungary’s historically determined belonging to the Soviet-led socialist brotherhood was the politically motivated research agenda after World War Two. There was a huge difference in the scholarly quality between the works produced in the two substantially different historical periods, still this communist political motivation resulted in the systematic research into earlier less frequented research fields as the history of the Hungarian peasantry and the history of the industrial proletariat. It was quite fortunate for example that a leading figure of a very broadly conceived agricultural history, István Szabó, appointed to the chair of Hungarian history in Debrecen in 1943 could keep his position until his retirement in 1959 (at the age of 61) and educated a new generation of agrarian historians. Here the ideological incentive resulted in numerous works of lasting value on the history of the Hungarian peasantry in the 18th and 19th centuries. Research into the history of the industrial proletariat, however, focused much more on the political than on the social historical aspects as the point to prove was that the communist-led working class movement had enough historical experience to lead the country. A separate institute was set up for the study of the history of the Hungarian working class movement in 1950 that in addition to propaganda also produced source-publications that, however, could and can be used as politically neutral research tools as well. Marxist axioms as the economic basis determining the social, political suprastructure and class struggles as the driving forces of political development gave economic history writing a privileged position. In the case of the middle ages and the early modern period this could be based on outstanding predecessors (Ignác Acşády, Sándor Domanovszky etc) but the history of Hungarian capitalism was totally unexplored. Some of the most talented and most motivated young historians were trying to put the study of the making of Hungarian capitalism into a broader international
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182 HADLER-PÓK

183 The best summary of the research results under István Szabó’s influence: SZABÓ. On István Szabó’s views on Hungarian history based on his university lectures in Debrecen see ERŐS.
context. With the easing of the political tensions during the 1960s this could lead to internationally acknowledged results in the field of comparative research into the economic and social history of Eastern and Central Europe. Iván T. Berend (1930-) and György Ránki (1930-1988) played here a leading role. Schoolbooks and rituals connected to anniversaries, commemorations, however, focused on the praise of social groups and personalities who were able to fight both for national independence and the political representation of the oppressed working classes as Ferenc Rákóczi II, a high ranking aristocrat leading an anti-Habsburg war from 1703 to 1711 or Lajos Kossuth, from the middle layers of the nobility leading the 1848/49 revolution and war for independence. This approach was complemented by revealing the treacherous role of the ’reactionary exploiting ruling classes’, especially the last long period before the communist take-over, the quarter of a century under leadership of Governor Admiral Miklós Horthy.

Politics, Ideology and Professionalism

It was only around the middle of the 1960s that a more sophisticated, balanced approach to some key issues of Hungarian history started to deeper permeate both the profession and popular interpretations of Hungarian history. Strangely enough it was to a great extent the political repercussions of the 1956 revolution that led to a productive fermentation in the profession. Namely, the political search for the causes of the 1956 ’counterrevolution’ highlighted the impact of radical nationalism. It was in the spirit of this politically motivated struggle against ’reactionary nationalism’ that Erik Molnár, the Marxist lawyer (director of the Institute of History of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences from 1949 to 1967) from the early 1960s on challenged the at that time dominating master narrative of the ’revolutionary progressive’ interpretation of Hungarian history. According to the ”classics” of this ’revolutionary progressive’ view (Aladár Mód and József Révai) Hungarian past was a series of failed revolutions and struggles for liberty. The failures were due to a smaller extent to the treacherous behaviour of most of the ruling classes and to a greater extent to external (Mongolian, Turkish, Habsburg, German and western imperialist) interventions. Thus, as Mód and his followers argued, the counterrevolutionary intervention of ’reactionary’ Austria (supported by the ’archreactionary’ czar) in 1849 prolonged Hungary’s longstanding backwardness that had originated in the Ottoman Turkish occupation of large central parts of the country from the mid16th to late 17th centuries. The Compromise of 1867 between the Hungarian political elite and the Habsburgs was a sell-out by the Hungarian ruling class and the interwar ’fascist’ Horthy system was imposed on Hungary by anti-Communist Western imperialism. Molnár and his followers blamed this approach to Hungarian history as being ’ahistorical’, ’naive’ and first of all ’non-scholarly’, feeding illusions to this nation instead of increasing its knowledge about itself, though it had already paid dearly for daydreaming. The ’Molnár- group’ argued that the dogmatic communists divorced the concept of the Hungarian nation from social class and historical age, as natio and patria had only reflected the interests of the ruling classes and not those of the ’working people’.

\footnote{184 Cf. PÓK 2003. Most recently about the Molnár-debate: LACKÓ.}
These were, of course, class struggle centred, truly dogmatic views and could easily be interpreted as a historian's contribution to the struggle against 'reactionary nationalism' which was given a leading position among the officially defined causes of the 1956 'counterrevolution'. Still, under the circumstances of Kádár's slowly consolidating Hungary (where those 'who were not against us were with us'\textsuperscript{185}) these views initiated a number of most productive research projects on the history of the interpretation of concepts like 'people', 'nation', 'patria', 'independence' resulting in a debate reaching out to contemporary history. It is also to be kept in mind that (as a contemporary foreign observer pointed out) it was Molnár's merit that for the first time since 1949 debate as a form of addressing theoretical, conceptual, methodological problems was institutionalized in Hungarian historical scholarship\textsuperscript{186}. The two platforms that emerged in the course of these debates were frequently labelled as 'sociological - realistic-denationalizer' versus 'romantic revolutionary - dogmatic nationalist' interpretations of Hungarian history. The 'sociological interpretation' (let us not forget that sociology was referred to by many communist ideologues as a reactionary bourgeois discipline) was trying - on the basis of plenty of new basic research - to examine the economic-social background to political and ideological developments whereas the 'romantic' camp was much more preoccupied with the subjective factors, the correct or faulty policies of leading personalities at major turning points of Hungarian history. It was especially in two fields where the newly emerging 'sociological - realistic-denationalizer' school reaped pretty rich harvest: the agricultural development of the 16\textsuperscript{th} and 17\textsuperscript{th} centuries and the genesis of Hungarian capitalism.

As to the key issues of the 16-17th centuries, there had been consensus in previous research that during the second half of the 15\textsuperscript{th} century Hungary was a par with West European social, economic, political and cultural development. The falling behind in the 16\textsuperscript{th}-17\textsuperscript{th} centuries was generally attributed to external factors: the one and a half century of Ottoman rule and Habsburg exploitation. New research shed light on the internal factors, as, for example, the complex process of the emergence of the second serfdom. During the early 1990s some colleagues suggested that the historical works presenting the non-West European peculiarities of Hungarian social-economic development in the 1960s and 1970s served eminently daily political interests.\textsuperscript{187} Namely, these works would have wanted to supply historical evidence proving the organic, deep-rooted nature of Europe's post World War Two division. Still, the ensuing debate clarified that the analysis of the in comparison with the core West diverging pattern of early modern Hungarian (and East Central European) economic and social development had for a long time been a key issue in German, Hungarian, Polish etc. historiographies. It is, however, hard to deny that in a political climate when Hungary seemed to be so much integrated

\textsuperscript{185} János Kádár made this statement at a meeting of the Patriotic People's Front on December 8, 1961 but he borrowed it from an emigré writer, Tibor Méray.

\textsuperscript{186} SEEWANN p. 296.

\textsuperscript{187} For the exchange of views between supporters and critics of theory of the 'deviation' of Hungary's economic development during the 15-16th centuries cf.PACH and HANÁK 1992.
into the Eastern half of a divided Europe (and world), research into the history of European regionalism and the origins of East European backwardness was politically strongly motivated.\footnote{188}

It is at this point that the impact of two books by a most influential cultural historian and film-expert, István Nemeskürty (1925-2015), working outside the established institutions of Hungarian historical scholarship, has to be pointed out. The first under the seemingly neutral title (Ez történt Mohács után. This Is What Happened after Mohács, 1966) touched upon one of the most sensitive points of Hungarian collective historical memory, the catastrophic defeat of the Hungarian army by Ottoman Turkish troops in 1526 and the ensuing collapse of the mediaeval Hungarian great power. The topic of the other book (Rekviem egy hadseregért. Requiem for An Army, 1972) was equally most sensitive: it paid tribute to the memory of Hungarian soldiers who died in World War II, a war Hungary fought on Germany’s side. What the approaches of the two books shared was that the commemoration of national and individual tragedies can be separated from ideological-historical-political evaluation of historical events. This was an important message for Kádár’s consolidating Hungary: private and public spheres can have their respective autonomies even if no formal guarantees safeguarded this option.

This example also shows that truly relevant historical questions always relate to the present of the historian. That was also true of the research subject that has perhaps mostly contributed to the ‘rejuvenation’ of Hungarian historical scholarship in the late 1960s and early 1970s: Hungary's position in the Dual Monarchy 1867-1914. In the aftermath of 1956, a cruelly suppressed national revolution, a number of historians, pondering about the perspectives of small peoples, nations in Eastern and Central Europe, started appreciating the framework that the Habsburg Monarchy offered for the coexistence of the peoples in the region. Economic historical investigations arrived at the conclusion that during the last third of the 19th century Hungary's economic growth rate was somewhat faster than that of the other parts of the Monarchy. The interest in economic history also reflected the political atmosphere of the time: the economic sphere seemed to be much more open for changes, reforms aiming at more efficiency, than the rigid political structure. Going far beyond the traditional explanations of the desintegration of the Habsburg Monarchy after World War One (where just the ‘machinations’ of the entente and some leaders of the national minorities or the oppression of the national minorities were blamed), a careful balance was set up of the external and internal desintegrating and cohesive forces of the Monarchy. Critics of this view spoke of ‘whitewashing’ the ‘reactionary’ Habsburg Monarchy. According to this criticism (a peculiar mixture of romantic nationalism and dogmatic Marxism) historians should concentrate on elucidating the conflicts between ‘reactionary’ and ‘revolutionary-progressive’ forces, assuming that it is possible to divide actors of history into these two groups.\footnote{189}

\footnote{188} A short, more recent summary of these debates has been presented by GYÁNI 1998.

\footnote{189} The chief initiator of this debate was Péter Hanák especially with his article: HANÁK 1967. A survey of the debate from a later perspective: HANÁK 1997.
The subjects of controversies that shaped the emergence of a number of historians without nationalist, dogmatic Marxist bias, among others, included the mediaeval and early modern roots of Hungarian national identity, the anti-Habsburg struggles of the 16th and 17th centuries, the history of Hungarian social democracy and even the short period of multiparty democracy after World War II. The debates helped a lot to clarify the history of Hungarian national consciousness, primarily the fundamental differences among mediaeval, early modern and modern interpretations of the concept of the nation. The works of the outstanding mediaevalist, Jenő Szűcs about the peculiarities of Hungarian national identity, national consciousness grew out of this debate. It was also Jenő Szűcs who initiated a major debate about Hungary’s position in Europe. His study on the three historical regions of Europe became one of the internationally best known pieces by any Hungarian historian after 1945. Along the line of the best traditions of great historical essays he refuted the Cold War logic of dividing Europe into just East and West. He argued that there had existed a third region delimited approximately by the Elbe region in the West, the Carpathians in the East, the Adriatic in the South and the Baltic in the North. According to Szűcs’s most influential argument this region was defined both by referring to institutions that existed there but could not be found further East (autonomous towns, corporate liberties, presence of Roman and Gothic art and architecture, the influence of the Reformation) and by the lack or the existence in a belated or distorted form of institutions typical further West, as free peasantry or the bourgeoisie. At approximately the same time, the late 1970s, early 1980s did some Czech, Polish and Hungarian intellectuals start propagating the cultural-political concept of Central Europe. Their point was very strong: this central region (to a great extent the former territory of the modern Habsburg Empire) was different from Western Europe but much more different from Russia and the orthodox world in general. Szűcs’ essay had an important role in strengthening this argument.

Attempts at Marxist Syntheses

The established institutions of Marxist historical scholarship, however, were focusing on the preparation of synthetic, comprehensive works. The most successful of all these ventures was published in two impressive large sized volumes in 1964. Though the main line of argumentation of this comprehensive survey of Hungarian history still reflected numerous stereotypes about class struggles and independence aspirations, it offered lots of well documented details of political and social history. With hundreds of illustrations the book turned out to be a success among readers, with more than 70 000

---

190 A collection of his studies in German: SZŰCS 1981.

191 Written in 1979, first English publication: SZŰCS 1983.

192 MOLNÁR-PAMLÉNYI-SZÉKELY. This book served as the basis of shorter summaries in French, German and English all edited by Ervin Pamlényi: PAMLÉNYI 1971, PAMLÉNYI 1974, PAMLÉNYI 1975.
copies in three editions, the only Hungarian Marxist synthesis that was truly read by both younger and older generations.

A most ambitious synthetic project, a history of Hungary in 10 volumes was initiated also by Erik Molnár in 1964 but his death in 1966 slowed down the preparations. Two thin books summarizing the preparatory debates of this largest ever (but incomplete) Hungarian historical synthesis serve as an excellent source for the state of the art of Hungarian historiography at the turn of the 1960s and 1970s. On the surface the subject of the discussions was the chronological periods to be applied in the new synthesis but this was far from being just a technical, editorial issue. These debates addressed the key turning points of Hungarian history and their conceptualization and how they related to contemporary mainstream West European and Soviet approaches to the chronological borderlines of the 'feudal age’ from about the 9th to the 18th centuries. The preparatory papers included a survey of the views of some outstanding West European historians connected to the Annales school and a very thorough description of the debates of Soviet historians on periods of Russian history in their leading review Voprosi istorii from 1945 to 1962.

A key issue of the first debate was the beginning of the emergence of structural differences between the Eastern and Western parts of Europe. The writer of the respective paper pointed out that it was in the middle of the 15th century that the economic unity of the industrialized West and the agrarian East was taking shape. He also suggested to define the period between the middle of the 15th to the second half of the 18th century as one long historical period defined by a long series of attempts at building out strong central political power in a fight with the regional power aspirations of the clergies and the nobility. This view was refuted by most participants of the debate who insisted on the traditional chronological turning points as 1526, the collapse of the mediaeval Hungarian great power as a result of the Ottoman expansions, or 1711, the defeat of the longest and best organized, still failed, Hungarian anti-Habsburg movement. Other preparatory papers brought in the perspectives of literary and art history as well with renaissance, baroque, classicism as defining concepts for time periods. The 26 participants included all shades of experts from Elemér Mályusz, a leading figure of the interwar ethnohistory-school, by this time researcher at the Institute of History of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Domokos Kosáry, the best known student of Gyula Székfű, imprisoned for his 1956 activities from 1957 to 1960, by this time also a researcher at the Academy, Dezső Nemes, Politbureau member, president of the party’s Political Science College, Zsigmond Pál Pach, a leading figure of the new Marxist younger generation. Most contributors challenged the suggestion that the traditional chronological turning points of political history be substituted by more vague processes of social and economic history. Most experts (in spite of their huge differences in their backgrounds) preferred political historical facts that at the same time reveal economic-social processes of international, European significance as, for example, 1848.

The debate on the capitalist period, from the turn of the 18th and 19th centuries up to 1945 also brought up conflicting views about such key issues as the evaluation of the Habsburg-Hungarian Ausgleich in 1867 or the Horthy regime between 1919 and 1944. The synthesis has never been completed: only seven of the planned ten were published.

The first in print was the 8th volume covering the 1918-145 period. Apart from the respective monograph of the author of the respective chapter, in post World War Two Hungarian historiography this volume gave the first detailed and fair description of the 1920 Trianon Treaty (depriving Hungary of two thirds of its territory and 40 per cent of its Hungarian population), its international political context and tragic consequences. This volume reflected many of the politically motivated stereotypes about the 'fascist features' of the Horthy regime, dealt little with its achievements in economic, social and cultural policies, still it was based on extensive new research, especially concerning social and economic history and the foreign policy aspirations of Hungary during the interwar period and during World War Two. The preceding six volumes (for a number of personal reasons volume 2 on the 1242-1526 period was not published) have successfully and in a well structured, readable form summarized respective research results. In a country of about 10 million inhabitants the extremely thick and generously illustrated volumes sold 45 to 80-90 thousand copies.

A three-volume History of Transylvania published in 1986 (after a decade of well-organized team work of three generations of Hungarian historians, selling 30 000 copies during a few months) was a true scholarly and political sensation. Scholarly sensation, because no previous synthesis gave such a comprehensive summary of the research results of the historians of all the three national groups in Transylvania: Hungarians, Romanians, Saxonians together with completely new findings, especially concerning the earliest history of Transylvania. The for the radically nationalist Romanian communist leadership most challenging message of the book was that it presented Transylvania as the common homeland of Hungarians, Romanians and Saxons whereas the official Romanian view defined Transylvania as one of the three Romanian lands together with Moldavia and Wallachia. It called for extended international political interest that the Romanian Academy of Sciences published a paid advertisement in the London Times under the title: 'A Conscientious Forgery of the History of Transylvania under the Aegis of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences.' Indirectly it was, of course, the tensions between the Hungarian and Romanian political leaderships over the position of the Hungarian minority in Transylvania that surfaced in the ensuing scholarly and political exchanges and continued even after the collapse of the communist regimes in both countries.

Just as much as this most successful synthesis of the history of Transylvania, the three volumes of the series Magyarok Európában (Hungarians in Europe) published during the politically so important year of 1990 showed the ultimate breakthrough of the above mentioned 'demythologizing, sociological, realistic' tendency in Hungarian historical scholarship. With a strong focus on the European context of Hungarian history.

194 L. NAGY.

195 KÖPECZI 1986. The synthesis in an abridged one-volume form was published in English, French and German as well.


197 ENGEL, SZAKÁLY, KOSÁRY.
the series covering Hungarian history until 1867 sold well and was also influential in high school history teaching.

**New Horizons**

It is, of course, extremely difficult to generalize but I think that from about the time of these debates, the late 1960s and early 1970s, it was representatives of that tendency that more and more dominated the profession. In fact, not only the profession but also historical discourses outside the guild. The popular historical bimonthly *História*198 (published from 1979 to 2013), edited by Ferenc Glatz airing these views reached a circulation of 30-40 thousand and a new generation of high school history teachers enthusiastically followed it. New horizons have opened up, Hungarian historians have through many ties been connected to the mainstream of the profession: be it the Annales school, Bielefeld, British or US social history. The economic history world congress was held in Budapest in 1982, a similar event of Enlightenment studies in 1987. As to the number of professional historians, during the 1970s and 1980s the number of those with 'scientific qualification', i.e. the Soviet type of candidate’s and doctoral degree moved around 300-350 and about 3-4 per cent of the Academy’s members (10-12 persons) were historians. Due to the good personal connections of some prominent historians, young talents had good opportunities for professional development in Austria, Western Germany, France, Italy and occasionally even in Britain or the United States. A number of bilateral agreements on governmental level or between Academies made archival research possible on the history of central state administration of the Habsburg Empire in Vienna and on territories of pre-World War One Hungary.

**After the Collapse of the Soviet Bloc**

The profession was widely represented in the post 1990 political elite: close to 10 per cent of the new, freely elected MPs were historians, including in the first 1990-1994 government the prime minister, the minister of foreign affairs, the minister of defence, the speaker of the House, a couple of secretaries of state, numerous ambassadors. Small wonder that the first sessions of the new parliament were dedicated to a number of historical issues. However, already at the first decisions the scholarly and political views started to diverge. Namely, a decision had to be made about Hungary's new coat of arms. Most historians were in favour of reintroducing the coat of arms initiated by Lajos Kossuth in 1849 without a crown. This coat of arms was the symbol of the revolutionary changes not only in 1849 but also in 1918 and 1956. The majority of MPs, however, voted in favour of the coat of arms with the crown. Their main argument was that the crown had always been a symbol of the continuity of Hungarian statehood and not that of royal power. In this respect a number of historians but also a few liberal and socialist politicians - argued that as the Holy Crown expressed the full territorial integrity of the Hungarian Kingdom, neighbouring countries might interpret it as a sign of Hungarian irredenta.

Closely connected to this issue was the decision about the number one national holiday. There were three candidates: March 15 (1848), August 20 (day of the founder of the Hungarian state, Stephen the Saint) and October 23 (1956). The parliamentary decision
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198 *História* has been published since 1979.
was fully in line with the previous decisions concerning the crown: August 20 turned out to be the winner. No doubt: without the conversion to Christianity enforced by Stephen (who ruled Hungary from 1000 to 1038) the Hungarian society and culture could have hardly been integrated into "Western civilization". The construction of a collective memory focusing on this tradition has been -especially since 1998 - a major priority of the governing political elite. Scholarship, of course, does not deny this, emphasizes, however, that the Hungarian cultural heritage was the result of the whole multinational, multiethnic, multiconfessional population of the Hungarian state. The contribution of the non-Hungarian ethnic groups (more than 50% of the population up to the early 20th century) to the Hungarian cultural heritage, problems of their assimilation, acculturation, dissimilation have been a major issue in the Hungarian historiography of the last decades or so. Special attention along this line is dedicated to the history of Jews and anti-Semitism.

Hungary's role in World War Two has been the subject of some of the most important historical-political debates of the last decades. Late July 1990 at a parliamentary session a former high ranking officer of the Horthy army spoke about the legitimate, justified Hungarian participation in the anti-Bolshevik crusade against the USSR. Respective scholarship has produced a great number of sober analyses of this most tragic period of our national history. It was pointed out that well deserved recognition of the often heroic achievements of simple soldiers is not to be mixed up with a criticism of mistaken strategies and war aims. These issues fit into a broader controversy on continuities in 20th century Hungarian history focusing on the four decades of communist rule. Namely: is this period just an off the main track period imposed on Hungarians by the Soviet Union or communism also had internal roots? There is here an especially striking discrepancy between the balanced, sophisticated scholarly investigations and the political discourse. In the latter some loud voices declared a continuity between the authoritarian Horthy regime (Admiral Miklós Horthy was governor of Hungary from 1919 to 1944) and the post communist period. A symbolic expression of this approach was the reburial of Miklós Horthy in September 1993: an event officially declared as a 'family affair' with 7 cabinet members present in a crowd of 50 000. It is quite interesting and illustrates the complexity of the picture that the same colleagues who 10-20 years earlier were standing up against a simplifying, orthodox Marxist totally negative, Mephistolian Horthy picture, now had to argue against presenting Horthy as a statesman of a great format. The evaluation of Horthy became a major bone of contention between liberals and socialists on the one hand and Christian-national rightish parties on the other. The former referred and refer to a continuity between 1918, 1945-47, 1956 and the post communist present and refused a cult of the antiquated, conservative, authoritarian Horthy regime, a dead end (as they call it) in historical-political thought. It is quite remarkable under these circumstances that for a long time the best Horthy biography was published by an American colleague. By now a young Hungarian colleague published a short comprehensive Horthy biography and a most interesting detailed analysis of Horthy’s cult as a great national leader. Still, the most recent Horthy biography came from outside the country.

199 SAKMYSTER. For all the issues in this subchapter in more detail: PÓK 2006.

200 HOREL
1956 is, of course, also a key issue in this historical-political public discourse about continuities in 20th century Hungarian history. If, namely, the main line of ‘organic sequence’ is between the Horthy regime and the post 1989-90 political system, the 1956 revolution dominated by reform communist leaders aiming at the reestablishment of democracy and national sovereignty, standing up against Stalinist Soviet imperialism, building on the "democratic potential" of the nation that was given a chance to bud between 1945 and 1947, is difficult to incorporate. You can do that with a twist: by trying to present it as an anti-Communist (and not anti-Stalinist) national uprising, even a ‘bourgeois’ or rather ‘civic’ revolution. Extensive scholarly investigations of the last decades show how heterogeneous the social background and political profile of the participants of this revolution were, a great number of publications analyze the major political tendencies and the international political situation that made the Soviet intervention possible. The current dominating political representation on the other hand calls for a single colour picture of the 1848 of the 20th century: the Hungarian people revolted in order to get rid of Soviet imposed communism, an interpretation that is, of course, directly connected to the present political battlefield. The socialists, who relate themselves to the reform communist leaders of 1956, are thus not the heirs to this great national tradition, just the opposite, they are heirs to Kádár's party who with Soviet help crushed the revolution and introduced a new wave of terror.201

These examples, I hope, will suffice to show to what a great extent the professional and political approaches to historical issues diversified in Hungary during the last two and a half decades.

Let me now turn, to the internal affairs of our guild. As far as the key issues of historical research are concerned, they show as much continuity as the dilemmas of the Hungarian society. Limits and possibilities of national self determination and modernization: are the two aspirations complementary or they have to come into conflict with each other? To what an extent is the relationship of Hungarians and non-Hungarians in the Carpathian Basin embedded into the European great power policies and their conflicts? The recent (i.e. those of the last two and a half decades) scholarly approaches to these ‘classical’ questions, of course, substantially differ from earlier interpretations. Let me refer here only to two new phenomena. One is the increasingly non-ideological approach which is reflected in the choice of research projects. Instead of focusing on periods of revolts, social and national confrontations, most attention is paid to the periods of consolidation, peaceful work, everyday life, national and social survival strategies, collective memories and traditions of cohesive and to a much lesser extent disruptive forces. The relationship between man and natural environment is an important issue and the state is evaluated more as a servant of its citizens than an institution of national or imperial expansion or defence. The other new phenomenon, closely connected to the first one, is the renewal of social history that with lots of broadly comparative microlevel investigations gives a much more concrete understanding of the modernization process of embourgeoisment, the beginnings of Hungarian capitalism than earlier less empirical, more theoretical analyses based on general, national level data. Especially important is the recent questioning of the theory of the so called"dual structure" of later 19th, early 20th century

201 On the conceptualization and interpretations of 1956 most recently PÉTER and RAINER.
Hungarian society, a discourse of great political significance as well. The issue at stake, namely, is whether you can speak about the parallel existence of a backward, Christian feudal and a modern, bourgeois, Jewish, progressive Hungary or rather the picture is much more complex, it is not possible to divide Hungarian society into progressive and conservative camps along these lines. If in the truly colourful, extremely manyfolded Hungarian historical profession we can point out some recent mainstream tendency (as the avant-garde role of economic history in the 1960s and 1970s taken over by social history from about the late 1970s), it is a peculiar mixture of anthropological, psychological and intellectual historical approaches.

As to personnel and institutions there is a distinct continuity, although the proliferation of new reviews, publishers and professional gatherings has been quite remarkable during the last two and a half decades. In the field of the political representative uses of history, however, quite understandably, 1989-90 represents a true rupture. More and more younger colleagues apply inter- and multidisciplinary methods and argue that the traditional organization of our academic life along disciplines is an obstacle to their professional advancement. Driven by this demand the István Hajnal Circle and new reviews as Aetas, Korall, Budapesti Negyed, BUKSZ, The Budapest Review of Books were established. Various political motives (including targeted funding) also contributed to the creation of larger research centres with 2-3 to 15-20 researchers each: the Institute and Public Foundation for the History of the 1956 Hungarian Revolution, The Public Foundation for the Research of Central and East European History and Society (Közép- és Kelet-európai Történelem és Társadalom Kutatásáért Közalapítvány ) that supports a museum in the former headquarters of fascist and communist political police (the House of Terror) and three research institutes (on the 20th century, 21st century and Communism), the Institute for Habsburg History and more recently the Veritas Institute and the Institute for the Research of the System Change (RETÖRKI). The Historical Archive of the State Security Services (created in 1997 is also an important research workshop of contemporary history. One can observe numerous creative initiatives at the history chairs of the Loránd Eötvös, Péter Pázmány, Gáspár Károli, Pécs and Szeged universities as well. The Party Historical Institute originally affiliated with the state party gradually transformed into a leftish think tank and a creative workshop of the history of the twentieth century. The Institute History of the Research Centre for the Humanities of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences remained the internationally best connected and recognized institution of Hungarian historical scholarship. The Central European University and the Andrássy University as international institutions in Budapest have also substantially contributed to the internationalization of Hungarian historical scholarship.

Hungarian national identity has always been greatly determined by collective historical memory. This has been both a great chance and a great danger for Hungarian historical scholarship – later generations will be in a real position to judge the performance of the profession.

---

202 A synthesis based on these new approaches is already available: GYÁNI-KÖVÉR-VALUCH. A most interesting exchange on this issue between Gábor Gyáni and Viktor Karády: GYÁNI 1997, KARÁDY.
BIBLIOGRAPHY

ENGEL Pál Engel: Beilleszkedés Európába a kezdetektől 1440-ig (Adjustment to Europe from the Beginnings to the 1440s) Háttér Lap- és Könyvkiadó, Budapest, 1990.

ERŐS Vilmos Erős: Szabó István "ellentörténelméi" az 1950-es években (István Szabó’s 'Counterhistories during the1950s) http://filozofia.unideb.hu/na/vol2011_2/201102_EV_Szabo.docilmos


MÓD Aladár Mód: 400 év küzdelem az önálló Magyarországért (400 Years of Struggle for an Independent Hungary). First published Budapest, 1943; six further revised, extended editions up to 1954.


Gábor BEZECZKY

Literary Studies in Hungary since 1945

Piecemeal sovietization

In 1944-1945, the members of the communist elite, returning from their Moscow exile in the wake of the invading Red Army, had boundless energy to rearrange the political landscape to their own advantage and had an unconcealed desire to direct the course of the events. They had nothing to fear in Hungary, except the wrath of Stalin. They were lucky to survive and painfully aware of their comrades and relatives who disappeared during the great purges in the Soviet Union.

A gradual sovietization of Hungary, as opposed to the introduction of instant draconian measures, the model of 1919, was decided at Party meetings in Moscow in September and October of 1944. This, however, not only implied that they had to accept, at least temporarily, the presence and activities of other legitimate political parties and organizations. They adopted an old military metaphor (i.e., people’s front) to describe their sharing of power with the rest of the political arena.

In the new situation, writers, critics, literary historians had to realize that the rules of the game were changing, and the old assumptions about success no longer applied. New possibilities opened up with new career prospects and entirely new types of winning arguments. The practice of literary history needs years or decades in preparation, so in the brief, frenzied coalition period before the communist takeover in 1948, the study of literature was most often limited to book reviews, short essays and opinion pieces in daily newspapers and literary journals. The period was unique in the sense that almost all the literary scholars participated in the debates about contemporary literature. It was quite
clear that the decisions and judgements about contemporary literature would later play a major role in how literary history would be written. And indeed, these debates outlined some of the features the study of literature would take on years and decades later. This, however, necessitates a few short detours in literature itself.

The situation was also new in the sense that a number of talented and ambitious young people, born in the early 1920s, like Előd Halász (1920-1997), László Kéry (1920-1992), Béla Köpeczi (1920-2010), Péter Nagy (1920-2010), Miklós Szabolcsi (1921-2000), István Király (1921-1989), Tibor Klanczyay (1923-1992), Sándor Lukácsy (1923-2001), Pál Pándi (1926-1987) came forward. Almost all of them would become academicians, and all of them would be at least heads of departments at universities or at the Academy of Sciences. In the company of a few older and younger people, usually the ones with the fiercest Stalinist rhetoric, determined to cow the non-communists into into reticence, some of them would become the dominant literary scholars of the socialist period.

**Parties and intellectuals**

The elections of November 1945, with an amazing 92 % turnout, showed that the Independent Smallholders Party had 57 %, both the Social Democrats and the Communists about 17 %, and the National Peasant Party 7 % share of the votes. Despite their sweeping victory, the Smallholders were prevented from forming a government on their own. Both marshal Kliment Yefremovich Voroshilov, the head of the Allied Control Commission in Hungary, and Vyacheslav Mikhailovich Molotov, the Soviet foreign minister, made it abundantly clear that they would only accept a coalition government with the interior minister, a key post supervising the police, appointed by the communists.

The Smallholders Party was somewhat bland and unexciting, usually hesitant to act decisively, but both of these features were part and parcel of their appeal. They offered no fanciful solutions to the problems of the country beyond democracy, i.e, the rule of law, and private property, i.e., capitalism. They were seen as the least threatening – in the sense of encroaching on and meddling with the lives of ordinary citizens – among the parties available. It also helped a lot that they were definitely not communists, apart from the ubiquitous infiltrators and police informers. The majority they initially enjoyed melted away as the Party, with a little help from their communist friends, broke up into ever smaller parts.

Gábor Tolnai (1910-1990), a literary scholar of old Hungarian literature, was a member of the Smallholders Party. His career, however, seems to be strangely incongruous with that of anybody outside the Communist Party. He was director-general of the National Library, 1946-47; an academian from 1948, one of the very few who could keep his membership in the Academy after it was reorganized in 1949; the head of the university department in the Ministry of Culture and Education, 1948-1949; the ambassador to Italy, 1949-1950; the minister of Education, 1950-1951; secretary, from 1952, then president,
from 1962, of the Scholarly Qualification Committee; the head of the old Hungarian
literature department at the Budapest university, 1953-1980; the editor of 'Kortárs' (The
Contemporary) one of the few literary journals of the period, 1957-1962. When he was
a university student, he belonged to the 'Szegedi Fiatalok Művészeti Kollégiuma' (The Art
College of the Youth in Szeged).

Two other members of the same circle, Ferenc Erdei (1910-1971) of the Peasant Party
and Gyula Ortutay (1910-1978) of the Smallholders Party, joined the Communist Party in
secret very early. (Erdei in 1944, Ortutay in 1945.) In other words, they acted as high-
level plants or infiltrators in the Smallholders Party and in the Peasant Party. The
sociologist Erdei, was interior minister, 1944-1945; an academician from 1948; minister
of agriculture, 1949-1953; minister of justice, 1953-1954; secretary-general of the
was an academician from 1945; the minister of culture and education, 1947-1950; the
member of the Presidential Council, 1958-1978; president of the Hungarian Folklore
Association, 1946-1978; president of the Society for Dissemination of Scientific
Knowledge, 1964-1978. Although there are documents to prove that Erdei and Ortutay
joined the communists in secret, Tolnai’s case is unknown. Anyway, unlike those of
Erdei and Ortutay, the scholarly achievement of Gábor Tolnai, as opposed to the power
he was entrusted with, was insignificant after 1945.

At the opposite end from the Smallholders, the National Peasant Party, with its meagre 7
% of support, had a sizeable group of well-known, highly educated and outspoken
intellectuals with grand ideas for the elevation and empowerment of the poorest and most
uneducated segment of society. They agreed, to some extent, with the Marxists that
fundamental changes were both necessary and inevitable in the structure of society, in
favour of the people at the bottom. They had, as a tradition to look back on, the
movement of the 'populist' writers between the two world wars. The word 'populist' is
an inadequate equivalent for the Hungarian word 'népi', but there does not seem to be
any better translation.

The noun 'nép' (people, population) and the adjective 'népi' were used throughout the
nineteenth century in quasi-religious contexts for the unprivileged, exploited, suppressed,
uneducated, mainly rural and agrarian masses supposed to provide the real backbone of
the nation. The word 'nép' is only related to the German 'Volk' through this nineteenth-
century connection. It is, therefore, not a direct counterpart of how the Third Reich
appropriated the word 'Volk.' The word 'nép' was immediately purloined by the people
returning from Moscow. The Communist Party daily was called 'Szabad Nép' (Free
People). The word was also used in compounds like 'népbíróság' (people’s tribunal),
népköztársaság' (people’s republic), 'népi demokrácia' (people’s democracy),
néphadsereg' (people’s army), 'Népstadion' (People’s Stadium), 'népfront' (people’s
front). As soon as it came in touch with unpopular things, not only did the word lose its
sublime overtones but started on its way to become tainted. Later it was simply seen to
reverse to its opposite the meaning of whatever it was connected with: people’s
democracy was understood to be the lack of democracy. The word 'szocialista' (socialist)
produced the same effect in 'szocialista demokrácia' (socialist democracy) and in other expressions. Grammatically, they acted as privative modifiers. Eventually, the word 'nép' fell out of use, except in old compounds like 'népharag' (public indignation, public uproar) or 'népsűrűség' (population density). The words 'socialist' and 'communist' could not fall out of use because they never entered common, everyday speech. Apart from Party meetings, they were almost exclusively reserved for public occasions in public spaces.

The populist group had a strong sense of solidarity despite their widely divergent ideas and frequent conflicts of personality. Being protean, they were free to use whatever energy, argument, leverage, career-enhancing opportunities they saw in order to further the cause of the 'people.' Some of them, like the poet József Erdélyi (1896-1978) echoed Nazi slogans and could not stop voicing anti-Semitic slurs, others became rabid communists, and were still accepted, praised and protected by the rest of the group. Ideological orientations were seen as superficial additions to, or inconsequential modulations of, the core populist doctrine about the empowerment of the people at the bottom of Hungarian society.

No matter how talented and articulate they were, the overall influence of the populist writers was overrated by the Marxists. This was the characteristic mistake of a Party, which saw its strategic enemy in the large Smallholders Party, and had no agrarian organizations to rely on. The Peasant Party’s election result, that is, their 7% shows that the 'people' the Party intellectuals idealized and idolized were less than enthusiastic about their grand ideas. Suspicious of schemes coming from neat townspeople, they resisted to be elevated and empowered the way the Party proposed. But such an unimportant thing as unpopularity could not turn off the communists. It was not popularity they were after but power. While the Smallholders Party was clearly slated for demolition through fragmentation, the populist writers as potential allies and legitimating partners were usually courted and treated with utmost care by the communists throughout the whole period of socialism. The novelist Péter Veres (1897-1970), the chairman of the Peasant Party from 1945 to 1949, was minister of defense between 1947 and 1949. Another novelist, József Darvas (1912-1973), the deputy chairman of the Peasant Party (1945-1949), suspected to be a closet communist, was almost continually a minister (construction, culture, education) from 1947 to 1956. Ferenc Erdei, mentioned above, also belongs here.

Other, more significant populist writers, like Gyula Illyés (1902-1983), László Németh (1901-1975), Lőrinc Szabó (1900-1957), János Kodolányi (1899-1969) acted more like partisans and were, if at all, loosely affiliated with the Peasant Party. Németh, Szabó and Kodolányi, waiting for the dust to settle, shunned publicity for some time. Erdélyi was hiding in Transylvania. He was tried and convicted for war crimes in 1947, but, after serving a most lenient sentence, he was free again in 1948. He was permitted to publish a book of poems in 1955. In return, he was only expected to include a few nice and understanding lines about the socialist regime. László Németh, in an attempt to preempt unfriendly measures against him, moved far away from the limelight to
Hódmezővásárhely, a small town in the south of the country, and taught in the local secondary school for years and translated a classic Russian novel, Leo Tolstoy’s Anna Karenina, for which he was awarded a literary prize in 1952. Eventually, Illyés and Németh grew into the highly ambivalent role of the ‘fellow-traveller.’ Both of them were guests of honour at the 10th congress of the Communist Party in 1970. At that time, having lost much of their outsider status, having been turned into allies, with their speech and attitude suggesting that they were letting bygones be bygones, they blended almost seamlessly into the tableaux of Party dignitaries. To be protean, it seems, has a price.

The Social Democrats had a proud tradition going back to the nineteenth century. The members of the Party were mostly urban blue-collar workers. The expression ‘organized worker’ referred to a member of a union. The unions were, in turn, controlled by the Social Democrats. At the turn of the century, the Party created a media empire (presses, publishing houses, newspapers, journals) second only to that of the Catholic church. They stressed the importance of education and supported reading clubs, choruses, recitals. They were familiar with various versions of Marxism and the idea of class struggle. However, instead of the revolutionary upheaval, they usually went for higher wages and better working conditions. Between the two world wars, the illegal communists, much as they despised the Social Democrats for their alleged petty bourgeois views and compromises, used some of their clubs and papers as covers. After the war, the Party, especially its top leadership, was infiltrated by the communists. This was the period when the term ‘crypto-communist’ entered the Hungarian language. The Party seemed to provide a relatively safe haven, at least for a while, for the disillusioned erstwhile communists, like Lajos Kassák (1887-1967), a well-known avant-garde poet, novelist and painter. But the days of the Party were numbered. Betrayed by some of their leaders and leaned on from the outside, they could not avoid merging with the communists in 1948. Since then, the anti-authoritarian tradition of the Social Democrats has disappeared without a trace.

Before the elections of 1945, the number of the Communist Party members swelled so fast that József Révai (1898-1959), who was to become an iron-fisted minister of culture, predicted a 70% victory. The rapid growth of the Party was partly due to the fact that the rank-and-file members of the Hungarian Nazi party (called the Arrowcross Party) were forced by the communist-controlled police to choose between joining the Communist Party and being interned. György Lukács (1885-1971), coming home from his Moscow exile, is said to have responded to this with caustic wit: „We are a small country. We have only one set of vicious thugs.” Like other excellent one-liners, this one is attributed to several people: György Lukács, Pál Királyhegyi (1900-1981), a journalist and comedian, and Jenő Heltai (1871-1957), a poet and novelist, the first cousin of the Budapest-born Theodor Herzl. Herding the ordinary members of the Arrowcross Party into the Communist Party was not as outrageous as it seems at first glance. It has been argued that the two parties, apart from anti-Semitism, had a lot in common, like railing against exploitation, social injustice, big banks, big corporations, agitating for a social revolution, for a planned economy and adopting underhand, violent methods. Sometimes people with exactly the same social background joined the Arrowcross or the Communist...
Party almost randomly. Endre Rajk (1899-1960), a member of the Arrowcross government from 1944 to 1945, and László Rajk (1909-1949), a communist, a veteran of the Spanish civil war, the interior minister between 1946 and 1948, the victim of a showcase trial based on fabricated charges, were brothers.

When added up, the informal influence, the administrative positions and the intellectual power of the Communist Party was formidable, and their special relationship with the occupying forces made it certain that they were listened to when they decided to speak. Anyway, György Lukács was one of the great philosophers of the twentieth century. But when he was not in one of his aphoristic moods, and was talking about, for example, indefinite objectivity (meghatározatlan tárgyiasság, unbestimmte Gegenständlichkeit) or when he used formulaic Stalinist phrases, he was sometimes less easy to follow. József Révai, on the other hand, saw through complex problems with ease and could come up with razor-sharp arguments on the spot. He even earned the grudging respect of the populists who regarded him as a worthy adversary. Despite the unimpressive 17% nationwide support of the Party, it is evident in hindsight, rather striking in fact, that writers and critics addressed their arguments to Lukács and Révai as if they were presiding judges considering their case. Lukács and Révai, on the other hand, assumed the airs of authority as a matter of course.

Within and without

An obvious consequence of the communist policy and communist police was that though a number of (to be more precise, 189 between 1945 and 1950) Nazi leaders and collaborators were summarily sentenced to death by the people’s tribunals, the de-Nazification of the country could not even start, because de-Nazificaton was mainly seen in terms of blacklisting, firing or interning the staff of the former state bureaucracy, rather than as a process of erecting institutional, constitutional and legal barriers to despotic, authoritarian, autocratic and dictatorial ways of conducting public affairs. When István Bibó (1911-1979), another – perhaps the most – outstanding member of the Peasant Party published an article, in 1945, about the obstacles to the introduction of real democratic measures, the communists, acting offended, disparaged him and belittled his arguments. Lukács described the article in a condescending manner as „superficial” and coming from the „right-wing.” In the absence of a public discussion about the nature of democracy, it may have seemed that the problem with Nazi Germany was not that it was a dictatorship, but that the power was in the wrong hands.

The fact that in his response to Bibó’s article, Lukács dismissed the possibility of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the short run, shows that he did not expect any sudden change in Stalin’s strategy of gradual sovietization. In other words, in 1945, the leadership of the Party guessed, quite mistakenly, that the transitional period of coalition governments might take much longer than a couple of years. After 1949, Lukács would suffer the consequences of this mistake. By attempting to create a broad-based but communist-dominated coalition, by wooing the populists, by letting in their midst people
coming from the direction of the populist writers, they were laying the groundwork for a period of relatively peaceful coexistence with what they thought to be the most influential intellectual force in the country.

In this short period, about three years, there was a great deal of uncertainty – when ‘uncertainty’ usually meant fear – about Stalin’s ultimate intentions. In addition to recruiting true believers and former Arrowcross Party members, it was possible for the Communist Party to grow rapidly because there was a sufficient number of smart renegades, opportunists and turncoats. They figured out early that in the new situation the sooner they declared themselves to have always been communists deep down, the better positions they could aspire to. The careers of Ferenc Erdei and Gyula Ortutay, among others, show that they were right. Despite all the uncertainty others saw, such opportunists were betting on the worst possible scenario for the country. In the meantime, however, the recruitment policy of the Communist Party and the idea of the people’s front lead to a major inside-outside problem.

As literary critics and theoreticians, Lukács and Révai disdained what they saw as bourgeois literature with its isolated self (das isolierte Ich), and had serious misgivings about avant-garde that they associated with the cacophony of the age of imperialism. Apart from envying their supposed popularity and reach, Lukács and Révai had doubts about the populist writers as well, and suspected them of right-wing tendencies. When, however, due to the recruitment policy and their desire to have a broad appeal, the floodgates were raised, it became a little late and rather awkward for the Party ideologues to reject the new adherents’ suspicious views. István Király, who was on government scholarship in Hitler’s Berlin as late as 1944, joined the communists early, acquired the Party jargon in no time, declared himself to be a Marxist, a disciple of Lukács and a follower of Révai at that, and, at the same time, came out in favour of the populist writers, especially László Németh whose name was somewhat unmentionable because of the things he said in 1943, after the defeat of the German army at Stalingrad, about the possible revenge of the Jews after the war.

When at the end of the semi-democratic period all the other parties with their daily newspapers and journals were swept away, the microcosm of the Communist Party, so far as writers and critics are concerned, represented the outside – the bourgeois, social-democrat and populist writers and critics – fairly well. What had been inter-party skirmishes and disputes continued as infra-party faction struggles. Parallel to the gradual sovietization of the country, the external dialogue was becoming an interior monologue. But this was the monologue of a split personality murmuring in different, conflicting voices simultaneously. The Party leadership, as usual, was both stirring up and thriving on such tensions. The populists, still courted, occasionally reproached, were never vindicated, while the hard-liner Stalinists back from Moscow (the so-called Muscovites), never fully rejected, were held on leash.

István Király went on to become one of the half dozen major figures in literary scholarship for the period of socialism. He was the editor (1949-1950, 1953-1956) of
'Csillag' (Star, 1947-1956), first the only, then the leading literary journal after the communist takeover; the editor (1960-1963) of 'Kortárs' (The Contemporary, 1957-), another literary journal; editor of 'Szovjet Irodalom' (Soviet Literature, 1970-1989); the head of departments of literature in Szeged and Budapest; academician from 1970; a member of Parliament between 1971 and 1985 and member of the Central Committee’s various organs after 1956. In 1952, his book on Kálmán Mikszáth the novelist (1847-1910) was awarded the highest prize for literary achievement. Whatever twists of fate history held in store for the country, Király always came out on top. Never disheartened by derision or contempt, he had the rare ability to alter his conviction and allegiance mid-sentence if he sensed a change of wind.

**The preeminence of literature**

Literature, book reviews, criticism, literary history had an outsize role after 1945. Actually, this, or something like this, started earlier. Between the two world wars, under the conditions of censorship, with the freedom of expression severely curtailed in comparison with the entirely free press of the Dual Monarchy, the communists and populists alike, and many people in between, scrutinized each and every literary work in detail for its direct and indirect political content. Reading between the lines, presupposing a significant degree of textual duplicity, was common. Lukács’s articles from the period, written in Moscow, mention the possibility of doublespeak quite often. Almost everybody agreed that literature was more than just literature. For them, literature was, not among others but primarily, or, for some, exclusively, a political statement, some kind of proxy, a coded message or a move in the struggle for power. Since their works were studied meticulously by a lot of people on each side, even by people who could not care less about literature, writers and critics looked upon themselves as the main protagonists in a drama of historic proportions. After 1949 when the turbulent coalition period turned into a straight Stalinist dictatorship, under the watchful and not especially benevolent eyes of the Party leaders who were, in turn, overseen every step of the way by the soviet Big Brother, the stakes were raised and the pursuit of literature suddenly became lethal. Everybody, including the topmost leaders like Révai, dreaded the fateful midnight knock at the door by the secret police. Lukács had a hair’s-breadth escape.

With the emergence of a new type of political police, not entirely different from the Orwellian thought police, another set of restrictions also applied. This was the beginning of what is called self-censorship: some names became unmentionable, certain topics were better avoided as if they had never existed. And this situation remained the same almost up to 1989, the collapse of socialism. The list of unmentionable names and topics changed periodically, but there were always lots of taboos. (And, accordingly, there were restricted areas in the major libraries. The books in the local branches and in the second-hand bookshops were carefully screened.) There was also an enormous gray area of sensitive subjects which could only be discussed and evaluated in public in accordance with the guidelines provided by a handful of literary scholars appointed by the Party to positions of power. It was not unlike the old joke: only a few things are permitted in socialism, but whatever is permitted, is, at the same time, mandatory. The landscape of
literary studies was, in fact, slightly more complex than that. Only occasionally did all the top figures speak in unison and act in a coordinated manner. Usually, there were factions and conflicts, temporary alliances and conflagrations of hostility among them, and it was not in the interest of the Party leadership to let them heal the wounds they inflicted and suffered.

One of the serious wounds, re-opened whenever deemed necessary by the Party leaders, was the decades-old animosity between the populists and the ‘urbanites’ (urbánus). Starting from the early 30s, the word ‘urbanite’ was usually not used in its literal sense but as a substitute or euphemism for ‘Jewish.’ But not all the urbanite writers were Jewish. Attila József (1905-1937), one of the greatest poets of Hungarian literature, a former communist and a former member of a populist organization, sided with the urbanites when the word was out – whichever side started it, most probably the populists – that writers could publish either in populist or in urbanite papers but not in both. After the war, when the derogatory communist connotations of the word ‘bourgeois’ (polgár, polgári) could already be taken for granted, bourgeois sometimes replaced urbanite, still referring to the Jews, in order to denounce them. Since it is always useful to divide in order to conquer, the animosity between the populists and the urbanites was kept alive throughout the period of socialism. Occupying various government and Party posts, the man responsible for cultural affairs after the 60s, György Aczél (1917-1991), always pointed out, whichever side he happened to be talking to, that he was not free in his decisions. He said he had to make concessions to the other side in order to moderate their demands. He was playing with fire, but never in his wildest nightmares could he imagine that socialism would ever come to an end, and the latent anti-Semitism could get out of control again.

In the socialist period, the lack of absolute unity at the top, on the other hand, meant that from time to time interesting developments took place in the cracks among the barons of literary studies. But for the outsiders, for the general public, the toxic rumours and byzantine intrigues whispered in the corridors and offices at the Party headquarter were usually not perceivable. The secrecy that made applied, practical and local Kremlinology indispensable for survival for those in the public sphere even had its own name: it was called ‘party discipline.’

**Paper shortage as cultural policy**

The central allocation of paper was introduced as a temporary measure in 1945. It remained firmly in place almost until 1989. Actually, paper shortage was just a convenient fallback reason for saying ‘no’ to whoever wanted to start their own newspaper, journal or to publish books. At the beginning of the coalition period, all the existing newspapers and journals were automatically terminated, and permission to new ones was granted by the Allied Control Commission, that is, by Voroshilov’s office. It was agreed that the newly established political parties and various other organizations, also permitted by the Commission, were entitled to have their own newspapers. The paper was allocated by Gyula Kállai (1910-1996), a die-hard communist, the head of the
prime minister’s press department. Later, when the periodical press was regulated by the Hungarian authorities, acquiring sufficient quantities of the subsidized printing paper became more important and more difficult, requiring excellent connections, than obtaining the necessary licence, which was often a mere formality after securing an allotment of paper.

During the coalition period, the communist papers like 'Szabad Nép' (Free People), 'Forum', 'Tovább' (Further Ahead), 'Szabadság' (Freedom) always had enough printing paper. They were the exception. The Social Democrats’ 'Népszava' (People’s Voice) and 'Kortárs' (The Contemporary), the Peasant Party’s 'Szabad Szó' (Free Word) and 'Válasz' (Response), the Smallholders’ 'Kis Újság' (Small Paper) had to deal with difficulties all the time, just like other significant papers. The journals 'Világ' (World) and 'Haladás' (Progress) belonged to small parties, 'Polgári Demokrata Párt' (Bourgeois Democratic Party, 76 thousand votes, 1.6 %), and 'Magyar Radikális Párt' (Hungarian Radical Party, five thousand votes, respectively. Other important journals like 'Magyarok' (Hungarians), 'Újhold' (New Moon), 'Valóság' (Reality) were published by various social organizations. 'Magyarok' and 'Újhold' were the best literary journals of the period. A donation of ten American dollars during the hyperinflation after 1945 solved some of the problems of 'Újhold' for some time.

The types of debates. (1) Contemporary writing

The word 'vita' (debate, controversy) started out as a relatively neutral, descriptive word referring to a public discussion. However, after the communist takeover, in expressions like the 'Lukács-debate' or the 'Déry-debate', it sounded more like an abbreviated indictment in a showcase trial. Shamelessly apologetic, the only book-length work on the history literary scholarship in Hungary after 1945, published in 1981, proceeds mostly by going from debate to debate. And there were debates on pessimistic poems, modernism, avant-garde, schematic writing, book reviews, typical characters, realism, socialist realism, socialist culture, socialist morality, socialist taste, heroes of the socialist work contest, socialist book publishing, literary partisanship, cosmopolitanism versus internationalism, sectarianism in literature, petty bourgeois views, young writers, literature as part of the superstructure of society as opposed to its base, the representation of workers and peasants in literature, structuralism, semiotics, hermeneutics and a host of other topics. As if by magic, the forces of socialism proved to be triumphant in all these battles. In the meantime, the word 'debate' ceased to be synonymous with 'death sentence.' The debates then were intended to provide guidelines to what should be established as socialist taste, morality, etc. Later, from the early 70s, whatever appeared in the context of 'debate' increasingly referred to 'something that can give a really bad headache to the cultural leaders of the Party even if they have not heard about it before,' or 'something that should be discussed out of existence' like structuralism, semiotics and hermeneutics.

It is fortunate that the criticism of contemporary writing and literary scholarship parted ways with the 'Déry-debate' in 1952, making it unnecessary to sift through the
widespread consequences of socialist realism, that is, most of the debates mentioned above. Studying the history of how the luckless writers and critics tried to translate, without success, into daily literary practice the vague, loosely defined, incoherent hints concerning socialist realism as the adequate artistic expression of communism is both entertaining and horrifying. Contemporary literature and literary scholarship came into touch again in 1979, only after socialist realism did not even have to be mentioned.

One of the early major debates took place at the first congress of the Hungarian writers in 1946 in Debrecen. The communists just adored such congresses which, like the writers’ union, were destined to become herding devices in the socialist period. The first congress was staged as a courtroom drama with the populist and the urbanite writers as plaintiffs and György Lukács as the judge delivering the verdict.

In his trial opening speech Lukács said that whereas Hungarian literature should be unified and its participants ought to respect each other as parts of the whole, it is sadly fragmented between the populists and the urbanites. Sowing seeds of discord, this was just the perfect introduction to an out-and-out polemic about the negative roles the plaintiffs saw the other side played both between the two world wars and since then. A few years later István Király remarked that at that time the main concern of the Party had been to prevent the various groups of writers from forming a united anti-communist alliance. And succeed they did. Péter Veres, pointing out what he regarded as an obvious obstacle to unity and reconciliation, mentioned that the bourgeois writers labeled István Sinka (1897-1969), Géza Féja (1900-1978), János Kodolányi as fascists and that they demanded punishment for them. In his speech, displaying the well-known solidarity among the populist writers, Veres somehow forgot about the fact that Sinka, Féja and Kodolányi published wildly anti-Semitic pieces in extreme right-wing journals throughout the 30s. Speaking immediately after Péter Veres, Pál Kardos (1900-1971), a literary historian whose parents, wife and child had been victims of the Holocaust, reminded him of the rampant anti-Semitism of the 30s and early 40s in which Sinka, Féja, Kodolányi, Erdélyi were regularly involved. Later, Gyula Illyés talked about the retrograde political and literary role the bourgeoisie played between the wars.

It is less interesting that the populist writers presented their case against the ‘bourgeois’ writers now in quasi-Marxist class-warfare terms and as if they had also been victims instead of perpetrators than the fact that the people at the congress had a foreboding that some form of punishment for those losing their case was a real possibility. Even if they sensed that Lukács was manipulating them, even if they knew that it was Lukács who set them at each other’s throat, they could do nothing because they could not afford to lose their case by turning against the judge. Anyway, it was a clever setup, a crafty stratagem, worthy of a cunning politician. And who was in a position to mete out a punishment? How severe could it be? Being banned from publication? Internment? Imprisonment? Being thrown into outer darkness? Nobody knew the answers and everybody had fears, except Lukács. In his concluding statement, he completely ignored the ‘bourgeois’ writers almost as if they were already unpersons and focussed on the populists. While he had nothing to say about their undeniable anti-Semitism, he presented a nuanced verdict.
The populists, not without fault, should abandon their pessimistic outlook, reservations about the future, as well as their outdated social views and should join the communists in building a new country. What made his uplifting speech, full of positive terms, encouragement and optimism, really scary was that it had no provisions for dissent. Using silence as a weapon, Lukács did not have to utter any threat, or a single word about punishment, still everybody was supposed to understand that there was just no alternative.

This was a clear indication that the communists were willing to turn a blind eye to their past anti-Semitism as long as the populists fell in line. And, at the same time, it shows that the communists expected to remain in power forever, keeping the potentially dangerous anti-Semites under permanent control. Thus, the literary historical treatment of the populist writers was more or less set for the period of socialism. They would always receive some sort of balanced evaluation: on the one hand, they served the cause of the poor and uneducated people and, on the other hand, they made some grave mistakes until they were made to see the error of their ways. It should be noted that this approach, couched entirely in political and social terms, does not say anything about the literary value of their achievement. It is indeed difficult, if at all possible, to disentangle the beauty of Erdélyi’s and Sinka’s poems from their occasionally odious content and invariably repulsive context.

This was not the only possible approach and not everybody appreciated what could be called the communists’ delicate tact and tactical moves. Béla Zsolt (1898-1949), a novelist and journalist, the author of one of the first Holocaust memoirs ‘Kilenc koffer’ (Nine suitcases, 1946), probably referred to by Péter Veres, relentlessly exposed, in his weekly ‘Haladás’ (Progress), without any balancing act, the anti-Semitism of Sinka, Erdélyi, Németh and Illyés. It should be noted, however, that Illyés stopped making anti-Semitic remarks after 1941, published Jewish writers and even offered to shelter some of them during the worst Arrowcross period.

The types of debates. (2) ‘Bourgeois’ literature

The label ‘bourgeois’ literature, when it was used by communists to refer to Hungarian literature between the two world wars, was ill-conceived and misleading. ‘Mainstream’ would be a little better, but it would also suggest that whatever was neither populist, nor communist literature was only one block on an almost equal footing with them. On the contrary, in varieties, quality, importance, legacy, size of production and size of readership, ‘bourgeois’ literature, with its iconic journal ‘Nyugat’ (The West, 1908-1941) was the overwhelmingly most significant part of literature. ‘Nyugat’, never homogeneous and always in opposition to the ruling governments, was so important that very few, if any, person was regarded as a proper writer until she or he managed to publish in it. This was true for the populist and communist writers as well. Its rivals, like ‘Napkelet’ (The East or Sunrise, 1923-1940) which was much closer to the governments, sometimes also excellent, or ‘Új Idők’ (New Times, 1894-1949), with the largest number of readers, were also ‘bourgeois’ or ‘middle class.’ Actually, the communists and the populists were
publicity-seeking minorities in literature, and like all self-righteous, publicity-seeking minorities with a cause and with the implicit feeling of representing the silent majority, they had a strong inclination for sensational, headline-grabbing writing. Even some of the violent anti-Semitic outbursts of the populist group can be seen as publicity stunts aiming to capture the attention – and to shatter the common decency – of the majority of readers.

The use of the words 'bourgeoisie' and 'bourgeois' went from the relatively infrequent and descriptive to the overused and ideologically overloaded after 1945. They were taking on secondary meanings like exploitation, capitalism, imperialism, sometimes even fascism, and thus became synonymous with the worst possible enemy the communists were fighting against. 'Bourgeois' was used with decreasing frequency after 1956, and gradually lost its menacing Stalinist overtones. It usually meant 'outdated and unimportant' and 'no longer relevant.' By the mid-70s, just like 'nép' and 'népi', it was not used any longer, except in Party documents left unread even by Party members. After a short period of intensive political use in the late 90s, when 'bourgeois' was used in positive contexts, standing for the doubleplusgood, now there seems to be an unspoken agreement among politicians not to abuse it again.

It was quite convenient for the communist cultural policy that most of the giants, belonging to the first generation of 'Nyugat,' like Mihály Babits (1883-1941), Dezső Kosztolányi (1885-1936), Zsigmond Móricz (1879-1942), Gyula Krúdy (1878-1933), Frigyes Karinthy (1887-1938) died relatively young, before 1945. It was convenient because they could be declared to belong to the bourgeois past, with no present-day literary relevance whatsoever. It was also convenient because no new role had to be invented for them. True, Milán Füst (1888-1967) and Lajos Nagy (1883-1954) were still around but they were awarded a medal and quietly pushed aside after 1949. The rest of the dinosaurs, that is, those who had published in 'Nyugat,' survived the meteor blast and did not hasten to join the communists, had to eke out a living on an individual basis.

Lukács may have been bruised by a scathing review of Mihály Babits in 1910. He could also be tone-deaf to literary excellence, or its opposite, if he so wished. Whatever the case, a series of articles shows that he decided to lower or deny altogether the value of what he regarded as Hungarian 'bourgeois' literature. He was not alone. Árpád Szabó (1913-2001), an outstanding classical scholar, published an article on Kosztolányi in 'Valóság' (Reality) in 1946. Szabó used words and expressions like 'petty bourgeois,' 'reactionary,' 'decadent,' 'perverted,' 'sick,' 'parasitic' and 'rotten.' Lukács, Szabó and others with similar arguments determined the way Babits, Kosztolányi, Krúdy – or even 'Nyugat' which was, quite unjustly, divested of any progressive role – were treated in literary essays and literary histories for a long time. After 1949, they became unmentionable, except in short denunciations, until about 1956, and then, excluded from the classics, they were at best described as minor major or major minor writers with considerable flaws. In the more relaxed atmosphere of the 80s, when some of the strict guidelines eroded, scholars and critics no longer felt compelled to continually warn the readers of the pitfalls and limitations of 'bourgeois' literature.
It is neither surprising, nor accidental that the best literary journals of the coalition period, 'Magyarok' (Hungarians) and 'Újhold' (New Moon) were not affiliated with any of the political parties but with some otherwise insignificant social organizations and looked upon themselves as the direct descendants of 'Nyugat.' Some of their authors, like János Pilinszky (1921-1981), Sándor Weöres (1913-1989), Géza Ottlik (1912-1990), Ágnes Nemes Nagy (1922-1991), Miklós Szentkuthy (1908-1988), Iván Mándy (1918-1995) produced a huge part of the most valuable literature of the post-war decades. It is also unsurprising that these authors were unwilling to make any concessions to the brutal dictatorship that followed the coalition period. Given their uncompromisingly non-political stance in literary matters, they were allowed to publish again only after 1956.

By now, both communist and populist literature seem to be defunct or, as one of the ironies of history, they are 'no longer relevant.' The pendulum is still on its way back from the intensive political reading of literary works. First and foremost, it was the expectation of readers that has done away with them and has re-established the heterogeneous literary legacy of 'Nyugat.'

The types of debates. (3) Things to keep mum about

Not only in his life but after his death as well, Attila József proved to be a thorn in the side of the communists. Although poets and critics knew, long before 1945, that he was one of the finest poets of Hungarian literature, the communists could only deal with him as a part of their necessarily restricted and strongly biased party political worldview. During the coalition period, among the communists it was most probably only Márton Horváth (1906-1987), Révai’s right-hand man and the editor of the Party daily 'Szabad Nép,' who knew that Attila József was a great poet quite apart from any political considerations. Other communists could never forgive that, when ostracized from the Party, instead of being terminally crushed, Attila József went over to the Social Democrats. This story, constantly lied about for decades, to be re-discovered and exposed only with the waning of socialism, was shrouded in secrecy. It was not accidental that Iván Horváth, (1948-), the son of Márton Horváth and a distinguished literary scholar of old Hungarian literature, played an important role in rectifying the story. Beginning in the coalition times, the name of Attila József and the poems of his communist period were mercilessly exploited for propaganda purposes. József Révai, expanding some of Lukács’s casual remarks, even invented a revolutionary triad consisting of Sándor Petőfi (1823-1949), Endre Ady (1877-1919) and Attila József as the mainstream of Hungarian poetry. Also seen as a Hegelian triad of thesis, antithesis and synthesis, this fiction, the only permissible approach to the history of Hungarian poetry until the early 80s, did an enormous disservice not only to all the other great poets, but to the members of the triad as well.

There was also a group of significant writers who became unmentionable to various degrees in different periods because they fled the communists. Although Arthur Koestler (1905-1983), the author of the novel Darkness at Noon (1940) left Hungary earlier, he
remained in touch with Hungarian writers. Actually, he wrote a nice obituary of Attila József as a friend and as fellow ex-communist. Koestler was strictly unmentionable.

The novelist Sándor Márai (1900-1989) left Hungary in 1948. He made it known that his books could not be published in Hungary as long as the country was occupied by the Russians. Until the late 80s, the old editions of his books could only be purchased in second-hand bookshops in secret.

György Faludy (1910-2006), Győző Határ (1914-2006), Béla Szász (1910-1999), leaving Hungary in 1956 after years of imprisonment and torture, also became unmentionable.

Although much less significant but much better known than these writers, quite like Koestler, György Mikes or George Mikes (1912-1987), the author of *How to Be an Alien* (1946), a comic writer representing the same old Hungarian tradition in humor as Karinthy and Királyhegyi, was also unacceptable for the Hungarian authorities.

Béla Hamvas (1897-1968), a novelist and a philosopher, did not leave Hungary but should be mentioned here. Forced into retirement from his job as a librarian and banned from publishing in 1949, he spent more than a decade as an unskilled laborer, a storeroom hand, far away from Budapest, while writing literature, literary theory, philosophy and translating from Sanskrit, Hebrew and Greek.

There is an interesting Hungarian word: ’agyonhallgatni.’ Literally it means ’to cause one’s death by remaining silent about him or her’ but it is always used to refer to an attempt – that can be foiled by the use of the word itself – to suppress somebody or something that should be talked about. Had it been up to the communists alone, death-by-silence would have been the fate of Koestler, Márai, Faludy, Határ, Szász, Mikes, Hamvas and others. But the attempt suppress them was not to succeed. Határ and Mikes could be heard on Radio Free Europe all the time, occasionally even Faludy and Márai made appearances, and ’Minden kényszer nélkül’ (Without Any Compulsion, 1963), the shocking memoirs of Szász, one of the countless Hungarian Counts of Monte Cristo, was serialized and repeated in reruns several times. The reputation of Hamvas, on the other hand, grew by word of mouth.

**The types of debates. (4) Lukács the intolerant**

In 1946, in his attack on the journal ’Újhold,’ Lukács stated that in the radically new situation those who wished to renew the poetics of the ivory tower and disconnect literature from everyday reality were against the democratic development of the country. The deceptive and formulaic Stalinist language needs translation. The expression „democratic development” means „sovietization,” „poetics of the ivory tower” means „unsuitable for class-warfare purposes” and „radically new situation” means „now that the communists have some real power and cannot be stopped from having more.” When read this way, it must be conceded that Lukács was right: the authors of ’Újhold’ were not keen on the sovietization of the country, did not produce political poetry and did not
seek the approval of the communist potentates. Young and unfamiliar with Stalinist language, not particularly interested in what politicians were talking about, not hearing the klaxon going off, Balázs Lengyel (1918-2007), the editor of the journal, simply shrugged off what Lukács said. He thought that, right or wrong, everybody, including Lukács, can have their opinion. He did not realize that Lukács had just issued a death warrant for the journal, suspended until the communist takeover. Ottó Major (1924-1999) an even younger contributor to the journal, had the cheeks to reply that intolerant vulgar Marxists, out of touch with contemporary literature, subordinated aesthetic judgement to their political and tactical purposes and, on top of all, Lukács had a conservative taste combined with avant-garde zeal. Major probably did not know at the time how fortunate he was to survive that he was rude, insolent – and right. He got lucky because the communist takeover coincided with Lukács’s fall from grace. Personally, Lukács was probably not vindictive. He did not have to be. Bullying and revenge was performed by people in another department. It was another twist of fate or another irony of history that Lukács also lost his journal ’Forum’ in 1949.

This type of debate, let alone impertinence, questioning the authority of the Marxist ideologues to pass judgement on everything they found disagreeable and denying the validity of the communist dogmas, was infrequent. The editors of other journals, older and more experienced than Lengyel, were a lot more cautious and they knew that printing paper was a precious commodity. However, despite all their caution, all the papers and journals, except those of the communists, were terminated in 1949.

**Lukács at peril**

In 1949, after the communist takeover, Lukács had to worry about his own life. László Rajk, a member of the government, was arrested in May, 1949. He was tried, convicted and executed for treason five months later. He was exonerated of all the fabricated charges in 1956. Only one or two months after his arrest, articles with ominous allusions to the case of Rajk were published against Lukács as well. A survivor of the Moscow showcase trials, having spent some time in the infamous Lubyanka prison, Lukács knew all about warning signals. It was obvious that he had to write a response to László Rudas (1885-1950), a crude and shrewd Stalinist hard-liner, who accused him of anti-Marxism, of disparaging Lenin and underestimating Soviet literature. The ritual communist apology, the self-flagellation, was called ’self-criticism.’ Although Lukács was convinced that the charges against him were rubbish, the fact that Rudas was allowed to publish his attack in the ideological journal of the Party ’Társadalmi Szemle’ (Social Review) was a clear indication that some form of ’self-criticism’ could not be avoided. In one of his letters to Révai, Lukács was speaking of a potential ’death sentence’ against him.

With the life of Lukács hanging in the balance, with our surge of sympathy for him, it would only be natural to regard his views as more justifiable than those of his Stalinist opponent. However, at that moment in history, both Lukács and Rudas were Stalinists pure and simple. Their main difference was that they had belonged to different factions within the Party between the two world wars. His diatribes against avant-garde, against
contemporary non-political poetry, against such 'bourgeois' classics as Babits and Kosztolányi and his overestimation of the populist writers show that the coalition times were one of Lukács’s worst periods when he did not let his sense of quality counteract the immediate political concerns of his Party. Only after long years out of power and in the decompression chamber of the post-Stalin world, could he abandon some of the worst aspects of mixing raw political arguments into considerations of literature.

After two rounds of abusive self-criticism, that is, after his full and unconditional surrender, when he had to lavish praise on insignificant soviet socialist realist novels and had to talk about the remarkable humanism of Lenin, finally Lukács was allowed to live. He could even keep his membership in the Academy.

Márton Horváth and József Révai played decisive roles in pushing him to self-criticism. Beside them, among others, two young literary scholars, István Király and Pál Pándi, were eager to display their Stalinist credentials by joining the campaign against Lukács. However, Király and Pándi would put the questionable achievements of Lukács’s Stalinist period to their own good use only a few years later.

Pándi went on to become another despot of literary scholarship for the period of socialism. A survivor of the Nazi death camps, he was a university professor from 1949; the head of a literature department in Szeged, 1960-1961; the head of the Budapest 19th century department from 1967, an academician from 1973, one of the editors of the Party daily ’Szabad Nép,’ 1955-1956; one of the editors of the new Party daily after 1956 ’Népszabadság’ 1967-1971, 1982-1985. In tandem with Király, Pándi used Lukács’s arguments according to which a ‘great poet’ had to be at the same time a ‘social revolutionary.’ Pándi always remained faithful to this type of orthodox Marxism.

For about a decade after 1956, Pándi had not only the ear of György Aczél, but was a close friend of István Király and Miklós Szabolcsi. The three of them represented the revolutionary triad invented by Révai. Pándi had Sándor Petőfi, Király had Endre Ady and Szabolcsi had Attila József. The friendship with Szabolcsi broke up when Szabolcsi deviated from the strict Marxist line and made concessions to avant-garde and structuralism in the mid-60s. The friendship with Király ended abruptly when in a heavy bout of drinking, Király said something about Pándi’s Jewish oversensitivity.

Ousting the academicians

The Hungarian word 'tudomány,' resembling the German 'Wissenschaft,' refers to both the humanities and the natural sciences. Thus, the name of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences may be a little misleading in an English context. Actually, the various natural science departments were later additions to what had been conceived of as a linguistic and literary establishment.

In 1949, after the communist takeover, the Academy underwent a major overhaul. Before 1949, it counted as a distinction, a recognition of outstanding scholarly achievement, to
be elected a member of the Academy. The members enjoyed certain privileges, but had no extensive power over their respective fields. After 1949, with its own five years’ plan, supervised both by the Party and the government, the Academy became an organ of the state, responsible for the ideological and scientific (scholarly) direction and control of the sciences and humanities.

One of the first acts of the new Academy was to re-organize the department to which the literary scholars belonged. This meant, and that was the whole point of the reorganization, that the membership of everybody was discontinued. Only a few of them, like Gábor Tolnai and János Horváth, were re-appointed again. János Horváth (1878-1961), generally regarded as one of the greatest Hungarian literary scholars, arguably the greatest ever, was allowed to keep his membership. However, he never set foot in the new Academy. Dezső Keresztury lost his membership in 1949 but was re-elected in 1973. The resolution about the expulsions was rescinded in 1989 but only Keresztury lived long enough to learn about it. Thus, he had two academicianships, not only consecutively but simultaneously as well.

The Institute of Literary Studies

From the late 50s, a non-teaching research establishment of the Academy, the Institute of Literary Studies, became one of the most important centres of literary scholarship beside the universities in Budapest, Szeged, Debrecen (and later Pécs) and the literary archives (called 'Petőfi Irodalmi Múzeum,' Petőfi Literary Museum). Founded in 1956, following the model of the Soviet Academy, the Institute of Literary Studies (called, at that time, the Institute of Literary History) came into being due to the efforts of Tibor Klaniczay. The idea of such an institute first came up when the Academy was re-organized. Then the idea was given an extended consideration in the appropriate committees and subcommittees. In other words, it was lost for years in the bureaucratic quagmire with nobody daring or willing to risk a decision. But Klaniczay had fears about the status of his own field of research, Hungarian renaissance and baroque literature. On the one hand, Latinists, once provided in sufficient numbers by the Catholic church, became an endangered species. On the other hand, old Hungarian literature was much less weaponizable for political purposes than contemporary, early 20th or 19th century literature. Some scholars even suggested that researching, teaching and learning old Hungarian literature was simply superfluous in socialist times. Klaniczay, however, was a genius of networking and organizing. After finding a suitable building, a potential director with considerable political clout and a perfect Party secretary for the Institute, somehow he managed to achieve that exactly the right person sent an indignant and threatening memo about the lack of due diligence, which compromised what the Party had already decided, to the right people in the Party, Ministry and Academy. This did the trick, a decision about the new institute was prepared for the government to accept. The Institute was housed in the building of "Eötvös József Collegium," with István Sötér (1913-1988) as director, Tibor Klaniczay as deputy director and Lajos Nyírő (1921-2014) as Party secretary. (Each and every workplace had to have a Party cell and a Party
secretary. They were key players, the local strongmen of the Party.) As it happens, choosing 'Eötvös József Collegium' as the venue was not entirely accidental.

The 'Collegium' was founded by the physicist Loránd Eötvös (1848-1919) in order to honor the memory of his father József Eötvös (1813-1871), a novelist, philosopher and politician, minister of culture and education, 1848, 1867-1871. The 'Collegium' was based on the model of the French École Normale Supérieur and it produced an amazing number of brilliant linguists and literary scholars. It is hard to tell whether they produced two thirds, three quarters or perhaps even more of Hungarian literary scholarship after 1945.

In 1950, when excellence was no longer a requirement in a teacher-training facility, the 'Collegium' was discontinued. The building was turned into a dormitory, the huge library, although it remained in place, was taken over by the Academy. Thus, it was only natural for Sőtér and Klaniczay, both of them former members of the 'Collegium,' to start the new Institute of the Academy in the building they knew so well. The new director and deputy director were later joined by other members of the 'Collegium': György Bodnár (1927-2008), Elemér Hankiss (1928-2015), Lajos Hopp (1927-1996), Károly Horváth (1909-1995), László Illés (1928-2012), József Kiss (1923-1992), András Martinkó (1912-1989), Pál Miklós (1927-2002), Péter Nagy, G. Béla Németh (1925-2008), József Szaunder (1917-1975), József Szili (1929-), Andor Tarnai (1925-1994) and György Mihály Vajda (1914-2001).

Even before the 'Collegium' was terminated, some of its brightest students were expelled in humiliating circumstances. More than a decade later two of them, Elemér Hankiss and Béla G. Németh, in whose expulsions Pál Pándi played the most significant role, made their glorious comebacks. Not only were they employed by the Institute and re-united with the library of their youth but were to have a major impact on Hungarian literary scholarship.

The director of the Institute of Literary Studies, István Sőtér, was the son-in-law of Dezső Jász (1897-1981), a powerful bolshevik military figure. Sőtér was a university professor in Szeged, 1948-1952; the head of a department of literature at the Budapest university, 1953-1963; the rector of the university, 1953-1956, 1963-1966; an academician from 1955; the deputy minister of education in 1956; the president of AILC, 1970-1973. He had various posts in his life, but always looked upon the Institute as his personal fiefdom and protected it against all outside attacks.

The Party secretary of the Institute, Lajos Nyíró worked as a miner in France before 1945. He studied French and Russian literature at the Budapest university between 1947 and 1948. Then he studied at Sverdlovsk University in the Soviet Union between 1948 and 1951. Armed with such an impeccable CV, he proved to be a key figure, a shield, for the Institute. In contrast to other Party secretaries who went week at the knees when summoned to the Party headquarters for a dressing-down, in a debate Nyíró, demonstrating the superiority of Soviet education, could quote Lenin, in Russian if
necessary, more extensively than any Party bureaucrat. From 1959 to 1988, he was the head of the department of literary theory at the Institute. Far from being anti-soviet or anti-communist, he just thought that the framework of socialist realism was unnecessarily restrictive and that an adequate literary theory should accommodate avant-garde or Russian formalism. Both of these went far beyond what was permissible even in the mid-60s.

The weakening of Stalinism

The bulk of literary studies of this period is little more than Stalinist propaganda. Some of the books show that the penetration of Marxist doctrines remained superficial. Since Marxism was limited to social issues and had nothing to say about literary tropes and figures, about literary language in general, huge and important areas were left untouched by the Marxist slogans. Stylistic analysis, the argumentation in literary biographies, the way of establishing literary facts showed a deep continuity with the conceptions and methods of positivism and Geistesgeschichte. It is not easy to believe but some of the books published in the 50s, or at least some parts of some of the books, are still quoted and are still relevant. István Sőter’s book on József Eötvös, Tibor Klániczay’s book on Miklós Zrínyi are among them. Although it is hard, if not impossible to decide how much of the Stalinist verbiage was meant to fool the censors and how much of it was intended seriously, reading such books is not entirely unrewarding and separating the perfunctory ideological statements from serious scholarship is not that difficult. László Sziklai’s book on Imre Gáspár, a semi-forgotten late 19th century poet and journalist, is another example of outstanding scholarship. Thus, even the worst years were not without lasting achievements.

The erosion of Stalinism in literary studies started in the late 50s when, as opposed to a narrow conception of revolutionary literature as the mainstream, a much wider canon of Hungarian literature became gradually available. The publication of the collected works of Gyula Krúdy, for example, started immediately after 1956. Any such project was unthinkable even a few years earlier. Each addition to the wider canon chipped away the hegemony and credibility of the revolutionary mainstream. Also, this was one of the ways how banishing literary scholars from the academic life of universities to museums, libraries and publishing houses struck back.

One of the tasks of the new Institute of Literary Studies was, after various, half-way abandoned attempts by a number of teams, to produce an authoritative, multi-volume history of Hungarian literature. Organizing and coordinating the contributions of dozens of literary scholars is as satisfying as herding cats. In addition, a great deal of diplomatic skill was also needed to strike a balance between the potentates of literary studies. For example, Pál Pándi who could have become one of the most ardent critics of the finished work was invited from the university to edit one of the volumes. Finally, the six thick volumes were published between 1964 and 1966.

As an achievement, this particular literary history is less than impressive. There are enormous differences of quality and conception between the chapters and volumes. There
is, for example, a long and informative chapter about the periodical press (newspapers and journals) in the third quarter of the 19th century. Since all the newspapers and journals had a literary section with a short story or a poem in each issue, and the number of periodicals doubled every decade, by the turn of the century the periodical press, especially the daily newspapers, was the place where literature happened. However, this all-important consideration is almost completely missing from the volume that deals with the turn of the century literature. The strange incongruity of the volumes is quite obvious. But apart from such mistakes, this history of Hungarian literature was old-fashioned, almost obsolete, the moment it appeared. The chapters dealing with individual authors attempted to derive the features of literature from authorial intentions, character traits, psychological insights, biographical facts in an authentic 19th century manner as if Russian formalism, Czeck and French structuralism, American new criticism had not taken place.

Roughly at the same time the literary history was being written, the Department of literary theory at the same Institute was busy adapting the various schools of structuralism. Although it was much too late for the literary history, the appearance of structuralism proved to be a decisive turning point for Hungarian literary scholarship. This was the moment when Lajos Nyírő and Elemér Hankiss played a crucial part. *Kritika*, a new journal of the Institute, devoted to a considerable degree to structuralism, became immensely popular. Hankiss produced a series of articles which that demonstrated how structuralist methods can be used in the analysis of poetic language, that is, in an area in which Marxist literary theory was completely unprepared and defenseless. Hankiss cited western scholars as if it was only natural and not a hanging offense. These articles also showed in an undirect manner that while Hungarian literary scholars were attempting to unite old fashioned stylistic and literary historical ideas with various Marxist doctrines, the rest of the world was engaged in different literary theoretical ideas. The wake-up call shattered the Hungarian literary scholars’ complacency. By the time the two-volume collection of international structuralist articles edited by Elemér Hankiss was published in 1971, it was already generally accepted that a thorough knowledge of the new interpretive ideas and methods was indispensable for any kind of literary scholarship. In a brief period, from the mid-60s to the beginning of the 70s, Hungarian literary scholarship was fundamentally transformed. This was possible because the academicians István Sőtér, Tibor Klaniczay, Miklós Szabócs, and Lajos Nyíró, the Institute’s Party secretary, were in a position to provide some protection.

After the Czechoslovak reform movement was crushed in 1968, there was a minor Ice Age in the socialist camp. The Stalinist old guard felt emboldened to try to eradicate any deviations from the Party line. In Hungary, it was Pál Pándi who organized a resistance to the new literary theoretical developments commonly referred to as structuralism. The journal *Kritika* was taken away from the Institute of Literary Studies and given to Pándi. He commissioned a series of articles to be published in the new *Kritika* against Hankiss and structuralism. It is remarkable, however, that the new editors of *Kritika* did not find any first-rate or even second-rate literary scholars to denigrate Hankiss and structuralism. They had to be contented with mediocre outsiders. At the height of the attacks, Lajos
Nyirő opened the Party’s daily newspaper *Népszabadság* every morning expecting news about measures taken against the Department of literary theory or even against the Institute. In his worst nightmare the Institute as a whole was discontinued. Finally, Pándi arranged that the Central Committee’s Cultural Policy Subcommittee issued a lengthy resolution that sharply criticized the activities of Elemér Hankiss, Endre Bojtár (1940-), ridiculed all forms of structuralism and reinstated orthodox Marxism. The resolution, especially when it speaks of the spread of structuralism, betrays fear and helplessness.

The effect of the resolution was paradoxical. The threat clearly worked. The word structuralism disappeared for years even from the books and articles that were close to it. On the other hand, literary scholars understood that the integration of whatever was new and exciting in structuralism into a Marxist framework was no longer possible. That marked the end of Marxism. After the resolution no literary scholar of any calibre, except the Stalinist academicians and one or two careerists, advocated Marxism in public. And nobody criticized structuralism either, even though it was widely known that there were people who, employing the insights made possible by the new interpretive methods, were unhappy with some of the fundamental statements of structuralism. They refrained from criticizing structuralism because, on the one hand, they thought it was the lesser evil, and, on the other hand, they did not want to create the impression that they were acting in accordance with the Party resolution. That would have been most embarrassing.

The attacks against structuralism, or the ‘structuralist debate’ as it was euphemistically called, was the second time the paths of Pál Pándi and Elemér Hankiss crossed. The first time Pándi had Hankiss kicked out of Eötvös Collegium, the second time he made him abandon literary scholarship for good. Hankiss started a new and highly successful career in sociology and published a number of excellent books.

In 1974, the Institute of Literary Studies started a new journal, *Literatura*, to fill in the void left behind by *Kritika*. As a message of defiance to the old guard, the first issue of Literatura carried an article by Hankiss who had already left the Institute. The new journal, however, was intended for literary critics and scholars, and never became as popular as *Kritika* used to be. This was a price the Institute had to pay for continuing what was started in the early 60s. And even the word ‘structuralism’ came back triumphantly when Endre Bojtár published the Hungarian version of his *Slavic Structuralism* in 1978.

The erosion of Marxism was unstoppable. Those who aspired for a membership in the Academy still had to join the Party before their case was considered but well-known non-Marxists, like G. Béla Németh (1925-2008), were accepted without any fuss.

The next enormous blow came at the end of the 70s, beginning of the 80s, when a group of young scholars consisting of Endre Bojtár, Iván Horváth, László Szőrényi (1945-), Mihály Szegedy-Maszák (1943-2016), András Veres (1945-), Ferenc Zemplényi (1943-2004) produced new literary textbooks for the secondary schools (ages 14 to 18). Zsigmond Ritoók (1929-), a classical scholar, joined them in the first book. The
textbooks, literary histories and readers, were based on the wide canon of both Hungarian and world literature and avoided the Marxist keywords. The Stalinist academicians, although not in a position to question the excellence of the books, were outraged and put aside their considerable differences to condemn them. They wanted to cancel the books but their dwindling power and respectability did not let them prevent the introduction of the new textbooks. All they could achieve was that the fourth book, the last one in the series, was never written.

It is quite symbolic that members of the same group, except Zemplényi, wrote articles about Péter Esterházy’s new novel in the same issue of Mozgó Világ in 1979. This was the first time since the communist takeover that serious scholarship was involved in the interpretation of outstanding contemporary literature.

The intellectual power of the group was beyond question. They became, except Zemplényi, heads of various literary departments. László Szörényi served as the director of the Institute of Literary Studies. Although they all had the potential, only Mihály Szegedy-Maszák and Zsigmond Ritoók were elected academicians after the collapse of socialism.

The last decade of socialism witnessed the final weakening of Marxism. Whereas Marxists in the West regularly updated their ideas under the influence of the new literary theoretical developments, members of the old guard in Hungary wanted to preserve Stalinism, even if they did not call it Stalinism, in pristine order. Everybody else recognised that no serious literary research could be carried out without knowledge of the new French, American, British and German literary theoretical developments and the major journals accepted pieces without any lip service to any of the Marxist doctrines. When Gábor Bonyhai (1941-1996) translated Hans-Georg Gadamer’s Truth and Method in 1984, and later introduced reception aesthetics, members of the old guard were quite unhappy but their reaction did not even come close to the ferocity of the Structuralist scandal.

Thus, there was no collective sigh of relief in Hungarian literary studies when socialism collapsed in 1989. There was no new beginning and no heads rolled. Business went on as usual. The transition that started long before the collapse was so imperceptibly smooth that nobody stooped to criticize the surviving Stalinists. They were even allowed to die as members of the Academy. The universities provided new textbooks and compiled new readers, the adaptation of whatever accumulated in the West has been in full gear, even if the novelty of it has somewhat worn off.

Conclusions

From positivism and Geistesgeschichte via Stalinism, Marxism and structuralism to poststructuralism: the paths Hungarian literary studies have taken since 1945 seem fairly obvious, almost pre-determined. The nouns in the first sentence – and one might add quite a few others like Freudism, formalism, reception aesthetics, dialogism,
deconstruction, post-colonialism – do not refer to intellectual movements that gently and gradually evolved into one another in the course of time. Rather, they reached Hungary fully formed, and existed there side by side. The state of being close together, however, can bring about peaceful coexistence through negligence and ignorance just like interaction through experimental combinations as well as interaction through tension and conflict. A consecutive pattern of the theoretical possibilities realized in real time yields the story of literary studies in Hungary.

The first period, 1944 to 1948, was extraordinary in a number of respects. The end of the war, the promise of a new beginning free from the taboos and restrictions of the earlier period and, in equal measure, the inherent uncertainty of the country’s situation (that is, the question whether and when the Soviet occupation would end) inspired frantic efforts both in literature and in literary criticism. Although literary studies were confined to the few daily newspapers and literary journals, and the topics included only contemporary and early 20th century literature, a new generation of literary scholars came forward. Some of them would become the dominant figures of the socialist period.

The original ambivalence was radically simplified by the communist takeover in 1948. Strict Stalinism reigned for a number of years, almost a decade. Under the surface, however, despite all the Marxist slogans and declarations, there was an unadvertised but inevitable continuity with the practice of literary history and literary criticism of earlier periods. Since there were no Marxist guidelines for some of the literary scholars main activities, for example biography and stylistic analysis, they were carried out according to the norms and standards established earlier.

The whole socialist period can be described as the gradual weakening of the initial Stalinism. After the strict Stalinism, from the late 50s, although the mainstream of Hungarian literature was still decreed to be the revolutionary triad of Sándor Petőfi, Endre Ady and Attila József, the canon of literary works published and discussed expanded significantly. The wider canon silently but steadily undermined the narrow Stalinist interpretation of Hungarian literary history.

When, in the mid-60s, structuralism hit Hungary, it had an immediate sobering effect on literary scholars and critics alike. It became obvious that while they spent almost two decades trying to unite old-fashioned stylistic and literary historical ideas with Stalinist dogmas, the rest of the world was fascinated by fundamentally different things. Awakened from their dogmatic slumbers, a number of scholars and critics attempted to integrate structuralist methods into various Marxist frameworks. The lingering hard-line Stalinists, however, banned all forms of structuralism in a Central Committee-level resolution in the early 70s. But this only marked the end of a period. Marxism, ever reverting to Stalinism, with nothing new or exciting to offer for the literary scholars and critics, lost its intellectual appeal. After the resolution, only the remaining Stalinists academicians and a few well-known careerists advocated Marxism in public. Even structuralism came back a few years later and the scandal of structuralism paved the way for other developments (e.g., reception aesthetics, deconstruction) in literary theory.
The next blow for Stalinism came at the end of the 70s, beginning of the 80s. A group of young scholars produced new textbooks for the secondary schools (ages 14 to 18). Their textbooks were built on the wide canon, showed the influence of new interpretive methods and admitted hardly any Marxist keywords. The united front of the Stalinist academicians was outraged but their dwindling power and respectability did not let them prevent the new textbooks from being introduced.

The last decade of socialism saw the acceleration of these processes. It was universally recognised that no serious literary research could be carried out without the knowledge of the new French, American, British and German literary theoretical developments and the major journals accepted pieces without any lip service to any of the Marxist doctrines.

Thus, there was no collective sigh of relief in Hungarian literary studies when socialism collapsed in 1989. There was no new beginning and no heads rolled. Business went on as usual. The transition that started long before the collapse was so imperceptibly smooth that nobody stooped to criticize the surviving Stalinists. They were even allowed to die as members of the Academy. The universities provided new textbooks and compiled new readers, the adaptation of whatever accumulated in the West has been in full gear, even if the novelty of it has somewhat worn off.
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